

A satellite is shown in orbit above the Earth's surface, which is covered in white clouds and blue oceans. The satellite has a central body with several solar panels extending outwards. The Earth's horizon is visible at the top of the frame.

UTOPIA OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

Adel El-Emary

Utopia of the Permanent Revolution

For Freedom, Welfare and Development for Every Human Being

Adel El-Emary

First published in Arabic in November 2019

Translated (by the Author) into English in April 2024

Dedication

To My Wonderful Children:

MERVAT



RAMON

Index

A Brief Presentation

1. What is the Permanent Revolution?
2. Human Nature
3. History Without End - a Critique of the Idea of Salvation
4. Freedom
5. Welfare
6. Development
7. Ideology
8. The Phenomenon of Religion
9. Morality
10. Marxism
11. Post-Marx and Post-Marxism
12. Critique of the Project of Socialist Revolution
13. The Failure of Utopian Socialism
14. Anarchism: The Magic Bullet
15. Modernism and Postmodernism
16. Intellectuals, Masses and Power
17. The Contemporary World
18. Post-capitalism
19. Mechanisms of the Permanent Revolution - What is to Be Done?

Sources and References

A Brief Presentation

The owl of Minerva takes flight only when the shades of night are gathering

What is meant herein by the permanent revolution is a process based on destroying all current political and social systems worldwide. The aim is not to create a new system but to achieve the following three STRATEGIES: Freedom, Welfare and Development, for every human being. These strategies can never be completely fulfilled; however, it is possible to take mounting steps towards them without their complete realization.

It is a never-ending process in the sense that you never stop working towards these ceaseless aspirations, so there is no ultimate goal or perfect “ending.” The logic behind the idea of a “permanent revolution” relies on the impossibility of reaching a static “perfect” system or bringing an end to history.

Every status produced by the Permanent Revolution should open the door for another status that is ever -changing. Nonetheless, the three strategies mentioned remain open in front of the oppressed classes. Let there be more and more freedom, welfare and development. Meanwhile, they are not considered holy or untouchable. On the contrary, people can modify or add to them to suit their needs.

This does not mean that the Permanent Revolution focuses on reforming the current systems or is intended to work to improve the conditions of the masses within the framework of the existing systems. Rather, it focuses on moving beyond; destroying and superseding them, since every system preserves its interests and those of the dominant class, thereby depriving the populace of achieving their aspirations.

Every step taken to accomplish one of the aspirations of the revolution is considered a legitimate step, and there are no sanctities in this field; starting from the literacy of one individual up to being part of a violent revolutionary uprising or mutiny.

The sharp and massive revolutions happen suddenly, occasionally and never fully achieve their goals. The more effective way is to destruct the social systems and regimes at all material and cultural levels, by implanting revolutionary foci at all these levels, not as a mere prelude to a general explosion, but rather for the sake of perpetual and profound radical change. Let the stormy revolutions be mere moments in a process of continuous change, by destructing the system, and depriving the ruling and exploiting powers of stability and tranquility. Along with removing every obstacle that is existing or that arises and impedes freedom, welfare and development of the public.

The book presents an overview of the traditional theories of revolution; Marxism and anarchism, as well as what took place in practice based on these theories. These involve the revolutions which all failed to achieve their slogans and ended with counter-revolutions which emerged in most cases from the womb of those revolutions themselves, and the failed projects of building isolated ideal societies. We have also provided a quick critical presentation of Post-Marxism theories that attempted to overcome the dogmatism that characterized Marxism after its Stalinist version had prevailed, led by critical theory of the Frankfurt School. In tandem with a quick review of the “postmodern” theories that had sprung up everywhere for decades and had done little to overcome the crisis of the contemporary world. These discussions serve as a prelude to present what we call the “Utopia” of the Permanent Revolution. It is meant a project for radical change, rather than ideological justification.

In addition, the book includes chapters on ideology, religion and morality, presenting critically the most prevalent theories in these fields. On the other hand, it presents a perception that we believe is more dynamic and consistent with the project of the Permanent Revolution, rejecting the idea of seeking the ultimate Truth. This perception advocates for undermining ideologies and sanctities prevalent in the contemporary world and the perpetual action

against them all, as they are weapons in the hands of the existing social systems. It also includes a chapter about intellectuals, containing a critical presentation of the prevailing theories of the supposed role of the intellectual and revolutionary vanguard, and provides a different perception of the actual role played by intellectuals.

We have espoused an idea, claiming that the most revolutionary force in the contemporary world is the New Proletariat: the marginalized and semi-marginalized sections. Not in the sense that they have a historical role or a mission, but in the sense that they are most capable of opposing authoritarian forces such as the dominant classes and the state apparatus, if they decide to do so. This is a fait accompli created by the mechanisms at work within existing systems.

The book ends with a chapter which takes up the contemporary world status, as a prelude to the final chapter which deals with the possible mechanisms of the revolutionary process based on all of the above.

We did not adopt a specific method or philosophy, nor did we offer a systemic theory. We broke away (not boycotted) from philosophy, metaphysics, ideology, the idea of historical teleology, inevitability, functionalism, and all sanctities and theoretical models. Nevertheless, it involves many ideas that are consistent with postmodernism, Marxism, anarchism, structuralism, libertarianism, existentialism, and others. All of these ideas work together in the strategies of the Permanent Revolution and the mechanisms of its praxis.

For the sake of honesty many of the ideas presented herein are referenced to their sources, in recognition of the credit due to their creators.

The psychological drives and motives are incorporated into all subjects of the book and their role in the movement of society and history is discussed. Therefore, a chapter (chapter two) was written

on the study of the human mind, taking care to deal with human nature as mere inclinations; flexible, contradictory and reacting with human culture and experience. Because psychological schools are diversified, we have not committed to a particular school but adopted the broadest ideas in this field, and those most closely related to common scientific data.

'Human work is only fulfilled with shortage, and reaches its peak strength with weakness'

1. What is the Permanent Revolution?

Humankind has a goal that it must strive for but never be able to achieve

Kant

There is no single conception of the revolution that is agreed upon by all people, including intellectuals and even the revolutionaries themselves. The concept of revolution ultimately depends on the social position from which the person is looking.

There are various fields of the revolution: economic, social, scientific, political, cultural, etc.

It has been historically demonstrated that every revolution ends with a counter-revolution against its own slogans. Among the most prominent examples: the French Revolution, which stopped at the

fulfillment of the aspirations of the capitalist class and then turned against the lower classes, establishing the Directory. Thereafter, Bonaparte's coup came to put an end to the revolution and to complete the establishment of the capitalist system, without achieving the goals of the populace. The goal of the Russian Revolution was the establishment of a socialist system that would lead to communism, a society of freedom. However, the counter-revolution began very early with the brutal oppression of the left opposition, ending with the building of the bureaucratic system with its well-known tyranny.

Even when the slaves had succeeded in their revolutions, the matter paved the way for a new slavery system. One of the most egregious examples is the Zanj Rebellion in Iraq during the Abbasid era, which was a blatant example of these revolutions.⁽¹⁾

Whenever revolutionaries and advocates of freedom and equality achieve victory, they often turn it into a basis for new oppression and exploitation. Subsequently, new revolutionaries emerge embracing the same slogans of freedom and equality. Typically, after a successful armed revolution, the country is governed through coercion. This pattern repeats in all revolutions because the aspirations of the people during the revolution exceed the capabilities of the revolutionary forces, leading to a counter-revolution. Every revolution inherently contains elements of a counter-revolution due to conflicting interests among the participating, revolutionary leaders, organizations and the new rulers with those of the general public. The new revolutionary regime tends to prioritize its own interests, perpetuating the cycle of revolution and counter-revolution. Humans are not inherently altruistic; they act to fulfill their own desires. This applies to leaders, intellectuals and revolutionaries. Therefore, revolutions do not always progress smoothly towards achieving their goals. However,

⁽¹⁾ One of the most important books about this is Faysal Al-Samer's book "The Zinj Revolution" (Arabic).

revolutions do bring about incremental improvements in freedom and equality, benefiting certain social groups more than others. This necessitates ongoing struggles to address the needs of still suffering groups.

While the contemporary worker enjoys more rights and freedoms than past slaves, modernity has also brought comfort alongside ongoing conflicts, dominance and oppression.

The lofty slogans of revolutions, such as Liberty, Fraternity, Equality and socialism have yet to be fully realized. The broad interpretations of these slogans allow new authorities to adapt them to serve their own interests.

It is unrealistic to expect a perfect Salvation Revolution that brings about complete freedom and prosperity. The most achievable outcome of a revolution is incremental progress for the people, marking just a step on an endless journey. Neither will the revolution achieve total victory, nor will the counter-revolution be permanently defeated.

The concept of the Permanent Revolution: This concept was used by Marx and Engels in the sense of the continuation of a revolution of some class until all its goals are realized. Later, Trotsky used it in a different sense; however, its content differs from its name. Trotskyism meant the emergence of the bourgeois revolution under the leadership of the working class and its transformation into a socialist revolution, leading to the construction of a socialist system. This is not a permanent revolution in any way; as it ends with the establishment of a new system.

What is meant by the Permanent Revolution herein is the Permanent Revolution in the literal meaning of the words. That is, the revolution without the horizon of establishing any system, but the perpetuation of the revolutionary process, the recurrent destruction of any social system and preparing to work against it even before it emerges. This is to be done by continuously struggling for the elimination of the factors of repression, stagnation,

backwardness and all forms of domineering, always paving the way for more freedom and the dignity of individuals, for the advancement of science and industry and the welfare of all people.

It is not a final goal, but open horizons; purposes that are not achieved once and for all but remain open and extendable; goals on their way to exist; absolute strategies that are incomplete at a specific point, requiring the perpetuation of the revolutionary process to achieve more.

