CHAPTER-II

CLASSICAL MARXISTS' PERSPECTIVES ON STATE

PREAMBLE:

"Theory of State" is indeed a "Theory of Statelessness", is not a mere tautology. This apparent contradiction in terms is the goal of classical Marxist epistemology and politics. Marxian theory supports the idea that the State, understood as a means for organizing class domination, can pass away for want of classes to dominate and be dominated. The State power which is the national war-engine of capital against labour is to ultimately "whither away", with the emergence of "Proletarian Dictatorship". Society which will reorganize production on the basis of a free and equal association of the producers, will put the whole machinery of state where it will then belong, into the museum of antiquities, by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe. The State power, which assumed more and more the character of national power of Capital over labour, a public force organized for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism, and which state power after every revolution marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, stood
out with its purely repressive character in bolder and bolder relief, would with the final emergence of a classless society, be relegated to the limbo of antiquity. Hence the origin and demise of the state need to be analysed in all its ramifications in understanding the relevance of the state in the process of history. This chapter undertakes this arduous and tortuous task of the critique of the state by focussing its attention on the views of the classical Marxists. We propose to study Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, V.I.Lenin, Joseph Stalin, Mao Tse-tung and Trotsky during our discussion regarding the state here.

MARX'S VIEWS:

There are certain hindrances and handicaps in the study of the perspectives presented by Karl Marx regarding the state. Karl Marx, the founding father of materialist interpretation of history, did not work out any systematic and formally complete theory of State. Marx was not a system builder nor his marxism a positivist science. And it needs to be remembered that his theoretical work is, in a most important sense, 'an unfinished project'. So much of what Marx expressly wished to write to ensure a clearer or fuller understanding of his ideas for example, on philosophy (Hegel), or political theory (the State), or at least 'two or three printer's sheets' on method...
There is no doubt that the Marxian theory of state has been generally neglected in the Social Sciences. As Marx himself never attempted a systematic analysis of the state, the enunciation of the Marxist Theory of State becomes a much more arduous task. However a comprehensive look at one of Marx's early writings, Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of the State (1843), which is in large part concerned with the state; his other works, notably his historical writings, for instance, Class Struggles (1850), 18th Brumaire (1852) and Civil War in France (1871), where this subject occupies an important place; and his journalistic writings, provide an insight into the understanding of the theory of the state as he would have perhaps, propounded. Apart from these, the Communist Manifesto (1848), On The Jewish Question (1843), The Holy Family (1845), The German Ideology (1846) contain important references to the state. Frederick Engels also refers to the state in many of his writings but more importantly in Origin of The Family, Property and the State (1894) and in Anti-Duhring (1878).

Before we probe into the great and massive writings of Karl Marx on state, it is worthwhile having a glimpse of the 'man' in 'Marx', as this would provide an insight into the purpose of his writings.
A clue to his view of State lies in the epigram "The starting point of religion is God. Hegel's starting point was the State. Marx's was Man." What is fascinating is that Marx evinced interest in the state along with philosophy, nature and law at the very early age of nineteen years. In a letter (written from Berlin) to his father, Marx wrote, "There are moments in one's life which are like frontier posts marking the completion of a period but at the same time clearly indicating a new direction.....Poetry however, could be and had to be only an accompaniment. I had to study Law and above all, felt the urge to wrestle with Philosophy.....I translated first two books of Pandect into German, and on the other hand tried to elaborate a philosophy of law covering the whole field of law.....Here, above all, the same question between what is and what ought to be, which is characteristic of idealism, stood out as a serious defect and was the source of the hopelessly incorrect division of the subject matter.....From the outset an obstacle to grasping the truth here was the unscientific form of mathematical dogmatism, ..... in the concrete expression of a living world of ideas, as exemplified by law, the state, nature and philosophy as a whole, the object itself must be studied in its development, arbitrary divisions must not be introduced, the rational character of the object itself must develop as something imbued with contradictions in itself and find its unity in itself. ..... The concept is
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indeed the mediating link between form and content. In a
philosophical treatment of law, therefore, the one must
arise in the other, indeed the form should only be the
continuation of the content....I had read fragments of
Hegel's Philosophy, the grotesque craggy melody of which
did not appeal to me. Once more I wanted to dive into the
sea, but with the definite intention of establishing that
the nature of mind is just as necessary, concrete and
firmly based as the nature of the body. My aim was no
longer to practise tricks of swordsmanship, but to bring
genuine pearls into the light of the day." Even as Marx
read Hegel's Philosophy he found it comically distorted,
ludicrous from incongruity and absurd and earnestly desired
to dive and bring "genuine pearls" of wisdom into the
"light of the day" from the deep sea of philosophical
knowledge. State was already a part of this great design
of Marx and he had indeed passed through the School of the
'great thinker' Hegel, but had nevertheless overturned and
de-mystified the dialectic, while extracting its rational
core.

The journalistic writings of young Marx in the
early forties illustrate his development as a political
tribune, a revolutionary democrat and a resolute critic of
the existing social and political system. It was in active
journalistic work, in political struggle against the whole
conservative and obselete Establishment that the young Marx
saw the way to integrating advanced philosophy with life. From the point of view of the development of Marx's theories, his early journalistic writings\textsuperscript{14} are important for two main reasons. In his sharp attacks on the Censorship Law he spoke out unequivocally for the freedom of the press, against the levelling effect of government restriction ("you don't expect a rose to smell like a violet; why then should the human spirit, the richest thing we have, exist only in a single form?") and also expressed views concerning the whole nature of the state and the essence of freedom. Pointing out that the vagueness and ambiguity, of the Press Law placed arbitrary power in the hands of officials, Marx went on to argue that censorship was contrary not only to the purposes of the Press, but to the nature of the state, as such.\textsuperscript{15}

"The Press in general is a realisation of human freedom. Consequently, where is a press there is freedom of the press... True, in the land of censorship the state has no freedom of the press, but one organ of the state has it, viz, the government."\textsuperscript{16}

"What a difference a Judge and a Censor! The Censor has no law but his superiors. The Judge has no superiors but the law."\textsuperscript{17}

"You know what it means to be a slave, but you
have never yet tried freedom to know whether it is sweet or not. For if you have tried it, you would have advised us to fight for it, not merely with spears but also with axes."18

"The essence of free press is the rational essence of freedom in its fullest character. A censored press is a thing without a backbone, a vampire of slavery, a civilized monstrosity, a scented freak of nature. Is there any further need to prove that freedom is in accordance with the essence of the press, and that censorship is contrary to it?"

"Censorship like, slavery, can never be rightful, even though it existed a thousand times in the form of laws".

"Censorship is contrary to the very nature of law and of the state, for a free press is an indispensable condition of a state fulfilling its own nature; it is embodied civilization, the individuals link with the state, a mirror of the people".

In this argument, Marx distinguishes the 'real' law and the state, those which correspond to their own proper nature, from laws and institutions which are maintained by police methods but are only binding in an
external sense. This distinction belongs to the Hegelian tradition: a state and a law which are not the realization of freedom are contrary to the very concept of state and law and are not truly, such, even though upheld by force. Marx, however, unlike Hegel, denies that freedom of speech and writing can be limited by the overriding interest of the 'true' state, since he claims that this freedom is an essential part of the concept of a state. Marx asserts that the freedom of diversity is an essential human value which carries with it its own justification. By linking his criticism of existing conditions of censorship to an exposure of the Prussian political system he not only demonstrated its irrationality from the standpoint of advanced philosophy but also came nearer to understanding the essential hostility of the Prussian state to the people.

Another main theme that appears in these articles by Marx, is his comments on "the law of theft of woods". This law was a revocation of the custom allowing peasants to gather brushwood without payment. Marx defending the peasantry and the customary law, adopted a philanthropic view-point but also argued that the Landtag was degrading the laws and the authority of the state to the role of an instrument of the private interests of the landowners, and was thus contravening the very idea of the state. In this way he opposes the state, representing the whole community
to institutions which turn it into the agent of one sectional group or another.  

"We demand for the poor a customary right, and indeed one which is not of a local character but is a customary right of the poor in all countries. We go still further and maintain that customary right by its very nature can only be a right of this lowest, propertyless and elemental mass."  

"This logic, which turns the servant of the forest owner into a state authority, turns the authority of the state into a servant of the forest owner. The state structure, the purpose of the individual administrative authorities, every thing must get out of hand so that every thing is degraded into an instrument of the forest owner and his interest operates as the soul governing the entire mechanism. All the organs of the state become ears, eyes, arms, legs by means of which the interest of the forest owner, hears, observes, appraises, protects, reaches out and runs."  

"We have, however, reached a point where the forest owner, in exchange for his piece of wood, receives what was once a human being."  

"It is with reluctance that we have followed the
course of this tedious and uninspired debate, but we considered it our duty, to show by means of an example, what is to be expected from an Assembly of the Estates of particular interests if it were ever seriously called upon to make law."25

The above extracts from Marx's article are amply illustrative of how he had come to understand the partisan character of the state as the upholder of the interests of private property and he had put up a stout defence of the interests of the poor, politically and socially propertyless. In his articles in the Rheinische Zeitung, Marx generally maintained idealist positions in his understanding of the state and the inter-relation between material and spiritual activity, treating the Prussian state merely as a deviation from the states essential nature... He began to understand the role of social contradictions in the development of society, took the first steps towards defining the class structure of German society, and the role of nobility as the social mainstay of the Prussian state.26

The works of Marx during 1843 to 1844 marked a crucial phase in his transition from idealism to materialism and from the standpoint of revolutionary democracy to that of communism. An avowed opponent of the Political systems of feudal absolutism and bourgeois
monarchy and any kind of social system resting on private property and exploitation of the working people, he saw that the only way to free humanity from social inequality and oppressions was in the emancipation movement of the working class. This is a period before the active collaboration began between Marx and Engels and the main efforts of Marx, during this phase, was directed towards working out the scientific basis of a new revolutionary-proletarian world outlook. The Works of this period cover Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law (1843), On The Jewish Question (1843), Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law - Introduction (1844) Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1844) etc. It is necessary to examine these and other related works of this period to understand as to how Marx's views were shaping on the state and its dynamics.

In Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Marx carried out an objective study of Hegel's Philosophy and studied a broad range of problems in the history and theory of the state and law. The philosophy of law, teachings on the state and society interested Marx most. In the process of criticising Hegel's philosophy of law, Marx was led to the conclusion that the state is determined by Civil society, that is, the sphere of private - first and foremost material - interests, and the social relations connected with them,
and not civil society by the state as Hegel had asserted. Marx wished to define the concept of Civil Society in concrete terms to bring out the essential features of its historical evolution, and in particular to analyse the stage at which bourgeois private property began to play the dominant role in the field of material relationships. Giving a materialist explanation of the mutual connection between the state in his time and bourgeois ownership, Marx wrote that the existing political constitution in the developed countries was "the constitution of Private Property".

"The political constitution at its highest point is therefore, the constitution of private property. The supreme political conviction is the conviction of private property. Primogeniture is merely the external appearance of the inner nature of landed property."^27

By criticising the conservative aspects of Hegel's philosophy, Marx arrived at the conviction that idealism inevitably leads to religion and mysticism. But Marx did not reject the rational content of Hegel's philosophy or his dialectics and stressed that Hegel had succeeded in presenting, though in an abstract, mystified form, many of the real processes of social life. Contrary to Feuerbach, Marx continued to attach great importance to
Hegel's dialectical method and made the first step towards a material transformation of dialectics towards freeing it from its mystical shell. Marx stressed: "We can acquire genuine freedom by throwing off the impositions of both the bureaucratically organised state and of a civil society resting on the egoistic principles of private property. But "for a new constitution a real revolution has always been required".

"Certainly, entire state constitutions have changed in such a way that gradually new needs arose, the old broke down, etc., but for a new constitution a real revolution has always been required."

In letters from Deutsch- Französische Jahrbucher Marx wrote that there was no use for speculative theories divorced from life and practical struggle of masses and demanded the embodiment of theoretical criticism in practical revolutionary activity. "We don't say to the world: cease your struggles, they are foolish: we will give you the true slogan of struggle. We merely show the world what it is really fighting for, and consciousness is something that it has to acquire, even if it does not want to." Marx had thus embarked upon one of the principal ideas of the emerging revolutionary-communist world outlook - the idea of the unity of theory and practice.
Marx's essay On The Jewish Question, is a polemic with Bauer, and he uses this occasion for a broader materialist examination of the problem of mankind's emancipation not only from national, religious and political, but also from economic and social oppression. While Marx developed the concept of the limited nature of the bourgeois revolution, which he called "political emancipation", he put forward the idea of the necessity for a deeper going revolution aiming at the real emancipation of all social antagonisms. This kind of revolution; he called "human emancipation".

"All emancipation is a reduction of the human world and relationships to man himself."

"Political emancipation is the reduction of man, on the one hand, to a member of civil society, to an egoistic, independent individual, and, on the other hand, to a citizen, a juridical person."31

Bauer, in Marx's opinion, turned social questions into theological ones: he called for religious emancipation as the chief pre-condition of political emancipation and was content with a programme for liberating the state from religion i.e., disestablishing the latter. But, Marx observed, religious restrictions were not a cause of
secular ones, but a manifestation of them. By freeing the state from religious limitations we don't free mankind from them: the state may free itself from religion while leaving the majority of its citizens in religious bondage. In the same way the state may cancel the political effect of private property, i.e., abolish the property qualification for voting etc., and may declare that differences of birth and station have no political significance, but this does not mean that private property and differences of birth and station will cease to have any consequences. In short, a purely political and therefore partial emancipation is valuable and important, but it does not amount to human emancipation, for there is still a division between the civil community and the state. In the former, people live a life which is real but selfish, isolated and full of conflicting interests; the state provides them with a sphere of life which is collective but illusory. The purpose of human emancipation is to bring it about that the collective generic character of human life is real life, so that society itself takes on a collective character and coincides with the life of the state. Political revolution does not liberate people from religion or the rule of property, it merely gives them the right to hold property and to profess their own religion. Political emancipation thus confirms the dichotomy of man. 32 "The actual individual man must take the abstract citizen back into himself and as an individual man in him empirical life, in
his individual work and individual relationships, becomes a species-being; man must recognize his own forces as social forces, organize them and thus no longer separate social forces from himself in the form of political forces. Only when this has been achieved will human emancipation be completed."\textsuperscript{33}

Marx's conception of humanity goes far beyond Feuerbach since the mystification of religion appears to him merely as a manifestation, not a root of social servitude. He does not, like Feuerbach, regard man from a naturalistic point of view; he does not imagine a return to innate rules of co-operation which would, of their own accord, prevail in human society once the religious alienation was overcome. On the contrary, he regards the emancipation of man as a specifically human emancipation made possible by identification of private with public life, the political with the social sphere. The conscious absorption of society by the individual, the free recognition by each individual of himself as a bearer of the community is, in Marx's view, the way in which man rediscovers and returns to himself.\textsuperscript{34}

However these postulates of Marx remain utopian (in the sense in which Marx later used this word) in as much as they simply oppose the actual state of man's dichotomy to our imaginary unity, described in very
abstract terms. The question of how and by means of what forces that unity is to be attained remains open. 35

In another article, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law - Introduction" - Marx continued his analysis of the problem of "human emancipation" and comes to the crucial conclusion of the historical role of the proletariat in the revolutionary transformation of the world. For the first time Marx declared that the proletariat is the social force capable of carrying out the complete emancipation of mankind. In this article Marx comes to another important conclusion regarding the profound revolutionary significance of advanced theory:

"The weapon of criticism cannot of course replace criticism by weapons; material force must be overthrown by material force; but theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses. Theory is capable of gripping the masses as soon as it demonstrates ad hominem, and it demonstrates ad hominem as soon as it becomes radical. To be radical is to grasp the root of the matter. But for man the root is man himself."36

Marx's article "Critical Marginal Notes on the
Article: The King of Prussia and Social Reform—" by a Prussian (Published in 'Vorwarts') deals with the uprising of the Silesian weavers in 1844 and regards it as the first major class action of the German proletariat against the bourgeoisie, a testimony to the broad revolutionary possibilities of the working class.

