

Part I

KARL MARX'S THEORY OF REVOLUTION: STATE AND BUREAUCRACY, by Hal Draper (Monthly Review Press, NY and London, \$28 the set) ~~1977~~ 1977.

BOOK I

Draper's Foreword claims (p. 11, actual ^{1st p.} ~~1st p.~~) that "There is no end if the books are on Marx's 'philosophy', economics, or social-historical theory ('historical materialism'). This still leaves 'everything else', which in fact constitutes the bulk of the 3 vols. of the M-E Werke." *the # says*

The next p. has the very 1st ref. to all of these accumulation of books on phil., turns out to refer to only 3, McLellan's Marx Before Marxism (rd: why he doesn't mention McLellan's The Grundrisse is very interesting); Meszaros' Marx's Theory of Alienation; and the 3rd and one that gets the greatest praise is Lowy's which is in French. The claim for the necessity to disregard phil. or to look for any 'grand theory' is because after all Mx was a revolutionist and therefore "it is to bend the stick the other way that this work is entitled ... rather than Political Theory which might be interpreted too narrowly. (p. 12) He stressed it again on p. 13: "It is this Marx, the political man, that is our subject."

He does claim, however, a sort of grand theory for one of the aspects of this book -- Marx's theory of the State -- because there the emphasis is on Marx's world-historical view of the state. *these quotes in the foreword were from his first subtitle, "Political"* the second is entitled "Class"; the 3rd is "Marx" where the emphasis is that he is writing on Marx, not Marxism. He acts (p. 19) as if you couldn't have seen the whole until 1961 when "between 61 and 68 of the German edition of the M-E work" (rd: evidently previously only the Russians had a collected edition of Mx's work but he knows Russian, or at least refers to it, and therefore why wait until 61) and then claim "the present work could not have been written before the publication of the Werke, practically speaking." p. 20.

* *****

The most fantastic of all explanations is the 3 pages that now follow as his 4th subtitle "Method". Obviously what method means to him is "excavation". And believe it or not, the one who gets credit for that word, as if that author meant it as a substitute for method is Lenin. Lenin's State and Rev. which was written in order to put an end to all the misinterpretations of Mx by established Marxism, and therefore produced Lenin's claim that one needs to engage in excavation to get down to what Mx stood for, is now singled out as the methodology needed. It is ironic that this method, so clearly demanded in the interest of simple scholarship has never been used by any academic treatise in this field." p. 21.

The 5th (actually the final, since the last "Format" is merely reference to ~~the~~ translations used and a thanks to the Rabinowitz foundation) is entitled "Engels" and is, indeed, not ~~only~~ merely a defense of E as if he and M were 1 but will actually define the whole work because it's Draper's idea that there is no difference and therefore when he quotes E it is as if he quoted Mx. Contrary to all others, including E, who said that Mx was the genius and

He always puts humanist principles in quotation marks, further concretizes it as "the realization of human freedom. A broader vision of communism is necessary" (104) This goes on into Ch. 5, "Implementing the New Direction", where he deals with Mx and the "Jewish Question" and in Ch. 6 he first get "Orientation toward (red emphasis) the Proletariat," stressing that "the political lexicon: proletariat... has been assuming the moderns meaning, mainly in the decade or so before Mx wrote down his new perspective." (p.131) Not only that, but obviously, according to the HD, "Mx is still moving in the twilight zone between politicalism taken for granted by the young Hegelians and a revolutionary principle which had not yet been developed." (p.147) And this continues in Ch. 7 "Towards a Theory of the Proletariat", whereupon we, of course, must stop (p.156) for Engels' contribution and his living with Mary Burris "Enter the Class Struggle" (p.162) but don't think you're actually entering it yet, since at this point he first gets to (1) the 1844 mss, which he blames the Mx-En. Institute for entitling "Economic and Philosophical" which he claims "is a little misleading for until the very last chapter, it is very definitely focused on political economy, not philosophy". How does he know? And when he gets to the question of alienated labor, he is so anxious to ~~claim~~ claim that the "notion of alienation which was by no means essentially original with him" (p.164) had been ~~developed~~ "largely suggested (via Hegel and Feuerbach's idea of alienation) by Moses Hess' essays of 1843 and 1844, which Mx had read with appreciation. What HD doesn't say, indeed gives the opposite impression, as if Mx had said it, turns out to be a book on Hess. That's one way of skipping over the entire new continent of thought. And evidently, the only way HD find it in his ~~own~~ soul to forgive Mx the concept of alienation (mutated from Hegel through Feuerbach and Hess) as any sort of revolutionary theory of the proletariat, is that it "not a merely philosophical notion" it was now part of the socio-economic foundation of the class struggle." (p.167)

