CHAPTER-III

NEO-CLASSICAL MARXISTS' PERSPECTIVES ON STATE

PREAMBLE:

A journey from later Marx to early Marx is apparently a physical and chronological retrogression but paradoxically and intellectually a philosophical progression. According to "Western Marxists" Marxism had to be rescued from positivism and crude materialism because Marxism was primarily a critique. Marxism was not exhausted by the discovery of new laws of social development. Critique also required an intellectual engagement with bourgeois consciousness and culture. Vulgar Marxists mistakenly believed that Marxism meant the death of Philosophy but according to the Western Marxists, it preserved the truths of philosophy until their revolutionary transformation into reality.\(^1\) According to Western Marxists, Marx outlined the essential role of philosophy in "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction", where he asserted that the Proletariat was the heart of emancipation, but philosophy was its head.\(^2\) Both were essential:
"Philosophy cannot realise itself without the transcendence of the proletariat and the proletariat cannot transcend itself without the realization of philosophy."³

Marx's early writings- his encounters with Hegel, the Young Hegelians and Feuerbach- revealed the philosophical core of Marxism and they breathed a utopian and libertarian spirit that was more subdued in his later writings. In this sense "Western Marxism" is almost synonymous with a return to the early Marx.⁴ In this chapter an overview of the writings of some of the "Western Marxists" and 'Neo-classical Marxists' regarding their perspectives on state is made, thus attempting a return journey, in colossal Marxian literary treasure, from the heart to the head.

ANTONIO GRAMSCI'S VIEWS:

Antonio Gramsci, who died in 1937- he was born eight years after Marx's death - was, thanks to an intense absorption in and then forcible isolation from political life, a pioneer, the first outstanding one perhaps, of a new kind of Marxism or, more exactly, of fidelity in a new age to the spirit of early Marxism, enquiring and speculative as well as purposeful, truly catholic or world-embracing, after the great schism and the onset of
its rigid disciplines. He can be looked back on as the first standard-bearer of what has come to be called "Western Marxism", but with broader and deeper implications than this title often suggests, and completely free from any tendency towards mere cloistered intellectualism. But ideas advance, like waves on an uneven beach, very irregularly. Gramsci's way forward for Marxism remained for long unknown. His prison writings on politics and history have only gradually been drawing on us since the end of the last war. How they might have influenced thinking if they had come earlier into circulation, one can only wonder. Possibly they would in any case have had to wait for a climate where they could be recognised as a contribution genuinely Marxist though often daringly novel, sometimes even eccentric. Now, at any rate, they are a treasure-trove for us to delve into or a rediscovered missing link, a lost generation, in the evolution of Marxism. Gramsci is a voice from the past, from beyond the tomb, and a summons to the future, he points us along one path towards a restored unity, or rather community of socialist thinking, for Europe and the world. Corsica astonished the world by producing Napoleon, and Sardinia with no Rousseau to prophesy produced Gramsci whose thoughts were to move about Europe as Napoleon's armies did.6

A sober realism was the key note of Gramsci's
Note Books, expressed in sober utilitarian language that contrasts startlingly with the many coloured glow of his prison letters. While in Russia success hardened Bolshevik thinking into dogma, failure taught Gramsci to question, doubt, analyse over and over again. Gramsci wrote - "Without scrupulous accuracy, scientific honesty, it would be impossible to work out the general character of Marx's ideas, from the master's scattered hints." Here was a standard of intellectual probity which from the standpoint of Stalinism, or of Maoism at its cruder levels - the doctrine that "truth" is what serves the working class, in other words the party leadership - would have to be called academic. With Gramsci, reasoning was never a bloodless, pedantic pursuit. "Political thinking cannot be purely objective or detached, because human will enters as a component of prediction - which only means seeing the present and the past clearly as movement: only the man who wills something strongly can identify the elements which are necessary to the realisation of his will, and strong passions are necessary to sharpen the intellect and help make intuition more penetrating", said Gramsci.

Minds like Gramsci's or Marx's can rove into the remotest seeming realms without losing the guiding thread of purpose that distinguishes them from the pedant or dilettante. Gramsci had found his own way to Marxism from out of a medley of contending-theories, and could still
take Sorel, seriously enough to find in him "flashes of profound intuition". This learning from scratch may have been necessary to form him into a creative Marxist. Doubtless with more books at hand he would have been a better ballasted Marxist, not perhaps so original a one. His basis was an adequate though far from exhaustive knowledge of the Marxist classic fertilised by a brief but intense season of political experience. This gives him a unique place among the major thinkers of the movement, as a pioneer, a scout, unencumbered with impediments, rather than a regular soldier. If we have his ideas only in fragmentary form, the same is true (except for economic theory) of those of Marx, who as Gramsci stressed left no rounded philosophy but only a heap of solutions or suggestions strewn here and there over his numerous works, mostly topical or unfinished. It may in fact belong to the nature of Marxism, as not a system but a search, to function best in this apparently haphazard fashion, and never to arrive at a codification. Gramsci risks a guess that the most significant views of any original mind should be looked for not in its direct pronouncements, but rather in its comments on extraneous issues.

Marxism represented to Gramsci the beginnings of a new civilisation; it opened up a completely new road. He felt that it was inefficiently developed for anyone to be able to sum up in popular treatise, like Bukharin's
Historical Materialism; any such attempt must produce an illusory appearance of unity and finality. At times Gramsci's words point to an inclination to regard Marxism as, potentially, if not actually, a self-sufficient whole. He defines Marxist orthodoxy, or emancipation from 'the old world' of ideas, as the fundamental concept that the philosophy of praxis (Sc. Marxism), is "sufficient unto itself" that it contains in itself all fundamental elements needed to construct a total and integral conception of the world."¹² This sounds like a claim to monopoly of truth.

Gramsci insists that Marxism must learn to transcend both idealism, the fetishism of ideas, and crude materialism, the denial of ideas. He found these opposite systems of error embodied in two writers, Croce and Bukharin, who were important to him for partly accidental reasons. No one can be perfectly equidistant from the two poles, and it is not surprising that Gramsci has often seemed to his readers a man brought up in the watery realm of ideas and finding his way from it to the terra firma of economics, rather than the other way about.

Gramsci did not set out to investigate the "mode of production" and its constituent parts, but he was haunted by the problem of base (or structure) and superstructure and their association, intimate but elastic and subtle like that of body and mind.
Coming to Gramsci's reflections on state, he declares that for classes with no long cultural and moral development of their own a ‘period of statolatry is necessary and indeed opportune’. In other words dictatorship of the proletariat in a backward country must mean respect for the state as a thing in itself, not only as an instrument, and the date for its whithering away must be a distant one. But it was not the socialist state alone that he had in mind when he queried Lasselle's view of the state as a mere "night-Watchman" or policeman, and credited it with a moral character.

Gramsci thought often about bureaucratism, and about the recruitment of bureaucracies from particular social strata. This was a subject of obvious interest for an Italian or Spaniard, because competition for state posts has been so heated in their retarded economies, by contrast with a country like England, where officialdom was a late and slow growth. He thought of the middle and lower bourgeoisie as the groups most addicted to government service. He noted that the transformation of politics since 1848 has included a proliferation of bureaucracies, unofficial ones of parties or trade unions as well as those of the state.

Gramsci viewed the state as a highly complex
phenomenon, and raised points about it which Marxists have seldom considered; for example 'the organic relations between the domestic and foreign policies of a state', and the question of which determines the other in certain contexts. As an illustration one might ask whether the absolute monarchies were chronically at war because of their intrinsic nature, or whether on the contrary, absolutism arose because countries had serious grounds for being chronically at war. Gramsci warns us above all, against conceiving the historic state too mechanically in terms of class power. Remarking that the concept of the state has been impoverished by the growth of sociology and the delusion that society can be studied by the methods of the natural sciences, he goes on: "the state is the complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules..." A ruling class holds sway by virtue of intelligence and character as well as by force. A corollary must be that it is in jeopardy when it loses its moral ascendancy, as the French aristocracy lost it long before 1789 to the bourgeoisie.

Gramsci writes in another pregnant adage that it matters very much to a ruling class, that the state, which the public looks up to as an independent entity, "should reflect back its prestige upon the class upon which it is
based. From this point of view it may be better for this class not to stand forward obtrusively but to leave the sceptre in other hands; that of a monarchy as in bourgeois Germany, or an aristocracy as in England. It must be set in the other scale that a ruling class which hides behind the facade of another is bound to contract weakness, short-sightedness; these were very marked in the German bourgeoisie, which left far more real authority to the Hohenzollerns and Junkers than was entrusted to Tory landlords in Britain. In countries where the ruling class lacks this spirit and is less self-reliant, it has often been nervously in haste to hand over the business of government to generals or dictators.

Gramsci pointed out that in the U.S.A., the State presented exceptional problems, because there the industrialists had succeeded in making the whole life of the nation revolve round production, and exercised their sway through the factory itself, with small need of professional political and ideological intermediaries. Since then salesmanship has been taking precedence over manufacturing and the State too has had to "sell itself" to the public, vastly expanding its apparatus in order to keep the country in good humour even more than for purposes of coercion. Another case Gramsci saw as exceptional was old Russia. "In Russia the state was everything, civil Society primordial and gelatinous."
Gramsci was a penetrating observer of social classes, their history and their special features in his own Italy, and one of his objections was to vulgar historical materialism the adulterated form in which Marxism was circulated— that it takes account only of sordid self-regarding motives, in a immediate and dirty Jewish sense forgetting the wider motivation of class. This fits into the thesis he advanced that economic forces are decisive only in an ultimate sense, and that men experience social conflict far more as struggle of ideas or beliefs than directly, as competition for shillings and pence. We may accept it for most of history, while wondering whether it still holds good of the advanced societies which in Gramsci's days were only entering on maturity.

Gramsci places class and nation side by-side when he speaks, very suggestively of an "educational relationship between all hegemonic classes or nations and the rest". An obvious example would be France's intellectual leadership of 18th Century Europe. He puts valuable stress too on the part played by international influences, those of ideology among them, in the moulding of class-consciousness. He says that this begins at the social apex. Those lower down lack a clear sense of their collective identity, and can only achieve self-awareness.
via a series of negations, by contrasting themselves with the classes above them. It is in the minds of intellectuals THAT the idea of the people takes shape, not in its own and in the tug-of-war of classes the higher ones, if not too decadent, have the advantage of longer traditions and memories. As Gramsci notes, unmistakably with recent Italian views in view, in times of crisis and dislocation the ruling class adopts itself more promptly, while the masses are prone to falling under the spell of 'violent solutions' offered by "men of destiny". We may indeed take failure by a ruling class to adjust itself to a novel quandry as proof of its obsolescence, such as that of the French nobility which in the two years before the Revolution so completely misconceived the situation facing it, and then for the most part collapsed so nervelessly taking its seat unresistingly in the tumbrils or at best running away to beg for foreign help.

"Every party is only the nomenclature for a class" appears too stringent a dictum, though at critical moments scattered political groupings will rally in a single class organization. Gramsci's conception of the party standing above the class as the class stands above the bulk of its members, is a most significant one. He says "parties are not simply a mechanical and passive expression of these classes, but react energetically upon them."
Gramsci was confronted with the question of how the working class was to succeed to the position of ruling class, and use it to remake society. Ruling groups realise their unity through the state and its bonds with society, whereas subordinate groups cannot unite until they are able to become a "state".30 If so, how can any of them acquire sufficient unity and resolve to take over the state? Of a modern bourgeoisie, at the level it was attaining in 18th Century France, we may say that it is close enough to the levers of power to see them within its reach, and how they can be utilised for its benefit, it itches to supplant its predecessor. To a labouring class, rural or urban, such an aspiration will not come so naturally; its instincts are defensive. A peasantry thinks of liberation from feudal burdens, a proletariat at first of liberation from the factory, then of bettering its conditions inside the factory. It would never be likely to imagine a dictatorship of the proletariat by itself, and Marxism in planning this road may have been confusing its own subjective requirements with the objective power of the working class to build it... some touch of Quixotic idealism, thirst for a new earth and a new heaven, may be needed to kindle the revolutionary mood which no economic grievances by themselves can produce. Gramsci was all the same well aware of the gap still to be crossed between the mass of the workers recognizing themselves as a class with common interests to defend and their aspiring to take power...
and build socialism. Gramsci had no thought of leaving it to history to do things by itself. Speculation about economic crisis or general strike conjuring up a tempest and transforming men's minds overnight, he dismissed as out and out historical mysticism. Only marxist parties could perform the task, and for him it was axiomatic that their function was to crystalize a socialist feeling in the working class and guide it towards power. They became necessary, he said, at the moment when in any country conditions are ripe for power to be taken over. The working class could come to power only by putting itself at the head of other sections of the people in need of change, in Italy primarily the peasantry. But it has everywhere found it hard to do this, or has baulked at the attempt almost as completely as at that of giving a lead to the masses in its countries colonies. In either case its assumption of leadership would probably require a certain abnegation or postponement of its own economic demands; it would be a matter of class consciousness having to learn as national consciousness has never learned to rise above self-asserting egotism. Gramsci argues "Revolutions are not made, in any immediate sense, by economic crisis" and asserts "nothing happens purely spontaneously" and emphasises "there are always leaders, initiators, though these may be nameless figures who leave no trace."