Marx's comments on James Mill, *Elements d'économie politique*: are important as they indicate that Marx succeeded in noting the main defect of bourgeois political economy - its anti-historic approach to capitalism. Marx remarks that Mill like other bourgeois economists, thought capitalist relations eternal and immutable, corresponding to "man's nature".

"It is seen that Political economy defines the estranged form of social intercourse as the essential and original form corresponding to man's nature."37

Marx developed the idea he had already expressed in *Deutsch Franzosische Jahrbucher* about the world historic role of the proletariat, in his article entitled "Critical Marginal Notes on the Article: by a Prussian" (Published in Vorwärts, August 15, 1844).

"A philosophical people can find its
corresponding practice only in socialism, hence it is only in the proletariat that it can find the dynamic element of its emancipation."\textsuperscript{38}

These Works evidence Marx identifying the dichotomy of man at the stage of political emancipation and he shed this dichotomy at the stage of human emancipation and the historic role of the proletariat in reaching this stage through unity of theory and practice.

"Revolution in general- the overthrow of the existing power and dissolution of the old relationships - is a political act. But socialism cannot be realised without revolution."\textsuperscript{39}

The Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right is regarded as a crucial text in Marx's intellectual development as it is here that he expresses for the first time the idea of a specific historic mission of the proletariat, and the interpretation of revolution not as a violation of history but as a fulfilment of its innate tendency.

The latter idea appears in a letter from Marx to Ruge written in September 1843.
"...The reform of consciousness consists only in the world becoming aware of its own consciousness: awakening it from vague dreams of itself and showing it what its true activity, is.....Then it will be seen that the world has long been dreaming of things that it only needs to become aware of in order to possess them in reality."

In Marx's view a reformed consciousness was basic condition of social transformation, because it was, or could be, the revealing and explication of what had been merely implicit; because it gave recognizable form to what had all along been merely an unconscious historical tendency into a conscious one, an objective trend into an act of will. This is the basis of what Marx later called scientific socialism, as opposed to the utopian variety, which confined itself to propounding an arbitrarily constructed ideal.

In the Introduction to the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Marx pursued this theme and at the same time emphatically opposed Feuerbach's Critique of Religion. Marx accepts that Man is the creator of religion, but adds-

"man is the world of man, the state, society."
This state, this society, produce religion an inverted world-consciousness, because they are an inverted world. Religion is the general theory of that world, its encyclopaedic compendium, its logic in a popular form, its spiritualistic point d'honneur, its enthusiasm, its moral sanction, its solemn complement, its universal source of consolation and justification. It is the fantastic realisation of the human essence because the human essence has no true reality. The struggle against religion is therefore indirectly a fight against the world of which religion is the spiritual aroma. Religious distress is at the same time the expression of real distress and also the protest against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the opium of the people. To abolish religion as the illusory happiness of the people is to demand their real happiness. The demand to give up illusions about the existing state of affairs is the demand to give up a state of affairs which needs illusions. The criticism of religion therefore in embryo the criticism of the value of tears, the halo of which is religion."
Marx maintained that when once the holy form of human self-alienation has been unmasked, the first task of philosophy, in the service of history, is to unmask self-alienation in its unholy forms. The criticism of heaven is thus transformed into criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into the criticism of law, and criticism of theology into the criticism of politics.

Thus Marx also illustrated as to how a correct understanding of religion and society are as important as a correct perspective into the state. He emphasised that the liberation of the proletariat signifies its abolition in a separate class and the destruction of class distinctions in general by abolition of private property. To abolish a particular oppression will mean the abolition of all oppression and the general emancipation of mankind.

"The head of this emancipation is philosophy, its heart is the proletariat. Philosophy cannot realize itself without transcending the proletariat, the proletariat cannot transcend itself without realizing Philosophy."

It is note-worthy that the idea of the proletariat's special mission as a class which cannot liberate itself without thereby liberating society as a whole makes its first appearance in Marx's thought as a
philosophical deduction rather than as a product of observation. Marx held that a society from which all sources of conflict, aggression, and evil have been thus extirpated was not only thinkable, but was historically imminent.43

Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 are a rough draft of Karl Marx's first economic investigation. The subject of this unfinished work is a criticism of the bourgeois political economy and the bourgeois economic system. Although merely an outline, it has come to be regarded as one of the most important sources for the evolution of Marx's thought.44 It would of course, be quite wrong to imagine that the Paris Manuscripts (as these are popularly called) contain the entire gist of Capital, yet they are in effect the first draft of the book that Marx went on writing all his life, and of which Capital is the first version. These manuscripts were the first attempt of synthesising the new philosophical, economic and historical political ideas of the integral world out look of the proletariat. Marx emphasised here for the first time the decisive role of production in the social process and pointed out that private property and division of labour are the material basis of society's division into classes. Analysing the economic structure of bourgeois society Marx, stressed that the class contradictions of capitalism would inevitably
grow deeper as wealth became concentrated in the hands of capitalist owners. Extremely penetrating are Marx's thoughts on the influence of Man's productive labour and his social relations on science and culture. He noted in particular the process not only of social enslavement, but also of spiritual impoverishment of the working man resulting from the domination of private property.

In these 1844 manuscripts, Marx wrote in Hegel's and Feuerbach's traditional terminology and said:

"Communism, as fully developed natualism, equals humanism, and as fully developed humanism, equals naturalism. It is the genuine resolution of the conflict between man and nature and between man and man - the true resolution of the strife between existence and essence, between objectification and self-confirmation, between freedom and necessity, between individual and the species. Communism is the riddle of history solved, and it knows itself to be this solution."45

Marx gave these terms new content and put forward views which were in many respects opposed to Feuerbach's abstract humanism and supra-class anti-historical anthropologism. Marx's manuscripts are pervaded with the
sense of history and understanding of the significance of revolutionary practice, and are distinguished by their class approach to the social phenomenon under consideration. As regards Hegel, it can be seen from the manuscripts of 1844 that Marx had achieved a quite mature understanding of the relationship between the rational and conservative aspects of his teaching. Marx showed the groundlessness of Hegel's attempts to transform nature into another mode of existence of the mystical Absolute Idea. At the same time he also stressed the positive aspects of the Hegelian dialect and in particular the significance of Hegel's conception—although it was expressed in an idealistic form—of the development and resolution of contradictions.

The problem of estrangement or alienation has been one of the central problems in the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Marx views alienation or estrangement very differently from both Hegel and Feuerbach. According to Hegel it is the Absolute Idea that undergoes estrangement while Feuerbach operates a similar concept in his theory of the origin of religion, reducing it to the alienation of the universal (generic) qualities of abstract man, which are imputed to an illusory divinity. Marx used the concept of alienation for the purposes of a profound analysis of social relations. So in Marx's interpretation, alienation is by no means a
supra-historical phenomenon. Marx was the first to link alienation with the domination of private property and the social system it endangers. He saw that alienation could be overcome only by the liquidation of private property and of all the consequences of its domination.47

Marx's views on alienation appeared in a concentrated form in his treatment of "estranged labour". This concept summed up the enslaved conditions of the worker in a capitalist society, his being tied down to a definite job, his physical and moral crippling as a result of labour which is forced on him, "the loss of his self."

"Lastly, the external character of labour for the worker appears in fact that it is not his own, but someone else's, that it does not belong to him, that in it he belongs, not to himself, but to another... operates as an alien ....so is the worker's activity not his spontaneous activity. It belongs to another; it is the loss of his self."48

In the concept of "estranged labour" was found the initial expression of the future Marxist theory of the appropriation of labour of others by capital. In the subsequent works of Marx this concept gets superseded to a considerable degree by the concept of "exploitation of
wage-labour".

In the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, Marx clearly formulated his conclusion that the system of private property can be overthrown only as a revolutionary struggle of the broad masses.

"In order to abolish the idea of private property, the idea of communism is quite sufficient. It takes actual communist action to abolish actual private property." 49

In these manuscripts Marx holds that even though finally, communism is the positive expression of annulled private property, communism emerges in stages and one of these stages is the "abolition of the state" and that it is incomplete even at this stage.

"Communism (a) still political in nature-democratic or despotic (b) with the abolition of the state, yet still incomplete, and being still affected by private property i.e., by the estrangement of man." In both forms communism already is aware of being reintegration or return of man to himself, the transcendence of human self-estrangement," but since it has not yet grasped the positive essence of private property
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and just as little the human nature of need, it remains captive to it and infected by it. It has indeed grasped its concept, but not its essence.\textsuperscript{50}

According to Marx it is only when "Communism fully developed as naturalism becomes humanism" and then only the transition would be complete. Hence Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 assume a place of high significance in Marx's thought both with regard to "abolition of state" as also with regard to "emergence of humanism".

The Holy Family or Critique of Critical Criticism; Against Bruno Bauer and Co., was the first joint work of Marx and Engels produced in 1844. The idea and general plan of this work was agreed upon by the two friends, but the major part of the text was in fact written by Marx. This work is mainly philosophical in content and occupies an important place in the formation of Marx's and Engel's Philosophical and Socio-political views. This work was designed as a Polemic launched against the subjectivist views of the young Hegelians and Hegel's idealist philosophical system as a whole.

The Holy Family contains in general and laconic formulas, the Seminal ideas of the materialist
interpretation of history; that of the mystification that falls human interests when they are expressed in ideological form, and that of the genetic dependence on history of ideas on the history of production. We find here the application to a new historiosophy of the classic schema of Hegel's dialectic, the negation of a negation. As private property develops it necessarily, creates its own antagonistic; this negative force is itself dehumanized, and as its dehumanization progresses it becomes the precondition of a synthesis that will abolish the existing opposition together with both its terms—private property and the proletariat and will thus make it possible for man to become himself again.51

In The Holy Family, Marx returns to the problem of the opposition between the true human community and the imaginary community of the state. Bauer holds that human beings are egoistic atoms which have to be welded into an organism by the state. To Marx this is a speculative fiction. An atom is self-sufficient and has no needs; a human individual may imagine himself to be an atom in this sense, but in fact he never can be, for the world of men is a world of needs and, despite all mystification, it is they which constitute the real links between members of the community. The Social bond is not created by the state but by the fact that, although people may imagine themselves to be atoms, they are actually egoistic human beings. The
state is a secondary product of the needs which constitute the social bond; this latter is not a product of the state. Only if the world of needs gives rise to conflict, if needs are satisfied by means of struggle between egoisms, and if the social bonds assumes the aspect of social discord only then does the question arise as to the possibility of a real human community. Bauer, however is content to maintain the hegelian opposition between the state as a community and civil society as a tangle of egoisms, and regards this opposition as an eternal principle of life.\(^{52}\)

In The Holy Family, Marx formulates very profound thoughts on the correspondence of the political system of a given society with the economic structure, their dialectical connection and mutual influence. Marx shows in this work that the historical destiny of the working class is the inevitable result of its position in capitalist society. Marx writes that "The conditions of life of the proletariat sum up all the conditions of life of society today in their most inhuman form." The proletariat, as a class, by virtue of its historical existence can and must emancipate itself.\(^{53}\) Thus the basic Marxist idea of the leading role of the proletariat in the anti-capitalist revolutionary and liberation movement was formulated for the first time in The Holy Family.

In The Holy Family, Marx analyses critically the
various manifestations of states namely a "Philosophical ideal of a State", "Critical State", "Christian State", "modern state", etc. He exposes the fallacies of "a philosophical ideal of a state" and taunts Bruno by exposing his confusions of the state with humanity, the rights of man with man, and political emancipation with human emancipation. Marx also rips open the concepts of "Critical State" and "Christian State". Marx explains that a politically perfected modern state knows no religious privileges and a "Christian state" only becomes a parody. Marx said regarding a "Modern State" as follows:

"Just as the ancient state had slavery as its natural basis, the modern state has as its, natural basis civil society and the man of civil society, i.e. the independent man linked with other men only by the ties of private interest and unconscious natural necessity, the slave of labour for gain, and of his own as well as other men's selfish need....the modern state has now recognized the womb from which it sprang and its basis by the declaration of the rights of man..."  

Thus The Holy Family also provides an incisive analysis of the "State" and throws new light on its contortions and contradictions.
The German Ideology, is a major joint work of the founders of Marxism, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, written between November 1845 and August 1846. It was in this work that the materialist conception of history, historical materialism, was first formulated as an integral theory. The German Ideology can be considered the first mature work of Marxism.

In The German Ideology considerable attention is devoted to the political superstructure and in particular to the relation of the state and law to property. For the first time the essence of the state in general and the bourgeois state in particular was revealed.

"The State is the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests, and in which the whole civil society of an epoch is epitomised." 60

In analysing the class nature and the main functions of the state at the capitalist stage of development Marx and Engels pointed out ....

"..... the bourgeois is forced to organise itself no longer locally, but nationally, and to give a general form to its average interests."
Through the emancipation of private property from the community, the state has become a separate entity, alongside and outside civil society; but it is nothing more than the form of organisation which the bourgeois are compelled to adopt, both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests."

In working on The German Ideology, Marx and Engels first and foremost clarified to themselves the basic aspects of the new world outlook. This work contains profound thoughts on questions pertaining to the theory and history of the state and of law, to linguistics, aesthetics and literary criticism. It was in this work that for the first time the materialist way of understanding history became an integral conception of the structure of society and of historical periodisation. The German Ideology was not only a theory of society but also a method understanding social and historical phenomena. This is a polemical work which devotes itself to the criticism of the views of Ludwig Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer and Max Stirner and of "true socialism". The German Ideology illuminated the whole conceptual system of historical materialism and made it possible to expound the substance of the materialist way of understanding history as an integral scientific conception. The above discovery can be summed up in the
following propositions; the productive forces determine the
form of intercourse (Social relations). At a certain stage
of their development, the productive forces come into
contradiction with the existing form of intercourse. This
contradiction is resolved by social revolutions. In the
place of the previous form of intercourse, which has become
a fetter, a new one is evolved which corresponds to the
developed productive forces subsequently, this new form of
intercourse in its turn ceases to correspond to the
developing productive forces, turns into their fetter and
is replaced by an ensuing historically more progressive
form of intercourse. Thus, in the course of the entire
historical development a link of continuity is established
between successive stages.