Though we are already on p. 168 we have yet to get to the real Mx, but, since he is obvious, as he entitles Ch. 8 "Toward a Class Theory of State" (that man is always moving toward, but never gets there) to talk of the greatness of Mx on the question of the state as he, HD, will interpret it, we get a lot of references prior to 1845 Mx, as Mxist, which nevertheless show how very opposed to state and bureaucracy Mx was, and therefore it's OK to quote pre-1844 statements. He even ~~subtitled~~ subtitled this "Engels Take the Lead", even though it's Engels himself who said that when he met Mx in Paris in 1844 Mx had already worked out the theory almost as clearly as what he, E., is expressing it in 1860 (?). In any case, by the time (p.189) when HD deals with what everyone recognizes as the first statement of his, mat. -- the Germ. Ideo. -- HD chooses to put the word Mxist in quotes -- "the first 'Marxist' work".

The only thing that is of any interest or relevance to the present -- and that only by taking the absolutely opposite point of view -- is the analysis of the Holy Family, which was directed in good part against Eugene Sue's Mysteries of Paris novel. But what would be of great interest or relevance to today is the fact that Sue had written this against Flora Tristan and Mx and E. came to Tristan's defense, which is never once mentioned. ~~omitted~~

It completely mistakes FT's Unus Communis et Quies Corporative Basis (p.133)

14380

Review of HD

Not only that, but even though HD gives the Holy Family credit for first stating the question of revolutionary practice, and even though he has to refer, therefore, to Mx's really first ~~great~~ great historical materialist ~~statement~~ projection, which came before 1845, i.e. The Theses on Feuerbach, he immediately sees a way out of dealing comprehensively with it, by saying: "These Theses on Feuerbach are naturally most important for Mx's historical and philosophic outlook, which is ~~not~~ our subject, but one, the third thesis, is fundamental to an understanding of the principle of self-emancipation." (p.232) And then he hurries to end this theme, though it links the philosophic background of Mxism with its political course. Mx's political theory develops as a guide to revolutionary practice in the course of which the revolutionary changes society, and the struggle changes the revolutionary and his political theory. We will see this happen more than once." (p.234)

to modify as selected, has been spent on degrading the young Marx to a liberal, and after showing a single instance of revolutionary practice jumps to the question of state with Engels' work the year after Mx died.

15/11/41

HD: key

Part 2 "guide to HD" - 2 pp. + 2 change KM's

PART II: The Theory of the State (p.235)

Ch. 11, which is the first chapter here, is entitled "The State and Society" and shows terrific dependence on the articles in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (1968 edition -- I believe -- check this -- that the articles on politics there are written by Easton) -- (yes, Vol. 12, "Political Science" -- it's in the fn. in HD) Note that here, too, HD begins with Engels' Orig. of the Fam. The first section of this chapter is called "Political and Protopolitical Authority" and just as it starts with Orig. of Fam., so the second section "The State Separates Out" is also. The 3rd section is called "The State is not simply a Class Plot", i.e. again referring to Engels, who "sees the beginning of state power, i.e. in institutions before the rise of the state," that is to say, the community. After which I assume HD considers himself very modern by quoting G. Corson Childe in a 1936 publication: "Just as anthropologists describe how Man Makes Himself, so we are dealing here with the historical process which might be called 'The State Makes itself.' Engels is concerned to show that it is in this process that the state makes itself independent of society as a whole." (p.247)

The 4th section, "The State as Superstructure" once again goes to the Encyclopedia and Easton.