Regarding Fascism Gramsci's analysis looks
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curious. He made a conjecture that Fascism is a new type of "restoration", which might represent, in however distorted a manner, a kind of progress - even a kind of "passive revolution". It might not turn out to be entirely reactionary; it was at least shaking up an ossified state. He thought it implied some real turning against the old order with all its train of parasites, under compulsion of 'Problems which are disturbing the old European bone structure'. Italy like Germany had been inducted into the capitalist era by foreign war instead of by class conflict, without any true bourgeois revolution; hence much lumber from the past still littered the ground, and we looking back may agree that it was part of the 'Mission' of fascism to clear away some of it, in order to carry out its main task of exorcising socialism, by seeming to provide an alternative path of reform. Gramsci expected the modernizing tendency to include expansion of industry, urged on and directed by the state.

Gramsci says that "mass ideological factors always lag behind mass economic phenomena and act as a drag on their impetus." In modern times what has hampered guidance of events in a progressive direction is not any omnipotence of material forces, but the reverse - their not being powerful enough to overcome the inertia of men's minds. What is called for then is an acceleration of thought, more rapid spread of ideas, enabling them to keep
up with the facts of collected life instead of lagging behind them, Gramsci fixed his hopes in this regard, on the intelligentsia, but an intelligentsia of a new type. This makes him almost a subscriber to the 'great man' theory of history: when for instance he speaks of those thousands or hundreds or even dozens of scholars of the highest quality, which are necessary to every civilization. Quite often Gramsci may be open to the charge of supposing that the hand that fills the ink-pot rules the world. This would, all the same, be a travesty of his position, which is that ideas can be everything when fused with objective forces, nothing by themselves. Every philosophy, he surmises has addressed itself in one way or other to the problem of theory and practice and how to combine them, most obsessively in periods of rapid change. Gramsci said abstract ideas are mere moonshine, typical of pure intellectuals (or pure asses). They blossom in minds cut off from the universe of ordinary people, so that knowing is divorced from feeling: the intellectual can reach true understanding only when he enters into the problems of the people, and feels them as his own. The identity, or the common roots, of authentic thinking and social feeling is a principle deeply ingrained in Gramsci, himself a born scholar yet also a man of action.

According to Gramsci if the working class was to meet the demand of the situation which enabled it to create
a new culture and a new system of power, it must also create new, forms of intellectual work and new inter-relation between politics and economic production on the one hand, and on the other, the activity of those intellectuals who took the side of the proletariat. The proletariat needed organic intellectuals (one of Gramsci's favourite and most frequent adjectives), that is to say, intellectuals who did not simply describe social life from outside in accordance with scientific rules, but who used the language of culture to express the real experiences and feelings which the masses could not express for themselves. In order to understand those experiences, they must feel the same passions as the masses. On the one hand, each of the 'main social classes developed its own intellectual' stratum; on the other, intellectual work united people into a single stratum which preserved the continuity of culture through the ages and was bound by a certain solidarity. The victory of the working class was impossible without a cultural victory, and for this it needed to evolve an intellectual stratum which could express the actual experience of the masses with conviction and in educated language. The 'organic' character of intellectual and artistic work was also a condition of cultural achievement.

The concept of "Hegemony" is important in Gramsci's writings. The main task of the workers in modern times was to liberate themselves spiritually from the
culture of the bourgeoisie and the church and to establish their own cultural values in such way as to attract the oppressed and the intellectual strata to themselves. Cultural hegemony was a fundamental and prior condition of attaining political power. The Working class could only conquer by first imparting its world-view and system of values to other classes who might be its political allies: in this way it would become the intellectual leader of society, just as the bourgeoisie had done before seizing political control.\footnote{44}

Gramsci was convinced that the parliamentary system of government was done for and could not provide a model for the state of the future. Like Marx, he believed that socialism would in time obliterate the difference between civil society and the state, or rather would cause the first to absorb the second, while the police functions of the state would whither away and become unnecessary.\footnote{45}

Gramsci's views on state can be summed up as follows:

Gramsci redefines the state as force plus consent, or hegemony armoured by coercion, in which political society organizes force and civil society provides consent. Gramsci uses the word state in different ways. In a narrow legal constructional sense, as a balance
between political and civil society; or as encompassing both. Some writers criticize his weak view of the state which over-emphasizes the element of consent, while others stress that Gramsci is trying to analyse the modern interventionist state where the lines dividing civil and political society are increasingly blurred. He argues that the nature of political power in advanced capitalist countries, where civil society includes, complex institutions and mass organizations, determines the only strategy capable of undermining the present order and leading to a definitive victory for a socialist transformation, a war of position, or trench warfare; while war of movement or frontal attack, which was successful in the very different circumstances of Tsarist Russia is only a particular tactic. Influenced by Machiavelli, Gramsci argues that the Modern Prince- the revolutionary party- is the organism which will allow the working class to create a new society by helping it to develop its organic intellectuals and an alternative hegemony. The political, social and economic crisis of capitalism can, however, result in a reorganization of hegemony through various kinds of passive revolution, in order to pre-empt the threat by the working class movement to political and economic control by the ruling few, while providing for the continued development of forces of production. He includes in this category Fascism, different kinds of reformism, and the introduction in Europe of scientific management and
A variety of debates developed as his works began to be published after the Second World War. Among the questions raised are whether the crucial dimensions of his thought are Italian or international, the relationship of his ideas to those of Lenin etc.

In conclusion we present the salient features of Gramsci's communist doctrine. Firstly, Human Praxis determines the meaning of all components of knowledge and there is no fundamental distinction between scientific and humanistic knowledge, for all knowledge is in fact humanistic. Secondly, Gramsci rejects the idea of "Scientific Socialism", i.e., the doctrine (accepted by both Kautsky and Lenin, and in a modified form by Lukacs) that socialist theory must be evolved by intellectuals outside the workers movement and then injected into that movement as its correct and authentic class consciousness. According to Gramsci Socialist theory does not come into being without the aid of intellectuals, who are a necessary element in socialism, but it is no better than a doctrinaire pastime unless it exposes the actual experience of the working class. Thirdly, Gramsci takes a different view of the party. It must not be a party of manipulators, using tactical and demagogic means to achieve temporary advantage and finally grasping the opportunity to exercise
dictatorial power. According to him party shall be able to perform the tasks associated with the conquest of power by the proletariat, it must identify itself with the latter's real aspirations and organize them or express them in its ideology. Fourthly, according to Gramsci, revolution is not a mere technical act of seizing power, a Coup d'etat enabling the communists to impose their will on society. Communist revolution is a mass process in which the toiling masses, backed by democratic confidence of all working classes, take over economic and political leadership in their own name and not through a separate political entity. A revolution in this sense cannot take place unless it is preceded by a large measure of spiritual emancipation of the working class, transforming it from an object of the political process into a subject and initiator.

In conclusion it can be said that Gramsci envisaged the radical expropriation of the bourgeoisie, the collectivisation of all means of production, and the eventual abolition of the state, and looked forward to a society of perfect unity. Yet his idea of communism was different from Lenin's, both philosophically and politically, though he was probably not aware of this. One may say that Gramsci provided the ideological nucleus of an alternative form of communism, which, however, has never existed as a political movement, still less as an actual regime.47
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GYORGY LUKACS'S VIEWS:

In philosophy, as a principal figure of Western Marxism, Lukacs constantly championed the cause of dialectics against various forms of irrationalism and mechanical materialism and dogmatism. Among the Western Marxists who shared a utopian impulse and reread Marx with particular attention to the categories of culture, class consciousness and subjectivity, Lukacs can be considered one of the most significant. Lukacs in his most utopian formulations, viewed Marxism as committed to the abolition of political economy or to emancipation from the rule of the economy. The vocabulary and concepts of Western Marxists were resonant with Hegel and return to the Hegelian sources of Marxism marked the whole tradition, and Lukacs was no exception. It was in the context of an attempt to translate the lessons of the October Revolution into a new, non-evolutionist Marxism that there occurred this great 'return to Hegel' with which the name of Gyorgy Lukacs is associated along with Antonio Gramsci and Karl Korsch. Lukacs produced The Young Hegel in this tradition. This triumvirate, Lukacs, Gramsci and Korsch represented "the Hegelian Marxists". Having discussed Antonio Gramsci in a bid to understand the distinctness of Western Marxism in the backdrop of 'Classical Marxism', let us now delve into the world of Lukacs. While our primary concern is to ascertain his perspectives on the state, we take a cursory
look at his other important contributions to Marxian thought too.

Lukacs's major achievements range over a wide area, from aesthetics and literary criticism to philosophy, sociology and politics. In aesthetics, in addition to many works in which he developed a Marxist theory of realism from a strongly anti-modernist stance, he produced one of the most fundamental and comprehensive synthesis of the theory of art and literature. In philosophy, he elaborated in History and Class Consciousness, a theory of alienation and REIFICATION, well before the belated publication of Marx's seminal works on the subject. He also produced a monumental and still little understood social ontology in his last ten years of activity. In sociology, it was his theory of CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS which made the greatest impact, strongly influencing the "Sociology of Knowledge" and the FRANKFURT SCHOOL as well as more recent theories. And in politics, he is primarily remembered for his ideas on organizational matters and as one of the first advocates of the 'Popular Front' and of a mass based political participation in the 'Peoples' Democracies'.

Lukacs's Marxist period shows five distinct phases of activity:

1) 1919-1929: As one of the leaders of the
Hungarian Communist Party, Lukacs was heavily involved in day-to-day political struggle, vitiated by internal factional confrontations, constantly under fire from Bela Kun and his friends in the Third International. Many of his writings were concerned with political/agitational issues and with elaboration of a viable political strategy, culminating in the BLUM THESIS. Written in 1928 and advocating perspectives very similar to the 'Popular Front' (adopted as official Commintern policy seven years later, after Dimitrov's Speech), they arrived rather prematurely and were concerned by the Commintern as 'a half-social democratic liquidationist theory'. His main theoretical writings of this period were collected in three volumes: History and Class Consciousness (1923), Lenin: A Study on the Unity of his Thought (1924) and Political Writings (1919-1929) of these History and Class Consciousness condemned by the Commintern through Bukharin, Zinovjev and others—exercised an enormous influence, from Korsch to Benjamin and Merleau-Ponty and from Goldman to Marcuse and to the students movement of the late 1960s.

2) 1930-1945: Condemned to abandon active politics through the defeat of his 'Blum Theses', Lukacs wrote mainly essays on literary Criticism and two major theoretical works: The Historical Novel (1937) and The Young Hegel (1938). His literary studies were later collected into two volumes entitled studies in European
Realism; Goethe and His Age and Essays on Thomas Mann. Theoretically this period was marked by a modification of his earlier views on 'reflection' and by his rejection of the 'identical subject-object (as expressed in History and Class Consciousness) following the publication of Marx's Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts and Grundrisse and Lenin's Philosophical Note Books. For a brief period he was imprisoned in 1941, and was released on the intervention of Dimitrov who shared his perspectives.

3) 1945-1949: After his return to Hungary, Lukacs was heavily involved in cultural/political activity, publishing many literary essays and popular philosophical articles, and he founded and presided intellectually over the cultural monthly Forum. In 1949 he was violently attacked by the party ideologues Rudas, Horvath and Revai for the views expressed in his volumes Literature and Democracy and For a new Hungarian Culture which recalled the perspectives of the Blum Theses. These attacks (joined by Fadeev and other Russian figures) signalled the complete Stalinization of culture and politics in Hungary, and compelled Lukacs to withdraw to his philosophical studies.

4) 1950-56: He embarked on some major works of synthesis of which two were completed in this period. The Destruction of Reason and particularity as an Aesthetic Category. In 1956 he wrote The Meaning of Contemporary
Realism, and in October he became Minister of Culture in Imre Nagy's short-lived government. After the suppression of the Uprising he was deported with the other members of the Government to Roumania, Returning to Budapest in the summer of 1957.