Marx and Engels arrive at a conclusion of immense
significance in disclosing the laws of social development.

"All collisions of history have their origin in
the contradiction between the productive forces
and the form of intercourse." 62

In The German Ideology, Marx and Engels
investigated the basic determinants of the sequence of
phases in the historical development of social production.
They showed that the outward expression of the level of
development of the productive forces is always to be found
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in that of the division of labour. Each stage in the division of labour determines a corresponding form of property. The transition from primary historical relations to the ensuing stage in social development was determined by the development of the productive forces, resulting in the transition from an initial, natural division of labour to the Social division of labour in the form which is expressed in the division of society, into classes. This was the transition from pre-class to class society.

Along with the social division of labour there develop such derivative historical phenomena as private property, the state and the "Estrangement" of social activity. Just as the natural division of labour in primitive society determines the first, tribal (family) form of property, so the increasing social division of labour determines the further development and change of the forms of property. The Second form of property is the "ancient communal and state property", the Third form is "feudal or estate property and the fourth is bourgeois property".

The singling out and analysis of forms of property which successively replace one another and dominate at different stages of historical development provided the basis for the Scientific Marxist theory of social formations, the successive replacement of which is
the principal feature of the whole historical process. Marx and Engels gave a materialist interpretation of the class structure of society and demonstrated the role of classes and class struggle in social life. It was demonstrated that the division of society into antagonistic classes and the existence of classes are connected with definite stages in the development of production, that the development of class struggle must necessarily, lead to a communist revolution carried out by the proletariat, and that this revolution will result in the abolition of classes and the creation of a classless society.63

In The German Ideology, Marx and Engels stressed that for the practical materialist i.e., The Communist, it is a question of revolutionising the existing world, of practically coming to grips with and changing the things found in existence."64 In this work, Marx and Engels first spoke of the necessity for the proletariat to conquer political power as the only way of carrying out a communist revolution.

"Every class which is aiming at domination, even when its domination, as is the case with the proletariat, leads to the abolition of the old form of society in its entirety and of domination in general, must first conquer political power in order to represent its interest in turn as the
general interest, which in the first moment it is forced to do."\(^{65}\)

In The German Ideology, it has been further said:

"The revolution is necessary, therefore, not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way, but also because the overthrowing it can only in a revolution succeed in riding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew."\(^{66}\)

Thus The German Ideology expounds the basic features of future communistic society the abolition of private property, of the class division of labour and of classes themselves, the transformation of production and all the social relations, and the disappearance of the state, the instrument of class domination. This view of the future communistic society is presented in this work for the first time as an integrated theory.

Both by its, positive ideas and by its criticism of ideological trends hostile to the proletarian world-outlook, The German Ideology represented an important land-mark in the development of Marxism. This work signified a decisive stage in the philosophical and sociological grounding of the theory of scientific
communism, in the scientific demonstration of the world historic role of the working class as the social force whose historical mission is to overthrow the exploiting capitalist system and create the new communist society.\textsuperscript{67}

Among the works produced by Marx and Engels produced covering the period between autumn of 1845 and March 1848, the principal ones are:

The Poverty of Philosophy, "Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith" and the Manifesto of the Communist Party. An overall review of these works throw light on the understanding of the perspectives of Marx on the state.

The Poverty of Philosophy (1847) is an answer to the Philosophy of Poverty by M. Proudhon. One of the first works of mature Marxism, this work expressed the essence of the materialist understanding of history in a clear and concise formula. Here Marx formulates one of the most important tactical principles of the revolutionary proletarian movement - the unity of economic and political struggle and the decisive role of the political struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat. The Poverty of Philosophy expresses the profound idea that the awareness of the fundamental contradiction between its own interests and the continuation of the capitalist system, which the proletariat acquires as an organised movement develops,
plays a decisive role in converting it from a mass that is "already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself" into "a class for itself".

"Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers. The domination of capital has created for this mass a common situation, common interests. This mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have pointed out only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself. The interests it defends become class interests. But the struggle of class against class is a political struggle."68

Thus Marx explains the process in which the mass of people become workers, the workers become a class-in-itself and how it gets metamorphised into a class-for-itself in the process of economic and political struggle against capital.

The Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith (June 1847) (the so called credo) is the first version of the Marxist programme for the working class movement written by Frederick Engels. It defines the aims of the communists and describes the proletariat as the class
destined to bring about the socialist revolution. Engels shows that the communist transformation of society depends on historical conditions and the laws of history, maps its paths and indicates the tasks of the working class after its conquest of political power in the conditions of the transitional period from capitalism to the new communist system. This document expresses some profound thoughts concerning the elimination of national differences and the overcoming of religious prejudices in the society of the future.

The Principles of Communism (October 1847) written by Engels is a programmatic document written on a broader, more comprehensive theoretical basis and was in effect the original draft of the Communist Manifesto. This document provides a definition of communism, analyses the pre-conditions for the rise and development of the working class movement and formulates its goals. It also enumerates the possible ways of abolishing capitalist private property, and emphasises the necessity for a deep going proletarian revolution carried out by the masses of the working people, a revolution which in the historical conditions obtaining at the time could be carried out only by force.

The Manifesto of the Communist Party (February 1848) written by Marx and Engels on the instructions of the
Second Congress is the first programmatic document of the international proletarian movement. It was the first document to expound the fundamentals of the Marxist outlook in a comprehensive and systematic form that reflected the essential unity of all the components of Marx's teaching. This has the mark of clarity and brilliance of genius. the Manifesto opens its first chapter on "Bourgeois and Proletarians", with the historic revelation:

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."\(^{69}\)

The Manifesto armed the proletariat by proclaiming the scientific proof of the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism and the triumph of the proletarian revolution.

"But not only has the bourgeois forged the weapons that bring death to itself, it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons- the modern working class- the proletarians."\(^{70}\)

In the Manifesto, Marx and Engels not only demonstrated the role of the class struggle in history but also went on to argue that the proletariat was the most
revolutionary of all classes known in history. The
whose world historic role was to perform a mission or
liberation in the interests of the whole of toiling
humanity by ridding society for ever of all oppression and
exploitation. the cornerstone of the Manifesto is the idea
of the dictatorship of the proletariat (though this
expression was not yet used). Marx and Engels show how the
proletarian state is needed in order to eliminate the
exploiting classes, abolish the conditions for the
existence of classes in general and ensure the final
victory of the social relations of a classless society.

Marx and Engels described and predicted more
fully the features of the future communist system in the
Manifesto and laid the foundations of the Marxist
conception of the proletarian party as the organiser and
leader of the working class and gives outlines of the
fundamentals of its tactics.

In Manifesto Marx and Engels examined the would
be socialist trends alien to the scientific outlook of the
working class and showed the working class as to how to
recognize these anti-revolutionary direction of socialist
theories and as to how to combat them. Manifesto declared
that the communist movement must always be international in
case, and emphasised the tremendous importance of
achieving unity of views and actions among the proletarians
of various countries, the importance of international proletarian solidarity. In their great slogan "Working men of All countries, unite"! Marx and Engels expressed the idea of proletarian internationalism as the principle of the international communist movement. The Communist Manifesto signified that the formation of Marxism as an integrated revolutionary world outlook was basically complete. The parting lines of the Manifesto are inspiring, illuminating and exhilarating:

"The communists disclaim to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win."\(^71\)

In the Manifesto, Marx and Engels have also said-

"The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts, from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, is its own grave diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."\(^72\)
Marx and Engels analyse that the conditions generated by the Bourgeoisie become so intolerable that they become unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society and the proletariat would turn its grave diggers.

It is pertinent to note that the classical Marxist view of the state is expressed in the famous formulation of Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto:

"The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie." 73

This is a more complex statement than appears at first sight, but it is too summary and lends itself to over-simplification: however it does represent the core proposition of Marxism on the subject of the state.

Historiographical works of Karl Marx have a very important bearing on the understanding of the subject of the state and we undertake a survey of The Class Struggles in France (1850), The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (1852) and Civil War in France (1871). Marx's incisive analysis of historical developments in France during the two decades referred to above is an inmost application of the principles of historical materialism to the ongoing struggles in France of the time and provides an
exquisite Marxian Model of applied historical science.

In The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850, Marx for the first time applied to a whole period of history the method of analysis and explanation of historical materialism and it was to contemporary history that he applied it. In the words of Engels - "Marx has set out to demonstrate the inner causal connection and so to trace the political events back to effects of what were in the final analysis, economic causes."

Marx analysed and drew conclusions from the practical experience of revolutionary struggles and demonstrated the objective necessity of social revolutions. He enriched by such an application-analysis the whole theory of revolution by the idea that "revolutions are the locomotives of history". He showed that in revolutionary periods history is speeded up. In France during the revolutionary period of different classes of society "had to count their epochs of development in weeks where they had previously counted them in half centuries." Examining the class struggles which were acute in France, Marx discovered that the bourgeoisie as a class was losing its revolutionary qualities and that the working class had become the principal driving force of revolution and of historical progress. In The Class Struggles in France, Marx pointed out that the first great battle between the
two classes whose division split modern society in two, serving notice that, despite the defeat of the proletariat, former bourgeois demand had given place to "the bold slogan of revolutionary struggle: overthrow of the bourgeoisie! Dictatorship of the working class!" This is the first time Marx used the phrase "dictatorship of the working class" to express the idea of the proletariat winning political power in their bid to establish Revolutionary socialism.

"The Paris proletariat was forced into the June insurrection by the bourgeoisie. This sufficed to mark its doom. Its immediate, avowed needs did not drive it to engage in a fight for the forcible overthrow of the bourgeoisie, nor was it equal to this task'. By making its burial place the birth place of the bourgeois republic, the proletariat compelled the latter to come out forthwith in its pure form as the state whose admitted object it is to perpetuate the rule of capital, the slavery of labour." Marx elaborating the concept of "Revolutionary Socialism" said:

"This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary
transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from these social relations."77

The Class Struggles in France contains Marx's classical definition of the tasks of the working class dictatorship and also expounds the key principles of the strategy and tactics of workers revolutionary struggle. Marx stipulates that the peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie were allies of the proletariat against the bourgeois system. This is a major work of Marx in which was achieved a new stage in developing the theory of scientific communism. 78

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte is one of Marx's most outstanding works containing a brilliant analysis of contemporary history providing one of the classic expositions of the mature theory of historical materialism and of the dialectic of history and crystalising in far-reaching theoretical conclusions. Marx made clear the whole complex interaction between socio-economic basis and the political superstructure and developed the theory of state in relation to its forms and executive organs, and demonstrated the role of political
parties, the relationship between parties and classes, and the real link between classes and their ideological and political representatives.

Marx showed in this work that every party struggle is an expression of concealed class interests and stressed the difference between objective social and political processes and relations and the subjective motives and impulses of the actual participants in events, and showed how the real relationships are reflected, though often in a distorted fashion, in their minds. 79

Marx explains the specific features of the 1848 revolution in France in the following terms:

Marx noted that the 1848 revolution in France was distinct from its historical antecedent of the eighteenth century and that it moved "in a descending line". The cause of this distinction was the counter-revolutionary resurgence of the French bourgeoisie as a result of the growing class antagonisms in capitalist society. Alarmed by the upsurge of the proletariat, the bourgeois was ready in part or wholly to renounce the democratic institutions and representative bodies for which, in its time, it had led the struggle against the reactionary forces of feudal society. To secure and consolidate the inviolability of its material and economic position and obstruct the
deepening of the revolution, the French bourgeoisie sacrificed even the bourgeois republic itself, and helped to establish the reactionary Bonapartist regime in which power was transferred to a clique of political adventurers. 80

Marx demonstrated that autocratic dictatorships like that of Louis Bonaparte emerge primarily as a result of the counter-revolutionary nature of the exploiting classes, that they are established when the balance of class forces is such that the bourgeoisie is no longer able, and is afraid, to rule by parliamentary methods, while the working class is not yet strong enough to put up a successful resistance.

Marx described Bonapartism as the dictatorship of the most counter revolutionary elements of the bourgeoisie and distinguished its features as policy of manoeuvring between classes to create a state power seen to be ruling over all alike; crude demogogy camouflaging the defence of the interests of the exploiters, combined with political terrorism; the omnipotence of the military machine; venality and corruption; the employment of criminals and the wide spread use of blackmail and bribery.

Marx devotes much attention to the French peasantry and its attitude to the Bonaparte coup. He notes
that to establish their dictatorship Louis Bonaparte and his clique made adroit use of the political backwardness of the downtrodden French Peasantry and its remoteness from the social and political life of the cities. On the one hand, the bourgeois governments of the Second Republic, which treated the peasantry merely as an object of taxation had discredited the revolution in their eyes and this stimulated their support for Bonaparte. On the other hand, there was the attachment of the property owning peasants to their small holdings and the fact that they had always looked up to the representative of the Napoleonic dynasty as their own traditional patron. Bonaparte exploited the conservatism of the property owning peasants. However Marx stressed that this peasant class will soon find their natural ally and leader in the urban proletariat, whose task is the overthrow of the bourgeois order.

Marx emphatically stressed that the proletarian revolution could only triumph provided that the working class was supported by the broad non-proletarian masses of working people, above all by the peasantry. It would obtain in the peasantry "that chorus without which its solo becomes a swan song in all peasant countries." 81

Marx also made clear the fundamental difference between bourgeois and proletarian revolutions. Marx said: "If Bourgeois revolutions are short lived and comparatively
superficial, proletarian revolutions are characterised by depth, thoroughness, a critical approach to their own actions and the results achieved, and an urgent desire to surpass them by moving further ahead. 82

Of great theoretical and practical importance is Marx's development in this work on the state and, in particular, on the attitude of the proletarian revolution to the bourgeois state. After investigating the history of the development of executive power in France and its essential element, the state machine, Marx comes to the following conclusion:

"All revolutions perfected this machine instead of breaking it." 83

This conclusion is the chief and fundamental point in the Marxist theory of the state.

Marx pointed out a distinction in his analysis of the English workers struggle. In his article "The Chartists" he made clear the real opportunities in England, unlike other European countries at that time, for a peaceful transfer of power into the hands of the working class. In England, he explained, there was no highly developed military bureaucratic machine, and the proletariat formed the large majority of the population.
In English conditions, this could open up the way to the democratisation of the entire political structure. Consequently Marx wrote, universal suffrage in England "would be a far more socialistic measure" than on the continent. At the same time Marx and Engels felt it necessary to criticize the adventurist and clumsy activities of many of the emigre groupings who ignored the real situation and conditions of revolutionary struggle and behaved as if they could create a revolution at will. They wrote satirical sketches of the leaders of this petty-bourgeois emigration and demonstrated how pernicious were the effects of playing at revolution and how ludicrous the claims of mere petty-bourgeois windbags to the leadership of the working class and the revolutionary struggle.