The last 3 chapters -- (12) "The State in Practice: Methods and Forms"; (13) "The State and Democratic Forms"; (14) "The Tendency Towards State Autonomy" -- all base themselves on the fact that "though" state is an expression of class antagonism, and "though" it can have democratic forms, it not only can have other than democratic forms but because it is an "ideological superstructure" it has a "tendency towards autonomy". The climax to it is "hypertrophy of the executive". And of course, along with hypertrophy HD feels it imperative to become poetic and talk of "the state as Galiban" (p.318). This becomes an absolute necessity because of "the political ineptitude of the capitalist class." All this is towards only one end, which though he says was "decisive for Mx's thinking on the subject", actually relies instead on Engels' expression (1866) about the supposedly "normal form" to which HD adds, "Bonapartism." On a single word, ~~338~~ 338 pages of text and nearly 50 pp. of notes and bibliography (a very, very poor one) without so much as bothering

14381

Q. to [unclear] [unclear]

KARL MARX'S THEORY OF REVOLUTION: PART I STATE AND BUREAUCRACY,

by Hal Draper -- BOOK II

Book II is a continuation of Part II in Book I. ~~whole and that...~~ In fact, since Part I is only 206 pages and Part II (Theory of the State) is 450 pages, Part I is really just an Introduction, and is therefore only one reason -- to pretend that the attack on phil. and the young Mx is not that but is necessary for the "true" (sic) Mx, the bur. state collectivist.

Ch. 14
Ch. 15 thru 23
Bourgeois

Just as Ch 11 thru 14 of Part II, in Bk I, was devoted to Origin of the Family (so the whole of Bk II, Ch 15 thru 23 plus 5 appendices, tries to expand Bonapartism to Stenmarkism as if it were a single development which, no doubt, will extend to the modern era.

Actually, there is only one single contribution and that is the expose of Wittfogel, which comprises the 2 chs on "Oriental Despotism" as well as the 5th Appendix, called "Special Note E: Oriental Despotism Before Marx: The Wittfogel Fable". Why then, (st. all the stretching on the quest. of statism as bureaucracy and endly how can possibly the expose of Wittfogel's fables help Draper's fables?

Take the 1st ch. of Part II; Ch. 15, "The Bonaparte Model". It is a 25 p. extension of Mx's great "18th Brûaire of Louis Bonaparte". Again, the ghost of Hegel is what drives him on. Here he is going to act as if there hasn't been enough written on Mx's ~~great~~ historic work, and his is needed ~~to show~~ just how great Mx is. Mx. had, however, begun this most brilliant work by devoting his very 1st sentence, indeed the very 1st word with "Hegel". Well, it takes ~~the~~ the arrogant "erudition" of a HD to say: "Leaving aside, Hegel's inflated generalization that 'all' great historical events occur twice, 'the 1st time as tragedy, the 2nd as farce', and granting the comedic elements in Bonaparte's rise to power, as in Hitler's, it was a concession to the short-sided punditry of the time to view the event of Bonapartism as a farce." (p.403). The only trouble with that statement is that, 1st it is a lie to attribute to Hegel what he had added that it was a tragedy the 1st time, a farce the 2nd. Surely, erudition ought to at least have noted that 1st sentence where Mx elaborates on the question of twice by specifying ~~that the 1st time it is tragedy and the 2nd time it is farce~~ ~~between 1793 and 1795 and 1804 and 1809~~ : "Caussidière for Danton, Louis Blanc for Robespierre, the Mountain of 1848 to 1851 for the Mountain of 1793 to 1795, the Nephew for the Uncle." Instead, HD's erudition footnotes this claim that it was only an initial reaction by showing in which 3 weeks exactly a coup d'etat occurred, when Ch. 1 was written, when Ch 2 was written, and the whole wasn't finished until March, concluding, "It is not until (ch. 3 to 4) that Mx's essential theory of Bonapartism is set down." (p. 403 fn.) The only trouble is that Mx didn't have a theory of Bonapartism. That theory of Bonapartism is attributed by HD as a good Trotskyist who remembers M's development of the th. of Bon. to explain Stalinism and thus avoid the class nature of the Russian transf. into opposite.