The strategies of the revolution are defined as mere proposals: Freedom, Welfare and Development. These strategies are the aspirations of the oppressed and exploited social classes that are deprived of all conditions of a decent life as defined by the slogans raised in all their revolts throughout history. They are neither “natural” nor sacred. These should be open, defined by the people as they wish at this or that moment, liable to modification, addition and even superseded. Neither human nature, nor the alleged laws of existence nor the historical teleology -as adopted by some philosophers- determine the conditions of human lives. These strategies can never be completed; rather, people in their revolutions aim to have the maximum possible degree of freedom and welfare, that has no ceiling. What creates the basis for achieving this and that is scientific and technological progress; something that has been demonstrated by human history. At last, people have to decide to do their best to actualize their aspirations without waiting for a hero to do it on their behalf, by grabbing what they consider their rights.

When it comes to designing an ideal system, it may seem theoretically easy, but defining an ideal system that may not be feasible within the constraints of existing cultural and material resources can lead to illusions and frustration. Therefore, it is more practical, and also more revolutionary, to always keep the future open. Similarly, the ideal system is ultimately just a system; one that can solidify stagnation and hinder further human aspirations.

In short, any revolution that aims at establishing a specific system carries within itself a project of a counter-revolution.

Solving any problem creates a new problem, so human beings have to endeavor all the time to overcome their problems.

What is meant can be described as a permanent revolutionary transitional state.

The Permanent Revolution is the rebellion of the oppressed social sections against the dominant powers in all fields; in the economic, cultural and organizational components of society, including political and social thought, institutions and against the privileged elites and all supporters of the social system; any system by and large. It also involves a rebellion against all forms of alienation, where people create sacred objects or delusions in various fields and submit themselves to them.

It also means a revolutionary action, which is the opposite of reformism, since reforms change the conditions within the framework of the same system. Contrariwise, a revolutionary action destroys the joints of the system and implants revolutionary foci in its body, for the purpose of changing it, while preparing to change the next system too. This is the difference between the Permanent Revolution and reforms; in the first case, the revolution takes from the system without giving it anything, but in reforms, a mutual exchange of benefits takes place; some gains are in exchange for contentment, silence, or surrender. In the revolutionary action, if you succeed in preparing for another action, and if you replace the system with a new system, be ready to oppose this new one as well; as it will surely face you with a counter-revolution. This does not exclude the fact that defeats and retreats of the revolutions are possible.

The process of the permanent revolution involves temporary pauses to digest what happened, overcome mistakes and then re-attack again. It is in a state of permanent attack, having temporary pauses only to prepare for more attacks. In fact, it is against the

peace of mind; the mind suffering from the contradictions between human aspirations and their reality.

The slogan of the Permanent Revolution does not emerge from the laws of existence or history, but from the dream of humans for freedom and welfare; from their desire to create meaning of their lives and from the will of humans to realize themselves; from the subject, not the object. This project is just a proposal for discussion among revolutionary forces in this world, not a theory that declares the discovery of Truth and the right pathway.

The revolution is not the “right” decision, but it is the decision of a human who strives for self-realization and to build self-esteem.

The idea of the Permanent Revolution does not go beyond the capabilities of humans. People have been in a revolution with regard to technology and social organization since the dawn of history. They discovered ways to make tools from stones and trees, afterward used fire, invented agriculture and began to transform from clans to peoples, nations and international groups; changing the ways of their lives, languages, etc. The idea is not strange to them, but what is presented herein is a permanent revolution on all levels, against the powers of repression and exploitation.

This introduction ends by proclaiming that the first of human “rights” is the right to rebel and revolt.

'The struggle and using force against conservative powers for the perpetuation of the revolution is not a struggle between right and wrong or genuine and false; it is not a struggle between values, but a struggle between two parties: revolution and counter-revolution, and between Utopia and Ideology'

2. Human Nature

Human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations

Karl Marx

The debate about human nature has not ended in terms of existence and its concept.⁽²⁾ It is a controversial subject, originally rejected by many philosophers and thinkers. Some argued that humans have no fixed characters, such as being vicious or benevolent, and that their ability to create culture allows them to change themselves as they determine what they are; they are free and freedom is imposed upon them.⁽³⁾ Sartre did not observe here that this freedom which humans are predestined to -according to his claim- is a part of human nature, prior to their existence and not subsequent to it; an essence; therefore, against his doctrine. There are even those who have dealt with human nature in detail,⁽⁴⁾ as well

⁽²⁾ For example, Michel Foucault, in: A debate between Noam Chomsky and Michel Foucault about human nature, 1971, p. 23 (Arabic translation).

⁽³⁾ Jean Paul Sartre is one of those who went this doctrine, Existentialism is Humanism.

⁽⁴⁾ Like Erich Fromm, the Sane Society.

as those who consider that personality is acquired, denying any role for heredity.⁽⁵⁾

Marx dealt with the subject of human nature occasionally in some of his writings.⁽⁶⁾ His opinion can be summed up as: human nature consists of a group of inclinations, motives and instincts, that work to meet human needs. The interpretation of that nature is precisely the interpretation of human needs, with a tendency to satisfy them. He distinguished between human production and animal production: the animal's product meets only its direct need, while humans form their need in their mind first before creating it. Here there is an emphasis on the power of consciousness as the essence of human nature.

Some leftists have been insisting on denying the existence of something called human nature, as if its adoption leads to the recognition of the existence of natural, non-social, “laws” of society; as if capitalism is exonerating. Many of them tend to accuse class division of all responsibility for “evil,” promising that everything would be fine in a socialist society.

Philosophers also differed about what differentiates humankind from nature, so they went on various doctrines, including labor in Marx's opinion, reason according to Hegel, language in Habermas's view, etc.

- Human beings are originally a part of nature. However, they have transcended it, creating new things such as tools, manufactured consumer products, even manufactured raw

⁽⁵⁾ Alfred Adler, Human Nature, p. 35 (Arabic translation).

⁽⁶⁾ *“Human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations”* (Theses on Feuerbach, 6). *“If I am determined, forced, by my needs, it is only my own nature, this totality of needs and drives, which exerts a force upon me; it is nothing alien”* (The Grundrisse, NOTEBOOK II, the Chapter on Capital). *“Man is directly a natural being. As a natural being and as a living natural being he is on the one hand endowed with natural powers, vital powers - he is an active natural being. These forces exist in him as tendencies and abilities - as instincts”* (Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844).

materials, relations of production, thought and art, principles, values, social institutions and the state. Animals are satisfied with adapting themselves to the environment, getting their immediate needs if possible and dying if they cannot achieve this; subordinated to the balance of the environment. Contrarily, humans try in a perpetual quest to make the environment fit with them, exceeding its balance and recreating it in their favor. That is humankind; a product of nature and its opposite. Accordingly, the moment of human rebellion against nature can be defined as the moment in which they re-created the world again, as a result of their interaction with the environment; that is the production of human society. This started with the production of language, abstract concepts, manufactured means of production, programmed work processes, relations of production, institutions and culture, etc.

Thus, since their separation from nature began, the entire world has been considered their property, dealing with it as such.

- It is not possible to reveal a natural state of a human individual outside of society and history. Human beings only existed within a community with a history, including the Neanderthals. Thus, it is impossible to find a “raw” human nature that manifests itself in each individual. Accordingly, human nature can only be inferred, not empirically demonstrated except in very broad categories.

- Human nature includes the body and the psyche, which are inseparable. It is not limited to their biological formation; not all their traits are found in genes. There are no genes pushing them to create relations of production, ideology, or a system of teamwork. Nonetheless, they must create all this under the drive of their biological and psychological needs, against the environment, to achieve the greatest possible degree of preserving themselves and their species, and satisfying their comfort.

- Psychology is not actually a true science, but rather consists of various theories about which thinkers differ more than they agree. There are dozens of schools; the differences between them are

endless. It is enough to look at the vast differences between Freud and Jung, despite their belonging to the school of psychoanalysis. This “science” is mostly subordinated to politics and the interests of the authorities just like philosophy. American schools of psychology, for instance, try to drive the individual to adapt to society. This is along with the widespread dissemination of “scientific” myths.⁽⁷⁾ Every attempt to render it an experimental science has produced a particular approach that is not universally accepted by other researchers. Social psychologists do not acknowledge one method to study social human nature, and there are many unanswered questions, such as the interpretation of people's responses to a particular stimulus.⁽⁸⁾ Moreover, there is no agreement about human instincts in terms of their identification or even their mere existence. Some use the word “instinct,” while others refer to instinctive tendencies or innate qualities. There is also a lack of agreement on the interpretation of human behavior.

No particular school of psychology is followed here, but rather the most general and common ideas or those more consistent with common social phenomena and known scientific facts.

- The social factors that subjugate the individual and communities do not originate from outside humans, but are their own production. The same applies to private property and the state. Engels made two attempts to explain the emergence of classes and the state, but he did not provide any clear interpretation beyond a human tendency towards selfishness and dominance.⁽⁹⁾ No other theory has succeeded in proving their necessity despite people's will. “Good” and “Evil” originate from people, not from accidental or

⁽⁷⁾ It was reviewed by Scott Lillenfield and others in the book “50 Great Myths of Popular Psychology.”

⁽⁸⁾ Lambert-Wallace&Lambert-William, Social Psychology, pp. 21-22 (Arabic translation).

⁽⁹⁾ Anti-Dühring, V., State, Family, Education - The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.

metaphysical factors.⁽¹⁰⁾ Everything that has happened throughout human life coincides with human nature. Even acquired qualities and ways of behavior can only be acquired if there are innate instinctive inclinations to this acquisition.

- The core of human nature consists of processes of adaptation with the environment, and the byproduct of this adaptation and the noise or random effects that remain cannot be neglected. A simple example of these processes can be borrowed from biology: the umbilical cord is the product of adaptation with the environment to preserve the life and development of the fetus. The byproduct result is the belly button that arises in the abdomen after the end of the umbilical cord's role, but the noise here is the unique form of the belly button in each individual.⁽¹¹⁾ This sequence occurs in all adaptation processes.

