

## Some Remarks on the Criticism of Marxism

For the sake of public understanding, we must start with a dubious thesis. Like so: Marxism is both the most profound unmasking and the most splendid and passionate apology of capitalist society. (Where by Marxism we mean Marx's life's work.)

The statement is fallacious, equivocal and totally illogical due to the use of two terms. The two terms are "capitalism" and "society". Both concepts are so organically connected to Marxist socialism that a critique of Marxism built on them as a basis would be no more than yet another justification, yet another apology of Marxism. Therefore both concepts are used only temporarily, and our statement will only gain a precise meaning once we manage to provide the non-Marxist meaning to both of these concepts. To talk of the ways and forms of human coexistence instead of just "society" is far more involved, but it is also incomparably more precise, so for the time being we shall use the two expressions interchangeably.

Corresponding to this default, the starting point, the principles and the method or methods of Marxism are ambiguous, inconfessably contradictory and logically empty so long as Marxism is to be regarded *as a whole*. And indeed Marxism must as the artistic, semi-moral and semi-religious expression of one of the greatest intrinsic, and certainly unresolved, contradictions of human coexistence of the 19<sup>th</sup> century be considered *as a whole*.

What is represented in Marxism as conserving Hegel's dialectic and "putting it back on its feet" can be expressed approximately like this: Marx, before putting dialectic back on its feet, made a quick and at least somewhat successful attempt at beheading it too. It is impossible to understand the concept of historical materialism and the atmosphere and fate of the Marxist labor movements without first understanding this *historic deed*.

This deed, which constitutes the original concept of historical materialism, was only ever raised to power in Marxist movements as something secondary and even then only in a fragmented sense. It was not the epigonic Marxists, the social-democrats, the communists or the revolutionary Engels – made responsible way beyond his significance – but Marx who repudiated the validity of the theory of historical materialism, i.e. of social revolution. The only thing in Marxism that became an effective force directly via Marx's work is epigonus Marxism: a muffled and irresponsible version of the original, a restful, bourgeois disregard for the problem of the head. This "historical materialism II" is nothing more than a more or less high level theoretical expression of the capitalist entrepreneur's view on life. The basis determines the superstructure, which due to Engels' unfortunate misunderstanding apparently also reacts on the basis.

Then what we find in the works of more significant Marxists is a variety of the alloys of these two kinds of Marxism. The spiritual-intellectual momentum, so indispensable for building a theory, only found its way into Marxism – unknown, perfectly incomprehensible and untouched as it remained for original as well as epigonus Marxists – in a roundabout way, via loopholes and all sorts of pseudonyms. Apart from the concepts of class-consciousness and self-awareness of classes, all these elements got there as contraband: black disguised as white, avoidance of conflict as class struggle.

The role natural sciences play in the dynamic system of basis and superstructure has since the beginning been unclear, contradictory and completely arbitrary, and remains so to this day; moreover, the sciences are continuously pulled to the front or relegated to the background as momentary tactics dictate it. (We have to note that, with very few exceptions, Marx-criticisms have not lagged behind Marx-apologies regarding any of the major points in terms of a complete lack of understanding.)

In the beginning the functional meaning of the concept of "productive forces" was approximately clear, and it was this that provided the whole dynamic for the entire Marxian theory of basic structure. Later, however, it lost this functional meaning and devolved into a collective idea of completely heterogeneous elements. Originally it meant the old and new organizational forms of the division of labor, old and new discoveries in dialectic unity with their human carriers and creators (the greatest productive force is the revolutionary class!), while later anything could be called a productive force in a special sense from tools of production to machines, to human labor or a dynamo, with the understanding that the original meaning could at any point be dragged back as necessary.

(1934)

*Translated by István Cziegler*