Ch. 16 extends Bonapartism and calls it the "Bismarkian Extension", only it turns out to be a quotation from the Origin of the Family (p. 410). He then goes in to explain how Engels "took up and developed" the analogy between Bismark's and Bonaparte's regimes ... but even he has to admit that he found no reference in Mx to justify Engels' statements to this extension that was supposed to have been elaborated by Mx. Having achieved the extension to his own satisfaction, it proceeds on Ch. 17 -- this is the 3rd ch. headed as Bonapartism -- this time as "Bonapartism and the 'Progressive Despot'". So anxious is HD to make Bonapartism a universal that out of nowhere, he brings in the case of Bolivar where Mx had written his hostility in the New American Encyclopedia (a disgusting article by HD was on this unrelated question to anything Simon Bolivar so pleased one man, HD, that he published it in New Politics 1968 Winter -- but here it serves only as transition point to the next ch. again on Bonapartism, Ch. 18 "Bonapartism in Extremis". To that add Ch.s 19 and 20, which makes a total of 11 chapters just on the question of the state. In fact, all the rest -- the 3 remaining ch. -- is that, too. However, since the ~~ch. 2~~ 2 on Oriental Despotism, along with their notes are the only half-objective chapters that could almost be called a contribution, this is what we will turn to and end up with.

The 2 chapters (21 and 22) on Oriental Despotism, the 1st "The Social Basis", and the 2nd "State and Bureaucracy", seem at first to have no relationship, practically no reason for being, for this whole part except that he very naturally singled out anything that had to do with bureaucracy. Moreover, it is the only place where he actually finally gets down to a single sentence, which shows that Mx wasn't interested in counter-rev'n, but a new force of revol'n, the Tai'ping (p. 515). He even brings out that fact again when he brings attention to the American edition of Capital having left out the para. which referred to the Tai'ping.

The very next page, however, we do start with the fact of state property, not private property, as the basis of the early class society, and in fact communal property, all leading to a different form of class society than private capitalism. And, in fact, that Mx already was looking, knew already (1853), to orientation to the Pacific, as against what was the central sea up to then, the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, and that this orientation of Mx was due to the discovery of gold and to the advance of world trade (p. 519). And while it's true that he tries to play down Mx's interest in America by saying it was "a bit of history in order to pillory the Duchess of Sutherland as she posed before the women's movement as a philanthropist." (p. 520). But no matter how he tries to play it down, there's absolutely no way to play down how excited Mx was with that Chinese rev'n and how Mx had written that "that rev'n will in time react on England and through England on Europe." It would be a curious spectacle, that of China sending disorder into the Western World while the Western powers, by English, French and American war steamers, are conveying order to Shanghai, Nanking and the mouths of the Grand Canal.

18

Finally, it begins to dawn what it is that HD is driving at, that the key to the Orient, and as Mx put it "even to the Oriental heaven" is absence of private property and land.

Nevertheless, this write-up on the pre-capitalist formations, from the Grundrisse and from his writings for the Tribune, even though HD gives a different source for it, is the best thing that he has done in the whole 2 books, and, in fact, is the only place where he calls attention to the English edition of Capital, not only having left out that paragraph, but in general de-Hegelizing Mx's original writing. Thus, instead of Fremdeheit being translated alienness and Gemeinwesen being translated primitive community, the latter is translated as society based on property in common (p. 529). And of course he has to conclude that Mx definitely was emphasizing the fact that property takes different forms before slavery, under feudalism, capitalism, etc. He even ends up, both referring to the letter to Zasulich and rises triumphantly: "With the 1851 letter drafts before us, we have as full an idea as we can get of Marx's conception of the social basis of Asiatic society. Now: what was the nature of the political structure associated with this form?"