The first goal of every living creature is to survive, reproduce and satisfy instinctive desires; that is, enjoyment or pleasure. These are innate genetic propensities. Consequently, any psychological mechanism acquires the appropriate form to achieve these goals. The mind's activity is a complex set of defense and attack mechanisms, whose ultimate purpose is to ensure the continuity of the organism and give it the ability to grow and develop safely.⁽¹²⁾ However, humankind differs from other animals in his ability to create and recreate new needs for satisfaction and enjoyment, such as engaging in various forms of sex, non-instinctive games, preparing diverse foods, engaging in different types of tourism, etc. All this indicates that there are various non-instinctive mechanisms of enjoyment, but this requires natural tendencies to feel pleasure.

(10) Metaphysics in the linguistic sense goes beyond the physical realm. It refers to unnatural ideas, essences, and powers that transcend nature or reason. Examples include God, the purpose of existence, wisdom beyond tangible things and the interpretation of phenomena based on hidden reasons.

(11) Handbook of Personality, pp. 34-35.

(12) Alfred Adler. Op. cit., p. 30.

- It is not possible to determine the human nature of the abstract individual. There is no -in fact- a human individual not part of the community, since a human is a species-being, and can only live in a community for biological and psychological reasons. Moreover, individuals share certain characteristics which they can have through being a community. Language can only be created and used in a community, children can only be raised in the presence of a family, and humans cannot face natural disasters and diseases except by teamwork. If people live as individuals, the death rate will be very high, and they will continue a life of gathering and hunting forever. This implies that humans will live as primitive animals forever or even perish. So, the human community precedes the individual, in the sense that the individual person does not exist and live except in a society. The human community is advantaged in comparison to animal species due to the mental-linguistic abilities of human beings, their meticulous organization and the ability to innovate and build civilization and make history. Without these special characteristics, people could have lived, like chimpanzees, in aggregates without history or civilization. Consequently, the individual mind is the mind of the social individual; the son of the human community.

- It is not possible to establish a precise definition of a human, such as: a social or political animal, a producer of machines, a sane or speaking animal, since there are many animals having the same capabilities, albeit to a limited degree. But man is concerned with dozens of traits that distinguish him from other creatures, such as physical structure, including the hand, foot, ability to walk upright, brain structure and the ability to produce abstract language. These traits served by his throat anatomy and the speech center in his brain. This results in the ability to think, abstract and produce concepts, to have a strong memory, etc. After the physical formation comes the human ability to produce and develop sophisticated means of production, establish relations of production, a mode of production, produce ideas, ideology, and various social institutions

and make history, including the change in all of the above human innovations. All these are traits that distinguish humans. Ultimately, it made them the supreme power on earth; the only being capable of adapting to the environment intentionally and consciously, by increasing their control over it. This is performed in part by manufacturing, altering and changing the environment, afterward by producing artificial materials. Thereafter, humans became able to transform themselves, by removing damaged or unnecessary organs (extra finger, for instance) and organ transplantation and lastly by modifying, treating and developing genes. All this implies the ability to develop, as there is no other being on earth capable of developing his community and developing his body intentionally. This ability is explained by all the special features that were aforementioned.

- The human psyche is very flexible and complex, encompassing a large number of intricate mechanisms with various motivations, incentives and goals. Due to the complexity and diversity of psychological mechanisms, human nature is likely to manifest in variable and context-dependent behavior rather than as invariant impulses as suggested by some personality theories. Moreover, human behavioral flexibility does not stem from general psychological mechanisms but from numerous specific mechanisms that are activated and interconnected in complex chains based on the adaptive challenges they face. Humans derive their psychological flexibility from a multitude of complex functional mechanisms. All of this makes studying human nature a challenging task, yet it is undoubtedly a subject worthy of knowledge and understanding to some extent.

- Intelligence, experience and culture play fundamental roles in shaping an individual's response to any stimulus. Human instincts are mere inclinations, and their responses are not automatic; rather, humans utilize their mental capabilities and engage in broad thinking compared to animals. Therefore, the creation of civilization is an inherent aspect of human inclinations, stemming from the

nature of human beings, and any community unable to achieve this is at risk of displacement, whether through natural selection or extermination. Civilization, the product of humanity, reshapes individuals to a certain extent and significantly influences their behavior.

- **Conscious and unconscious processes:** Consciousness refers to awareness, specifically the thoughts and feelings that a person is consciously aware of having. Psychologists have debated the existence and content of the unconscious, with behaviorists and experimentalists dismissing it due to its lack of direct observability. Freud distinguished a section of the unconscious known as the "preconscious," which is latent and temporarily unconscious, easily transitioning to conscious awareness. The unconscious, on the other hand, remains inaccessible without special effort.⁽¹³⁾ For practical purposes, the unconscious is considered a unified component encompassing instincts, forgotten information, repressed desires, talents, language usage, individual and collective experiences and more. The concept of Reason will be used in the sense of the faculty of conscious thinking based on logic and evidence, which is not an entity but an innate ability. The unconscious can be revealed through behavior analysis, dreams, language use, literary and intellectual output, among other means. Freud suggested that the unconscious influences about 90% of human decisions, while Jung agreed that it constitutes most of the mind. This is practically a very plausible idea.

- A human being is not a purely rational animal, as some philosophies suggest. Rather, humans are part of the animal kingdom, responding to basic needs such as hunger, thirst and the need for thought when necessary. While humans can engage in abstract thinking, they do so in response to biological and psychological needs, not as a leisure activity. The human mind, in accordance with Kautsky, is conservative, acting in response to

⁽¹³⁾ The Ego and the ID., Chapter 1.

drives when necessary.⁽¹⁴⁾ The unconscious exerts a greater influence on human behavior than the conscious mind, playing a significant role in history and society. Humans are not and will never be entirely rational beings due to the dominance of the unconscious shaping their behavior.

- There is no doubt that reason has played a big role in the process of creating civilization, but it cannot be stated that civilization is merely a product of reason; since human instinctive inclinations are the basis for preserving self and species, besides achieving sexual pleasure and other satisfactions. These are at the heart of human nature and the determinant factor of human behavior, including conscious thinking. The creation of civilization is the product of human desire to meet their needs, to achieve various kinds of pleasure, to control nature to protect themselves from its dangers and to preserve the species. All these are instinctive inclinations, while reason is only a tool used to help achieve them.

- The human mind generates ideas through its interaction with environmental and social conditions, driven by the need for knowledge to achieve maximum safety. Detecting harmful and fatal foods, causes of disease, how to build constructions that protect against the anger of nature, making weapons and tools necessary for life, making and constructing roads, etc.; all this requires research, investigations and thinking. However, what is the interpretation of the continuation of memes (units of ideas) in people's minds for varying periods, up to thousands of years after the disappearance of the material factors of their emergence? Humans do not act according to pure reasonable thinking, but reason is only one of their weapons, as they are not submissive to it, as aforementioned, but it is an instrument for achieving desires. Consequently, it is impossible for all human behaviors to be "reasonable." There are motivations for behavior that are not related to reason. In spite of the progress of knowledge and abstract thought, humans have never

⁽¹⁴⁾ The Materialist Conception of History, part 1, section 5, chapter 4.

become rational, except from a technical standpoint. Rather, he used reason to develop forms of oppression and hegemony, to invent forms of exploitation and mass murder in the most heinous ways for the sake of goals that can only be considered despicable, such as nationalism, racism and auto-centrism, to rob the labor of others, to dominate and just to satisfy the desire to control and humiliate other humans. However, he also did the opposite: produced forms of cooperation, solidarity and sympathy with the suffering, the exploited and even the animals. Human communication is essentially not subordinated to reason, but instincts and feelings play the main role, which are neither good nor vicious. It cannot be ignored that what is being said now is also subordinated to this method of thinking. Even ideas are not a product of pure reason activity, but a result of people's interaction as a whole with reality. Inherited and accumulated culture -agreeing with Kautsky- also plays an important role. Therefore, in most cases, human ideas are illogical; illusory, and fanatical, having logical fallacies, since most mental processes take place outside of the conscious. The dissemination of ideas varies with the power of their influence on people's desires, not necessarily their material interests or the conformity with objective facts. They can become strong forces, but only to the extent to which they are answers to specific human needs.⁽¹⁵⁾ The supremacy of the unconscious explains why people make decisions that may harm them, plus creating unjustifiable phenomena, such as the cult of personality, consecrating the state and the army, racism and all forms of fanaticism. For all this, mental proof and logic do not guide most people. It is quite usual for logically contradictory ideas to coexist in the minds of the vast majority of people and to act against their stated convictions. But perhaps with development and civilization progresses, people may become smarter and more reasonable.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Erich Fromm, the Fear of Freedom, p. 224 (Arabic translation).

- Reason is by nature instrumental; it is an instrument for acquiring knowledge and for conscious thinking, capable of turning things into perceptions and making conclusions. However, what a person decides is only what he tends to; what meets the call of his unconscious, especially its component of instincts as aforementioned. After all research, investigations and detection of facts, he makes just a choice; not “right” or “wrong.” To make it clear, for instance, you may know completely that this or that food is harmful to your health, but there is no correct decision regarding eating or avoiding it. The decision depends on a balance of psychological desires, such as the goal of self-preservation (whether by avoiding harmful food or eating it due to the inability to get a healthy alternative), the goal of killing hunger and seeking approval of others with whom they share their food to preserve social relationship.⁽¹⁶⁾ It is also easy to identify the relations of exploitation in society by reasonable thinking, but the decision to accept or resist them depends on the interaction of many psychological factors; not being “right” or “wrong” decision. Thus life goes on; reason is only an instrument, but the unconscious is the one lying behind the decisions (this is the same view of Freud). Even the conspicuous facts presented by reason may be accepted or rejected by a person, according to his emotional motivations. He may deny explicit and confirmed facts or accept completely misinformation; as desired. It can be added that even scientific discoveries and the course of scientific research are made under unconscious motivations; imaginations, intuitions, guessing and suspicions. These are indispensable for the work of the “pure” reason; and science fiction in this regard must not be ignored. There are even ideas that become clear and consolidated in dreams or when one is in a state of hypnagogia (between sleep and wakefulness); what is known as revelation (not meaning any

⁽¹⁶⁾ For example: there is the phenomenon of sugar and carbohydrate addiction, which is widespread all over the world. It is considered a disease and one of the most important factors of obesity and diabetes mellitus type II in modern time. The cause of this addiction is unknown, but most likely it resembles drug addiction.

religious revelation at all). This shows the essential role of the unconscious. Even a thinker, when he creates an idea, must add hypotheses and fantasies that have nothing to do with reason. Finally, reasonable formulation of ideas is made after they are discovered, and become consolidated under the influence of both the unconscious and the activity of reason. It can -with great confidence- be determined that all forms of creativity and progress are made under drives from the unconscious, especially instincts or feelings, which employ reason to be actualized. Illogical and subjective thinking is consistent with certain incentives, such as fear, an inner desire to achieve certain goals, a desire to feel safe, a desire to achieve status, jealousy, envy, etc. In conclusion; reality is perceived -through human senses- by the human mind, which is not a pure and neutral reason. So, human perception is not entirely objective.