5) 1957-1971: In this period he completed two massive synthesis; a work on AESTHETICS (The Specific Nature of the Aesthetic) (1962) and a social ontology (towards an ontology of Social Being) (1971) of which three chapters appeared in English: Hegel (1978) Marx (1978) and Labour (1980).49

Lukacs was condemned and attacked by orthodox Stalinists and frequently submitted to party discipline, recanting his previous opinions only to disavow or modify the recantation when times became easier. Thus his works are full of palinodes, retractions, withdrawals of retractions, and reinterpretations of earlier writings, particularly in forewords and epilogues to reprints of his books that appeared in the 1960s.50

As a philosopher of exceptional brilliance, we find Lukacs endeavour to relate even the most detailed questions to the totality of great social processes and the past and future history of mankind. This attitude, he believed, was essential to Marxism as it was to
Hegelianism, and accordingly he approached all questions from the standpoint of a philosopher. To understand the view of Lukacs regarding Marx's conception of society and the dialectical method, we have to peruse through his works, *Tactics and Ethics* and *History and Class Consciousness*. Lukacs poses the question "What is orthodox Marxism?" and answers it by saying that this concept does not involve the acceptance of any particular tenet. An orthodox Marxist does not, as such, owe allegiance to any specific view and may criticize Marx's ideas so long as he remains faithful to the essence of Marxism, namely the dialectical method. 'Method' does not mean here a set of rules for intellectual operations, as it does in logic, but a particular way of thinking which includes awareness that in thinking about the world it is also helping to change it, being at the same time a practical commitment. The Marxian dialectic is not merely a way of perceiving or describing social reality, or even indicating how it should be described: it is the main spring of social revolution and does exist outside the revolutionary process, of which, as method, it forms an integral part. Lukacs argues that this conception of method involves regarding the social universe as a single whole of totality, is the key to Marxist theory. "According to Lukacs- This absolute primacy of the whole, its unity over and above the abstract isolation of its parts- such is the essence of Marx's conception of society and of the dialectical method."51
Thus according to him Marx's theory of revolution and socialism can be based only on a global understanding of society that cannot be achieved by any detailed factual analysis. In *History and Class Consciousness* Lukács emphasizes that a theory which simply takes account of facts as they are directly given is, by the same token, locating itself within capitalist society. But to understand the meaning of facts is to situate them in a 'concrete whole' and to discover the 'mediation' between them and the whole, which of course is not directly given. The truth of the part resides in the whole, as if each part is properly examined the whole can be discerned in it. The whole is the vehicle of the 'revolutionary principle, in social practice as well as in theory. There is only one single science, embracing the whole of human history—politics, economics, ideology, law, etc., and it is that whole which gives meaning to every separate phenomenon. Facts are not the final reality but are artificially isolated aspects (Momente) of the whole: the over-all trend of historical evolution is more real than the data of experience. But, the 'whole' is not simply a state of affairs comprising all the particulars of reality at a given moment. It must be understood as a dynamic reality, involving a certain trend, its direction, and its results. It is in fact identical with present, past and future history—but a future which is not simply 'foreseen' like a fact in nature, but which is created by the act of
foreseeing it. Thus is whole is anticipatory, and present facts can only be understood in relation to the future. If the integral viewpoint is abandoned, capitalism does indeed seem invincible, as the peculiar laws governing its economy appear to be 'given' as unalterable facts and laws of nature, which may be turned to use but cannot be nullified. A global view on the other hand shows capitalism to be a historical and transient phenomenon, and is therefore the vehicle of revolutionary consciousness.\textsuperscript{52}

In his book on Lenin, Lukacs again uses the notion of Totalitat to describe the core of Lenin's doctrine and the secret of its greatness. Lenin was the one genius who discerned the revolutionary trend of the age independently of particular facts and events, or rather in the facts themselves, and united all current issues even the smallest, in a single great socialist perspective. He knew the global process was more real than any of its details, and despite all appearances he saw that the hour of revolution had already struck.\textsuperscript{53}

Lukacs contends that the maxim 'social being determines consciousness' has nothing to do with what is called economism. This maxim does not link the world of forms and the contents of consciousness with the economic structure in a directly productive relationship, but links it with the whole social being. The determination of
consciousness by social being is thus of a purely general kind. Only vulgar Marxism, from the Second International to the age of Stalin and after, claimed to establish a direct unqualified causal link between the economy, or even particular aspects of it, on the one hand, and ideology on the other. In other words, the basic dependence in social life is not between the base and the superstructure but between social being (or 'the whole' i.e., everything) and particular elements of the whole.

This delineation of the essence of Marx's conception of Society and of the dialectical method by Lukacs provides a vital link to the understanding of the concept of state, the theory of revolution and the emergence of socialism.

Lukacs emphasizes the fundamental quality of dialectical thinking by stating that the dialectic is not simply a scientific method that can be transferred at will from one object to another nor is it independent of the subject who applies it. According to him in both Hegel's and Marx's theory, it is an active constituent of the Social reality to which it is applied as a method, and not simply a way of apprehending that reality. It is the expression of history ripening towards the final transformation and is also the theoretical consciousness of the social agent, namely the proletariat, by which that
transformation is to be brought about. The dialectic does not exist outside the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, it is the self-awareness of that struggle and a component of it.

The dialectic presupposes the conception of society as a whole; and only the social agent which is itself a 'whole' i.e., Marx's "universal class", the proletariat can perceive the whole in isolated phenomena. In accordance with Hegel's principle, the truth is the subject i.e., in the present case, the truth concerning the historical process can be revealed only from the viewpoint of the class whose revolutionary initiative is destined radically to transform the whole of social life and to abolish the class society.

Marxism, is not a scientific description of historical reality that anyone can accept if he applies logical rules correctly. It is nothing else than the theoretical consciousness of the working class as it matures towards revolution; and the class consciousness of the proletariat is not a mere reflection of an independent historical process, but is the indispensable driving force of that process. Unlike all previous revolutions as a matter of principle, cannot be brought about without the complete, un-mystified self-awareness of the proletariat in regard to its position in society and the destiny it is
The proletariat is doubly privileged by history; it is called upon to achieve the radical task of abolition of class divisions and exploitation; it is also privileged from the epistemological point of view as its historic role entails the complete understanding of society. Only the proletariat can apprehend history as a whole, for only its actions is the totality truly realised as a revolutionary movement. The Proletariat's self-awareness coincides with its awareness of history as a whole; theory and practice coincide, as the proletariat transforms the world in the process by which it arrives at a mature understanding of the world. In this particular case the understanding and transformation of reality are not two separate processes, but one and the same phenomenon. Proletariat cannot at any point detach its 'ideal' from the actual process of realizing it. Socialism is not a state of affairs waiting for humanity and guaranteed by the impersonal laws of history, nor is it a moral imperative, it is the self-knowledge of the proletariat, an aspect of its actual struggle.

According to Lukacs, Hegel and Marx after him had overcome the dualism of 'what is and what ought to be', subject and object, freedom and necessity, the fact and the norm are no longer opposed but are aspects of a single
reality. This put an end to the Kantian dilemma of how obligation can be deduced from empirical facts, and likewise to the dilemma of 'Scientism'. In the same way there is no longer a conflict between voluntarism and determinism, or human will and scientific prediction. The act of foreseeing, coincides with the act of effecting what is foreseen; the proletariat knows the future in the act of creating it, not after the fashion of a weather forecast where the changes that actually happen are unaffected by anything the forecaster can do. Lukacs argues that this unity of the object and subject, of history of the cognitive and normative aspects of consciousness is the most precious legacy of Hegelianism to Marxism. A Marxist must be someone who plays a practical part in the movement that gives effect to the theory, for the theory is itself nothing but the self-awareness of the movement.\textsuperscript{56}

As the dialectic consists of the interaction of the historical subject and object in the movement towards unity, it follows that Engels idea of the dialectic of nature is untenable; on this point Lukacs accuses Engels of culpable misapprehension of the spirit of Marxian dialect. If the dialect denotes a mere system of ready-made natural laws ascertained by man, we are still in the realm of 'predestined' reality and the idea of knowledge as purely contemplative. The laws of dialect turn out to be an unalterable property of nature; we can discover them and
use them, but this external knowledge of nature and its exploitation by human technology have nothing to do with dialect as understood by Marx and Hegel. The dialectic loses its revolutionary character and the unity of theory and practice can be conceived only in a contemplative bourgeois, reified sense- the technical exploitation of the world as it exists, not the collective subject taking possession of the world by revolutionary action. Pre-Marxist philosophy with its dichotomy between knowledge and praxis was obliged to see the world as a collection of crystalized 'data' and praxis as a set of arbitrary ethical precepts and technical devices. The idea of the unity of subject and object cannot survive if the dialect relates to external nature. For the same reason knowledge cannot be regarded as the mere 'reflection' of a pre-existing reality.

From the point of view of dialectics as Lukacs understands it, to treat cognition as the 'reflection' of the external world in mental experience is to perpetuate the dualism of thought and being and to assume that they are fundamentally alien to each other. If however, cognition signifies taking possession of the world in a process of revolutionary change, and if understanding and changing the world are a single indivisible act, liberated consciousness of the proletariat, it no longer makes sense to speak of knowledge as a process whereby an
already existing world duplicates itself in passive human consciousness. The process of thought is not dialect unless it is part of the historical process of transforming its object.

The 'contemplative' notion of reality, which leaves no room for the unity of theory and practice or the subjects creative role, is linked by Lukacs with "reification" as a typical feature of the mystified consciousness of capitalist society. The term 'reification' was not used by Marx and in fact owes its currency to Lukacs himself but the idea is thoroughly Marxian; the analysis of commodity fetishism in Volume I of Capital is really an analysis of the reified consciousness. The bourgeoisie, by virtue of its social action, must have a false consciousness; it is contrary to its interests to understand the nature of economic crises and the transient historical character of the system in which it plays the dominant role. Reification cannot be overcome within the terms of bourgeois consciousness. Only when the proletariat, which is a mere commodity in bourgeois society, becomes aware of its own situation will it be able to understand the social mechanism as a whole. The consciousness of the proletariat may be thought of as an acquisition of self-knowledge by a commodity. In the proletariat's situation the process of reification, the transformation of men and women into things, takes on an
acute form. When the proletariat becomes aware of itself as a commodity it will at the same time understand and rebel against the reification of all forms of social life. Its awakened subjectivity will liberate the whole of humanity from the thraldom of objects; its self knowledge is not a mere perception of the world as it is, but a historical movement of emancipation, and for consciousness of this kind there can be no question of a mere 'reflection' of reality. Hence proletarian consciousness is not a mere 'reflection' of reality but a conscious rebellion against the reification of all forms of social life in the process of liberating the whole of humanity from the thraldom of objects and for emancipation.

Lukacs's criticism, aimed directly at Engels and implicitly at Lenin, aroused the wrath of orthodox Russian Marxists. In 1933, Lukacs withdrew his criticism of the theory of Reflection and the dialectic of nature; History and Class Consciousness, he declared, was an idealist work, and as idealism was the ally of Fascism and of its social democratic hangers-on his error was dangerous in practice as well as in theory. Lukacs repeated his recantation several times in similar terms, blaming his mistake either on revolutionary impatience or on his Hegelian and syndicalist background. After Stalin's death he tempered his self-criticism to a great extent. In the preface to a new edition of his book in 1967 he admitted to having
neglected Marx's distinction between objectivization and alienation and, in consequence, pushed too far his own theory of the identity of subject and object (i.e., presumably by suggesting that all objectivity ceased to exist in the proletarian consciousness, and not only the alienated object). As, however, labour itself was necessarily a process of objectivization it could not be said that all objectivity disappeared in the revolutionary process, and therefore it was wrong completely to exclude 'reflection' from the act of cognition.

In short, Lukacs did not deliver a clear judgment, on his early work. He certainly did not abandon his theory of totality and mediation or his critique of reification and he held on to his view of the basic distinction between humanistic and natural science. The upshot of his revised theory seems to be that in the revolutionary movement object and subject coincide, but only to a certain degree; it remains true that the cognition of social reality is itself a part of that reality and that the proletarian consciousness revolutionizes the world in the very act of understanding it. It can also still be maintained that Marxism has overcome the dilemma of freedom versus necessity, facts versus values, will versus fore-knowledge; but it is not the case that this does away with objectivity altogether. This being Lukacs's final position, are we to take it
simply as meaning that he wished to exclude the idea that all reality, including external nature and the objective material products of human labour, was subsumed into conscious revolutionary praxis— in other words, that he desired to limit the identity of subject and object to the sphere of social process and not to extend it to the extra-human world? If so, this would not mean a significant departure from his original thesis but rather a restatement of it. 58

Lukacs provided a better theoretical foundation for belief in the infallibility of the party than anyone before him, including Lenin. In Tactics and Ethics, he had already stated that it is the great achievement of Russian Bolshevism to incorporate, for the first time since the Paris Commune, the consciousness of the proletariat and its self-knowledge in terms of world history. 59 In the nature of things, Bolshevism was the truth of the present age—a belief that Lukacs never renounced. Lukacs also had no doubt that the dictatorship of the proletariat was and ought to be realized as the dictatorship of the party. In his book on Lenin, Lukacs condemned the ultra-leftists who regarded the Soviets (Workers councils) as the permanent forms of class organization and sought to establish them in place of the party and the trade unions. The Soviets, Lukacs argued, were naturally designated organs of the struggle against the bourgeois government in the
revolutionary period, but those who wished to endow them with state power after the revolution did not understand the difference between a revolutionary and a non-revolutionary situation, in short, they were thinking un-dialectically. The party's role after a successful revolution was greater and not less than before, one reason being that in the post-revolutionary period the class-struggle, far from abating, became inevitably more and more acute. This doctrine, as to the role of the Soviets differs to some extent from that expressed in Lukacs's main work, where he said that it was their function to liquidate the bourgeois distinction between executive, legislative, and judicial powers and to be an instrument of 'Mediation' between the immediate and ultimate interests of the proletariat. This might suggest that Lukacs ascribed to the Soviets functions which, according to Lenin, belonged exclusively to the party (although other references to the party in History and Class Consciousness do not support this view). However, in his work on Lenin he corrects any such ultra-leftist errors and makes it clear that after a victorious revolution, the Soviets can be dispensed with. From that time on, it would appear, the task of abolishing the bourgeois separation of powers devolves on the party in other words, the latter makes the laws, carries them out and judges offenders without aid or supervision from any quarter. In 1924, Lukacs proclaimed a world-view purged of any remnants of
Lukacs was, beyond doubt, an outstanding interpreter of Marx's doctrine, and rendered great service by reconstructing it in a completely different way from that followed by the previous generations of Marxists. He emphasized Marx's profound debt to the Hegelian dialect as the interplay of subject and object seeking identity. Lukacs showed, in the historically privileged case of the working class the 'objective' process coincided with the development of awareness of that process, so that free action and historical inevitability became one and the same thing. Lukacs certainly formulated a radically new and correct interpretation of Marx's Philosophy, and from this point of view his achievement is unquestionable. Lukacs viewed Marxism as not simply a theory about the world, which can be accepted by anyone whether or not he approves the values of the political Marxist movement; it is an understanding of the world that can only be enjoyed within that movement and in political commitment to it. Thus Lukacs showed that Marxist consciousness obeys the epistemological rules appropriate to a myth. Lukacs's Marxism implies the abandonment of intellectual, logical and empirical criteria of knowledge and as such it is anti-rational and anti-scientific.