The articles and reports, Journalistic and theoretical writings of Marx and Engels written between March 22, 1853 and February 10, 1854, and published mostly in the New York Daily Tribune, a bourgeois newspaper which played a progressive role in U.S.A. are also of immense significance particularly in assessing the historical fate of the colonial peoples, understanding the colonial problems on a general theoretical plane and explaining the general laws of capitalist development and the place which colonial exploitation occupied in it. In these journalistic articles which incorporated theoretical
research, Marx revealed laws actually operating in a capitalist economy, and refuted the arguments of bourgeois apologists who represented capitalism as a never changing harmonious system which ensures the well-being of all classes of society. Commenting on the working class movements in Britain, Marx concluded that they should not confine to waging an economic struggle but should combine it with a political struggle as the main means of liberating the working class from wage-slavery. He also emphasised the need for organising the proletariat on a national scale, from a mass political party of the working class and wage a struggle for the conquest of political power.

In 1850 Marx and Engels paid more attention to the history of the colonies and dependent countries, colonial policy, and the methods and consequences of colonial rule. These articles also proclaimed the ideas of proletarian internationalism, and of the solidarity of the working class with the oppressed peoples of the colonies and dependent countries. This approach to the colonial question enabled Marx to give a new interpretation of the history of the peoples of the oppressed countries, to reveal the inter-relation and inter-dependance of the historical development of the countries where capitalism was well established and the backward countries of the East, of the metropolis and the colonies. Marx regarded
colonial policy as an expression of the most repulsive and cruel aspects of the capitalist system.

"I cannot part with the subject of India without some concluding remarks. The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked."  

Marx devoted considerable space in his Works on India and analysed the most important stages and methods of the colonial enslavement of India by Britain. Marx showed the major role played by the East India Company, merchant adventurers, in the subjugation of India, with its colossal natural resources and ancient culture. The company made wide use of the Ancient Roman principles divide et impera (divide and rule) as one of the methods of effecting colonial conquests even in the capitalist age. These colonialists took advantage of India's political fragmentation, its communal heterogeneity and the strife between the local rulers, and bribed members of the local aristocracy to win their support. Binding the native sovereign princes to them by a system of subsidiary treaties, promissory notes and other bonds of "alliance" they turned them into the Company's puppets. The robbery and usurpation committed by the Company in India served as
a source of wealth and strength for the land owning magnates and money-lords in Britain. Marx gives a vivid portrayal of the British colonialists predatory rule in India and its appalling consequences for the peoples of that country.

In these articles Marx has also offered an analysis of the internal situation in India and other Eastern countries the reason for their retarded historical development in the periods preceding conquest. Marx saw that the isolated nature of the small village communities, the concentration of considerable means of production in the hands of despotic rulers impeded the emergence of capitalist economy and pushed them into backwardness which was the reason for their falling an easy prey for conquerors. He said that the British retained in India's social and political system numerous feudal forms, which hampered the country's progressive development, while destroying old patriarchal forms of communal land owning. Marx also showed that the system of land tenure and land taxes introduced by the British in India essentially consolidated pre-capitalist relations in the countryside and adapted them to the interests of the colonialists. Remarking on the colonial administrative, legal and military apparatus, Marx said that it was a parasite on the body of the oppressed country and also showed that under system of government of India, true power was wielded by a
clique of officials from the head office of the East India Company in London.

"The real home Government of India are the permanent and irresponsible bureaucracy." 88

Marx also used the example of British rule in India to show the contradictions and the double faced nature of the bourgeois system as a whole, and revealed the reverse side of progress under the rule of the exploiters.

Marx also saw, in the colonial system of capitalism, that it bore the seeds of its own destruction. For example, the British colonialists of India, who were solely motivated by the pursuit of profit, would be compelled to promote the development of elements of capitalism in their colony in particular to commence railway construction and create related branches of industry. By permitting, albeit in a colonially distorted form, the birth of capitalist economy, the colonialists were bringing to life forces which threatened their rule a local proletariat and a national bourgeoisie, which were capable of giving a more organised and stable character to the growing resistance of the masses to colonial repression.

Marx saw two possible paths for the future.
liberation of the colonies, which he by no means regarded as mutually exclusive. He considered the struggle of the working class for proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement as two inter-connected aspects of the revolutionary process.

"The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of Society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindoos themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether."\textsuperscript{89}

Marx's study of colonial problems reveal his discovery of the profound inner connection between the process of revolutionary ferment in the colonial world and the maturing of the pre-requisite for proletarian revolution in the West, which was perhaps the most important result of this study. He also showed in these articles that the national liberation movement in these countries would inflict blows on the capitalist colonial system, and would weaken the position of capitalism in the metropolis. He referred to the revolutionary processes in the East and remarked:

"Under these circumstances, as the greater part..."
of the regular commercial circle has already been run through by British trade, it may safely be argued that the Chinese revolution will throw the spark into the overloaded mine of the present industrial system and cause the explosion of the long prepared general crisis, which spreading abroad, will be closely followed by political revolutions on the continent."  

Marx's studies of national and colonial problems in his articles of 1853 and subsequent years were vital contributions to revolutionary theory and provided the foundation for working class policy on the colonial question. The National and colonial questions were vital in the study of state and the above reflections provide a theoretical perspective for this understanding. In getting a clearer insight into revolutions the following conclusions of Marx are highly relevant. Marx stressed the objective pre-requisites for a bourgeois-democratic revolution and the impossibility of importing it. At the basis of a bourgeois-democratic revolution lie deep seated social, economic and political causes, the struggle between the obsolete feudal system and elements of emergent and growing capitalism. A state of "Revolutionary Crisis" has to develop for the success of a revolution in any given country. Hence a revolution cannot be "imported" and till a "revolutionary Crisis" develops revolutions cannot be
ENGELS ON STATE:

Frederick Engels, the co-founder of Scientific communism along with Karl Marx, also deals at length with the state in many of his writings but only two of these important works Anti-Duhring (1878) and The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (1894) have been selected here for an analysis.

Anti-Duhring is by no means the fruit of any "inner urge" of Frederick Engels but is a product of a Polemic against Herr Duhring, who came out with a new socialist theory, which was a new doctrine with mighty pretensions and which caused confusion in the young minds of Germany and needed to be effectively countered. Hence what started as a negative criticism became positive; the Polemic was transformed into an exposition of the dialectical world outlook; an exposition covering a fairly comprehensive range of subjects. In this study we cull out what is relevant to the understanding of the state, from the point of view of origin, functions and dying out.

Engels explains the origin of state power in the following terms:
"As men originally made their exist from the animal world... they made their entry into history; still half animal, brutal, still helpless in face of the forces of nature, still ignorant of their own strength; and consequently as poor as the animals and hardly more productive than they. There prevailed a certain equality in the conditions of existence, and for the heads of families also a kind of equality of social position at least in the absence of social classes- which continued among the primitive agricultural communities of the civilised peoples of a later period. In each such community there were from the beginning certain common interests the safeguarding of which had to be handed over to individuals, true, under the control of the community as a whole, adjudication of disputes, repression of abuse of authority by individuals; control of water supplies, especially in hot countries and finally when conditions were still absolutely primitive, religious functions. Such offices are found in aboriginal communities of every period- in the oldest German marks and even today in India. They are naturally endowed with certain measure of authority and are the beginnings of state power."
According to Engels, "State power" had originated with the emergence of the need to safeguard "common interests" and the recognition of certain individuals to safeguard them, who came to be naturally endowed with certain authority. But with the gradual increase of the productive forces and increase in population, there came to be created a common interest, on the one hand, and conflicting interests, on the other, leading to new division of labour, demanding the setting up of organs to safeguard common interests and combat conflicting interests. This further led to independence of social forces developing into domination over society, and he who was originally the servant, where conditions were favourable, changed gradually into lord; and this lord, depending on the conditions, emerged as an oriental despot or satrap, the dynasty of a Greek tribe, chieftain of a Celtic clan etc., and finally the individual rulers united into a ruling class.

At the outset it was a natural division of labour within the family cultivating the soil made possible, at a certain level of well being, the incorporation of one or more strangers as additional labour forces. Labour Power acquired value. But the community itself yielded no available superfluous labour forces, and such forces were provided by war. Till then it was not known as to how to use Prisoners of War. They were either being killed or
eaten. But the "economic" stage that was reached; the prisoners acquired value, and they were let live and their labour was made use of. Slavery had been invented, and this became the dominant form of production among all peoples who were developing beyond old community, but in the end was one of the chief causes for their decay. It was slavery that first made possible the division of labour between agriculture and industry on a larger scale, and thereby Hellenism, the flowering of the ancient world. Without slavery no Greek state, no Greek art and science; without slavery no Roman Empire, also no Modern Europe.

Engels holds that our whole economic, political and intellectual development presupposes a state of things in which slavery was as necessary as it was universally recognised. Hence "without the slavery of antiquity no modern socialism." Hence the introduction of slavery under the conditions prevailing at that time was a great step forward.

Engels continued this analysis to hold that -

"Where the ancient communities have continued to exist, they have for thousands of years formed the basis of the cruelest form of state - Oriental despotism from India to Russia."
In the historical conditions of the ancient world, and particularly of Greece, the advance to a society based on class antagonisms could be accomplished only in the form of slavery. This was an advance even for the slaves; the prisoners of war, from whom mass of slaves were recruited, now at least saved their lives, instead of being killed as they had been before; or even roasted, as at a still earlier period.

Engels said "all historical antagonisms between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes to this very day find their explanation in this same relatively undeveloped productivity of human labour."

Engels contrasted the role played by force with the role played by economic development in history, in the following terms:

"In the first place, all political power is originally based on an economic, social function, and increases in proportion as the members of society, through the dissolution of the primitive community, became transformed into private producers, and thus became more and more divorced from the administrators of the common functions of society. Secondly, after the political force has made itself independent in relation to society, and has transformed itself from its
servant into its master, it can work in two different directions. Either it works in the sense and in the direction of the natural economic development, in which case no conflict arises between them, the economic development being accelerated. Or it works against economic development, in which case, as a rule, with but few exceptions, force succumbs to it.... But where apart from cases of conquest the internal state power of a country becomes antagonistic to its economic development, as at a certain stage occurred with almost every political power in the past, the contest always ended with the downfall of the political power. Inexorably and without exception the economic development has forced its way through— we have already mentioned the latest and most striking example of this; the great French Revolution."  

Engels maintains that "force plays yet another role in history, a revolutionary role". In the words of Marx "Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one."  

Engels analyses the change in the functions of the state from the primitive tribal society to the modern capitalist society and states:
"With differences in distribution, class differences emerge. Society divides into classes; the privileged and the dispossessed, the exploiters and the exploited, the rulers and the ruled; and the state, which the natural groups of communities of the same tribe had at first arrived at only in order to safeguard their common interests (e.g., irrigation in the East) and for protection against external enemies, from this stage onwards acquires just as much the function of maintaining by force the conditions of existence and domination of the ruling class against the subject class."  

State, which took its birth as an instrument of protection gets transformed into an instrument of domination in the capitalist society. Engels states that "modern capitalist production, which is hardly three hundred years old and has become predominant only since the introduction of modern industry, has in this short time brought about anti-thesis in distribution- concentration of capital in a few hands on the one side and concentration of the propertyless masses in the big towns on the other- which must of necessity bring about its downfall."  

"The capitalist forms of production and exchange become more and more an intolerable fetter on production itself that the
mode of distribution necessarily determined by those forms has produced a situation among the classes which is daily becoming more intolerable the antagonism, sharpening day by day, between capitalists, constantly decreasing in number but constantly growing richer, and propertyless wage workers, whose number is constantly increasing and whose conditions taken as a whole, are steadily deteriorating..."99 In other words, the reason is, that both the productive forces created by the modern capitalist mode of production and the system of distribution of goods established by it have come into crying contradiction with the mode of production itself, and in fact to such a degree that, if the whole modern society is not to perish, a revolution in the mode of production and distribution must take place, a revolution which will put an end to all class distinctions."100 "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, abolishes also the state as state."101

Engels elaborates the character of the state and states: "Society, thus far based upon class antagonisms, has the need of the state, that is, of an organisation of the particular class which was protempore the exploiting class, for the maintenance of the external conditions of production, and therefore especially, for the purpose of
forcibly keeping the exploited classes in the condition of oppression corresponding with the given mode of production (slavery, serfdom, wage labour). 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 society, it renders itself unnecessary. As soon as there is no longer any social class to be held in subjection; as soon as class rule, and the individual struggle for existence based upon our present anarchy in production with the collisions and excesses arising from these are removed, nothing more remains to be repressed, and a special repressive force, a state is no longer necessary. The first act by virtue of which the state really constitutes itself the representative of the whole society—the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—this is, at the same time, its last independent act as a state. 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 process of production. The state is not "abolished". It dies
Thus we find Engels present a comprehensive frame of the state from its origin to its demise in his polemic Anti-Duhring.

The origin of the Family, Private Property and the State is another very important work of fundamental importance of Frederick Engels, which deals with the state. This great work of Engels presents the results of Morgan's researches relating to the materialist conception of history. Morgan discovered and reconstructed this prehistoric foundation of our written history in its main features, having found in the sex groups of the North American Indians, the key to the most important, hitherto insoluble, riddles of the earliest Greek, Roman and German history. Morgan's work is considered as one of the few epoch making works of our times as he grappled with his material for forty years before he completely mastered it. Though for our purpose we only scan through the last part of Engels work relating to the state in this work, it is of supreme significance in understanding the state and its manifestations.

Engels explains the origin of the state in the following terms:
"... the gentile constitution had grown out of a society that knew no internal antagonisms, and was adapted only for such a society. It had no coercive power except public opinion. But now a society had come into being that by the force of all its economic conditions of existence had to split up into free men and slaves, into exploiting rich and exploited poor; a society that was not only incapable of reconciling these antagonisms, but had to drive them more and more to a head. Such a society could only exist either in a state of continuous, open struggle of these classes against one another or under the rule of a third power which while ostensibly standing above the classes struggling with each other, suppressed their open conflict and permitted a class struggle at most in the economic field in a so-called legal form. The gentile constitution had outlived its usefulness. It was burst asunder by the division of society into classes. Its place was taken by the State."  

The state was built up on the ruins of the gentile constitution in three main forms in Athens, Rome and Germany. In Athens the state sprang directly and
mainly out of the class antagonisms that developed within gentile society. In Rome gentile society became an exclusive aristocracy amidst a numerous plebs, standing outside it, having no rights but only duties. The victory of the plebs burst the old gentile constitution asunder and erected on its ruins the state. Among the German vanquishers of the Roman Empire, the state sprang up as a direct result of the conquest of large foreign territories, which the gentile constitution had no means of ruling.