- It can be emphasized that the mind is not logical⁽¹⁷⁾ and does not work in a consistent or orderly manner. It operates using the components of the conscious and the unconscious, which are replete with fantasy, myths and facts. If the human mind were working logically, it would not need to create the science of logic. The dominance of the unconscious over the conscious mind leads to the use of illusions, where something is perceived as something else, like a mirage. Additionally, dogma or belief, which certifies things without evidence of their existence or reality, is prevalent. The most famous example is the belief in the existence of gods, irrational deduction of ideas, or belief in the superiority of a specific race. Delusions, false beliefs and perceptions of unreal things, such as feelings of grandeur or persecution in an imaginary way, are also common. This is in addition to lying for various purposes, such as gaining power, status, escaping punishment, or seeking approval from others, along with defense mechanisms (some of which are mentioned later). These are distinct from pathological perceptions

⁽¹⁷⁾ There is no consensus about the concept of logic, but the most accepted meaning is: the science that studies the rules, general laws of thought and human feelings. This is the concept used in this book.

caused by serious neurological and psychological disorders, such as confabulation (memory loss leading to the creation of stories to conceal memory loss without awareness of the falsehood), hallucination (sensing something that does not exist), schizophrenia, etc.

This perspective is supported by the existence of phenomena that defy logic and cannot be explained by economic, social, or environmental factors. For example, why did some people choose to exploit others, leading to the emergence of social classes after egalitarian and classless old societies? Why did the majority accept being exploited by a class? Why did some individuals decide to oppress the rest of society by establishing a state apparatus when old societies were autonomous? Why did the majority tolerate this oppression? Why do some people continue to accumulate wealth beyond their needs? Despite brutal conflicts between ancient clans and tribes over resources, why did they not choose to share instead of engaging in devastating wars? Why do not all people unite to overthrow exploitative systems when they could do so quickly? How does ideology play such a significant role in human life? Can most people be deceived for thousands of years without being willing to break free from this deception?

In conclusion, the human mind basically operates under the influence of the unconscious. Moreover, the conscious mind itself includes many delusions, so the mind does not work logically; instead, logical thinking mixes with illusion and delusions.

- Human beings are characterized by biological weakness. A child needs their parents for many years to learn to stand, walk, speak and care for themselves. A woman needs assistance during pregnancy, delivery and child-rearing. Humans lack sufficient muscle power to face predators and can only confront diseases and natural disasters through teamwork. They also require many years to accumulate and store experience in their minds and to train in dealing with the environment. They are fully aware of their weakness, which drives them to strive to overcome it by creating

civilization and controlling nature. There is no other way, as humans as a species are conscious of their relative weakness and the consequent lack of complete safety. This drive to discover the best way to adapt to environmental conditions⁽¹⁸⁾ begins in the child, who is in need of care from others. Thus, human biological weakness serves as a drive for building civilization.⁽¹⁹⁾ Each human individual feels more vulnerable; therefore, a human being is a social being, in need of a community and love, just as a child needs their mother. Consequently, expulsion from the tribe in ancient societies was a severe punishment. As the community is a prerequisite for the continuation of human life, it was necessary to organize its life. That is why its existence became superior to the individual, even among some other animals. The type of social rules for each community depends on its living conditions, the amount of knowledge available at a particular time, and the types of dangers it faces, including the risk posed by other communities. This collectivism ensures the continuation of the species and, of course, sexual intercourse, protection and a sense of security, which is generally lacking due to the terror of the natural world. Language can only be produced and used in a community. In any community, the individual is subject to certain rules and regulations, thereby relinquishing a part of their freedom in exchange for safety. This subordination or adaptation to the community compels the individual to control or repress certain instinctive inclinations, especially related to sex, within the boundaries of the community's rules and norms. Similarly, the need for love and friendship arises as an instinctive human need, serving as a mechanism for self-preservation, achieving safety, receiving love in return and integrating into the community. Self-control is necessary for actions such as urinating, defecating, changing clothes and having sex. According to Freud, all forms of control and

⁽¹⁸⁾ Adler, *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Fromm, *The Fear of Freedom*, p. 34 (Arabic translation). Freud considered that the sexual repression is the motive of civilization that seems an exaggeration. Most reasonably, sexual repression or sex control is the result of civilization.

repression do not signify the disappearance of instincts but rather their transformation into the unconscious, whether in the young or the old.⁽²⁰⁾

The child's feeling of weakness towards adults is marked, with a strong sense of powerlessness. He either resorts to searching for power or uses his weakness and explicitly expresses it to obtain adult sympathy, which is also a mechanism to achieve power. His preference for one of the two mechanisms influences his subsequent psychological formation.

Living in a community and teamwork by and large make the individual feel stronger and gain courage and daring. Society creates in the individual the feeling of being supported by some power. Because the individual belongs to this power, he feels that he has overcome his weakness. This feeling may partially explain the phenomenon of totemism, as taken up by Durkheim,⁽²¹⁾ which he interpreted as representing the emblem of the clan. It may also explain the phenomenon of the sacred in general. However, living in a community also makes the individual feel less free, unless he is directly involved in setting up the community system.

Nonetheless, humans as a species-being in a community also feel vulnerable to nature, as well as vulnerable to other communities, in addition to jealousy and envy of them. Therefore, the community also endeavors to achieve status, whether towards nature or other communities, by various possible means. Among these means are creating very effective fictional entities and concepts, such as totem, tribe, this village, that city, this nation, that state and all other sanctities and collective rituals, to unite a large community whose members do not know each other personally. The legend of “Peugeot” is a good example.⁽²²⁾

⁽²⁰⁾ Totem and Taboo (Arabic translation).

⁽²¹⁾ In his book: The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.

⁽²²⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind, pp. 30-34: The author explained the legend as follows: Peugeot is a company that started as a small family

Not only does weakness drive humans to progress, but also their power or their ability to overcome their weaknesses. Such as their ability to walk upright, their skilled hands, their ability to speak and create language and their exceptional mental capabilities.

Despite successive progress, man will never be able to dominate nature. The universe that extends to unimaginable dimensions is not controllable, so nature will remain forever superior to humans. Even a cosmic particle may immediately destroy all that man has made on Earth.

- In the struggle for survival and comfort, the ordinary individual strives for Status Striving within the community, which is Power; superiority. As aforementioned, the individual feels inferiority towards his community and finds himself involved in collaboration, rivalry and competition with others; collaboration for the interests of the group and competition for satisfying his own needs, biological and psychological, especially his sexual desire. This inclination accomplishes several goals consistent with the instinct of self-preservation, without being directly instinctive: providing good living conditions, increasing opportunities for enjoying sex and other forms of pleasure, and ensuring good conditions for raising children. This inclination involves striving for power, domination, sovereignty, and competition which may become a violent conflict. Moreover, it is one of the actions to overcome the feeling of vulnerability by this compensatory mechanism.

The same inclination was observed in higher animals (chimpanzees, e.g,⁽²³⁾). This is what Nietzsche called der Wille zur Macht (The Will To Power), considering it the essence of life. Hence, natural selection works to favor this type of people over others. This

business, then became a producer of many cars and gained tens of billions of euros in profits. But if all Peugeot cars are dismantled and turned into scrap, all employees of the company are terminated, and all of its equipment is sold, the company remains in place. It can borrow money, hire new employees, build new factories, buy new machinery and resume production. The company is just a “Peugeot” brand, which is a facade.

⁽²³⁾ Handbook of Personality, p. 41

status is achieved through striving for excellence, by competition, and driven by envy, jealousy and hatred. The inability to achieve power and superiority directly may lead to neurosis, hence, to a compensatory “policy” in diversified ways, according to the conditions of the social environment. In this case, the individual resorts to using indirect mechanisms to achieve power, such as love, making friends, sympathy for others or caring for them, volunteering in public service, helping weak persons and even submitting oneself to the strongest and identifying with him. In addition, behaviors such as hypocrisy, groveling, repression, displacement, rationalization, sublimation, projection, reaction formation, fixation, identification, conversion, compensation, denial, fantasy, displacement, negativism, withdrawal, aggression, regression, etc.⁽²⁴⁾ The goal is to achieve power and reach an internal

⁽²⁴⁾ Psychological defense mechanisms: these are unconscious strategies on the part of the individual, as weapons of psychological defense that lead to obliterating or erasing the truth. The goal is to overcome the state of tension and anxiety resulting from unresolved frustrations and conflicts which are threatening his psychological security. They aim is to bring about psychological balance for the individual, to protect and defend oneself and to maintain self-confidence and respect.

They are normal mechanisms that occur in all people, psychologically normal and abnormal, but the difference between them is their moderate use at the first party and excessive use at the second. Excessive use of e.g., Introjection, leads to depression, as well as Projection, which leads to Paranoia, excessive Displacement may lead to Phobia, and so on.

These unconscious mechanisms are different from the conscious control of behavior by adaptive mechanisms, which are intended and performed by a self that is conscious of itself. The individual may use more than one defense mechanism to satisfy or confront more than one drive or more than one situation at the same time.