It is significant to note the Lukacs's argument
that "as long as the world is torn by the struggle between capitalism and socialism and if socialism is assumed on philosophical grounds to be an essentially superior system irrespective of any empirical facts, then clearly any internal opposition to socialism as it exists at a given time is a blow struck in favour of the enemy. Any public criticism, however mild, of the system and its leaders is exploited in some way by the adversary a fact which, even since Soviet Russia came into existence, has been effectively used to silence real, imaginary or potential critics by branding them as allies of imperialism."61

Though this theoretical justification, he strengthened his stand in not opposing Stalinism, even though Stalin might have made mistakes.

There is a school of thought which compares Lukacs to Jesuit Naptha in Thomas Mann's "The Magic Mountain" a highly intelligent character who needs authority, finds it and renounces his own personality for its sake.62 Whether this description of Lukacs would be accepted or not it cannot be denied that he was an extremely important figure in the history of Marxism as also among "Western Marxists", and his perspectives on the state enable a neo-classical understanding of this vital phenomenon.

As one of the most outstanding Marxist
philosophers during the period of Stalinist orthodoxy, Lukacs, whose role in the history of Marxism has remained a matter of lively controversy, has made a very significant contribution to the theoretical understanding of the State from a Marxian perspective. His conceptualisation of class consciousness, enunciation of the phenomenon of reification, delieration of dialectics and its method etc., have had a great bearing on the interpretation of Marx's theory of revolution and socialism. Even though these have already been discussed at length in expounding the views of Lukacs, a very concise presentation of the most significant aspects of his contribution to the theoretical understanding of the State, has been made in this exercise of summing up.

Lukacs's critique of empiricism and his theory of dialectical method are basic to the theory of the state. According to him Marxian dialect is the main-spring of social revolution. The key to Marxist theory is the dialectical method regarding social universe as a single whole of 'totality'. According to Lukacs - "This absolute primacy of the whole, its unity over and above the abstract isolation of its parts - such is the essence of Marx's conception of Society and of the dialectical method". Thus he says - "Marx's theory of revolution and socialism can be based only on a global understanding of Society".
Lukacs presents the concept of "integral view" which involves the understanding of the 'whole' as not simply as a state of affairs comprising of all the particulars of reality at a given moment, but as a dynamic reality. The dynamic reality is identical with past present and future; it is not simply what is 'foreseen' like a fact in nature, but which is created by the act of foreseeing. This global view alone will enable capitalism, which looks like an invisible one, become a historical and transient phenomenon and a vehicle of a revolutionary consciousness.

Lukacs held out that the basic dependence in social life is not between 'base' and 'superstructure' but between 'Social being' and particular elements of the 'whole' and thus torpedoes the concepts of base and superstructure.

The other important concepts of Lukacs relate to 'unity of subject and object of history', 'unity of normative and cognitive aspects of consciousness' and 'unity of theory and practice'. Lukacs highlights the role of the Proletariat, the "universal class" (as called by Marx), which class alone can perceive the whole in the isolated phenomenon. He says that the Proletariat, whose revolutionary initiative is destined radically to transform the whole of social life and to abolish the class society.
The Proletariat is the indispensable driving force of historical process.

Lukacs distinguishes the previous revolutions from the Proletarian revolution and says that in the Proletarian revolution the proletariat has unmystified self-awareness in regard to its position in the Society and the destiny it is called upon to fulfil.

According to Lukacs, Socialism is not a state of affairs waiting for humanity and guaranteed by the impersonal laws of history, nor is it a moral imperative but the self-knowledge of the proletariat, an aspect of its actual struggle.

Applying the concepts of unity of subject and object, unity of theory and practice; Lukacs identifies that the Proletariat has a double privilege. One, the abolition of class divisions and exploitation; the other, from the epistemological point of view, its historic role entails the complete understanding of society. He says "A Marxist must be someone who plays a practical part in the movement that give effect to theory, for the theory is itself nothing but the self-awareness of the movement." As theory and practice coincide, the Proletariat transforms the world in the process by which it arrives at a mature understanding of the world.
Lukacs emphasises the relevance of the phenomenon of Reification and proletarian consciousness and says that proletarian consciousness is not a mere reflection of reality but a conscious rebellion against the reification of all forms of social life in the process of liberating the whole of humanity from the thraldom of objects and for emancipation.

Lukacs holds that the dictatorship of the proletariat was and ought to be realized as the dictatorship of the party. He said that Soviets were designed as organs of struggle against the bourgeois government in the revolutionary period and that after the victorious revolution the Soviets can be dispensed with and the Party can take its place in building a classless society.

Lukacs propounded that as long as the world is torn by the struggle between socialism and capitalism, the upholder of Socialism as a 'Superior' system should not oppose it internally as that would be taken advantage of by the enemy to wreck Socialism from outside. It is because of this conviction that he did not oppose Stalinism even though he had found many mistakes in Stalin's thought and action.
HERBERT MARCUSE'S VIEWS:

From a journey to Western Marxism let us make a detour to the Frankfurt School to get a fuller view of Neo-classical Marxism regarding its perspectives on state. The idea of the Frankfurt school are generally referred to under the heading "Critical Theory" and came to be associated with an anti-Bolshevik radicalism or open ended critical Marxism. Hostile to both capitalism and soviet socialism, its writings sought to keep alive the possibility of an alternate path for social development, and many of these committed to the New Left in the 1960s and 1970s found in its work both an intriguing interpretation of Marxist theory and an emphasis on issues and problems (bureaucracy and authoritarianism, for instance) which had rarely been explored by the more orthodox approaches to Marxism. The genesis of the Frankfurt school, which emerged in Germany during the 1920s and 1930s is inseparable from the debate over what constitutes Marxism, or the scope of a theory designed with a practical intent, to criticize and subvert domination in all its forms. The tradition of thinking which can be loosely referred to as the Frankfurt School, is divided into two branches. The first, was centered around the Institute of Social Research, established in Frankfurt in 1923, exiled from Germany in 1933, relocated in United States shortly thereafter and re-established in Frankfurt.
in the early 1950s. The Institutes key figures were Marx Horkheimer (Philosopher, Socialologist and Social Psychologist), Friedrich Pollock (Economist and specialist on the problems of National Planning), Theodor Adorno (Philosopher, Sociologist, Musicologist), Erich Fromm (Psycho-analyst, Social Psychologist), Herbert Marcuse (Philosopher), Otto Kirchheimer (Political Scientist, with expertise in law), Leo Lowenthal (student of Popular culture and literature), Henryk Grossman (Political Economist), Arkady Gurland (Economist, Sociologist) and as a member of the Outer circle of the Institute, Walter Benjamin (Essayist and Literary Critic). The pre-eminent members of the Frankfurt School were Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse and Habermas and their key contributions to the critical theory of society centered around certain common strands in their work. The extension and development of the notion of critique, from a concern with the conditions of possibility of reason and knowledge (Kant) to a reflection on the emergence of spirit (Hegel) and then to a focus on specific historical forms - capitalism, the exchange process (Marx)- was furthered by them. Through an examination of these systems they hoped to enhance awareness of the roots of domination, undermine ideologies and help to compel changes in consciousness and action. All four thinkers retained many of the concerns of German Idealism- for example, the nature of reason, truth and beauty but reformulated the way these had been understood.
by Kant and Hegel. Following Marx they placed history at the centre of their approach to philosophy and society (eg. Marcuse) but while each of them maintained that all knowledge is historically conditioned, they contended that truth claims can be rationally adjudicated independently of particular social (eg. class) interests. They defended the possibility of an autonomous moment of criticism (Horkheimer; Adorno).  

That Marxism became a repressive ideology in its Stalinist manifestation—thereby confirming that its doctrines do not necessarily offer the key to truth—constitutes one of the crucial premises of critical theory. It allows recognition not only of the fact that Classical Marxist concepts are inadequate to account for a range of phenomena (Stalinism, fascism, among other things), but also that the ideas and theories of, for example, Weber and Freud provide vital clues to problems that face Marxists—why revolution in the West was expected and why it has not occurred. While they acknowledge the central importance of Marx's contribution to political economy, this is regarded as an insufficient basis for the comprehension of contemporary society. The expansion of the state into more and more areas, the governing interlocking of base superstructure the spread of what they called as culture industry, the development of authoritarianism all implied that political economy had to be integrated with other
concerns. Hence political sociology, cultural criticism, psycho-analysis and other disciplines found a place in the frame-work of Critical Theory. The Frankfurt School decisively broadened the terms of reference of critique and helped to transform the notion of the political. They also contributed new emphasis and ideas in their conception of theory and practice. Marcuse's defence, for instance, of personal gratification (against those revolutionaries who maintained ascetic and puritanical outlook) of individual self-emancipation (against those who would simply argue that liberation follows from changes in the relations and forces of production); and of fundamental alternatives to the existing relationship between humanity and nature (against those who would accelerate the development of existing forms of technology); all constitute a significant departure from traditional Marxist doctrines. The Central tenet of their thought is that the process of liberation entails a process of self-emancipation and self-creation. Although what has become known as "Frankfurt" School theory often began from familiar Marxian axioms, many of the conclusions reached ran counter to traditional Marxist theory as their findings highlighted many obstacles to social transformation in the foreseeable future.

The following constellation of elements was central to their account of contemporary developments in capitalist society:
i) They identified a trend towards increasing integration of the economic and political.

ii) that the increasing inter-locking of economy and polity ensures the subordination of local initiative to bureaucratic deliberation, and of the market allocation of resources to centralized planning.

iii) that with the spread of bureaucracy and organization, there is an extension of the rationalization of social life, through the spread of instrumental reason—a concern with the efficiency of means to pre-given goals.

iv) that a continual extension of the division of labour fragments tasks. As tasks become increasingly mechanised there are fewer chances, for the worker to reflect upon and organize his or her own labour. The majority of occupations become atomized isolated units.

(v) That with the fragmentation of tasks and knowledge the experience of class diminishes. Domination becomes even more impersonal. The particular pattern of social relations which condition these processes—the capitalist relations of production—are reified. As more and more areas of social life take on the characteristics of mere commodities, reification is reinforced, and social
relations become ever less comprehensible, conflict centres increasingly on marginal issues which do not test the foundation of society. 67

Theodor Adorno, one of the key figures of this school, maintained on an analysis of television, art, popular music and astrology, that the products of Industry simply duplicate and reinforce the structure of the world people attempt to avoid. They strengthen the belief that negative factors in life are due to natural causes or chance, thus promoting a sense of fatalism, dependence and obligation. The culture industry produces a social cement for the existing order. 68 In his classic study, The Authoritarian Personality, aimed at analysing this susceptibility in terms of a personality syndrome which crystalizes under pressures. The study showed how deeply ideology was ingrained, and why it was that people might accept belief systems "contrary to their rational interests". 69

Jurgen Habermas, another important member of this School, developed his ideas in a frame-work which substantially differs from that of Horkheimer, Adorno or Marcuse. He probed further into the philosophical foundations of critical theory attempting to explicate its presuppositions about rationality and the good society and has recast its account of the developmental possibilities of
capitalist society.  

In this backdrop of the general developments of the Frankfurt School, a more specific attention is given to the study of the contributions of Herbert Marcuse to the theory of state, in particular, and to the unravelling of Marxism, in general.

In an address delivered in Korcula, Yugoslavia, Herbert Marcuse, raised the question of "whether it is possible to conceive of revolution when there is no vital need for it". The need for revolution, he explained, "is something quite different from a vital need for better working conditions, a better income, more liberty and so on, which can be satisfied within the existing order. Why should the overthrow of the existing order be of vital necessity for people who own, or can hope to own good clothes, a well stocked larder, a TV Set, a car, a house and so on, all within the existing order. Marx, Marcuse related, expected a working-class revolution because in his view, the labouring masses, represented the absolute negation of the bourgeois order. The accumulation of capital destined the workers to increasing social and material misery. They were thus both inclined and driven to oppose and to transform capitalist Society. However, if the proletariat, is no longer the negation of capitalism then according to Marcuse, it is no longer qualitatively
not only the socially needed occupations, skills and attitudes, but also individual needs and aspirations. It obliterates the question between private and public existence, between individual and social needs and it serves to institute new, more effective, and more pleasant forms of social control and social cohesion."\(^77\) In totalitarian technology, Marcuse says, "culture politics and the economy merge into an omnipresent system which swallows up or repulses all alternatives. The productivity and growth potential of this system stabilize the society and contain technical progress within the framework of domination."\(^78\)