In view of the above historical analysis Engels maintains that state is neither "the reality of the ethical idea", "The image and reality of reason" or "a power forced on society from without" as Hegel maintained, but it is a product of society at certain stage of development; it is the admission that this society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it has split into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to dispel. But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, might not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, it becomes necessary to have a power seemingly standing above society that would alleviate the conflict, and keep it within the bounds of "order" and this power arisen out of society, but placing itself above it, and alienating itself more and more from it, is the state."105
Engels presented the distinguishing features of the state as follows: State divides its subjects according to territory; is the establishment of a Public power; levies taxes; being vehicles of a power that is becoming alien to society, respect for them must be enforced by means of exceptional laws by virtue of which they enjoy special sanctity and inviolability. Engels caustically remarks: "The shabbiest police servant in the civilized state has more "authority" than all the organs of gentile society put together." 106

The state thus arose from the need to hold class antagonisms in check, but because it arose, at the same time, in the midst of conflict of these classes, it is, as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class. Thus the state of antiquity was above all the state of the slave owners for the purpose of holding down the slaves, as the feudal state was the organ of the nobility for holding down the peasant serfs and bondsmen, and the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage labour by capital. 107

Engels identified an exception to the above process of domination and oppression.
"By way of exception, however, periods occur in which the warring classes balance each other so nearly that the state power, as ostensible mediator, acquires, for the moment, a certain degree of independence of both. Such was the absolute monarchy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which held the balance between the nobility and the class of burghers; such was the Bonapartism of the First, and still more of the Second French Empire, which played off the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois against the proletariat. The latest performance of this kind, in which ruler and ruled appear equally ridiculous, is the New German Empire of Bismarck nation: here capitalists and workers are balanced against each other and equally cheated for the benefit of the impoverished Prussian Cabbage Junkers."

Engels very rightly holds that "the state has not existed from all eternity" and that there have been societies that did without it, that had no idea of the state and state power. He analyses that, the state became a necessity owing to the split of Society into classes and envisages that we are now rapidly approaching a stage in the development of production at which the existence of these classes not only have ceased to be a necessity but will become a positive hindrance to production and that they will fall as inevitably as they arose at an early
stage. Along with them the state will inevitably fall.

Engels's conclusion about the state indicates a state of statelessness:

"Society, which will reorganize production on the basis of a free and equal association of the producers, will put the whole machinery of state where it will then belong; into the museum of antiquities, by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe."109

LENIN'S VIEWS:

Lenin, the founder of the first ever Socialist Republic in the World, was a versatile genius, an immaculate Marxist theoretician and a practical revolutionary. He can be credited with the lifting of the science of Marxism from the morass into which the revisionist leaders of the Second International had landed it and for developing it into a revolutionary weapon of the proletariat in the stage of Imperialism. While Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism, were the first to develop a scientific theory of the state, Lenin elaborated this Marxian theory in conformity with the new historical conditions of imperialism and the socialist revolution.110 In understanding the state from the
classical Marxist angle, it is highly pertinent to study the formulations of the great revolutionary Lenin, as expounded in one of his outstanding works, "The State and Revolution: The Marxist Theory of the State and the tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution", written in August-September 1917, on the eve of the proletariat taking power in Russia as also his exposition in a post-Revolutionary lecture "The State". The State and Revolution is considered a tremendous contribution to the treasure-trove of Marxism, as the main purpose of this book is in defence and restoration of Marxist theory of state by purging it from opportunistic distortions implanted in it by the opportunists of the Second International. Lenin developed Marx's theory of the state on the basis of new revolutionary experience and hence assumes greater relevance.

In The State and Revolution Lenin elaborated the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat in detail. He showed that this dictatorship would cover the entire epoch of transition from capitalism to communism. Lenin taught that the proletariat must take state power into its own hands, must smash the old bourgeois state machinery and create its own new proletarian state, suppress the resistance of the deposed exploiting classes and begin building a new socialist society. For this task to be fulfilled, the dictatorship of the proletariat, a new and
higher type of democracy, would be needed.

Lenin's elucidation, interpretation and affirmation of the tenets of Marxism regarding the state as expounded in The State and Revolution constitute not only a mere reiteration of the principles of state but also an exposition-application of these principles in the light of the experiences of 1848-51 and the Paris Commune of 1871, and hence this is an invaluable contribution to the Marxian theoretical corpus. Coming from a practical revolutionary these reflections have a place of higher significance.

The analysis of Lenin on state is presented in two parts: the first part confining itself to what is contained in The State and Revolution and the second part dealing with the light thrown on the state by Lenin in the lecture delivered at the Sverdlov University under the caption The State. This classification is made in view of the fact that the first work, The State and Revolution, is an exposition made on the eve of the great October Revolution in Russia as it was written in August-September 1917, while the second Work, The State, is an evaluation made during the post-October Revolution Phase in July 1919.

First Part: The State and Revolution, written on the eve of the Bolshevik revolution, was intended as a restatement of the Marxist theory of the state against what
Lenin took to be its conception by the Second International "revisionism". As Lenin himself says - "The subject indicated in the title of this chapter is so vast that volumes could and should be written about it. In the present pamphlet we shall have to confine ourselves, naturally to the most important lessons provided by experience, those bearing directly upon the tasks of the proletariat in the revolution with regard to state power." Further, this pamphlet was intended to "re-establish" what Marx really taught on the subject of the state. As Lenin stated - "After the death of the great revolutionaries, Marx and Engels, attempts are made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonise them, so to say, and to hallow their names to a certain extent for the "consolation" of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping the latter, while at the same time robbing the revolutionary theory of its substance, blunting its revolutionary edge and vulgarising it. Today, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the labour movement concur in this doctoring of Marxism. They omit, obscure or distort the revolutionary side of this theory, its revolutionary soul. Hence the main thrust of this pamphlet is re-establishment of Marxist teachings on the state.

The State and Revolution contains seven chapters of which the First Chapter deals with the "Class Society
and the State" and the Second and Third Chapters deal with "The State and Revolution", the experiences of 1848-51 and the Paris Commune of 1871 respectively. The Fifth Chapter deals with "the economic basis of the whithering away of the state" and the Sixth Chapter "the vulgarisation of Marxism by the opportunists". While the Seventh Chapter "The experience of the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917" is not taken up by the author, "as the manuscript breaks off", the Fourth Chapter deals with "continuation, supplementary explanations by Engels". Of these emphasis is laid on the first three chapters here.

The First Chapter dealing with "Class Society and the State" encompasses a quadrilateral view of the subject, analysing the state as a product of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms, as consisting of special bodies of armed men, prisons etc, as an instrument for the exploitation of the oppressed class, and as the 'whithering away' and violent revolution.

Lenin commences his thesis with the famous quotation of Engels on state drawn from his most popular work The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State:

"The state is, therefore, by no means a power forced on society from without:........But in
order that these antagonisms, these classes with conflicting economic interests might not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, it became necessary to have a power seemingly standing above society, that would alleviate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of "order"; and this power, arisen out of society but placing itself above it and alienating itself more and more from it, is the state (PP 117-78, sixth German Edition).

Based on this premise, Lenin affirms the basic idea of Marxism with regard to the historic role and the meaning of the state as -

"The State is a product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. The State arises where, when and in so far as class antagonisms objectively cannot be reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable."117

Lenin contends that it is on this most important and fundamental point that the "distortion of Marxism" begins and that it proceeds on two main lines. The first kind of distortion is the petty bourgeois ideologists -103-
distortion and the second kind of distortion is the "Kautskyite" distortion.

According to the first distortion, the bourgeois and particularly the petty-bourgeois ideologists "correct" Marx in such a way as to make it appear that the state is an organ for the reconciliation of classes. Marx's precept "State would alleviate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of "order" has been so distorted by the petty-bourgeois politicians to give meaning of "reconciliation of classes" to the concept of 'order'. According to these ideologists 'order' means the reconciliation of classes and not the oppression of one class by another; to alleviate the conflict means reconciling classes and not depriving the oppressed classes of definite means and methods of struggle to overthrow the oppressors. All the Mensheviks and the socialist revolutionaries descended, to this theory that the "state reconciles classes". They came out with a blaze of this petty-bourgeois and philistine "reconciliation" theory. Lenin asserted Marx's view that the state is an organ of class rule, an organ of oppression of one class by another; it is the creation of 'order' which legalises and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the conflict between the classes; and that the state is an organ of the rule of a definite class which cannot be reconciled with its antipode (the class opposite to it). Lenin condemning
the distortionist Petty-bourgeois Ideologists said - "Their attitude to the state is one of the most striking manifestations of the fact that our Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks are not socialists at all (a point that we Bolsheviks have always maintained), but petty-bourgeois democrats using near-socialist phraseology." 118

The Second distortion, the "Kautskyite distortion" is "far more subtle". While it does not "Theoretically" deny that the state is an oppressive instrument and that the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible without a violent revolution and without the destruction of the apparatus of state power which was created by the ruling class and which is an embodiment of "alienation", Kautsky "forgets" and "distorts" this conclusion. Lenin elaborately attacks both these "distortions" quoting profusely from Marx and Engels.

Lenin makes an incisive analysis of the second aspect of the state as comprising special Bodies of armed men, prisons etc., and exposes the contortions and distortions of the West European and Russian Philistines. Lenin quotes the famous quotation of Engels relating to the distinguishing features of the state and exposes its distortion by the Philistines. Engels said -

-105-
"The Second distinguishing feature is the establishment of a Public Power which no longer coincides with the population organising itself as an armed force. This special public power is necessary because a self-acting armed organisation of the population has become impossible since the split into classes... This public power exists in every state: it consists of not merely of armed men but also of material adjuncts, prisons, and institutions of coercion of all kinds, of which gentile (clan) society knew nothing..."  

Engels elucidates the concept of "Power" which is called the state, a power which arose from society but placed itself above it and alienates itself more and more from it, and consisting of special bodies of armed men, having prisons, etc., at their command. Engels asserts that but for the split of the Society into irreconcilable antagonistic classes, which necessitated the creation of a special power comprising of special armed bodies, prisons, etc., the self-acting armed organisation of the population would have been sufficient. A state arises, a special power is created, special bodies of armed men, and every revolution, by destroying the state apparatus, shows us the naked class struggle, clearly shows us how the ruling class strives to restore the special bodies of armed men which
serve it, and how the oppressed class strives to create a new organisation of this kind, capable of serving the exploited instead of the exploiters. The West European and Russian Philistines without understanding the need for the above-said special bodies, are inclined to utter to a few phrases of Spencer of Mikhailovsky, to refer to the growing complexity of social life, the differentiation of functions and so on. Lenin also refers to "rivalry in conquest", which has taken gigantic strides in the background of the growth of Imperialism, and which has become one of the most distinguishing features of the policy of great powers, and condemns the "Social Chauvinist Scoundrels" who have been covering up defence of the predatory interests of "their own" bourgeoisie in the name of "defence of fatherland", "defence of the republic and the revolution".

Lenin, then proceeds to analyse the next aspect of the state as an instrument for the exploitation of the oppressed class. He elaborates the power of the state to levy taxes and the privileged position of the "officials" who stand above society. Lenin narrates the illustration of Engels - "The shabbiest police servant has more authority than the representative of the clan" and quotes another statement -

"In a democratic republic, wealth exercises its power indirectly, but all the more surely, first,
by means of "direct corruption of offi
(America); secondly, by means of an "alliance of
the government and the Stock Exchange" (France
and America)."

Lenin says - "Imperialism and domination of the
banks have "developed" into an exceptional art both these
methods of upholding and giving effect to the omnipotence
of wealth in democratic republics of all descriptions". He
explains that "A democratic republic is the best possible
political shell for capitalism and therefore, once capital
has gained possession of this very best shell, it
establishes its power so securely, so firmly, that no
change of persons, institutions or parties in the bourgeois
democratic republic can shake it". Lenin condemns the
Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks for instilling in
the minds of people the false notion that "universal
suffrage" is capable of revealing the will of the majority
of the working people and of securing its realisation. He
maintains that through the bureaucracy, through wealth-
Money Barons the state continues to be an instrument for
the exploitation of the oppressed class and asserts that
with the ceasing of classes the State machine would be
relegated to the museum of antiquities by the side of the
spinning wheel and the bronze axe.

Lenin finally expounds the fourth aspect relating
to the "Whithering away" of the state, and violent revolution. This aspect is dealt with at length by him as this concept has been subject to varied opportunistic interpretations by the anarchists and socialists, who obscure revolution.

Lenin distinguishes the Marxian concept of "Whithering away" with the anarchist concept of "abolition" of the state and says - "to prune Marxism to such an extent means reducing it to opportunism, for this "interpretation" only leaves a vague notion of a slow, even, gradual change, of absence of leaps and storms, of absence of revolution. The current, wide-spread, popular, if one may say so, conception of the "Whithering away" of the state, undoubtedly means obscuring if not repudiating revolution." 121 Such an interpretation, according to Lenin, is the crudest distortion of Marxism, advantageous only to the bourgeoisie.

Lenin presents an exquisite pentagonal exposition of the "Whithering away of the state" in the following terms:

In the first place, in seizing state power the proletariat abolishes the state as state. The bourgeois state is "abolished" by the proletariat in the course of the revolution. What "Whithers away" after this revolution
is the proletarian state or semi-state.

Secondly, the "Special Coercive Force" for the suppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, must be replaced by a "Special Coercive force" for the suppression of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat (the dictactorship of the proletariat). This is what is precisely meant by "abolition of the state as state". And it is self-evident that such replacement of one (bourgeoisie) "Special force" by another (proletariat) "Special force" cannot possibly take place in the form of "Whithering away".

Thirdly, in speaking of the state "Whithering away" and even the more graphic and colourful "dying down of itself", Engels refers quite clearly and definitely to the period after the Socialist revolution. The Political form of the State at that time is the most complete democracy. It is this "State" i.e., democracy that "Whithers away". Hence Revolution alone can "abolish" the bourgeois state, while the state in general i.e., the most complete democracy, can only "Whither away".

Fourthly, after formulating his famous proposition that "The State Whithers away", Engels at once explains specifically that this proposition is directed against both the opportunists and the anarchists. The "free people's state" was a programme demand and a
catch-word among the German Social-Democrats in the seventies. This catch-word is devoid of all political content except that it describes the concept of democracy in a pompous philistine fashion. Every state is a "special force" for the suppression of the oppressed class. Consequently, every state is not "free" and not a "people's state".

Fifthly, the necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with this and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of the entire theory of Marx and Engels. Engels's historical analysis of the significance of the role of violent revolution is a veritable panegyric on violent revolution. The Suppression of a bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution. The abolition of the proletarian state i.e., of the state in general, is impossible except through the process of "Whithering away".

Through the above exposition, Lenin stripped the German Social Democrats, the anarchists, the philistines, Social Chauvnists and the Kautskyites of their sinister designs and thwarted their attempts of "falsifying Marxism in opportunist fashion" and in "substituting eclecticism for dialectics".

Lenin, in Chapter II of his Pamphlet, deals with
"the State and Revolution" in the light of the writings of Marx and Engels before, during and after their experience of 1848-51 revolutionary movements and traces the development of Marxian theory of state in these writings.