Here is a brief explanation of some of these mechanisms:

1. Sublimation: It is a defense mechanism used by individuals to reduce stress and anxiety. It is one of the most important and widespread mechanisms, where individuals with high mental health express undesirable motives in a socially acceptable way, gaining appreciation and respect. Through sublimation, a person can replace repressed aggressive behavior with socially and personally acceptable actions. It is a successful means of coping with emotions. For example, an individual may use sublimation to channel anger through sports or express socially unacceptable ideas through creative outlets like drawing, acting, or writing poetry. For instance, satisfying sexual desires by writing romantic poetry.

2. Compensation: is a mechanism used when a person feels deficient in one area and seeks to strengthen another area to make up for this deficiency by achieving success. The goal is to gain power and prestige. For example, a child with a speech disorder may become a skilled orator, or someone compensating for feelings of inferiority due to physical weakness or chronic illness by excelling in science.

3. Projection: The individual attributes defects and undesirable characteristics that cause his pain to other people, arousing feelings of guilt, even with magnification. In addition, he accuses others of behaviors that he deems socially unacceptable. For example, describing people and accusing them of indifference, selfishness, envy, fraud, lying, miserliness, or bad manners, etc. He gets rid of his faults by projecting them onto others as a self-defense mechanism to protect himself from anxiety. An example (mentioned by Freud) is a jealous husband who describes his wife as lacking sincerity, projecting a character in himself onto her because he cannot face that aspect of himself. Other examples include a liar who accuses others of lying, a person who harbors hostility towards others and mistreats them, and a woman who loves a man but accuses him of flirting with her, and so on.

4. Identification: In identification, a person unconsciously adopts the thoughts, values, and feelings of another person to fulfill desires that he cannot achieve on his own and to feel self-satisfied. He collects, borrows, and attributes to himself the desirable characteristics of others, molding himself into the image of those who possess these traits. This process involves submitting oneself to the personality, values, and behaviors of another individual. Children who fear their father and cannot confront him may seek to emulate his behavior to overcome their fear, and students may identify with their teachers. A common example of identification is the audience's identification with a cinematic protagonist, experiencing joy in their success and sorrow in their suffering. Another significant example is known as identification with the aggressor, where fear motivates the identification. A girl who is afraid of her mother may unconsciously identify with her to avoid harm. Identification differs from simulation or imitation, as the former is an unconscious process while the latter is a conscious act. Identification, in its simplest form, plays a crucial role in self-growth and personality development.

Many manifestations of identification and attachment to others stem from social compassion and empathy for others' problems, leading to a sense of unity with others and the ability to empathize with their circumstances. This defense mechanism is commonly observed in individuals with schizophrenic, paranoid, or manic tendencies, shaping their behavioral patterns. Feelings of inferiority can serve as a strong motivator for identification, particularly evident in psychotics, especially those with paranoia.

Projective Identification is a step beyond abstract projection. In Projective Identification, the individual not only projects motives onto others but actively seeks to see those motives embodied in them to avoid acknowledging them within himself. When experiencing psychological stress, an individual practicing Projective Identification not only deflects pressure onto others by accusing them but also tries to make the other person feel that pressure, behaving as if they are experiencing it themselves, and may ask them, "Why do I see you sad?"

5. Introjection: It is the internalization of feelings, emotions, norms, and values of others into oneself. The individual responds as if these elements are part of himself. It is the opposite of projection; instead of denying the existence of certain characteristics in oneself and attributing them to others, introjection involves incorporating the characteristics of another person or object into one's own psyche. For example, an individual may internalize social behavior norms and express them as if they are his own.

6. Regression: It is the reversion to an earlier stage of development through behaviors that characterize that stage, in order to achieve the same results that were obtained during that period. This can provide a sense of security and comfort when facing problems or frustrating situations. Regression is closely related to the need for safety. Examples include crying to get attention or attract love, reverting to behaviors from childhood, such as bedwetting, or returning to past comforting habits. This defense mechanism is often observed in children and can also occur in adults after experiencing difficult situations.

7. Fixation: It occurs when a person's growth is halted at a particular stage due to the perceived threat of progressing to the next stage. It is considered a rejection of the growth process and can manifest as emotional immaturity. For example, emotional childish behavior exhibited by a young man or adolescent social behavior displayed by an adult.

8. Dissociation: Involves a break in how one's mind processes information leading to a sense of disconnection from thoughts, feelings, memories, and surroundings. This can impact one's sense of identity and perception of time, often resulting in feelings of alienation or unreality. An example of dissociation is someone praying while simultaneously insulting religion

9. Negativism: Is the tendency to resist directions from others, with active negativism involving doing the opposite of what is asked. This behavior is commonly seen in young children.

10. Isolation: A mental defense mechanism that involves isolating feelings from an unpleasant or threatening cognition in order to avoid emotional stress. For example, surgeons in the operating room may resort to using this defense mechanism until the operation is successfully completed.

11. Passive-Aggressive behavior: expressing anger and hostility towards others in negative or indirect ways, such as through insults disguised as humor or disruptive actions that are important to others. Pretending not to understand is a typical behavior.

12. Aggression: An attack directed at a person or thing resulting from feelings of hatred and anger towards others. It can take multiple forms, which may be hidden if directed towards an authority or powerful person. Examples include maliciousness, defamation, stinging jokes, or satire directed at enemies.

13. Withdrawal: Escaping and moving away from obstacles to satisfy motives and needs, sources of tension and anxiety, and states of frustration and intense conflict. It is a negative behavior as evident. Examples include emotional withdrawal, isolation, and loneliness to avoid frustration in social interaction.

14. Fantasy: Resorting to the realm of imagination to achieve success that has not been achieved in reality, such as excessive daydreaming.

15. Conversion: the transformation of emotional stress or repressed impulses and their external expression through sensory, motor, or physiological processes. Examples include blast trauma affecting soldiers on the battlefield, leading to hysterical blindness and temporary dumbness due to severe emotional trauma.

16. Rationalization: interpreting failed or socially unacceptable behavior using logical reasons and excuses that are personally and socially acceptable. It differs from lying in that unconscious justification deceives the individual themselves, while lying is a conscious act aimed at deceiving others. Rationalization is often used to maintain self-esteem and respect. This mechanism is called “sour grapes”: after the fox failed to reach the grapes, it convinced itself that the grapes were sour. An example is justifying the failure to marry a desirable beautiful girl who refused to complete the marriage by labeling the girl as bad.

17. Denial: The unconscious denial of painful, stressful and what is directly threatening the self by denying its existence or confronting it. For example, some individuals refuse to accept the death of persons they love and act as if they are still alive.

18. Undoing: A defense mechanism that works to nullify or erase an idea or improper act that threatens the individual, by undoing it by another countermeasure, to get rid of the feeling of guilt or an accompanying stress. This expresses repentance. For example, a mother who punishes her child, feeling guilty as a result, tries to retract or nullify that punishment by flooding him with positive emotions. An individual, who intended to be violent towards a person, after rethinking, treats them very kindly.

19. Repression: This is the first primary unconscious defense mechanism. It involves the exclusion of what is unacceptable to the conscious mind, such as painful, frightening, and shameful motives, emotions, and thoughts, and expelling them from the conscious to the unconscious. This is a way to avoid awareness of impulses and motives that one prefers to deny, leading to a decrease in feelings of anxiety. However, repression does not eliminate the existence of the motive that has been repressed; it remains preserved in the unconscious and may resurface in dreams, errors, slips of the tongue, feelings of distress, guilt, or mental illness. The ongoing struggle between repressed motives and the self continues until a level of clarity is reached, prompting the self to employ other defense mechanisms to distort reality and maintain a sense of strength and control.

Repression differs from suppression, which is a conscious and intentional act of postponing the satisfaction of drives and instincts until suitable conditions arise. For example, suppressing pent-up jealousy, hatred, or socially forbidden sexual desires.

20. Forgetting: This defense mechanism involves hiding unacceptable or threatening experiences and situations from the conscious mind, such as forgetting an unwanted appointment or the name of a disliked person.

21. Displacement: Is the redirection of emotions from a threatening subject to a less threatening one. For instance, redirecting aggressive behavior towards a family member instead of a manager. Displacement is a common defense mechanism in cases of phobia.

state of balance. This may explain the phenomenon of accepting submission by most people to a dominating power as a compensatory mechanism; since no one can dominate people without their ability to submit. The existing social system determines the socially acceptable way for an individual to achieve status, subjecting the type of this status to its norms. The status may involve accumulating the greatest amount of wealth or the individual becoming a brave fighter, a volunteer in the service of orphans, struggling against injustice, having great knowledge in one field or another or in ideology, etc. On the contrary, it is possible to achieve a status by becoming a criminal, a serial killer, or by plundering the possessions of others; thus achieving sovereign power that becomes socially welcomed under coercion and subjugation. In all cases, the individual becomes respectful, depending on the environment in which he lives. It is society's values and ideals that pave the way for the individual to choose status. In

22. **Generalization:** It involves applying a specific experience to other similar situations, as seen in the proverb "once bitten, twice shy."

23. **Reaction Formation:** This mechanism entails expressing behaviorally reprehensible motives and desires in an acceptable opposite form. It involves displaying feelings that are contrary to one's true emotions, such as showing affection towards someone one actually dislikes. This defense mechanism helps hide true motivations from the conscious mind.

24. **Symbolization:** Symbolization is an unconscious process of indirectly representing an unconscious idea, conflict, or desire through another symbol. For example, a person's interest in women's clothing may symbolize their interest in the opposite sex.

25. **Idealization:** It involves exaggerating appreciation to the point of losing objectivity and ignoring flaws. This can lead to ascribing only positive qualities to a person while disregarding their faults.

26. **Acting-Out:** It is an exaggerated expression of feelings when an individual struggles to express emotions in a more controlled manner. For example, throwing or breaking objects in a fit of extreme anger.

27. **Intellectualization:** It involves isolating feelings from an event and replacing them with logical thinking. This defense mechanism focuses on rationalizing the situation to avoid emotional distress. For instance, analyzing the causes and statistics of a serious illness to distance oneself from the emotional impact and maintain a rational perspective.

(Several references).

some societies, having a large number of children is an important value, while in others having money is a measure of success, etc.