Marcuse recognizes of course that there are large areas where these totalitarian tendencies of control and cohesion do not exist.\(^79\) But he regards this as merely a question of time, as these tendencies assert themselves "by spreading to less developed and even pre-industrial areas of the world, and by creating similarities in the development of capitalism and communism."\(^80\) Because technological rationality tends to become political rationality Marcuse thinks that the traditional notion of the neutrality of technology must be given up for any political change can turn into qualitative social change only to the degree to which it would alter the direction of technical progress that is, develop a new technology."\(^81\)
It is clear that Marcuse is not realistically describing existing conditions but rather observable tendencies within these conditions. In his view, it is the unchallenged unfolding of the potentialities of the present system which seems to lead into completely integrated totalitarian society. Preventing this development, Marcuse says, would now require that the oppressed classes "liberate themselves from themselves as well as from their masters". To transcend established conditions presupposes transcendence with these conditions, a feat denied one-dimensional man in one dimensional society. And thus Marcuse concludes that "the critical theory of society possesses no concepts which could bridge the gap between the present and the future; holding no promise and showing no success, it remains negative." In other words the critical theory of Marxism is now merely a beau geste. For Marcuse the world is in a bad and hopeless state just because Marxism proved no match for the resilience of capitalism and for its capacity not only to absorb the revolutionary potentialities of the working class but to turn them to its own advantage. In view of the present situation in the advanced capitalist nations, history, seems to validate "Marxian" revisionism rather than revolutionary Marxism. Marcuse bases his pessimism on what appears to him to be capitalism's newly gained ability to solve economic problems by political gains. Marcuse describes the situation of co-existence of communism and
capitalism "which explains both the metamorphosis of capitalism and the disfigurement—which the original idea of socialism has undergone in practice." While this co-existence precludes the full realization of socialism, he also sees it as the driving power behind the general growth of productivity and production. It impels capitalism "to stabilize itself and hence it brings social integration within capitalist society; there is a suspension of anti-thesis and contradictions within the society." Marcuse thinks that capitalism can continue to develop the social forces of production, and still maintain its class structure. In his view, it is not capitalism's class character which hinders technical development, it is technology rather which secures the continued existence of capitalism. Marcuse says "Technical Progress, technology itself, have become a new system of exploitation and domination." A system which is no longer challenged but willingly or passively, accepted by all social classes. According to Marcuse "Marx did not foresee technologically advanced society" is hardly justifiable in view of Marx's projection of social development towards the abolition of labour through the unfolding of the social forces of production, which include science and technology. But it is true that Marx did not believe that much in this direction could be done within the confines of capitalism, which was an additional reason for calling its abolition. Capitalism has always been simultaneously a productive and
a destructive system, not only in every day competition, but in an accelerated and concentrated form, in times of crisis and depression. Imperialist conflicts, finding their decisive sources in economic rivalries, led to destructive world wide wars. Both the destruction of capital values in peaceful competition and in bringing about a new upswing in capital production and a further extension of its markets. What Marcuse relates as typical for "mature capitalism", has been typical all along; only the social consequences were less devastating and less ferocious because the more limited possibilities of production also circumscribed those of destruction.  

It is, of course, conceivable that nothing will move the working population, that they would rather accept whatever misery comes their way than rise in opposition to the system responsible for it. However, the absence of a revolutionary consciousness is not the absence of intelligence. It is far more likely that the modern working class will not indefinitely endure all that the capitalist system has in store for it; there may be a breaking point where intelligence may come to include class consciousness. The readiness to take revolutionary steps does not necessitate a consistent oppositional behaviour prior to the first independent act; an apathetic working class under certain conditions can become an aroused working class under different conditions. Because it is
this class which will most deeply be affected by a reversal of the fortunes of capital production, or by capitalist excursions into war, it may in all likelihood be the first to break with the one-dimensional ideology of capitalist rule.

But again, there is no certainty. There is only a chance - as Marcuse remarks in a somewhat different context. But it is only a chance not because part of the proletariat is left out of the capitalist integration process, but because capital may destroy the world before an opportunity arises to stay it hands. Integration in death is the only integration really given to capitalism. Short of this final integration one-dimensional man will not last for long. He will disappear at the first break-down of the capitalist economy in the bloodbaths the capitalist order is now preparing for him. Capitalism, at the height of its powers is also at its most vulnerable; it has nowhere to go but to its death. However small the chances are of revolt, this is not the time to throw in the towel. 94

Is there a way out of the system which multiplies bogus needs and offers the means of satisfying them, and which binds the multitude under a spell of false consciousness. Yes, says Marcuse, there is. We must completely 'transcend' existing society and strive for a
qualitative change; we must destroy the very structure of reality so that people can develop their needs in freedom; we must have a new technology (not simply an application of the present one) and recapture the unity of art and science, science and ethics; we must set free our imaginations and harness science to the liberation of mankind. But who is to do all this when a majority of the people, and especially, the working class, are absorbed by the system and are not interested in the global transcendence of the existing order? The answer according to one-Dimensional Man, is that underneath the conservative popular base is the substratum of the outcasts and outsiders the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colours, the unemployed and the enemployable. They exist outside the democratic process—The fact that they start refusing to play the game may be the fact which marks the beginning of the end of a period." Accordingly it would mean that the lumpen proletariat of the racial minorities are ordained above all others to restore the unity of Eros and Logos, to create the new qualititative science and technology and to free mankind from the tyranny of formal logic, positivism and expiricism. However, Marcuse explains elsewhere that we can also count on other forces, namely students, and the peoples of economically and technically backward countries. The alliance of these three groups is the chief hope for the liberation of humanity. Student movements of revolt are a "decisive
factor of transformation, though in themselves insufficient to bring it about. According to Marcuse Revolutionary forces must use violence, because they represent a higher justice and because the present system is itself one of institutionalized violence. Violence is justified when the aim is liberation. It is also an important and encouraging sign that the students political revolt is combined with a movement towards sexual liberation. Violence is inevitable because the present system afflicts the majority with a false consciousness from which only a few can liberate themselves. Capitalism has devised such means of assimilating all forms of culture and thought it can disarm its critics by turning their criticism into an element of the system: what is needed, therefore, is criticism by violence, which cannot be thus digested. It follows that those endowed with a true and unmystified consciousness must strive for liberation from democratic freedoms and tolerance. 97

"Liberating tolerance... Would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the left".98 This simple formula epitomizes the kind of tolerance that Marcuse advocates. His object is not to set up a dictatorship but to achieve true democracy by combating the idea of tolerance, on the ground that the vast majority cannot form right judgments when their minds are deformed by democratic sources of
information. He said when it is a question of establishing a new society, indiscriminate tolerance cannot be permitted. Marcuse did not write from a communist standpoint but rather from that of the New left which broadly shared his ideas. His attitude to existing forms of communism was one of mixed criticism and approbation, expressed in highly vague and ambiguous terms.  

Marcuse expressed the view that Soviet and capitalist systems are growing more alike, as types of the same process of industrialization. In Soviet Marxism he sharply criticizes Marxist state doctrine and claims that the system based upon it is not a dictatorship of the proletariat but method speeding up industrialization by means of a dictatorship over the proletariat and peasantry, the Marxist ideology being skewed for the purpose. He realizes the primitive intellectual level of soviet-version of Marxism and the fact that it serves purely pragmatic aims. On the one hand, he believes that Western capitalism and the Soviet system show marked signs of converging in the direction of increased centralization, bureaucracy, economic rationalization, regimented education and information services, the work ethos, production, etc., on the other hand, however, he sees more hope for the Soviet system than for capitalism because in the former, bureaucracy cannot become completely entrenched or perpetuate its interests. He sees a hope of resolution of
the conflict in the Soviet Society in the future, which is not the case with capitalism. 

It is pertinent to note that while Marcuse's early works may be regarded as expressing a version of Marxism his later writings, though they frequently invoke the Marxist tradition, have little in common with it. What he offers is Marxism without the proletariat, without history and without the cult of science; a Marxism, furthermore, in which the value of liberated society resides in pleasure and not in creative work. All this is a pale and distorted reflection of the original marxist message. Marcuse, in fact, is a prophet of semi-romantic anarchism in its most irrational form. But Marxism, is not itself if it is stripped of all other elements than these, including its theory of this class struggle and all its scientific and scientistic aspects. The only feature of the millenium that we can deduce from his writings is that society is to be ruled despotically by an enlightened group whose chief title to do so is that its members will have realized in themselves the unity of Logos and Eros, and thrown off the vexatious authority of logic, mathematics, and the empirical sciences. This may seem a caricature of Marcuse's doctrine. Marcuse expressly says that we must completely transcend existing society and civilization, carry out a global revolution create qualitatively new social conditions and so on. The only positive conclusion
to be drawn is that whatever tends to destroy existing civilization is praise worthy.

Marcuse was the main guru of the Wild 1960s, the prophet of campus revolutionism from Berkeley to Berlin and Paris. Rudi Dutschke and Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the leaders of student revolt, never bothered about Althusser, but they were often said to be Marcussians. And it must be admitted, Marcuse, more than any other aging star of Western Marxism, knew how to sing to impatient radical ears. "All thinking that does not testify to an awareness of the radical falsity of the established forms of life...is not merely immoral, it is false."101 This kind of root and branch antinomianism sounded like the best possible prelude to insurrection. Marcuse's Marxism without either history or a proletariat, and that his mood of revolution without a day break lacked cogency, was of little concern to the new militant radicals. What they required was a rationale for ritual revolt not a persuasive analysis of largely imaginary evils. The essential thing was to reconnect Western Marxism with the thrills of street protest and active-establishment hatred.

Marcuse's negative thought, his glorification of Refusal, became the favourite jargon of compulsive repressing bashing. Thus, the spent flame of Lukac's fervour was rekindled, together with the false Hegelianism
of the spirit of History and Class Consciousness and of Lukacs's virulent anti-positivism. If ever there was classic vulgar Kulturkritik masquerading as neo-Marxism, then it was Herbert Marcuse. 102

Herbert Marcuse said "A Marxist shall not be duped by any kind of mystification or illusion. Perhaps, Marcuse himself could not have passed this test. There could hardly be a clearer instance of the replacement of Marx's slogan "either socialism or barbarism" by the version "Socialism equals barbarism". And there is probably no other philosopher in our day who deserves as completely as Marcuse to be called the ideologist of obscurantism. 103

Herbert Marcuse marks a significant deviation from traditional Marxist doctrines and hence his perspectives on State deserve a special focus. While the details of his theoretical tenets have already been elucidated, this effort at summing up concentrates only on their impact on the theory of the State. Marcuse's Marxism, if it could be termed so, being a curious ideological mixture, poses its own problems and provides a complete break from the classical Marxist perspectives. It is also to be noted that Marcuse, more than any other "Western Marxist", emerging as the main guru of the wild student revolts of 1960s, the prophet of campus
revolutionism, has also its own bearing on the State. Marcuse's Marxism has popularly been described as "Totalitarian utopia of the New Left".

The first and the foremost distinction which distinguishes the Marcussian view from the classical Marxist view is that while the classical Marxists assign the historic role of being "grave diggers" of the bourgeois State to the proletariat, Marcuse characterises this class as having got integrated into the bourgeois class. According to Marcuse, the capitalist system has succeeded in channeling antagonisms between the capitalist class and the working class in such a way that it can manipulate them. Materially and ideologically the very classes which were once the absolute negation of the capitalist system are now more and more integrated into it. Marcuse holds that even now the bourgeoisie and the Proletariat continue to be the basic classes of the capitalist society, but the structure and the function of these classes have been so altered that they no longer appear as agents of historical transformation. The distinctness of Marcuse is evidenced in his statement - "It is as if a class-less society were emerging with a class-society, for the former antagonists are now united in an overriding interest in the preservation and improvement of the institutional status-quo. The analysis presented by him is that technological development transcending the capitalist mode.
of production - tends to create a totalitarian productive apparatus which determines not only the socially needed occupation, skills and attitudes, but also individual needs and aspirations. In a Totalitarian technology, culture politics, and the economy merge into an omnipresent system which swallows up or repulses all alternatives, and the system stabilizes the society within the framework of domination.

The second distinct factor to be recognized in Marcussian thought is that he identifies "a new vanguard for the Revolution"; the students, the lumpen proletariat, racial minorities, women, etc., who are not subsumed by the totalitarian control and cohesion.

The strategy suggested by Marcuse is that the oppressed classes liberate themselves as well as from their masters. The oppressed classes should undergo two types of liberation; they should liberate themselves first from the "integrative culture" and then get liberated from the Masters, the exploiting capitalists. According to Marcuse classical Marxism proved no match for the resilience of capitalism and for its capacity to absorb the revolutionary potentialities of the working class. In advanced capitalist nations, history seems to validate Marxian revisionism rather than revolutionary Marxism. Capitalism has gained the ability to solve economic problems by
Marcuse describes the above situation as a co-existence of communism and capitalism. There is social integration of capitalist society. There is a suspension of anti-thesis and contradictions within the Society. Technical progress, technology itself become a new system of exploitation and domination. However Marcuse does not rule out the break of the working class with one-dimensional ideology of capitalist rule, if there is a reversal of fortunes of capitalist production or by capitalist excursions into war, which may create an apathetic working class. He strongly feels that "Integration in death is the only intergration really given to capitalism", and thus envisages the utlimate death of capitalism.

Marcuse proposes the need to transcend existing society and strive for a "qualitative change" and develop a new technology and recapture the unity of art and science, science and ethics, and harness science to the liberation of mankind.

Marcuse contends that Revolutionary forces must use violence and says that violence is justified when the aim is liberation. According to him those endowed with a true and unmystified consciousness must strive for
Marcuse severely criticized the Marxist state doctrine and expressed that Soviet and capitalist systems are growing more alike and believed that Western capitalism and Soviet system showed signs of converging in the direction of increased centralization, bureaucracy, economic rationalization, etc. However he sees the resolution of conflicts in the Soviet Society but not in the case of capitalism.

In the light of the above observations we can conclude by saying that what Marcuse offers is - "Marxism without Proletariat, without history and without the cult of science". His is not a communist stand point but a New Left viewpoint. Marcussian doctrine aims at transcending the existing society and civilization, carry out a 'global revolution' and create qualitatively new social conditions. This is his millenium.