The Poverty of Philosophy and The Communist Manifesto appeared on the eve of the revolution of 1848 and reflect to a certain degree the concrete revolutionary situation of the time. The Communist Manifesto provides a formulation of one of the most remarkable and most important idea of Marxism on the subject of the state, namely, the idea of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and also a highly interesting definition of the state - "the state i.e., the proletariat organised as the ruling class". The proletariat needs state power, a centralised organisation of force, an organisation of violence, both to crush the resistance of the exploiters and to lead the enormous mass of the population- the peasants, the petty-bourgeoisie and semi-proletarians- in the work of organising a socialist economy. Marx's theory of "the state i.e., the proletariat organised as the ruling class", is inseparably bound up with the whole of his doctrine of revolutionary role of the proletariat in history. The culmination of this role is the proletarian dictatorship, the political rule of the proletariat. 122

The conclusions of the revolution of 1848-51 on
the subject of the state are summed up in The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte:

"All revolutions perfected this machine instead of smashing it." 123

In this argument Marxism takes a tremendous step forward compared with The Communist Manifesto. The above conclusion is the chief and fundamental point in the Marxist theory of State.

Lenin analyses the argument of Marx in 18th Brumaire regarding "to concentrate all its forces of destruction" against the state power, and to set itself the aim not of improving the state machine, but of smashing and destroying it" as follows:

"It was not logical reasoning but actual developments, the actual experience of 1848-51, that led to the matter being presented in this way. The extent to which Marx held strictly to the solid ground of historical experience can be seen from the fact that, in 1852, he did not yet "specifically raise the question of what was to take place of the state machine to be destroyed. Experience had not yet provided material for dealing with this question, which history placed
on the agenda later on in 1871. In 1852, all that could be established with the accuracy of scientific observation was that the proletarian revolution had approached the task of "Concentrating all its forces of destruction" against the state power, of "smashing the State machine".

Lenin identifies here as to how Marx had metamorphosed his historical experience into scientific formulations.

In a letter written by Marx to Weydemeyer on March 5, 1852, Marx succeeded in expressing with striking clarity two very important things. One, the Chief and radical difference between his theory and the bourgeois thinkers: Two, the essence of his theory of the state. The relevant extracts of this letter are as follows:

"And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists, the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the existence of classes is only bound up
with particular, historical phases in the development of production, (2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat (3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society. ¹²⁵

Lenin commenting on the above observations stated as follows:

"For the theory of class struggle was created not by Marx, but by the bourgeoisie before Marx and, generally speaking, it is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Those who recognise only the class struggle are not yet Marxists: they may be found to be still within the bounds of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the theory of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the touchstone on which the real understanding and recognition of Marxism should be tested."

Lenin had thus discovered the touchstone to test
enthusiastic about the heroism of the communards and complemented them as having "stormed heaven". Marx regarded the Paris revolution as a historic experience of enormous importance, as a certain advance of the World Proletarian revolution, as a practical step. Marx analysed this experiment, to draw tactical lessons from it and re-examine his theory in the light of it.

Lenin notes that Marx and Engels effected the "Only" correction to *The Communist Manifesto* on June 24, 1872, as a result of the lessons from the Paris Commune:

"...one thing especially was proved by the Commune viz., that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes..."\(^{127}\)

Lenin remarks - "Thus Marx and Engels regarded one principal and fundamental lesson of the Paris Commune as being of such enormous importance that they introduced it as an important correction into *The Communist Manifesto.*"\(^{128}\) Marx's idea is that the Working class must break up, smash the ready-made state machinery and not confine itself merely to laying hold of it. The words "to smash the bureaucratic-military machine" briefly express the Principal lesson of Marxism regarding the task of the proletariat during a revolution in relation to the state.
Lenin launched a scathing attack against the Kautskyite "interpretation" of Marxism, for having ignored the above lesson relating to the "smashing" of the bureaucratic-military machine. However Lenin subjects Marx's argument in this regard to a critical review in regard to his restricting his conclusion to the continent and states that in 1917, at the time of the first Imperialist War, this restriction made by Marx was no more valid and both Britain and America had also developed bureaucratic-military cliques. The Second critical observation he makes is about the use of the phrase "People's revolution", Lenin says that the idea of "People's revolution" coming from Marx seems strange and that the Russian Plekhanovites and Menshaviks would brand it a "slip of the pen". Lenin explains that Marx meant by "People's" workers and peasants and that they must make an alliance to "smash" the bureaucratic-military state machine.

Lenin very rightly holds that Marx did not indulge in utopias and expected the experience of the mass movement to provide the reply to the question as to the specific forms this organisation of the proletariat as ruling class would assume. Marx subjected the experience of the Commune to the most careful analysis to find solutions to this riddle. Lenin said "The direct anti-thesis to the empire was the commune". It was the
"Specific form" of "a republic that was not only to remove the monarchial form of class rule, but class rule itself".  

Marx analysing the experience of the Commune says "with breaking state power", which was a "parasitic excrescence", "its amputation, its smashing", the state became superfluous.

Lenin concluded as follows:

"When the mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat burst forth, Marx, inspite of its failure, inspite of its short life and patent weaknesses, began to study the forms it had discovered. The Commune is the form "at last discovered" by the proletarian revolution, under which the economic emancipation of labour can take place. The Commune is the first attempt by a proletarian revolution to smash the bourgeois state machine; and it is the political form "at last discovered", by which the smashed state machine can and must be replaced."  

The work of the Paris Commune confirms Marx's brilliant historical analysis. Lenin's adroit application of Marxian tenets to the expounding of the theory of state in "The State and Revolution" has left a great masterpiece synthesising theory with practice.
The other important work of Lenin is the Lecture he delivered at the Swerdlov University on The State on 11th July 1919. This is obviously a post-October Revolution literature, while the earlier work The State and Revolution is a pre-October Revolution work. We can say that this work comprehends the subject of the state more or less in a capsular from while The State and Revolution is an elaborate re-establishment of the Marxian Theory of State, with all the invectives against the Mensheviks and the Kautskyites. While there is not much of new material in the work, it is worthwhile making a few observations on this piece of work.

Lenin emphasises and reaffirms that the "question of the state is a most complex and difficult one". He poses a series of the questions: What is the state? What is its nature? What is its significance and what is the attitude of our party, the party that is fighting for the overthrow of capitalism; the Communist Party- what the attitude of our party? The conclusion of this lecture is very significant:

"We have deprived the capitalists of this machine and have taken it over. With this machine on bludgeon, we shall destroy all exploitation. And when the possibility of exploitation no longer
exists anywhere in the world, when there are no longer owners of land and owners of factories, and when there is no longer a situation in which some gorge while others starve—only when the possibility of this no longer exists shall we consign this machine to the scrap heap. Then there will be no state and no exploitation..."131

Lenin's inclusion of the expression "and when the possibility of exploitation no longer exists anywhere in the world" is what is highly significant, indicating that the "State" cannot be consigned to the scrap heap as long as there is a possibility of exploitation anywhere in the world. This very realistically and objectively presents the world outlook of Marxism and provides a final shape to the Marxian theory of state.

STALIN'S VIEWS ON STATE:

In understanding questions regarding the nature of the state, Stalinist thought also plays a vital role and hence we undertake a survey of Stalin's views on state. Stalinist thought on the state insisted on its paramount and enduring importance; far from "Whithering away", the state must be reinforced as the prime motor in the construction of socialism, and also in order to deal with its many enemies at home and abroad. The 'revolution from
above' of which Stalin spoke, was made 'On the initiative of the state'. This state, Stalin claimed, was a state of new type which represented the interests of the workers, the peasants and the intelligentsia, in other words, of the whole Soviet population. It was, in this sense, no longer a class state, seeking to maintain the power and privileges of a ruling class to the detriment of the vast majority, it was rather, in a phrase which came to be used under Khruschev, a "state of the whole people". 132

Stalin, amongst his various writings, has delineated his views on state importantly in Foundations of Leninism (1924), Concerning Questions of Leninism (1926) and in The Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B) on the work of the Central Committee (1939).

Foundations of Leninism133 were lectures delivered by Joseph Stalin at the Sverdlov University and published in Pravda in April and May 1924. During the course of these lectures, Stalin analyses "the dictatorship of the proletariat", from three view points: (i) the dictatorship of the proletariat as the instrument of the proletarian revolution (ii) the dictatorship of the proletariat as the rule of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and (iii) Soviet Power as the State form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.
Stalin asserts that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is the instrument of the proletarian revolution, its organ, its most important mainstay, brought into being for the purpose of, firstly, crushing the resistance of the overthrown, exploiters and consolidating the achievements of the proletarian revolution, and secondly, carrying the proletarian revolution to its completion, carrying the revolution to the complete victory of socialism. The revolution can defeat the bourgeoisie, can overthrow its power, even without the dictatorship of the proletariat. But the revolution will be unable to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie, to maintain its victory and to push forward to the final victory of socialism, unless, at a certain stage in its development, it creates a special organ in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its principal mainstay." According to Stalin to retain power gained through the proletarian revolution, to consolidate it, and to make it invincible three main tasks are to be carried out by the dictatorship of the proletariat: (a) to break the resistance of the land-lords and capitalists who have been overthrown and expropriated by the revolution, to liquidate every attempt on their part to restore the power of capital, (b) to organise construction in such a way as to rally all the working people around the proletariat, and to carry on this work along the lines of preparing for the elimination, the abolition of classes, (c) to arm the revolution, to
organise the army of the revolution for the struggle against foreign enemies, for the struggle against Imperialism. The dictatorship of the proletariat is needed to carry out to fulfil these tasks. Stalin asserted that the dictatorship of the proletariat, the transition from capitalism to communism, must not be regarded as a fleeting period of "Super-revolutionary" acts and decrees, but as an entire historical era, replete with civil wars and external conflicts, with persistent organisational work and economic construction with advances and retreats, victories and defeats.\textsuperscript{135}

Analysing "the dictatorship of the proletariat as the rule of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie", Stalin stated that the state is a machine in the hands of the ruling class for suppressing the resistance of its class enemies. In this respect the dictatorship of the proletariat does not differ essentially from the dictatorship of any other class, for the proletarian state is a machine for the suppression of the bourgeoisie. But there is one substantial difference. This difference consists in the fact that all hitherto existing class states have been dictatorships of an exploiting minority over the exploited majority, whereas the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the exploited majority over the exploiting minority",\textsuperscript{138}. Stalin comes to two main conclusions in the light of the above analysis.
and oppressing the labouring masses, but to the task of completely emancipating them from all oppression and exploitation to the tasks facing the dictatorship of the proletariat." Hence according to Stalin, "In that the Soviet organisation of the state alone is capable of immediately and effectively smashing and finally destroying the old i.e., the bourgeois bureaucratic and judicial apparatus. The Republic of Soviets is thus the political form, so long sought and finally discovered within the frame work of which the economic emancipation of the proletariat, the complete victory of socialism, must be accomplished. The Paris Commune was the embryo of this form: Soviet Power is its development and culmination."  

Stalin brought out his work Concerning Questions of Leninism in 1926 and there deals with the subject - "The Proletarian Revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat", wherein he not only distinguishes the characteristic features of the proletarian revolution as distinct from the bourgeois revolution in very succinct terms, but also vividly presents the characteristic features of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this analysis Stalin enunciates his concept of "capitalist encirclement". He states - "It should not be forgotten that for the time being the revolution has been victorious in only one country. It should not be forgotten that as long as "capitalistic encirclement", exists the danger of
intervention, with all the consequences resulting from this danger, will also exist." It is in this background of "capitalistic encirclement" that Stalin stressed the need for the Proletarian dictatorship of the model he formulated with the triple characteristics as enumerated here-under:

"(1) The utilisation of the rule of the proletariat for the suppression of the exploiters, for the defence of the country, for the consolidation of the ties with the proletarians of other lands, and for the development and victory of the revolution in all countries (2) the utilisation of the rule of the proletariat in order to detach the labouring and exploited masses once and for all from the bourgeoisie, to consolidate the alliance of the proletariat with these masses, to draw these masses into the work of socialist construction, and to ensure the state leadership of these masses by the proletariat. (3) The utilisation of the rule of the proletariat for the organisation of socialism, for the abolition of classes, for the transition to a society without classes, to a socialist society." 141

Perhaps of all the writings of Stalin, the postulates made by him while answering "Some Questions of
Theory" in his Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B) on the Work of the Central Committee, presented on 10th March 1939, are most revealing and throw up a new challenge to the Marxian theory of State. He refers specifically to "the question of the state in general, and of our socialist state, in particular". Stalin was conceptualising his theory of state in answering these questions. "We have abolished the exploiting classes; there are no longer any hostile classes in the country; there is nobody to suppress; hence there is no more need for the state; it must die away? Why do we not strive to put an end to it? Is it not time to throw out all this rubbish of a state?" He laments that certain of the general tenets of the Marxist doctrine of the state were incompletely elaborated and were inadequate and also remarks that - "it received currency owing to the unpardonably heedless attitude to matters pertaining to the theory of the state, inspite of the fact that we have had twenty years of practical experience in state affairs which provides rich material for theoretical generalisations, and inspite of the fact that, given the desire, we have every opportunity of successfully filling this "gap in theory". Stalin was thus trying to fill the "gap in theory" relating to the state in this analysis which was being presented with his invaluable experience in administering a socialist system for nearly two decades.
Stalin questions the validity of the classical formulation of the theory of the development of the socialist state given by Engels, wherein Engels conceptualises the "Whithering away" of the state and answers it by stating that Engels concept is correct only if one of the two conditions are fulfilled - "(1) if we study the socialist state only from the angle of the internal development of a country, abstracting ourselves in advance from the international factor, isolating, for the convenience of investigation, the country and the state from the international situation or (2) if we assume that socialism is already victorious in all countries, or in the majority of countries, that a "socialist encirclement" exists instead of a "capitalist encirclement", that there is no more need to strengthen the army and the state". Stalin propounded "the doctrine of Socialism in one country". He asks "what if socialism has been victorious only in one, separate country, and if, in view of this, it is quite impossible to abstract one-self from international conditions, what then? Engels formula does not furnish an answer to this question." Hence, Stalin contends - "it follows that Engels general formula about the destiny of the Socialist state in general cannot be extended to the partial and specific case of the victory of socialism in one country only; a country which is surrounded by a capitalist world, is subject to menace of foreign military attack, cannot thereby abstract itself from the
international situation, and must have at its disposal a well-trained army, well organised punitive organs, and a strong intelligence service, consequently must have its own state, strong enough to defend the conquest of socialism from foreign attack.\textsuperscript{145}

Stalin refers to the intention of Lenin to complete the second volume of The State and Revolution on the basis of the experiences of 1905 and 1917 Russian Revolutions and formulate a new theory of state, and how he could not realise his intention due to intervention of death and that it was the duty of his disciples to fulfil the task.