There are two states of individual existence: 1. The independent ego, which is self-conscious and can take and give in balance and independence, depending on her internal capabilities. 2. The weak ego, which cannot exist on her own, resorting to one of two compensatory mechanisms: either she conquers the other ego and controls it (the sadistic) or joins herself to another ego (the subordinate, submissive, or dependent person).

Humans generally have multiple inclinations and different capabilities that lead to various phenomena. One seeks to achieve status, i.e., power; and if he fails he may resort to the mechanism of submitting or identification with the stronger. If this mechanism also fails and life becomes intolerable, he may resort to other mechanisms: escape and searching for either a sanctuary or disobedience and rebellion. In extreme cases, he may show a destructive tendency towards others, in the form of individual violence or destructive rebellions. When he is unable to destroy others, he may tend to destroy himself. The defeated person is potentially aggressive or ready for aggression with the emergence of a possibility.

A glaring example of the different mechanisms for achieving power is the behavior of herdsmen and peasant tribes in the past. The herdsmen were usually poor and suffering from living hardship; that is why they were aggressive, bold and vigilant because they did not feel safe. On the other side, the peasants were achieving power through abundant production; that is why they tended to be peaceful and more democratic than the herdsmen. Usually, the herdsmen felt envious towards the peasants and possessed by greed, attacking them to plunder their wealth. The same is true for the peasant tribes that were afflicted by poverty, and the rich herdsmen tribes were subjected to the same attacks. This phenomenon leads to the conclusion that ethnic intolerance and racism originate from the desire to dominate, envy and greed; the

scourges of the human species which are among the mechanisms of achieving power. The conflicts happening in the European Union and menacing its integration are a model for this. Indeed, the tendency for vengeance has been found in all civilizations as a defense mechanism. Even showing weakness sometimes plays the role of the defense mechanism of human groups (for instance, the victimhood discourse of some groups, including e. g. Zionism and the Muslim Brotherhood). Moreover, one of the mechanisms of achieving power is working for the future: saving means of livelihoods, violence and domination.

To counteract egoism and stimulate altruism or create a balance, people have created general “humane” values and many peoples have added to them a sacred character by attributing them to the teachings of the gods. However, this failed to prompt people to prioritize love and cooperation because egoism, till now, is stronger than altruism.

- The human mind tends to reveal the relations between things and phenomena. It is capable of abstraction, analysis and inference, using this ability to produce concepts and abstract thought. This does not mean merely the desire to think; rather, it is a mechanism to control and command the environment, which contributes to facilitating the fulfillment of human needs. The terror of nature, its ups and downs and its constant aggression push humans to fight for imposing their control and employ it on their behalf. This control requires a good knowledge of the world and recognition of necessity to be used. This is one of the most important drives of development and building civilization. However, humans do not do this all the time, but only when needed, but all the time he is acting mainly under the guidance of his unconscious.

- Human needs never end, and there is nothing called essential needs separated from time and place. Actually, human needs are always relative and variable, and the starting point is to secure the immediate needs. The more people achieve a degree of progress, the more new and indispensable needs emerge for them. For example,

people decided to protect their bodies from cold and hotness using animal skins, but when they found it rough, they decided to search for other sources, so the industry of clothes from plants appeared. Afterward, it became necessary to manufacture tools for spinning, weaving, then dyes, developing this industry to suit the increased population and afterward mineral extraction to manufacture machines, etc. Thus, the development of economic life proceeded. Regarding wars, they required the use of sticks, stones, then as conflicts continued, the need for minerals appeared and competition between human communities played an important role in developing weapons. The appearance of exchange pushed the people to reduce the cost of production, and money became necessary besides its industry. The drug industry also necessitated the production of medications to overcome their side effects or making them more effective and less risky. Accordingly, human needs are infinite and never satiable. There is also an imperative need to satisfy instinctive psychological needs, to enjoy and to escape from painful reality; the cruel world, by creating innovations or escaping into fantasies and delusions, which is a tendency for both the individual and the human species. The ingenious person is never satisfied, never feels contentment, so he needs more and more success. Even the wealthy guy is usually not satisfied with what he gathered, even if he accumulates a fortune, but he seeks for more. He is psychologically in need of this fulfillment and more without end; being in a constant frantic pursuit of success. If one decides to hoard money, his greediness for it does not stop because collecting value, whether use (in the premodern society) or exchange (in the era of capitalism) has no ceiling. He feels poverty and fears that his wealth may be lost, so he grows it constantly. As Marx considered, *“all the things which you cannot do, your money can do.”*⁽²⁵⁾ If those people stop achieving more success, they suffer from neurosis. However, it may be the opposite; that their struggle is a symptom of neurosis

⁽²⁵⁾ Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.

and personality disorder.⁽²⁶⁾ Likewise, the human community has not and will not be satisfied with its development and welfare, and will continue to work for more. All human innovations are a compensation for a feeling of inferiority, weakness and insecurity. It is an endeavor to achieve status, whether material or spiritual. Humans found themselves thrown into the universe without support, faced by the deadly wrath of nature and in need of protection without finding it, which is a very difficult situation. They need safety that is never full, and whenever they make a step on the path of knowledge and progress they can achieve a higher degree of safety, which remains just a dream on the way to exist, without actually being fulfilled. This requires the transmutation of the human into a God, which is impossible. Because safety is more important than freedom for human species life, people may sacrifice their freedom to get security. This explains many social phenomena.

- The human psyche has instincts of self-satisfaction, including self-preservation, avoiding pain and seeking pleasure; sexual and others, besides the instinct to preserve the species. The first inclinations are the basis for egoism, and the second are the basis for altruism, sympathy and emotional empathy. People may act, individually or collectively, with either of them, depending on the circumstances; the type and level of risk facing the individual and the community.

Parental love is innate; included in the instinct of preservation of the species, influenced by identical genes. This is supported by some studies which demonstrated that the love of the biological mother or father – by and large - exceeds their love for the adopted son.⁽²⁷⁾ Regarding self-love; it starts from birth. The child is completely selfish (or even narcissistic as Freud considered and called this

⁽²⁶⁾ This is the interpretation of Freud according to Antony Store, *Genius: History of an Idea*, chapter 12 (Arabic translation).

⁽²⁷⁾ *Handbook of Personality*, pp. 44-45.

“primary narcissism” considering it natural⁽²⁸⁾). He begins to give up his selfishness little by little with his awareness of others. But every person remains selfish to some extent, seeking to preserve themselves, experience pleasure and avoid pain. Thus, when it comes to personal affairs, individuals prioritize their own interests either directly or through indirect mechanisms that involve cooperation with others, seeking their assistance and love in exchange for a corresponding benefit. Ultimately, the goal is self-preservation. Altruism within primitive communities was a necessity due to human limitations such as the inability to store food, the challenge of providing for daily needs individually, and physical weakness.⁽²⁹⁾ Certainly, civilization plays a major role in creating mechanisms for self-preservation and controlling this instinct itself, through the norms and values it creates, which affect various human instincts. It is necessary to have a balance between the instincts of self-preservation and species preservation so that egoism does not lead to the extinction of the human species. Nevertheless, culture may affect human feelings and behavior to the point of creating destructive tendencies that threaten even the entire life, especially in the era of weapons of mass destruction.

The conflict between egoism and altruism is a source of neurosis; the individual looks for safety and protection by the community, integrating into it for this purpose. In this way, he is obligated to submit to its norms, suffering from repression, internal conflict and feeling guilty, either for fear of societal punishment or for fear of remorse. The struggle between egoism and altruism continues inside and outside the individual; that is civilization is in constant crisis; a situation described precisely by Freud as: *“anyone thus compelled to act continually in accordance with precepts that are not the expression of his*

⁽²⁸⁾ On Narcissism, an Introduction, p. 74.

⁽²⁹⁾ This nice article addresses the issue in an educational-pedagogical manner: Mike Reid, The Myth of Primitive Communism.

instinctual inclinations, is living, psychologically speaking, beyond his means and may objectively be described as a hypocrite.”⁽³⁰⁾

The community is like the individual; somewhat narcissistic, even groups within a single community, such as professional groups and social institutions. This tendency is necessary for the development of communities, their achievement of power and protecting themselves. But this may be extreme to create illusions, fantasies, racism and aggressive tendencies against other groups or societies. Erich Fromm was accurate when he described the first as productive narcissism and the second as malignant narcissism, accompanied by additional symptoms of anti-social, paranoid and sadistic personality disorders.⁽³¹⁾

All moral invitations and all religions have failed to restrain narcissism, indicating that it is an inherent strong inclination in the human psyche.

- There are tendencies in the human species that are not necessarily genetic, including greed, envy, aggression and sadism. Not all people have all these characters, but there is at least an innate possibility to acquire them, just as there is an innate possibility to acquire their opposites. This depends on the different circumstances of the individual's upbringing, general social conditions, accumulated experiences of each community, etc. The question that persists in this regard is: why do people resort to aggression, exploitation, greed, etc., without other solutions to their problems? Why do love, cooperation and contentment not dominate unless there are instinctive inclinations that drive these “evil” behaviors? Most likely, these contradictory tendencies are part of human nature, not necessarily genetic, but they arise in the human psyche as a result of the interaction of their instinctive inclinations with their physical formation, the nature of the general social

⁽³⁰⁾ Thoughts for the Times on War and Death.

⁽³¹⁾ The Heart of Man, its genius for good and evil, pp. 102 ff. (Arabic translation).

formation and the general life experiences inherited throughout human history.

- Libido plays an important role in human life, essential for the conservation of the species and for experiencing pleasure. In this respect, humans and higher animals, such as chimpanzees and dolphins, differ from lower beings. Most organisms do not enjoy sex and only engage in it for reproduction.⁽³²⁾

Failure of humans to satisfy this drive would definitely lead to neurosis. Libido also explains why people are interested in being attractive to the other side, through many mechanisms involving high status, good health and beauty. This may lead to rivalry, competition and conflict among people. There is no doubt that sexual jealousy plays an important role in the formation of personality, in social relationships and in of individuals behavior. It is also a defense mechanism to counter the threat of losing a partner and has contributed to prohibiting incestuous marriages, among other factors.