LOUIS ALTHUSSER'S VIEWS:

Louis Althusser, French Communist and Philosopher, proffered a novel conception of Marxist Philosophy as a challenge to humanist and Hegelian themes which were then current in the discussion of Marx. While Adorno deconstructed Hegelian Marxism from within, Louis
Althusser attacked it from outside. The two most celebrated books of Althusser, *For Marx* and the collaborative work *Reading Capital*, both first published in 1965, are noteworthy for the stress they lay on the scientific character of Marxism: "Marx" opened up for scientific knowledge a new "continent", that of history - just as Thales opened up the 'continent' of mathematics for scientific knowledge, and Galileo opened up the 'continent' of physical nature for scientific knowledge. Althusser sought to impugn the pre-eminent status accorded by the "Western Marxists" to the early writings of Marx and argued that whatever the superficial similarities between them and Marx's mature work, here were two radically distinct modes of thought. The problematic of each - that is, the theoretical frame-work or system determining the significance of each particular concept, the questions posed, central propositions and omissions - was fundamentally different: in Young Marx, an ideological drama of human alienation and self-realisation, with humanity the author of its unfolding destiny much in the manner of the world spirit according to Hegel; thereafter, however, a science, historical materialism, theory of social formations and their history; and its concepts of structural explanation: the forces and relations of production, determination by the economy, superstructure, state, ideology. The two systems of thought were separated by an epistemological break (in which a new science emerges
from its ideological pre-history), and the break was disclosed according to Althusser, by a critical reading of Marx's work, able to discern in his discourse, in its sounds and in its silences alike, the symptoms of its underlying problematic. To prove his point, Althusser had to show that there was a fundamental difference between the Marxist and Hegelian dialectics. His critique of Hegel, first developed in the celebrated essay "Contradiction and Overdetermination" (1962), was more radical than Adorno's, for it repudiated not only the identical subject-object, but also the Hegelian method conceptualizing the social whole retained by the Frankfurt School. Like Adorno and Della Volpe, Althusser regarded multiplicity, difference, as primordial. "Marxism rejects...the theoretical presupposition of the Hegelian Model: the presupposition of an original simple unity... There is no longer any original simply unity... but instead, the ever-pre-givenness of a structured complex unity" or as Althusser's collaborator Etienne Balibar, put it, a Plurality of instances must be an essential property of every social structure. The problem of how a plurality of instances combines to form a "complex structured unity" was obviously crucial once Althusser had rejected the Hegelian notion of "expressive totality". His critics accused Althusser of resolving society into an aggregate of discrete elements lacking any intrinsic connection to one another. His reply was to claim that the
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complex whole has the unity of structure articulated in dominance. In other words, every social formation is constituted by a 'structure in dominance', a specific hierarchial organization of the social practices comprising it such that one of them plays the dominant role. Thus in feudalism the political instance is dominant, in capitalism the economic itself. The economy is however, always determinant in the last instance, since which aspect of the whole is dominant depends upon the nature of the prevailing relations of production. The causality of economic relations are not epiphenomenal; but constitutive of the Social Whole. "The economic dialect is never active in the pure state.... From the first moment to the last, the lonely hour of "last instance" never comes. A revolutionary reputation is the product, not of 'natural necessity, a la Kautsky, but of an 'overdetermined' accumulation of contradictions involving superstructural as well as economic factors.

Althusser claimed that the superstructure is 'relatively autonomous' of the economic base, and criticized the notion of 'a continuous and homogenous time'. Such a stress on the dislocations between the different levels of the social totality was attractive to Althusser for, among others, political reasons. As a member of the French Communist Party critical of Stalinism he wishes to be able to explain the "Stalin Phenomenon" in
political and ideological terms, crudely, as a survival of bourgeois ideology, while continuing to regard the relations of production as socialist. Althusser's critique of the reductionism characteristic, on his account, of both evolutionist, and Hegelian Marxism, provided him with impeccable Marxist reasons for asserting the independence of theoretical work from Party control, a matter of importance to communist intellectuals after the experience of Zhadanovism and the 'Class line' in science at the height of the first cold war.114

The notions deployed in his periodization of Marx's thought—the problematic and the epistemological break, the idea of a so called Symptomatic reading—were proposed by Althusser as themselves belonging to the revolutionary new philosophy inaugurated by Marx. This philosophy, dialectical materialism, was implicit in the foundation of the science, historical materialism—though, because only implicit, in need of articulation development—and was in the first instance epistemology, a theory of knowledge or science. Its chief target was empiricism, a view of cognition in which the knowing subject confronts the real object and uncovers its essence by abstraction; and which seeks, from this assumption of thought's direct encounter with reality of the subjects unmediated vision of the object, for external guarantees of knowledges truth. To the conception of knowledge as vision
dialectical materialism opposed a conception of it as production, as theoretical practice; and was itself therefore, said to be the theory of theoretical practice. 115

"Theoretical practice" occupied, indeed, a central position within Althusser's system. He distinguished four instances, or types of social practice, as characteristic of class societies: the economic, political, ideological and theoretical. All were subsumed under a general concept of practice, derived from Marx's analysis of the labour-process in Capital volume 1: "by practice in general I shall mean any process of transformation of a deteminate given raw material into a determinate product a transformation effected by a determinate human labour using determinate means (of "production"). 116 The Hegelian Marxists had also laid great stress on the concept of social practice, and the expressive unity of the social whole; for Althusser, however, heterogenecity is ever pre-given both in the sense that each practice combines essentially distinct elements, and in the sense that the social formation always comprises a multiplicity of practices. This conception of practice is a fundamental challenge to the notion, basic to Hegelian Marxism (and anti-naturalism generally) that society is the creation of the subject. Applied to theoretical discourse, this model of practice involved the claim that the 'means
of production', or problematic, of a given discourse, 'the system of questions commanding the answers given by the discourse, sets to work, not on reality (the real object) but on the "thought-object", i.e., the pre-existing concepts and theories is the field. This conception of the sciences operating entirely "in thought" according to their own internal norms (theoretical practice) is indeed its own criterion, and contains in itself definite protocols with which to validate the quality of its product, was heavily influenced by Gaston Bachelard, as was the proposition that the sciences are constituted not through generalization from experience, but through a break with experience, identified by Althusser with ideology, which he treated, not as Marx had, as the reflection of a contradictory and exploitative reality, but as 'the lived relation between men and their world', a structure essential to the historical life of societies, even communism.\(^{117}\)

Althusser was also staging a "return to Marx" but this return was distinct and different from the "return" of 'Western Marxists', who journeyed from 'later Marx' to 'early Marx', Althusser described his reinterpretation of historical materialism as a 'return to Marx', not to the ideological, humanist Marx of the Paris Manuscripts but the scientific, materialist Marx of Capital.\(^{118}\) At stake in this 'return' was an attempt to reinstate the concept of the class struggle at the heart of Marxism. This is the
significance of Althusser's declaration that "History is a process without a subject". Like Adorno, Althusser rejected any attempt to secularize Hegel's theodicy, to treat history as the realization of any end, the manifestation of any subject, transcendent or collective. But, whereas Adorno had taken refuge in the individual as the only space not yet completely subjugated by commodity fetishism, Althusser, sought to restore the stress laid in capital on the relations of production as objective, antagonistic structures determinant of social life. Thus he attacked humanist interpretations of social relations as inter-subjective relations, forms of consciousness. Especially, in his later writings, Althusser stressed that the 'subject' of history is not the Idea, or man, or even the proletariat, but the class struggle, whose nature depends on the prevailing relations of production but whose outcome cannot be determined from advance. Althusser treated subjectivity as a necessary illusion generated by ideology which, by giving individuals a false belief in their uniqueness and autonomy, helped to bind them to the status quo. What Adorno and the early Lukacs would have regarded as peculiar to a society governed by commodity fetishism, the domination of individuals by anonymous structures, Althusser declared to be an invariant feature of every social formation, but a factor of social cohesion, the cement of social life: ideology (as a system of mass representation) is indispensable in any society if men are
to be formed, transformed and equipped to respond to the demands of their conditions of existence."\textsuperscript{121} This picture of history as a closed system was reinforced by a tendency, most clearly evident in Althusser's concept of structural causality to treat social formations as endowed with the capacity to generate their own ideological and political conditions of existence, and therefore to reproduce themselves in perpetuity.\textsuperscript{122}

Marxist philosophy, the 'theory of theoretical practice, was accorded the grandiose role of guaranteeing the scientificity of Marxism thanks to its ability to express' the essence of theoretical practice, through it the essence of practice in general, and through it the essence of transformations, of the "development" of things in general."\textsuperscript{123} As for the problem of the unity of theory and practice, this was no problem, since ;theory itself is a practice, theoretical practice. Marxism became a closed system, without any intrinsic connection to the working class.\textsuperscript{124} Althusser, looking back on For Marx and Reading Capital after ten years of their publication, explained that all he had tried to do was justify the relative autonomy of theory and thus the right of Marxist theory not be treated as a slave of tactical decisions."\textsuperscript{125}

Althusser has always insisted that the point of his intervention was as much political as theoretical,
Althusser has called his early writings "the work of a militant trying to take politics seriously in order to think out its conditions, limits and effects within theory itself, trying in consequence to define the line and forms of intervention." It is the relation between theory and politics that preoccupies Althusser. He defined the political objective of his early writings as follows: "to justify the relative autonomy of theory and the right of Marxist-theory not to be treated as slave to tactical decisions." The political conclusion Althusser drew was that the autonomy of theory had to be defended at all costs. He sought to do so by means of a reinterpretation of Marx, which challenged both humanist and evolutionist readings of his thought and which would, he hoped, provide a starting point for an analysis of Stalinism. Althusser's theoretical intervention was irreducibly political, but the politics at stake involved in the first instance a declaration of intellectual independence from the communist party. But the eccentricity of Althusser's enterprise lay in the fact that he wished to challenge the communist party's theoretical authority, but not its political authority. His politics were oddly a political.

Althusser endeavoured to show that Marxism could provide a structuralist method of investigation from which human subjectivity and historical continuity were consciously excluded. As with all scientific works,
according to Althusser, the subject-matter of Capital is not actual reality but a theoretical construct, all elements of which are dependent on the whole. The essence of historical materialism is not that it makes certain aspects of historical reality dependent on others (the superstructure and the base respectively), but that each of them depends on the whole. Althusser does not define ideology and science mere stating that science cannot be bounded by any 'external' criteria of truth, as the positivists would have it, but creates its own, scientificity in its own theoretical practice. In true Marxism however, science does not belong to the superstructure, it has its own rules and its own evolution, it constructs objective conceptual wholes and is not an "expression" of class consciousness. Lenin was right in saying that it must be brought into the working class movement from outside and cannot come into existence as a mere element or product of the class struggle. For it is an essential fact that the different aspects of social life develop unevenly (a point which Althusser claims to find in Mao Tsu Tung) and do not all express the same zeitgeist in the same way. Each of them is relatively autonomous, and the social 'contradictions' that culminate in revolution are always the product of conflicts arising from these inequalities. To this last phenomenon Althusser gives the name Super determination, meaning apparently that particular phenomena are determined not only by an existing
of investigation from which humanist subjectivity and historical continuity were consciously excluded. Althusser followed Levi-Strauss, the first French Advocate of a structural, non-historical approach to humanistic studies, paying little attention to the individual but concentrating on the analysis of a system of signs as they operated in the myths of primitive societies; the 'structure' of that system was not consciously devised by anyone and was not present in the minds of its users, but could be discovered by the scientific observer. Althusser discarded the ideological approach and evolved a strictly scientific theory and termed this as genuine Marxism. He declared that Marx's analysis of capitalist society is not concerned with human subjects but with production relations which determine the functions of the people involved in them. In true Marxism, science does not belong to the 'superstructure'; it has its own rules and its own evolution, it constructs of objective conceptual wholes and is not an "expression" of class consciousness. The social 'contradictions' that culminate in revolution are always the product of conflicts arising from these 'inequalities'. To this phenomenon Althusser gives the name 'Super-determination'.

The second influential contribution from Althusser was his recapituation of the Marxist doctrine of ideology. He so redefined ideology that from being an
illusion and a prop of class rule it become a powerful cement without ceasing to serve class interests. He held that every society, even the communist paradise, feeds on ideology in order to work.

Althusser introduced the concept of "Ideological State Apparatuses" (ISA): For a class to ensure its rule, the social system as it has to be reproduced; and the reproduction of relations of production is secured by class 'hegemony' over the ISA. Thus Althusserianism became the mainstay of "dominant ideology thesis".

Althusser procured a smart Marxism; his was a theory which insisted on rejecting capitalism and upholding revolution.

Althusser was critical of Stalinism and branded it as a 'survival of bourgeois ideology', while continuing to regard the relations of production as socialist.

Another significance of Althusser's approach is that he asserted the need for independence of theoretical work from Party control, a matter of importance for party intellectuals.

Althusser accorded a grandiose role to "theory of theoretical Practice". Theoretical Practice occupied a
central place in Althusser's scheme. Althusser declared that there is no scientific discipline as philosophy but emphasised its identity in practice by stating that "It is the class struggle in theory".

**ERNEST MANDEL'S VIEWS:**

Ernest Mandel, a well known revolutionary Trotskyist and one of the towering representatives of Fourth International is increasingly being recognized as one of the major authorities expounding authentic Marxism, in the context of the contemporary world situation. His celebrated works Marxist Economic Theory, Revolutionary Marxism Today, Late Capitalism have been acclaimed as great works of Marxian Scholarship and we delineate the "Marxian Theory of State" as expounded by him in these works. The booklet The Marxist Theory of the State, which is considered as a companion volume to An Introduction to the Marxist Economic Theory, throws new light on the subject of the state alongside with the chapter entitled "The State in the Age of late capitalism" in his work Late Capitalism.