Stalin holds that "the forms of our state are changing and will continue to change in line with the development of our country and with the changes in the international situation"\textsuperscript{146} and quotes Lenin to support his contention:

"The forms of bourgeois states are extremely varied, but their essence is the same; whatever their form, all these states in the final analysis, are inevitably the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The transition from capitalism to communism certainly cannot but yield a great abundance and variety of political forms, but the
essence will inevitably be the same: the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Stalin proceeds to analyse the two main phases of development of the socialist state in Russia since the October Revolution, and traces the metamorphosis the state underwent in these phases and draws his conclusions as follows:

"As you see, we now have an entirely new, socialist state, one without precedent in history and differing considerably in form and functions from the socialist state of the first phase. But development cannot stop here. We are moving ahead, towards communism, will our state remain in the period of communism also? Yes, it will, unless the capitalist encirclement is liquidated, and unless the danger of foreign military attack has been eliminated although naturally, the forms of our state will again change in conformity with the change in the situation at home and abroad. No, it will not remain and will whither away if the capitalist encirclement is liquidated and is replaced by a socialist encirclement."148

Hence we find Stalin propound newly the concepts of "Capitalist encirclement" and "Socialist encirclement"
and formulate conditionalities regarding the "Whithering away" of the state. This presents an opposite pole to the formulation of Marx - "All revolutions perfected this machine (State) instead of smashing it."¹⁴⁹

TROTSKY ON STATE:

Trotsky is another important Marxian thinker whose views are to be ascertained before getting a comprehensive picture of the perspectives of the state. Lyov Davidovich Bronstein, Pen name, "Trotsky", a member of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, was prominent in the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and October 1917, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs (1918) then for Military and Naval Affairs (1918-25). From 1923 he led opposition movements against "betrayal" of the revolution by the Soviet bureaucracy. He was expelled from Russia by Stalin in 1929 and he formed the Fourth International abroad to oppose Stalinism.

Trotsky's major contribution to Marxist thought was the theory of 'uneven and combined development', and the derived doctrine of 'Permanent revolution'. A backward country overcomes its backwardness not by passing through the stages already traversed by advanced countries but by telescoping or even skipping them, which results in a combination of features of backwardness with features of an
advanced stage of development, usually at the highest level available. This process is seen as typical of countries outside the advanced capitalist nucleus of Western Europe and North America. The practical political consequence is that since, normally introduction of advanced industry takes place in a colonial or semi-colonial way, the country affected will acquire a proletariat stronger than the native bourgeoisie. The latter being incapable, or afraid, of attempting to carry out a bourgeois revolution this task falls to the proletariat, leading the lower orders of the pre-capitalist sector in a revolution which proceeds immediately from abolition of feudal survivals to taking steps in the direction of socialism.

The victorious proletariat must try to promote revolutions in other countries, especially advanced ones, since progress towards socialism cannot get far within the confines of a single country, especially one (like Russia) with substantial elements of pre-capitalist relations to overcome. The very circumstances facilitating revolution in such a country also hinder its socialist development. "Permanent revolution" challenged the view that a prolonged period of capitalist development must follow an anti-feudal revolution during which the bourgeoisie would rule, or else some combination of social forces (e.g., revolutionary democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry) acting as surrogate. Trotskyists claim that Lenin in April
1917 adopted Trotsky's concept and put it into practice in the October Revolution.

Trotsky opposed Stalin's doctrine of Socialism in one country and warned that this would lead to disastrous adventures within Russia and conversion of the Communist International into a mere instrument of non-revolutionary Russian foreign policy. Trotsky saw Russia's social order under Stalin as merely transitional between capitalism and socialism, fated either to progress towards socialism (which would require revolutions in the advanced capitalist countries plus a supplementary political revolution in Russia) or to regress into capitalism. The ruling class is seen not as a new class but as a parasitic excrescence, a Soviet society not a 'State Capitalism' but as a 'degenerated worker's state', in which nevertheless some fundamental gains of the October Revolution survived, so that in the event of War revolutionaries must defend USSR. 150

The theory of Trotsky clashed most fiercely in the country of its origin with Stalin's theory of socialism in a single country, which for Trotskyism is a contradiction in terms, and was banished as a heresy of all heresies form the part of the world where the Soviet model of socialism prevailed.
The establishment of a classless socialist society, according to Trotskyism cannot come about otherwise than through a revolutionary break in the existing order. Trotskyism rejects the evolutionary parliamentary road of the ballot box as illusory; it takes for granted that the exploited classes will not be able to take power without a struggle against the property owning classes defending their economic dominance. The Victory of the proletariat in such a class struggle, will in the Trotskyite scheme of things, have to be safeguarded by the establishment of a "Proletarian dictatorship".\textsuperscript{151}

Apart from the ideological antagonism between Stalin and Trotsky, their personal animosity is evidenced by the following invective adopted by Stalin to attack Trotsky, while delivering a speech at a meeting of Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the C.P.S.U. (B) on October, 23, 1927.

"Note the language, comrades! Note the language! It is Trotsky writing. And writing about Lenin. Is it surprising then, that Trotsky, who wrote in such an ill-mannered way about the great Lenin, whose shoe-laces he was not worthy of tying, should now hurl abuse at one of Lenin's numerous pupils Comrade Stalin."\textsuperscript{152}
MAO TSE-TUNG ON STATE:

Mao Tse-tung, who was Chairman of the People's Republic of China, Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party's Central Committee and its Politburo, is the most important single person in Chinese history, and is also one of the most important Marxist philosophers and writers. For twenty two years he led Chinese armies in guerrilla warfare, and then for ten years was the leader of one-fourth of the human race. Popularly called Chairman Mao, his views on the state become important as the emergence of the People's Republic of China into the Socialist Block, is a highly significant maiden application of a Eurocentric Marxist thought to the Asian continent.

Mao has often been praised or attacked, as a "Peasant revolutionary". While he did indeed attribute to the peasants a role, and above all a degree of initiative greater than is commonly regarded as orthodox, the problem of what he did with, or to Marxism can perhaps best be approached by considering first the structure of Chinese society as a whole, and the conclusions he drew from it. China in the 1920's, when Mao began his apprentice in revolution, was of course economically a very backward country. This meant that, whatever might be said about the hegemony of the proletariat (or of the vanguard) the communist party had to rely on the peasantry as the
greatest single social force supporting the revolutionary cause. But Chinese society was not primarily capitalist in character, nor was it simply 'feudal' or 'Semi-feudal'. It included, in addition to a limited but rapidly growing number of urban workers, and Chinese entrepreneurs or 'national bourgeoisie', a small but extremely powerful landlord class, the peasants (rich and poor, landed and landless), and a rich variety of other categories, from artisans and hawkers to 'compradors' in the service of foreign capitalists, and from bureaucrats and militarists to monks, bandits and rural vagabonds. This complex social structure, derive from the co-existence of elements and strata dating from different historical epochs, and shaped both by indigenous and foreign influences. Mao's article - "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society" (written in March 1926) is highly significant in not only enabling us to get an insight into the class character of the Chinese society of the day, but also in helping an understanding of the approach of Mao to Chinese revolution. In his preamble to this article, Mao says:

"Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution. The basic reason why all previous revolutionary struggles in China achieved so little was their failure to unite with real friends in order to attack real enemies. A
revolutionary party is the guide of the masses, and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary party leads them astray. To ensure that we will definitely achieve success in our revolution and will not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies. To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution."

Mao's approach as indicated above is not only indicative of the dialectical application of Marxian principles, but also of the emerging Mao's innovative - 'the mass line', apart from being highly pregnant with pragmatism, which projects him as a practical revolutionary. In this article Mao makes an incisive analysis of the condition of each of the classes in Chinese society, their inclination and attitude towards the revolution and sums up:

"To sum up, it can be seen that our enemies are all those in league with imperialism - the warlords, the bureaucrats, the comprador class, the big landlord class and the reactionary
section of the intelligentsia attached to them. The leading force in our revolution is the industrial proletariat. Our closest friends are the entire semi-proletariat, and petty-bourgeoisie. As for the vacillating middle bourgeoisie, their right wing may become our enemy and their left wing may become our friend—but we must be constantly on our guard and not let them create confusion within our ranks."

The consequences of the peculiar class character of the Chinese society are reflected in Mao's concepts of the 'Principal contradiction' and the 'Principal aspect of the principal contradiction', which play so large a part in interpretation of dialectics. Mao saw it as his more urgent practical task to determine, in the light of what he regarded as a Marxist analysis, where the decisive cleavages should be drawn, both in China and in the world. In a sense, of course, Mao was simply following a line of analysis sketched out by Marx, and further developed by Lenin and Stalin according to which not only the peasants, but other classes and groups in a pre-capitalist society could participate in the democratic stage of the revolution, and the behaviour of various classes in a given country could be affected by the fact of foreign domination. But Mao systematized and elaborated these ideas, and drew from them philosophical conclusions to
which he attributed general validity. It is arguably, this dimension of his approach to revolution, in conjunction with his view that practice was primary, and theory secondary or derivative, which has led to such a wide range of often categorically opposed interpretations of Mao and his idea. Both from the point of view of tactics and also from the view of general principles of Mao's thought, perhaps, the most crucial single issue is that of what Mao meant by 'Proletariat'. He was aware, of course, at least from the late 1920's onwards, of the leading role assigned by Marxism to the urban working class, and in principle he accepted this axiom. Undoubtedly his understanding of the term 'Proletariat' was in some way coloured by the literal meaning of the Chinese expression Wu-ch'an Chieh-chi (Propertyless class), but he consistently recognized the hegemony in the revolution of the urban proletariat. A more important and significant ambiguity, which has frequently been underscored, is that surrounding the relation between objective proletarian class nature, and proletarian ideology or proletarian virtue.  

The most important aspect of Mao's dialectics in the reduction of the three laws of Hegal and Marx to one; the unity and struggle of opposites. This was prefigured in 'On Contradictions' (in 1937) when he said that "the law of the unity of opposites was the fundamental law of thought", thus apparently giving it higher status than the
negation of negation, and the transformation of quantity into quality. In 1964, he explicitly repudiated the last two laws, saying that he "did not believe" in the negation of negation, and that the transformation of quantity into quality was merely a special case of the unity of opposites. There is no doubt that logically it went hand in hand with Mao's increasing tendency to view historical development as an ambiguous and problematic process, and the continued forward progress of the revolution as something of a miracle, against the grain of the revisionist tendencies inherent in all of us.

Mao's views on state can be delineated from his article "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship". This article was written on the eve of the 28th Anniversary of the Communist Party of China, on June 30, 1949, in commemoration thereof, and happens to be written earlier to the establishment of the People's Republic of China on 1st October, 1949. These views are highly significant, though formulated earlier to the establishment of the Republic. Mao states that "When classes disappear, all instruments of class struggle, parties and the state machinery- will lose their function, cease to be necessary, therefore gradually whither away and end their historical mission; and human society will move to a higher stage. We are opposite of the political parties of the bourgeoisie. They are afraid to speak of the extinction of classes, state power and
parties. The leadership of the Communist Party and the state power of the people's dictatorship are such conditions. Anyone who does not recognize this truth is no communist.\textsuperscript{159} Here we find Mao place his stamp of approval to the concepts of "Extinction of classes" and the "Whithering away of the state", but with a distinction and a difference. He visualises the whithering away of all the instruments of class struggle, the party and the state machinery including. Interestingly he brands one who does not recognize this truth as "no communist". According to Mao "Communists the world over are wiser than the bourgeoisie, they understand the laws governing the existence and development of things, they understand dialectics and they can see farther. The bourgeoisie does not welcome this truth because it does not want to be overthrown...But for the working class, the labouring people and the Communist Party the question is not one of being overthrown, but of working hard to create the conditions in which classes, state power and political parties will die out very naturally and mankind will enter the realm of Great Harmony."\textsuperscript{160}

Mao continuing his analysis observes as follows:

"....the Chinese revolution led by the Communist Party of China, has made tremendous advances both in theory and practice and has radically changed
the face of China. Upto now the principal and fundamental experience, the Chinese people have gained is two fold:

1) **Internally**, arouse the masses of the people. That is, unite the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, form a domestic united front under the leadership of the working class, and advance from this to the establishment of a state which is a people's democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the working class and based on the alliance of workers and peasants.

2) **Externally**, unite in a common struggle with those nations of the world which treat us as equals and unite with the peoples of all countries. That is ally ourselves with the Soviet Union, with the People's Democracies and with the proletariat and the broad masses of the people in all other countries, and form an International United Front."

Mao conceives two kinds of united fronts: "a domestic united front" and "an international united front". The "domestic united front" shall be under the leadership of the working class, but curiously consisting of both the
national bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie along with
the working class and the peasantry, and advance to
establish "a people's democratic dictatorship". Is this
another name for "Dictatorship of the proletariat"? The
other is - "the International United Front". This is a
front of nations of the world like People's China, Soviet
Union and People's Democracies and the proletariat and the
broad masses of the people in all other countries. This is
curiously a united front of like-minded socialist and
peoples democratic nations on the one hand and proletariat
and broad masses of all other countries on the other. Is
this another name for "Proletarian Internationalism"

Mao defines the "People's democratic
dictatorship" as follows:

"The combination of these two aspects, democracy
for the people and dictatorship over the
reactionaries, is the People's democratic
dictatorship".

He defines also the "People" and distinguishes
them from the "reactionaries", while answering the
question, "who are the people?"

"At the present stage in China, they are the
working class, the peasantry, the urban
petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. These classes, led by the working class and the Communist Party, Unite to form their own state and elect their own government. This is people's democracy. Then, who are the reactionaries? The landlord class and bureaucrat, bourgeoisie as well as representatives of those classes, the Kuomintang reactionaries and their accomplices. Mao directs to enforce their dictatorship over these reactionaries whom he calls "running dogs of Imperialism", and to suppress them. He says "Democracy is practised within the ranks of the people, who enjoy the rights of freedom of speech, assembly, association and so on. The right to vote belongs only to the people, not to the reactionaries." So in short, Mao's dictum is "Democracy for the people, dictatorship for the reactionaries. This is People's Democratic Dictatorship."

Mao proceeds to answer the next important question: "Don't you want to abolish the state Power?" and answers by saying:

"Yes, we do, but not right now: We cannot do it yet. Why? Because Imperialism still exists,
because domestic reaction still exists, because classes still exist in our country. Our present task is to strengthen the People's state apparatus—mainly the people's army, the people's police and the people's courts—in order to consolidate national defence and protect the people's interests. Given this condition, China can develop steadily, under the leadership of the working class and the communist party, from an agricultural into an industrial country and from a new democratic into a socialist and communist Society, can abolish classes and realize the Great Harmony. The State apparatus including the army, the police and the courts, is the instrument by which one class oppresses another. It is an instrument for the oppression of the antagonistic classes; it is violence and not "benevolence"... we certainly do not apply a policy of benevolence to the reactionaries and towards the reactionary activities of the reactionary classes. Our policy of benevolence is applied only within the ranks of people, not beyond them to the reactionaries or to the reactionary activities of the reactionary classes."

Mao attaches great significance to the "national
bourgeoisie" at this stage and states:

"The national bourgeoisie at the present stage is of great importance. Imperialism, a most ferocious enemy, is still standing alongside us... our present policy is to regulate capitalism, not to destroy it. But the national bourgeoisie cannot be the leader of the revolution, nor should it have the chief role in state power...."

Mao sums up his analysis in the following terms:

"To sum up our experience and concentrate it into one point, it is; the People's Democratic Dictatorship under the leadership of the working class (through the Communist Party) and based upon the alliance of workers and peasants. This dictatorship must unite as one with the international revolutionary forces. This is our formula, our principal experience, our main programme."