- Moreover, human instinctual inclinations include the father's interest in his children (as well as chimpanzees); which is needed by the child.

- The members of the human species vary biologically and psychologically. Their reactions are not the same; the level of intelligence varies, as well as natural talents and capabilities, and special experiences vary perhaps since the embryonic stage. This difference exists notwithstanding the presence of human nature, creating what is called personality. The latter can be defined as the sum of the various qualities and enduring characteristics of a person, which distinguishes him from others and with which he is born. It is reflected in his interaction with his environment, including people and social situations, whether in his understanding and perception or in his feelings, behavior and external appearance.

⁽³²⁾ Jared Diamond, why is sex fun.

Personal values, tendencies, desires, talents, ideas and personal perceptions produce the so-called character.

The individual's personality is distinguished from one another by several factors; there are genetic differences (even though it is not unlikely that the ability to comply and the tendency to dominate are hereditary⁽³³⁾), the role of hormones, different physical composition; the shape and size of the body, its weight, muscle strength and the presence of congenital defects or acquired diseases - even the birth order of the person in his family affects his psychological structures.

⁽³⁴⁾ In addition to the way of family raising, education and the circumstances he met, regardless of the social system, such as the death of one of the parents, brothers, or friends or their illness, exposure to various accidents and diseases, relationships within the family, living conditions, family status, place of residence and the extent of emotional and sexual satisfaction. He is also affected by the ways and how well the adults cared for him and satisfied his needs, and the difference between him and those around in powerfulness and abilities. There are individuals who have special or unusual abilities; talent or genius (the difference between them is not clear), often results from a genetic factor. If they pay attention to it, they create special innovations, otherwise, it remains dormant. However, some talents may be possessed by each person, but can only be realized in special circumstances. Examples include producing a music track by a child (e.g., Hayden), solving complex math problems without paper and pen or a calculator, or portraying future inventions (Da Vinci is an example), etc. Special capabilities are realized in different directions from one person to another, according to the rest of his personal characteristics and social circumstances. The degree of intelligence varies according to many environmental and educational factors, in addition to a role for

⁽³³⁾ Lambert Wallace - Lambert William, Social Psychology, p. 41 (Arabic translation).

⁽³⁴⁾ This phenomenon was studied by: Lambert Wallace - Lambert William, Op. cit., p. 41.

genes.⁽³⁵⁾ There are genetic differences between children and parents, thanks to the mutation, which equals 1.62 per capita in each generation,⁽³⁶⁾ which is generally harmful and has a relation to IQ and mental and other illnesses.

The interaction between natural instinctive inclinations, especially egoism and its various components, along with the circumstances of each individual generates the formation of different personalities. These personalities are studied by psychology according to what is called the Five Factor Theory.⁽³⁷⁾ The genetic trait of egoism plays a fundamental role in creating psychological problems related to libido, greed, aggression, desire to dominate, sadism, etc.

Among the most important and dangerous personalities that threaten community cohesion is the psychopath, characterized by: ignoring laws and norms, ignoring the rights of others, absence of conscience and lack of remorse, tendency towards violence and intense emotional agitation including anger and mood swings, nervousness and easy arousal. They may be socially marginalized and uneducated, but often have a high social stature. They are unable to settle in a specific job or place for a long time, can only sympathize with specific individuals, engage in a group, and may bond with one or more people but cannot integrate into society and follow its norms. The crimes they commit may be spontaneous and unplanned. The prevailing view is that these personalities arise due to environmental factors, with a possible role for genetic factors or brain injury.⁽³⁸⁾

Yet the human species cannot be described as benevolent or vicious. Instinctive inclinations are just inclinations. Normative

⁽³⁵⁾ Robert Plomin, *Is Intelligence Hereditary?*

⁽³⁶⁾ *Handbook of Personality*, p. 50.

⁽³⁷⁾ Details are found in: *Handbook of personality*, part 5.

⁽³⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

values are produced by civilization. Regarding instincts - as Freud regarded - *“reaction-formations against certain instincts take the deceptive form of a change in their content, as though egoism had changed into altruism or cruelty into pity.”*⁽³⁹⁾ Love and hate may come together, for love means giving; it is power, but it is also weakness, as it means a need for the other. The person may also change from sadism to sympathy with the other and from a gentle person to a fierce monster in certain circumstances. One of the characteristics of human nature is being omnivorous (this is the prevailing view); eating meat and plants; so he has two propensities: aggressiveness and peacefulness; as eating meat requires killing, unlike eating plants (the plant does not have a device to feel pain). One of the striking phenomena - as mentioned by Freud - is that the ancient tribes were fighting and killing each other and meanwhile practiced rituals expressing remorse for killing the enemy; killing is treated as a legitimate and illegal act simultaneously. This indicates that the aggressors were not intending to kill, but to dominate, plunder wealth and women or for expressing self-existence and showing power. Numerous anthropological studies have shown multiple tendencies of primitive human communities, ranging between extreme pacifism to extreme aggressiveness and passion to kill, and from kindness and meekness to treachery and sadism.⁽⁴⁰⁾

If humans were benevolent by nature, they would not need to produce invitations to values and ideals, and if they were vicious by nature they would not be interested in making invitations for the “good.”

Some thinkers and psychologists have attempted to exonerate the human race from the instinctive inclinations of aggression, without justifying why they resorted to “evil.” All that was presented were

⁽³⁹⁾ Thoughts for the Times on War and Death, complete works, p. 3073.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Presented by Erich Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, chapter 8 (Arabic translation). He made a great effort to prove that the phenomena of destructiveness and killing are not natural in humans. But he should answer this question: if so, why human feelings responded to the stimuli by practicing destruction and aggression?!

the causes behind this behavior, from defensive aggression, to instrumental aggression (aiming to achieve another goal), the scarcity of resources and the existing social system, etc. Indeed, humans seek to secure their lives, and for this goal, they resort to all means and possess the ability to follow all means. Their culture could not direct them in a certain way.

- **Collective consciousness or collective conscience:** is actually a collective unconscious because it is embedded in the depths of the mind, not perceived by reason. This is something other than Jung's vague concept. The latter viewed the collective unconscious as archetypes or universal symbols, including primitive basic and fundamental pre-existing images, symbols, or forms, found before human appearance, not part of the conscious and can be unveiled through dream interpretation. They are instinctive archetypes that form part of the mind, inherited by birth, from primitive human beings and our ancestors animals in the context of evolution, not genetically, but psychologically.⁽⁴¹⁾

Collective conscience is formed in the mind of the masses; not of any masses, but of masses coexisting for a long time, which have been sharing experiences and shared a common life. It will be useful to point out Durkheim's view, who considered that the collective conscience includes what is broader than the psychological life of society and weakens as the social division of labor widens. He defined it as *“a set of shared beliefs and emotions among the average members of a single society that constitute a specific social system which has its own life.”* He also believed that there is a correlation and mutual influence between the collective conscience and social ideas in social reality, as a result of the pressures exerted by the collective conscience on its

⁽⁴¹⁾ He addressed this issue in his books: *The Archetypes and The Collective Unconscious - The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, chapters 4-5 (Arabic translation) - *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Ich und dem Unbewußten* (The relation between the ego and the unconscious), part I, chapter I (Arabic translation), chapter I - *The Meaning of Psychology for Modern Man*, chapter I (Arabic translation).

members.⁽⁴²⁾ And added - quoting Adolphe Quételet - that there is a definite model of characters in each society, called *“theory of the average man... more or less exactly reproduced by the majority, from which only the minority tends to deviate under the influence of disturbing causes.”*⁽⁴³⁾ This last idea implies exactly that the ordinary individual has a propensity to imitate and a propensity to follow the majority. That phenomenon was called by Erich Fromm the *“clan instinct”* and by Freud: *“the herd instinct.”* These propensities are important to get and transfer experience, as they are mechanisms for adaptation and submission, and provide the individuals with a guarantee of protection by the majority they follow. This model tends to change relatively slowly compared to individualism.

Here, the contributions of Gustave Le Bon in this field must be pointed out, with some reservations. Among his contributions is his observation of the phenomenon of mass movement under the influence of the unconscious (in agreement with Freud). Another contribution is the idea that the masses possess characteristics that are very different from the characteristics of each of its individuals. This is characterized by: collective spirit - the incorporation of the mental capabilities of individuals and their individuality in the collective spirit - the individual involved in the crowd gains a feeling of power and loses the sense of responsibility - emotions are also transmitted among individuals by what is called *“Contagion”* and the crowd becomes hypnotized.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Le Bon also considered that *“it is not by the mere fact of a number of individuals finding themselves accidentally side by side that they acquire the character of an organized crowd”* but this can include separate people if their minds are severely affected by a major accident, just as the whole nation might become a group if

⁽⁴²⁾ Qalmeen Sabbah Lectures in philosophy of Morality, p. 25 (Arabic translation).

⁽⁴³⁾ Suicide, p. 265.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ All opinions of Le Bon mentioned here are from his book: *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*.

something impacted it, while a community status might not apply for hundreds of persons gathered together.⁽⁴⁵⁾

The collective unconscious includes a general human component, inherited from the long human experiences common to various or most human communities. These experiences may include fear of certain creatures and love of certain views. Certainly, different human beings dealt in the past with various animals or ancient humans in the evolution tree, and they used similar ways of life since before the use of fire and the invention of agriculture. They also dealt in a similar way with natural phenomena that they did not understand; with dreams, diseases, natural disasters, etc. Many human species had lived for two million years, however only thirteen thousand years ago did Homo sapiens become the only one of them on Earth.⁽⁴⁶⁾ It is very likely that the ghouls, the giant humans and the dwarves are not mythoi in reality. Indeed, the giants and dwarves were found, and savage humans even, all are certainly preserved in human memory.⁽⁴⁷⁾

This unconscious may be the basis for a humanistic conscience and feelings of solidarity among human beings.