At the outset it is proposed to present the salient aspects of the booklet, "The Marxist Theory of the State". This is one of the shortest, clearest and upto-date Marxist statements on the subject, and along with Lenin's lecture on "State" delivered to the students.
Sverdlov University in Moscow. This pamphlet is the briefest and clearest formulation on the Marxist theory of the state. This deals with the most crucial point needed to understand "The State" as an institution. The state as a historic category is indicated in the following terms "To the extent that social division of labour develops and society is divided into classes, the state appears and its nature is defined: the members of the collectivity as a whole are denied the exercise of a certain number of functions a small minority alone takes over the exercise of these functions." Mandel then enunciates in simple terms the foundation of the Marxist theory of the state in the following words. The state is a special organ that appears at a certain moment in the historical evolution of mankind and that it is condemned to disappear in the course of the same evolution. It is born from the division of society into classes and will disappear at the same time that division disappears. It is born as an instrument in the hands of the possessing class for the purpose of maintaining the domination of this class over society, and it will disappear along with this class domination.

Mandel explains as to why the above fundamental truth of the Marxist theory of the state as propounded by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and others, in their writings needs, reassertion in 1970s. Some of the reasons adduced are: the Bourgeois and Petty Bourgeois scholars have
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elaborated massive studies on government, public administration, political elites etc., on the assumption of a Democratic pluralist view of the state, which endeavours to blur the state as a repressive class institution, the blurring of the theory of the state by the Stalinist and Neo-Stalinists who do not want a proper analysis of the monstrous bureaucratic deformities that have emerged in non-capitalist countries, the attitude of Stalinists and Neo-Stalinists to regulate class struggles to suit their foreign policies etc. Mandel also touches upon the crucial issues connected with the States in capitalist countries as well as States in post-capitalist Societies after October Revolution. In Part II of this booklet, Mandel describes the peculiar features developed in the Bourgeois State and explains as to how certain institutions of the Bourgeois state have become more subtle and more complex as a consequence of universal suffrage. In modern times, the class character has become a little less transparent and hence the analysis of the state becomes more complex. He sums up this discussion by saying: "In sum, all functions of the state appears are reduced to this; surveillance and control of the life of the society in the interest of the ruling class." It warns all fighters for socialism to evolve correct strategy based on this new situation, where permanent power has slipped outside the parliament and is being concentrated into sprawling institutions of administration. The significance of this feature of the
Modern Bourgeois state has to be properly appreciated if scientific evaluation of character of the state is to be made and adequate strategy of political movements to end capitalism worked out.

In chapter III, entitled "the Proletarian in Power" Mandel attempts to answer some questions connected with the state in post-capitalist societies which have emerged during the last fifty years. Mandel reiterates the profound truths systematically formulated by Marx in "Critique of the Gotha programme," by Engels in "The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State and Lenin in "The State and Revolution". Mandel, examines the objective and subjective causes of deformities that have developed in states in post-capitalist countries and more particularly in the Soviet Union. He has also put forward suggestions to fight these deformities and to avoid abnormal growth of bureaucracies that appeared in the U.S.S.R. and shown the way for replacing them by genuine proletarian democratic government.

Another important work of Mandel on the subject of the state is found in Late Capitalism, wherein he devotes a chapter on "The State in the Age of Late Capitalism". He commences this chapter with the classical approach regarding its origin: "The state is a product of the Social division of labour... The starting point of
Marx's theory of the state is its fundamental distinction between state and society." After explaining the importance of the state in particular in the capitalist mode of production as three fold focussing on the repressive function of enforcing the rule of the dominant class by coercion (army police, law, penal system), he enunciates the integrative function "as expounded by Lukacs and Gramsci, as essentially the ideology of the ruling class. This integrative function is exercised by the state through different ideologies like magic, ritual, philosophy, morality, law, politics. Mandel's emphasis that "the bourgeois state is a direct product of the absolutist state, generated by the seizure of political power and its institutions by the bourgeois class", but at this state the classic bourgeois state is a "Weak state" par excellence, but with the predominance of private property and ascendant industrial bourgeoisie, there is "autonomization of state power". But with the transition from "Competitive capitalism" to "imperialism" and "Monopoly capitalism" the character and the functions of the state change because both the subjective attitude of the bourgeoisie towards the state and the objective functions of the state change. This produced a sharp increase in arms expenditure and growth of militarism. At the same time, in Western Europe, the rise of monopoly capitalism coincided with the growth in the political influence of the working class movements, resulting in
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acquisition of universal suffrage etc. With this there was a general extension of social legislation, which gained particular impetus in the period of Imperialism.

According to Mandel "A further extension of the functions of the state takes place in the late capitalism stage of monopoly capitalism". "Late Capitalism is characterized by increasing difficulties in the Valorization of capital (over-capitalization, over accumulation)". "Another hallmark of late capitalism is the increasing liability of the social system to explosive economic and political crisis which directly threaten the whole capitalist mode of production. Consequently "crisis management" is just as vital a function of late capitalist state as its responsibility for a greatly increased range of "general conditions of production" or its efforts to ensure a more rapid valorization of surplus capital. The state thus deploys a huge machinery of ideological manipulation to "integrate" the worker into late capitalist society as a consumer, 'social partner' or 'citizen' and so on".

Mandel observes: "The Growing hypertrophy and growing autonomy of late capitalist state are historically a corollary of the increasing difficulties of a smooth valorization of capital and realization of surplus value". Mandel makes a very significant remark- "The
greater the intervention of the state in the capitalist economic system, the clearer does it become that this system is afflicted with an incurable malady."\(^{145}\)

It is also important to note that "Late Capitalism" is characterized by the simultaneous combination of the directly economic role of the bourgeois state, the drive to depoliticize the working class and the myth of a technologically determined, omnipotent economy which can allegedly overcome class antagonism, ensure uninterrupted growth, steadily raise consumption and thereby bring forth a "Pluralistic" society.

"The transition from competitive capitalism to monopoly capitalism means a qualitative jump in the concentration and centralization of capital, which necessarily determines a displacement of the articulation of bourgeois class interests from the political arena of parliament- into other spheres."\(^{146}\) Private lobbies of the capitalist class acquire a greatly enhanced importance. The unofficial "reprivatization" takes place. This also leads to the "Synthesis" between large firms and high government offices, which has become the rule in many countries". Mandel poses the question- what are the concrete mechanisms which mediate the control of the bourgeois class over the state apparatus of late capitalism? and answers it by saying..."the impotence of
even the 'strong' Gaullist State or U.S. government to deal with sudden, short term international movements of capital, are a graphic enough reminder that the Golden chains binding the state to monopoly capital have by no means disappeared, where capitalist relations of production have not been abolished.\textsuperscript{147}

Mandel very categorically states "To imagine that the bourgeois state apparatus could be used for a socialist transformation of capitalist society is as illusory as to suppose that an army could be dissolved with the aid of pacifist generals."\textsuperscript{148}

Mandel refers in his analysis and explains the vast "integrative" powers of the bourgeois state - "Symbiosis with the capitalist state apparatus via numerous joint committees typically draws leading cadres of mass working class parties and trade unions into conformity with the system, if not into outright collusion with late capitalism. The rigorous instrumentalization of the bourgeois state as a weapon of capitalist class interests, is concealed from both the factors and from the observers and victims of this tragi-comedy by the mystifying image of the state as an arbiter between classes, a representative of the "national interest", a neutral and benevolent judge of the merits of all "pluralist forces".\textsuperscript{149}
Mandel explains that when the bourgeois state apparatus is confronted with the direct threat in pre-revolutionary or revolutionary crisis and faces such a danger "the bourgeois class may still continue to manoeuvre. It may promise or enact reforms, to create a temporary impression of fundamental change rather than allow a real social revolution to develop. In the end, however, it will be forced back to the ultimate ratio of brute force. The true nature of the capitalist state apparatus is then suddenly and unambiguously revealed. Fundamentally it remains what is always was, 'a group of armed men' arrayed to maintain the political domination of a social class, if necessary, it will proclaim a state of internal war. 150

Mandel says that the propensity of late capitalism to develop into violent dictatorships was seen in exceptional situations, when it produced fascist or quasi-fascist states (like in Spanish or Chilean military system) which also seek to atomize the proletariat as a class). Today the movement is clearly towards a strong state imposing increasing restrictions on the democratic liberties which have existed in the past when conditions were most propitious for the organised working class movements.

With this brilliant analysis of the development
of the nature, character, functions and manoeuvres of the state in Late Capitalism, Mandel concludes that "the pre-condition of emancipation of the working class is the conquest of political power and the demolition of the bourgeois state apparatus by the associated producers."\(^{151}\)

Thus we have Mandel's excellent enunciation of the Marxian theory of state extended to capitalism and late capitalism on the paradigm of the models formulated by the classical Marxists, Marx - Engels - Lenin.

A COMPENDIUM:

Neo-Classical Marxism is like a spectrum, constituting the various strands of Marxism spread over more than half a century, encompassing within it Western Marxism, Austro-Marxism, "Euro-Communism, Frankfurt-School of Marxism, Cultural Marxism, Scientific Marxism, Structural Marxism, New Left, etc. We have in our preceding analytic of "Neo-Classical Marxists' Perspectives on State presented at length the various thought-strands of these Neo-Classical Marxists, of the West including Antonio Gramsci, Gyorgy Lukacs, Herbert Marcuse, Louis Althusser and Ernest Mandel, to illustrate their varying perspectives on the state, in the backdrop of their distinct and different Marxian thought-pigments. These paradigms of thought are so vast and diverse that any comprehension
becomes difficult. While no general theorisation of these brands is desirable, an effort has been made in this Compendium to present an analysis of the various thought-trends on State before we finally part company with them.

Before we enunciate the paradigms of Neo-Classical Marxists' perspectives on state, it is significant to mark the difference between the Classical Marxist perspectives on State discussed in the earlier chapter and the neo-classical Marxists Perspectives to which we are addressing ourselves here. In the classical Marxist perspective we see a neat and clear cut structure and a pattern, a continuity and an inter-connection. Hence the characteristics of the Foundational Model could be discussed in comparison with the derivative models and the distinct features of each of the derivative models and the comparative developments of these models could be elucidated. A paradigm of homogeneity and continuity could be delineated. Such an analysis is not advisable with reference to the neo-classical Marxists as their thought-strands present a heterogeneity. However the general background which gave impetus to this neo-classical Marxism and the distinct features of some of these trends as also the characteristic differences of some of these thought-strands may be sketched in this compendium.
Neo-classical Marxism is generally taken to mean a body of thought, chiefly philosophical, encompassing the work of authors as different as Gyrogy Lukacs and Louis Althusser, Herbert Marcuse and Ernest Mandel. Roughly speaking some of them are designated as Western Marxists, some as Frankfurtians, some as New Left theorists, etc. From a historical perspective Western Marxism, was born in early 1920s as a doctrinal challenge coming from the West to Soviet Marxism. We have Lukacs and Gramsci who took issue with the over-naturalistic outlook of the more determinist brands of Marxism. These great initiators of Western Marxism, Lukacs and Gramsci; above all, evinced a life-time loyalty to the communist movement and were proud of the Bolshevik triumph that came in the wake of the 1917 Russian Revolution, unlike the German Social Democrats. For all their departures from Lenin's philosophy both Lukacs and Gramsci remained to the end impeccable Leninists as far as practical politics were concerned. With the emergence of the Frankfurt School, the Western Marxism, ceased to be Leninist or even communist at all. Even then, one powerful group, the Althusserians, retained a clear desire to maintain allegiance to the communist party. However there is a theoretical dissent that is discernible, while the focus of classical Marxism was on economic history and the politics of class struggle, Western Marxism concerned itself primarily with culture and ideology. Instead of analysing processes of capital accumulation or
the mechanics of crisis and the reproduction of social relations most major Western Marxists have written extensively on problems of alienation and reification within capitalist society, of course, Gramsci, was adept at scrutinizing historical varieties of class struggle and class alliance; and Althusserians though hard on modes of production and social formations. But on the whole it is not inaccurate to describe Western Marxism as the Marxism of the superstructure. What sets Western Marxism beyond a mere shift from economics into culture, is the combination of a cultural thematics and the near absence of infrastructural weight in the explanation of cultural and ideological phenomenon. Most Western Marxists emphasised Marxism as a Critique, and wielded it as a philosophical weapon against any quest for social regularities endowed with causal power. Western Marxists opted for humanist epistemology and Western Marxism generally amounted to a restoration of the idealist element in Marxism, even though there were striking differences between these thinkers.

There is another major heresy i.e., Austro-Marxism. Austro-Marxists did not much refine classical Marxism, or by-pass the coarse tenets of 'vulgar Marxism'.

We can say that Western Marxism is not just the Marxism of the superstructure, it is also a theory of
culture crises, a passionate indictment of bourgeois civilization. It is a theoretical exercise whose cradle was the rekindled revolutionism that followed in the wake of October 1917, but whose habitat has mostly been the human intelligentsia. Recanting the philosophy of Western Marxism's oldest Gospel, Lukacs described it as 'romantic anti-capitalism'.

The term Frankfurt School has been used since 1950s to denote an important German para-Marxist Movement. This School is characterised by the fact that it treats Marxism not as a norm to which fidelity must be maintained, but as a starting point and an aid to the analysis and criticism of existing culture and hence made free use of many non-Marxist sources of inspiration such as Hegel, Kant, Nietzsche and Freud. Its programme was expressly non-party and was influenced by Marxism evolved by Lukacs and Korsche especially the concept of reification; it emphasized the independence and autonomy of theory. Though it was profoundly revisionist the school regarded itself as a revolutionary intellectual movement.