MBL

When we come to the 22nd chapter, "State and Bureaucracy" as the subheading to Oriental Despotism, HD will continue with this correct interpretation of Oriental society, and have only one relapse when, on p. 549 he makes a reference to "anthropological studies" and that the 7 will tell you he is referring to Marx's Notebooks on Maine, but nowhere is there a direct quotation either from those Notebooks or to where you could find them or to Krader's magnificent transcription of Mx's Ethnological Notebooks in the Amsterdam Institute for Soc. History where they are posited in the original form. (The only other photographic form that Ryazanov took of these Notebooks, in 1922, were first made available in Russia in 1941 and had been used, as wrongly as they had been translated, by one American Lucas. None of this is referred to in HD.) The "new" contribution by HD begins on p. 516 section 7 "The Political Dependency Relationship" where he is back to Engels, ~~Marx~~ and this time not only makes Mx equally responsible but stresses that this "intellectual collaboration with Marx", the sole work in which they undertook a more or less systematic presentation of Mx's ideas..." (p. 562, evidently the reference is to Ch. 22 of Anti-Duhring).

15
Ethnology
Studies

Joseph

All of this is in order to lead to what Mx called "the innermost secret", which begins with "labor rent" that Mx was explaining in Capital, Vol. III, and the super-climax to that will therefore be ~~the hidden foundation of the entire social structure~~ (Ch 47, second subsection, Kerr/ p. 917)

2. "the hidden foundation of the entire social structure and ~~with~~ with it, of the political form of the relations between sovereignty and independence, in short, the specific form of the state." (Check the Kerr edition p. 919 against the Moscow edition that HD is using.)

18

~~the hidden foundation of the entire social structure and with it, of the political form of the relations between sovereignty and independence, in short, the specific form of the state." (Check the Kerr edition p. 919 against the Moscow edition that HD is using.)~~

14384

Here, then, comes Draper's conclusion: "These three sentences present the most concentrated statement by Marx of his theory of the state in relation to his theory of social structure and change, pitched in terms applicable to all class societies without exception. If one had to select from Marx's writing a single statement which contains the main body of his theoretical work in ovo, this would be it." (p. 571)

These 2 chapters, followed also by 2 special notes ^{one of which =} which are good as an expose of Wittfogel and bring out some of the debates in the 1950s, which was done much better by Hobsbawm, and outside of such expressions by Marx as "the priests were the ruling class" / I have no idea how HD is going to use it for his purposes. More of that, perhaps, in the note F, in order to go back again to the Origin of the Family.

which
is a debate
defense
HD
Bite
my
part

Part adherence
to a political tendency

Julius Rosta
made definite Rev.

fn. on p. 212, of Hal Draper's, Vol II, Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution

ed - s. W. u. not o. e.

"Democratic party" was a much-used expression but of course there was no organization with this name. As we have explained, party meant a political tendency even if unorganized. We shall see Engels writing, later, about joining the Democratic party; this meant announcing adherence to a certain wing of politics. What Marx actually became a member of was the local Democratic Association in Cologne (as well as becoming a member of the Workers Association). Later the local Democratic Associations got so far as to meet regionally and nationally and to elect executive committees for coordination. In the legislatures, a "party" meant at most a parliamentary caucus. The club movement in the revolution should not be confused with modern party structures. A good place in the N.R.Z. to see this meaning of "party", and also the above-explained meaning of Organ der Demokratie, is a business announcement which boasted: "Through their personal connections with the heads of the Democratic party in England, France, Italy, Belgium and North America, the editors are in a position to reflect the politico-social movement abroad for their readers more correctly and clearly than any other paper. In this regard the Neue Rheinische Zeitung is the organ not simply of the German but of the European Democracy."²⁴ That is, it is the organ of a movement (the Democracy) and not simply of a concept (democracy).

imposed concept has no connecting coming in

24-"Information on Orders . . .," in NRZ, (19 Dec. 1848 to 14 Jan. 1849) MEW 6:576 (ME: CW 8:509). For previous discussion of "party", see KMTR 1:153 fn.