No doubt, the USSR got disintegrated with the dissolution of Soviet Russia and the People's Republic of China is moving in the direction of inducting Market Economy. While these developments have to be marked and a
detailed research into these debacles require to be carried out, the principles and the formulations of the classical Marxists, under the leadership of Marx and Engels, still need to be thoroughly understood and meticulously applied to current developments, without forgetting for a while that Marxism can never be a dogma.

AN EPITOME:

We can only hope to develop Marxism starting from the classics, resting on the shoulders of the giants. Having discussed at length the various perspectives of Classical Marxists on the state, in an attempt to develop a comprehensive Marxian theory of state, we make a final bid here to present an epitome of Classical Marxism to enable a better comprehension. This exercise assumes a place of great significance as the most important theoretical issue confronting Marxism today is that of the state, for it is the point at which practical political considerations converge with those of scientific research.

The Classical Marxist dialectic on state can be classified into four theoretical models, considering the views of Marx and Engels as the Foundational (original) model and the views of Lenin, Stalin and Mao as variant Derivative models. We prefer to call the following three as 'derivative models' as all these Marxists, Lenin, Stalin
and Mao, applied and adopted the Theory of State, as expounded by the Founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, in practice and built mighty socialist republics as challenges to the capitalist states. As Marx and Engels developed scientific socialism and founded the theory of state, their concept has been designated as the Foundational (original) Model. The views of Trotsky are significant. However they are not considered as an independent derivative model here, but discussed as a critique of Stalin's model. This sketch would not delve into details but engage only in a skeletal presentation.

The Foundational (original) Model is not a simple but a complex one: it is in a sense multi-dimensional and undergoes continual metamorphosis in the historical process for over four and a half decades (1837 to 1883). The interest of Marx in this concept dates back to 1837 when he mentioned about his interest in the study of state in a letter written to his father on November 10-11, 1837 from Trier and ends up with his work in the Capital. It configurates the philosophical works reflected in the Hegelian Critiques and the practical revolutionary experiences gained in French and other revolutions of the period. To elucidate this model it has to be noted that the core proposition of Marxism, on the subject of the state is expressed by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto as follows:
"The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie".

This crystalizes as a result of Marx's rejection of Hegel's claim that the state is an embodiment of society's general interest. Marx held that state does not stand for the general interest but defends the interests of property. This view of the state as the instrument of ruling class, so designated by virtue of its ownership and control of the means of production, remained fundamental throughout for Marx and Engels. Engels said:

"The state as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class."

There are two different approaches, to explain as to why and how the state, as an institution separate from the economically dominant class or classes, play this role of exploitation and oppression. One approach is that the state is the state of the capitalists; the other approach is that the state is the state of capital. These
approaches are not exclusive but complementary. However, an exception has been recognised by Marx and Engels, when the state assumes a considerable degree of autonomy. The examples quoted are that of the dictatorial regimes such as the Bonapartist regime in France after Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte and the rule of Bismarck in Germany.

Marx said in The Civil War in France as follows:

"Bonapartism was the only form of government possible at a time when the bourgeoisie had already lost, and the working class had not yet acquired, the faculty of ruling the Nation."

Engels said in Origin of the Family:

"by way of exception, periods occur in which the warring classes balance each other so nearly that the state power, as ostensible mediator, acquires, for the moment a certain degree of independence of both."

Similar was the rule of Bismarck in Germany, and Engels says:

"Capitalists and workers are balanced against each other and equally cheated for the benefit of"
Similar is the situation under 'Oriental despotism', to which Marx and Engels refer in their writings.

In the above situations it is seen that the state enjoys a 'relative autonomy', and has made itself altogether independent of society, and it rules over society as those who control the state think fit and without reference, to any force in the society external to the state.

Further, there are instances when the 'state machinery' must be taken to have interests and purposes of its own. Marx speaks of the executive power of the Bonapartist state as an "immense bureaucratic and military organization, an ingenious and broadly based state machinery..." and he describes this force as a "frightful parasitic body, which surrounds the body of French society like a caul and stops all its pores".

As the axiom goes "Exceptions prove the Rule", the above exceptions prove the rule that the state is an instrument of exploitation of the proletariat, in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the ruling class.
There is also the concept of "State Monopoly Capitalism", which is the description of advanced capitalism, in which the major function of the state in its partnership with the economically dominant class is to regulate class conflict and to ensure the stability of the social order. The class rule which the state assumes takes many forms and the form of the class rule is of great importance to the working class.

It is important to note the point made by Marx in 18th Brumaire: "all revolutions perfected this machine instead of smashing it". In this model a distinction is made between the state which was used as an instrument to exploit the proletarians, which according to these Founders required to be "smashed" and the state of the Proletariat, which is designated as 'dictatorship of the proletariat' which has to "whither away", when the function of exploitation ceases and when a classless society is established.

It is also important to note that "smashing" of the state of the Bourgeois Rule is as central and fundamental to the Marxian theory of state as is the later "Whithering away" when according to Engels: "government of persons is replaced by the administration of things". At this stage state becomes superfluous. It is also pertinent to note that Classical Marxism rejected the anarchist
notion that the state could be done away with on the very morrow of the revolution. Another, important tenet formulated by Marx is that a revolution cannot be 'imported' and till a 'revolutionary crisis' develops revolution cannot be successful.

This, in essence, is the Foundational (original) model of the theory of the state as expounded by Marx and Engels.

Amongst the variant derivative models, we shall take up first, the Leninist Model.

Unquestionably the most influential political leader and theorist of Marxism in the twentieth century, Lenin, revitalized its theory of revolution by stressing the centrality of class struggle led by a tightly organised party. He elaborated a theory of Imperialism as the final stage of capitalism preparatory to an international proletarian revolution establishing and maintaining itself through force in a transitional Dictatorship of the proletariat. He led the Bolshevik Party in the October Revolution of 1917 and established the world's first "socialist state".

While Leninist model is generally a re-establishment of the Marx-Engels model, we find him
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disagreeing with the Founders in certain respects. Before the first world war, Lenin, like Marx and Engels before him, had made a distinction between different forms of regime, to the point of referring to the United States and Britain, in contrast to tsarist Russia, as countries "where complete political liberty exists". But with the first world war, Lenin no longer took such distinctions to be significant. In Preface to *State and Revolution*, he said that the "Monstrous oppression of the working people by the state, which is merging more and more with the all powerful capitalist associations, is becoming increasingly monstrous. The advanced countries- we mean their hinterland- are becoming military convict prisons for the workers". Lenin virtually obliterated the distinction between "Bourgeois democracy" and other forms of capitalist rule.

Lenin faithfully echoed the basic propositions of the Foundational (original) model so far as 'smashing' of the state is concerned and reiterated these views in *State and Revolution* through which he combated the revisionist notion that the bourgeois state, might be reformed. Leninism always stressed the coercive role of the state, almost to the exclusion of all else, the state is essentially the institution whereby a dominant and exploiting class improves and defends its power and privileges against the class or classes which it dominates.
and exploits.

Lenin had discovered the touchstone to test the understanding and recognition of Marxism, when he said "only he is a Marxist, who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat". Regarding "whithering away" of the state Lenin says that state can be consigned to the scrap heap only - "when the possibility of exploitation no longer exists anywhere in the world". This very realistically and objectively presents the world outlook of Marxism to the Marxian theory of state.

Leninist model adds a new dimension to the Foundational (original) model. In 1916 Lenin produced what is arguably his most influential and characteristic book, Imperialism, the Highest stage of Capitalism. He maintained that a new and final epoch of capitalism had arisen in which monopoly replaced capitalism and the concentration of capital and class divisions of society had reached their extremes. Capitalism, in the epoch of imperialism, had become militaristic, parasitic, and decadant. It had however, concentrated production in trusts and cartels, and capital in the banks and has thereby greatly simplified the task of bringing the whole economy under social control and ownership. It had itself created "a material basis for socialism".
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So we find the Leninist model, apart from being a re-establishment of the theory of state as formulated in the Foundational (original) model, adds certain innovations in identifying the new forms of exploitation in a world that had reached the highest stage of capitalism, Imperialism. By a practical application and adoption of the principles of Marxism, Lenin had succeeded in leading the October Revolution to a resounding victory in Russia in 1917 and had established the first-ever Socialist State in the world. The bureaucratic militarist-state capitalist trust was replaced by organs of popular democracy, administrative organs of the Paris Commune type whose modern forms were the Soviets. Thus Lenin became the founding father of modern communism and his model assumes a place of new significance.

The second kind of the derivative model is the Stalinist model. As Stalin presided over the destinies of the first Socialist State for nearly a quarter century, almost drawing an 'Iron curtain' on the U.S.S.R, his perspectives on state assume a unique place of significance. In one sense Stalinist model is a real variant from the Foundational (Original) model and shall have to be given a closer look.

Stalin propounded the doctrine- "Socialism in one
country", and elucidated that the construction of Socialism could be completed in the Soviet Union without a socialist revolution elsewhere. He proclaimed that the class struggle would be intensified as the advance to socialism proceeded. He held a variant view on "whithering away" of the state. Stalin proclaimed that the proletarian state could not 'whither away' with the transition to socialism; it must be strengthened because of the "Capitalist-encirclement". He contended that the state in a socialist structure shall be highly strengthened as long as capitalist encirclement was there and may wither away only with socialist encirclement in the world. Stalin's doctrine, "socialism in one country", had strong nationalist connotations and enhanced what Lenin had earlier denounced as "Great Russian Chauvinism". In doctrinal terms, Stalinism was marked by an attempt to turn Marxism into an official state ideology, whose main tenets and prescriptions were authoritatively laid down by Stalin, and which therefore required total and unquestioning obedience. Stalinist thought on the state insisted on its paramount and enduring importance: far from withering away, the state must be reinforced as the prime motor in the construction of socialism, and also in order to deal with its many enemies at home and abroad. The "Revolution from above" was another doctrine propounded by Stalin as against the 'Revolution from below' propounded by Marx, Engels and Lenin. According to Stalin - "This state was
state of new type, which represented the interests of the
workers, the peasants and the intelligentsia, in other
words; of the whole Soviet population," and held that "it
was no longer a class state, seeking to maintain the power
and privileges of the minority ruling classes as against
the majority proletarian class". Stalinist model provides
an opposite pole on theories of state as propounded by
Marx. Hence the Second derivative model, the Stalinist
model, is very different from the first two models already
discussed.

The Stalinist concept of state has been subject
to severe criticism. Trotsky was one of the leading
critics of Stalin's doctrine of "Socialism in one
country". Trotsky warned that this would lead to
disastrous adventures within Russia and conversion of
Communist International into a mere instrument of
non-revolutionary Russian foreign policy. Trotsky saw
Russia's social order under Stalin as merely transitional
between capitalism and socialism, fated either to progress
towards socialism (which would require revolutions in
advanced capitalist countries plus a supplementary
political revolution in Russia) or to regress into
capitalism. The ruling class in Russia was not a "new
class" but a parasitic excrescence and Soviet society not
as 'state capitalism' but as a 'degenerated worker's
state'.
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In the light of the disintegration of USSR during the end of 1991, Trotsky's criticism of Stalinist doctrines made six decades ago sound prophetic (though this expression may sound un-Marxist). Trotsky's major contributions to Marxist thought was the theory of 'uneven and combined development' and the derived doctrine of 'Permanent revolution'. Trotskyism rejects the evolutionary parliamentary road to socialism and propounds a revolutionary break in the existing order.

The Third derivative model, the Mao's model, has the highest significance in evaluating the Marxian theory of state for more reasons than one. Mao was the first to apply a Euro-centric Marxian doctrine to Asiatic China, which had an altogether variant socio-economic-politico-cultural milieu and which covered one-fourth of the human race.

The Classical Marxist model of political change has been assumed to be one in which bourgeois modernization must precede true socialistic or communistic political modernization. In this sense even Russia was not ripe for socialism and agrarian societies have to wait for centuries to become first bourgeois modern and then go on to bring about socialist or communist modernisation. This model tends to neglect the special conditions prevalent in historically non-bourgeois traditional, agrarian societies.
of Asia and Africa. If Mao or a Castro bypassed it, he does so not as a Marxist heretic, but as a Marxist, who applied Marxist principles to a specific historical situation. We should say that Mao has succeeded in establishing a local model of political modernization.

Mao Tse-tung, is an explicit Marxist, but one who rejects dogmatic adherence to the European Marxists models or the dominance of European Socialist-Communist movements over the Asian ones. He claimed the right to apply Marxism-Leninism to the specific conditions obtaining in China. In opposition to Stalin, he evolved his version of Marxism-Leninism, by accordingly the peasantry a revolutionary role, though admitted the role of a follower of the working class and the communist party in building up the forces to establish the Marxist goals of socialism and communism. The country-side is an overwhelming reality in China, a fact that would not appeal to the highly urbanised Western Marxist tradition. Of course, built into this frame-work was the national system, subject to an eventual proletarian internationalism of a genuine type. By unmasking the nationalist bias of the Soviet Union, Mao discovered true Marxism-Leninism as separable from the historical experiences of a particular nation, even if it be the first socialist nation in history. In developing the concepts of socialist imperialism and revisionism, Mao restored to the long neglected Afro-Asian Marxism a certain
human and historical right to create history according to true application of the Marxist-Leninist Principles. In his attack on revisionism, he served the cause of socialism in Soviet Union itself by pin-pointing the danger of being seduced by crude bourgeois values.

The most important aspect of Mao's dialectics is the reduction of the three laws of Hegel and Marx to one: the unity and struggle of opposites. Mao falls in line with Marx-Engels-Lenin regarding the concepts of "extinction of classes" and "whithering away of the state", but with a distinction and a difference. He visualises the whithering away of all the instruments of class struggle, the party and the state machinery including. Mao envisages two united fronts; one, the domestic united front comprising of the peasantry, urban petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class, and two, the International United front for a struggle with socialist nations, people's Democracies and the proletariat and broad masses of all other countries. It is significant to note Mao take even non-proletariat like the national bourgeoisie in the domestic united front.

Mao envisages a "people's democratic dictatorship" which is democracy for the people (working class, Peasantry, urban petty-bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie) and a dictatorship over the reactionaries.
(landlord class, bureaucrat-bourgeoisie, Kuomintang reactionaries and their accomplices). This connotation is different from the 'Proletarian Dictatorship' of the Foundational model. Regarding whithering away of the state, Mao agrees in principle with the Foundational model and makes it more explicit by saying "Yes, we do, but not right now: we can't do it yet. Because imperialism still exists, because domestic reaction still exists, because classes still exist in our country."

In Mao's model we have a refreshingly different model but in tune with basic tenets of classical Marxism, but applied and adopted admirably successfully to a non-western milieu; a true derivative model.

We conclude by saying - "We cannot simply 'return' to Classical Marxism: its silences and lacunae are too evident and filling them may involve transforming Marxism." 167

We march ahead with this task of identifying the gaping gaps in the process of transforming Marxism.
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