In late 1960s we have the upsurge of the New Left who emerged as revolutionaries bent on an overall transformation of society. The rediscovery of Marxism was combined with persistent distrust of orthodox communist versions of the theory. Orthodox Communism seemed
consistently out of joint with the experience of the New Left.

Then sprouted the Socialist-Feminist Movement. They joined the Western Marxists in transforming Marxism, as they contend, from a purportedly universalist doctrine which actually justifies bureaucratic repression to a living theory that shapes the struggle for a rational, free, and liberating society. They share Marx's goal of creating a society in which human capacities can freely unfold and his belief that such a society is incompatible with capitalism. Yet the Western Marxists have rejected belief in the sole social primacy of the economy, the historic laws that make socialist revolution inevitable, and in the leading political role of a homogeneous working class. Western Marxists think and act, organize, and communicate. In so doing they seek to keep alive the human image of liberating socialism in the midst of brutal and deadening societies whose contradictions brought their tradition into existence.

In the backdrop of these intellectual and ideological movements which have attempted to revise, transform, and adopt classical Marxism to the dynamic and changing society, we present an analysis of the neo-classical Marxists' viewpoints on the state.
There is a world of difference between the classical Marxist approach to the state and the neo-classical approach. According to the classical Marxists, the bourgeoisie, even as it develops as an exploiting class, has created the proletarian class, which turns out to be its grave-diggers, and this revolutionary process occurs with the conscious proletariat in the vanguard of the class struggle. In a capitalist society, the state is an instrument of oppression and exploitation in the hands of the ruling bourgeois class to suppress the working class, and the proletariat has been endowed with the historic task of eliminating the bourgeoisie and establishing a classless society with the establishment of which the State withers away. As against this original classical model, we find that in neo-classical Marxism, we cannot identify any uniform pattern. State is seen not merely as an economic category but an all embracing category with enlarged functions including the cultural. The emphasis is shifted from the economic to the cultural, from the base to the superstructure, from economic determinism to reification, from empiricism to science and theory.

We find in Lukacs the stress on Marxian dialect which is considered the main-spring of social revolution, absolute primacy being given to the 'whole' its unity over and above the abstract parts; the proletarian viewed as
'Universal class', which is not simply 'foreseen' as a fact of nature but which is created by the act of 'foreseeing' and which is the driving force of historical process destined to abolish class society. For Lukacs, proletariat shall have unmystified self-awareness in regard to its position in society which it is called upon to transform, and a Marxist must play a practical role to give effect to theory. Lukacs gives the phenomenon of reification wherein the working class gets transformed into things and commodities in the capitalist production process and become conscious of this dehumanization process and in an actual struggle against those dehumanizers establish socialism. For Lukacs dictatorship of the proletariat is dictatorship of the party; and the Soviets, established in Soviet Russia, as organs of struggle against the bourgeois rule, will be replaced by the party in building a socialist society. Lukacs holds that the acquisition of the global view makes the proletariat realize that capitalism which appears invincible, is realized only as a historical stage and as a transient phenomenon and becomes a vehicle of revolutionary consciousness. Capitalism is to be abolished ultimately.

We see the opposite of this in Herbert Marcuse, who admits that in capitalist society the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are still the basic classes, but says that their structure and functions have been altered. According
to him the working class, which was once antagonistic to the capitalist class gets integrated into the capitalist class in a bid to perpetrate the capitalist society and abandoning its historic role of transformation and abolition of the class society. The Epigram of Marcuse - 'It is a class-less society in a class-Society' explains this phenomenon. He attributes this to the Technological development due to which culture politics, economy merge into an omnipresent system which swallows up the repulses. The class-antimony and antagonism is kept in suspension. As the proletarian class, which according to the classical Marxists, should have been the vanguard of the revolution, has got integrated, Althusser identifies a "new vanguard" for revolution, the unemployed and the unemployable, the lumpen proletariat and the backward, the women and the racial minorities, who were left out by the bourgeois state from the process of integrating them into the Capitalist Society. Marcuse proposes the need to transcend existing society and strive for a qualitative change. New Science and New Technology to liberate man-kind. Despite this Marcuse envisages a situation when there may be a break with the capitalist state when fortunes of capitalist production are reversed or by capitalist excursions into war, when the working class would get conscious and revolt. He strongly feels that "Integration in death is the only Integration really given to capitalism" and envisages the ultimate death of capitalism. Marcuse is for use of force
and violence by the revolutionary forces. Here we find Marcuse represent the New Left view point, and the state is identified as playing a role of integrating the exploited class into the exploiting class and making them unconscious of exploitation itself, which distinguishes it from the classical Marxist view of state as an instrument of exploitation. Here we have Marcuse present a "Totalitarian Utopia of the New Left" as against "Cultural Communism" of Lukacs. We have in Marcuse "Marxism without proletariat, Marxism without history and Marxism without cult of science".

In Althusser, we find a rejection of capitalism and upholding of revolution, but we have structural non-historical approach promulgating a scientific Theory. His is a "dominant Ideology Thesis". According to him Ideology is required even in a communist society. He propounds the phenomenon of "Super-Determination". Althusser excludes humanist subjectivity and historical continuity. He holds that capitalist Society is not concerned with human subjects but with production relations which determine the functions of people involved in them. Science does not belong to Superstructure according to him. It constructs objective conceptual 'wholes' and is not an expression of class-consciousness. Social contradictions and conflicts that arise in inequalities culminate in revolution. He envisages "Ideological State Apparatus"-
Church and School were depicted as means of tacit indoctrination on behalf of class-ridden social cohesion. The reproduction of relations of production is secured by class hegemony over the Ideological State Apparatuses. This concept was evolved by Althusser with Gramsci's inspiration and he adds a pinch of holistic salt to Gramsci's suggestions: Althusser's very significant pronouncement is "Philosophy is class struggle in theory". He gives a place of high importance of "Theory of theoretical practice".

Gramsci presents a model of communist revisionism. Gramsci's writings do not amount to a coherent theory but rather an embryonic sketch constituting an independent attempt to formulate a communist ideology. To Gramsci "Marxism is not a system but a Search". Marxism, represented to him a new civilization, a completely new road. Marxism for him was absolute historicism of history.

For Gramsci, State is a highly complex phenomenon. He warns us against conceiving the historic state too mechanically in terms of class power and says state is the complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but manages to win the active consent of those over whom its rules. A ruling class holds
sway by virtue of intelligence and character as well as by force. Gramsci's characteristic epigram reflects this notion: "State is force plus consent: political society organizes force; civil society provides consent". We find here Gramsci's views being different from that of classical Marxists who hold that state is an instrument of repression. He says: "Revolutions are not made, in any immediate sense, by economic crisis... nothing happens purely spontaneously. There are always leaders, initiators, though these may be nameless figures who leave no trace".

Gramsci says Fascism may not be entirely reactionary it was at least shaking up an ossified state. He seems to subscribe to the "Great Man" theory of history. Gramsci argues that Modern Prince—the revolutionary party, is the organism which will allow the working class to create a new society by helping it to develop organic intellectuals and an alternate hegemony. Gramsci's vision, the birth of a labour intelligentsia, instead of an aristocracy of labour, was a splendid one. This gives a new dynamism and a new dimension to the labour class. His enunciation of the "Communist doctrine" spells out the theory and strategy for the establishment of a communist society. Gramsci was convinced that the parliamentary system of government was done for and could not provide a model state for the future. Socialism would obliterate the
differences between political and civil society and with its establishment the state would whither away. Gramsci had provided an ideological nucleus for an alternative form of communism.

Ernest Mandel who analysed late capitalism propounds that "the pre-condition of emancipation of the working class is the conquest of political power and the demolition of the bourgeois state apparatus by the associated producers". Mandel extended the classical Marxist principles relating to the mode of production and the role of the bourgeois state to late capitalism. He elucidates that competitive capitalism and monopoly capitalism result in concentration and centralization and leads to displacement of articulation of bourgeois class interests from parliament to other spheres like reprivatization, synthesisisation between larger firms and government institutions. When this advanced capitalism fails in the technique of integrating the proletariat into the capitalist society, it develops into violent dictatorship. He holds that the bourgeois state apparatus cannot be used for socialist transformation. Mandel's model falls mostly in line with the foundational model and can be designated as the Derivative model.

Hence we have a colourful spectrum of thought-strands under neo-classical Marxism, but they
remain various strands without getting integrated into a single Marxist-light.

The classical Marxist concepts of state, class struggle and transition to socialism have been modified by the Neo-classical Marxists into Instrumental Marxism, Structural Marxism, Neo-Gramscianism, Neo-Trotskyism, and the dependency theories. A few of these trends of state theorising in the context of problem of transition to socialism are examined. The neo-Marxian trends are afflicted by political indeterminism.\textsuperscript{152}

The problematics of bourgeois state are two fold: whether to explain 'state' in terms of the role of the state itself or explain it in terms of the inner logic of capitalism. State intervention is a concept of state function, is common to both the problematics, albeit they differ in nature and scope of intervention.

The instrumentalist regards the state as a subject or tool in the hands of a class or fraction. The state and the class are inter-locked in a relation of externality. The other way of looking at the same phenomenon is to see it as a relation, "for the state is not a thing but a relation, more exactly the condensation of a balance of forces".\textsuperscript{153} The State is not a metaphysical entity or thing \textit{vis-a-vis} social classes. The
state apparatus or bureaucracy is a concrete structure. The 'balance of forces' is problematic, may be hegemonic or contradictory, as reflected in the capitalist state apparatus.

Poulantzas rejects the instrumentalist argument regarding the motivational conduct of state managers. He emphasises the objective co-ordinates that defines contradiction between the socialisation of productive forces and their private appropriation. "Thus the characterization of the existing social system as capitalist, in no way, depends on the motivation of the conduct managers." A close inter-personal relation between the monopolies and members of the state apparatus constitutes a "single mechanism". It is actually not state but 'effect' of state. For Poulantzas state is an autonomous obstruction of 'balance of forces'. State in concrete terms, is a system composed of several apparatuses and institutions of which some have repressive and others have ideological roles to play in mutual connections. The political and ideological function of the state is to regulate the process of production. The State organizes and regulates the production conditions and the reproduction of products relations including valorisation of capital and reproduction of capital. The monopoly-capital state forms its class hegemony. As a state interventionist, Poulantzas, though sceptical about
its effective control of the contradictions of capitalist reproduction, holds that capitalist planning is not an illusion. It supplements the instances of production, industrialisation and technical progress.156

The state, in late capitalist tendencies of capitalism, inspite of its interventionist and hegemonic characteristics, fails to suspend the objective laws of capitalist development. "It is the state which accumulates the social surplus for providing material conditions of further development of the process of production.157 The distinction between monopoly-capitalist state and 'late capitalist' state is characteristic of their major functions. The former's immediate sphere of concern is production whereas the latter is concerned with 'reproduction'. The state in late capitalism fails to control the 'anarchy of production'. Late capitalism is 'rational' at the micro-level but it is incapable of controlling the overall context of economy. It is a contradiction between 'rationality' of the part and 'irrationality' of the whole.158 Therefore the state is to be explained in terms of the inner-logic of capitalism. The bourgeois state is not a mere political instrument of capital. -Mandel writes: "It can only be regarded as a mechanism for preserving the social existence of capital":159 in face of intra-class fractional competition, inter-class conflict, and the international, manoeuvre of
monopoly capital. Consequently, state economic planning and state socialisation of costs (risk) are the major concern of the bourgeois state. The other vital concern of the bourgeois state is crisis management to protect the capitalist mode of production from the thrust of economic and political crises in two ways. One, economically it has to manage the counter-cycles to prevent or postpone economic slumps. Two, sociologically it has to deploy "a huge machinery of ideological manipulation to 'integrate', the worker into late capitalist society as a consumer, 'social partner' or 'citizen' (and ipso facto supporter of a existing social order) and so on."160

In order to manage all these difficult conditions of valorisation of capital, the bourgeois state gains autonomy and becomes interventionist. Some may have the illusion that an interventionist state brings fundamental changes. "To imagine that the bourgeois state apparatus could be used for a socialist transformation of capitalist state is as illusory as to suppose that an army could be dissolved with the aid of pacifist generals."161 The state operates in the interest of dominant class, but is not necessarily an instrument of that class— the state is thus "instrumentally autonomous" but it is unable to transform the structures of dependent capitalism within which it operates.162
Poulantzas and Mandel have certain differences on the functions of the state. Poulantzas makes a distinction between the political and economic functions of the state. The main function of the bourgeois state is 'political'; while the main form of the bourgeois state is 'economic'. Mandel treats Poulantzas's distinction as scholastic and artificial. Poulantzas introduces the role of class struggle as the very essence of bourgeois state dynamism. "The class division of society necessarily means class struggle, for we can not speak of classes without speaking of class struggle. This runs counter to official modern sociology, which is prepared to speak about classes, but never about class struggle."  

The state is a dictatorship plus hegemony of the dominant class. Class struggle has its problems under the bourgeois system. A hegemony of basic and non-basic classes and forces can be developed as a part of pre-revolutionary strategy. 

Gramsci has to find out a way to sustain the masses during a prolonged class struggle in the capitalist system. Between mobile strategy and trench strategy, Gramsci adopted the trench strategy as the inevitable course of action during the phase of unfavourable relationship of forces. Hegemony, as a strategy, is the game of political front. As a strategy hegemony may be
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