Memetics provides what may explain this phenomenon. Memes are cultural units, similar to computer viruses that are reproductive, propagating and inherited, just like genes. This concept was invented by Richard Dawkins.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Afterward, the extensive research established a “science” called Memetics. These memes are acquired by human beings, whether intentionally or spontaneously, being the building blocks of the feelings and general culture of the peoples.

Every people has a culture which is a storehouse of memes in the minds of its members. These memes compete together; a natural

⁽⁴⁵⁾ The Crowd - A Study of the Popular Mind, p. 9.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, Sapiens, a Brief History of Humankind, p. 9.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ The selfish gene, chapter 11.

selection process keeps the most capable of adapting to society as a whole. They are also among the tools of ideological hegemony of the powers of every kind

Collective unconscious determines the general behavior and reactions of the majority of society members, without blurring the detailed differences between one individual and another. One of the propagative memes is the meme of domination. Exposing a person to subjugation impels him to subjugate others, as a compensatory mechanism, to regain a feeling of powerfulness. Therefore, the desire to dominate becomes infiltrated in the whole society, not only the ruling class. But in critical conditions, such as calamities, disasters, or victories, the community members are found to behave in the same way at the same time, without any prior coordination. The powers of the unconscious increase, making the memes propagate faster within the crowd and the common memes become in the foreground.

Among the components of the collective unconscious are the structure of the language, sanctities or creeds by and large, ideals, predominant values and mythoi. In spite of the differences between members of a community, and even the antagonistic interests and aspirations, every society produces and maintains feelings, ideas and moreover collective sanctities which are constant throughout a long period of time giving society a certain character and a sense of common belonging. Manifestations of collective unconscious include the way people protest, mass (or collective) hysteria during disasters and wars, transmitted by inspiration, influence, imitation and mutual empathy. It also includes the identification of the masses with a heroic leader and sanctifying him, the collective intolerance in a sports team and racism. In the massive uprisings, the individual is affected by the power of the crowd, so - as Le Bon pointed out - they get a hypnosis-like condition. Hence, they walk in the path of the crowd without hesitation, not fearing death; as well, they lose the sense of responsibility; break the law, get rid of the feeling of inferiority towards the authorities and transcend their selfishness

and become able to sacrifice for the interest of the crowd. In this state, the propagation of the spirit of rebellion is easy, the spirit of cooperation prevails and the community's embedded ideas move from the unconscious to the conscious, which explains the phenomenon of radical changes in the consciousness of the masses during major events, especially revolutions.

Each people has its own collective unconscious. It may be useful here to mention the following description of the differences between the eastern (east Asian) and western minds as follows (without falling into generalization, and with some reservation, considering modern changes): *“The western mind is analytical, discriminative, differential, inductive, individualistic, intellectual, objective, scientific, generalizing, conceptual, schematic, impersonal, legalistic, organizing, power-wielding, self-assertive, disposed to impose its will upon others, etc. Against these western traits, those of the East can be characterized as follows: synthetic, totalizing, integrative, non-discriminative, deductive, non-systematic, dogmatic, intuitive (or affective), non-discursive, subjective, spiritually individualistic and socially group-minded, etc.”* ⁽⁴⁹⁾

Formation of the Soviets by the Russian people in the 1905 and 1917 revolutions, Parisians used to construct barricades in all their uprisings and the Vietnamese used to resort to the forests and make & shoot arrows at the enemy, are manifestations of the collective unconscious. In Egypt, the rise of the masses all over the country at the same time, their formation of popular committees during the January 28, 2011 uprising, expressed their collective unconscious.

- Humanistic conscience (one of the genius contributions of Erich Fromm in his book: *Man for Himself*): Throughout their long history, humans were able, notwithstanding all the “evils,” to formulate general values and norms that appeared with the emergence of civilization. These constituted the Humanistic Conscience, formulated through the ages and have been constant for thousands of years. They involve: courage - compassion towards the

⁽⁴⁹⁾ D. T. Suzuki, *The East and the West*. A topic in the book: *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, p. 5.

suffering - honesty, especially honesty with oneself - self-respect - sincerity, etc. Like any human innovation, this is subject to change, not “right” or “wrong.” There are also values that express human propensity to preserve the species; altruism versus selfishness, such as prioritizing children in times of disaster. They oppose the authoritarian norms imposed by every social system. This morality is currently represented in “human rights,” which have evolved throughout history since their declaration by the French Revolution. This Humanistic conscience is not the internalized voice of an authority imposed over the individual, which he is eager to please and afraid of displeasing; but it is his own voice, present inside every human being, independent of external sanctions and rewards. The individual's violation of the Humanistic Conscience may be socially acceptable or rejectable, according to the prevailing social values, but it is rejected from within the ordinary individual in all cases. It is one of the contents of the general human collective unconscious.

The American Psychological Association (APA) defines sublimation as *“a defense mechanism in which unacceptable sexual or aggressive drives are unconsciously channeled into socially acceptable modes of expression and redirected into new learned behaviors, which indirectly provide some satisfaction for the original drives.”* It is actually the pursuit of people towards higher socially valuable activities, such as art, scientific research and sports. Moreover, a person may seek self-realization after satisfying his physical and emotional needs and his need to obtain a social status, as Maslow regarded,⁽⁵⁰⁾ or through the transformation of socially unacceptable motivations and desires into alternative activities that coincide with social norms; directed to acceptable fields, as Freud regarded.⁽⁵¹⁾ This is just a realization of the power inherent within him; a showing of power and an attempt to achieve a higher status. Regardless of the interpretation,

⁽⁵⁰⁾ A. H. Maslow (1943), *a Theory of Human Motivation*.

⁽⁵¹⁾ *Thoughts for the Times on War and Death*.

sublimation is a phenomenon in human society. It is clear that people enjoy playing and practicing art plus other forms of sublimation, either by practicing them or by receiving them auditorily or visually. They may be a part of work as well. By and large, people do not like pure work without enjoyment, which deprives them of art, personal skill, or lacks the element of pleasure and entertainment. However, psychologists have differed in the interpretation of these phenomena.

The problem of death: This tragedy has been encountered by humans throughout their history. A healthy person develops senility with time and moves towards death since birth. The certainty of this fate of humans created a sense of powerlessness and futility, prompting them to search for the *raison d'être* (reason for being) and for eternity in vain. They created ideas such as: the idea of resurrection, the soul (meaning a wraith), contempt of worldly life in favor of an eternal life after resurrection, reincarnation of souls, the prohibition of killing, attempts to prolong life by developing medicine, recently creating the idea of freezing the body and searching for the genes of aging. The mechanisms of achieving immortality may include the performance of “immortal” actions, childbearing, interest in raising children and working for the continuation of the community and human species. The life instinct expressed in these actions seeks to overcome death and annihilation.

Death instinct: with aging and having diseases, individuals' hope in life fades, so they often look for death. The same thing takes place if they lose hope in life for any other reason or if life becomes harder than they can withstand. Some people resort to suicide, with multiple motives: a social crisis, the torment of conscience, a health crisis, a psychological crisis of some cause. However, not everyone who faces the same circumstances commits suicide, but the reactions vary, and it seems that the common tendencies of each society play an important role. This is strengthened by the stability of the social

rate of suicide, which is very small; 300-400 at most per million,⁽⁵²⁾ which implies that the instinct for life is much stronger.

When the hope for the continuation of life fades, the death instinct may take the form of a destructive tendency, whether for the individual or those around them. This becomes prominent in moments of devastating popular uprisings. The masses become frenzied because of their frustration, so the destruction of the world becomes their preferred option. As proposed by Fromm, destructiveness is the outcome of the un-lived life.⁽⁵³⁾

- Psychological differences between males and females: the biological differences are obvious and well known: body weight in general (12% more for males), bone size and muscle strength; women are physically feebler than men, although they may be physiologically stronger. It is also the woman who menstruates, carries, gives birth, breastfeeds and raises children in the early years of their lives; all of which consumes a lot of her physically. All this leads to different social roles and proclivities. Her relationship with children is different from that of males, regardless of the existing mating system. In addition, the task of fighting, hunting and handicraft was mainly assigned to men since the dawn of history, and agriculture was added after its scope expanded. This difference in physical strength and social tasks creates different feelings; a feeling of powerfulness on the part of the man and feelings of weakness, jealousy and envy on the part of the woman, who endeavors to compensate for it by multiple mechanisms. Moreover, the testosterone hormone, which is more in males than females since puberty, affects behavior; so the male is more aggressive and violent than the female. A male who produces more of this hormone has – by and large – more sexual abilities and attractiveness. Moreover, generally speaking, in humans, males resort to physical aggression

⁽⁵²⁾ Durkheim, *Suicide*, p. 266.

⁽⁵³⁾ *The Fear of Freedom*, p. 148. He also described it as the alternative to creativeness, the sane society, p. 144 (Arabic translations).

more than females to seize the resources of others, perhaps due to genetic factors. According to evolutionary psychology, the sex difference in the use of physical aggression emerges as early as three years of age.⁽⁵⁴⁾ At this age, the rate of testosterone is equal in males and females, which indicates a role of genetic factors. It has been found that out of ten million animal species that exist, including four thousand mammals, only two species have been documented to show maleinitiated coordinated coalitions that carry out fatal coordinated assaults on groups of the same species: chimpanzees and humans.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Moreover, no other being except humans has been detected to enjoy torturing others.

Existence is a dilemma: humans were thrown into the world without their will, did not choose this universe in which they are living, and they realize that they are distinguished from the nature of which they are a part. They are forced to live under the pressure of the life instinct and forced to face nature, which they regard as their own property. They are seeking to control it, trying to overcome its laws, so they circumvent it to serve them. They are also incapable of making a decision to commit suicide because the instinct of life is much stronger than the death instinct. They also know that they will die, so they resort to work to prolong their lives, raise their children, preserve the human species, etc. They are in a permanent struggle against their living conditions without finding any justification for their existence or existence in general. Moreover, they understand all this and therefore live in a dilemma. Life seems to be absurd, without meaning. All these are among human motives for creating ideology in an attempt to make the world reasonable and meaningful. It is they who make a contrived meaning for the world to deal with their dilemma.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ David Buss, evolutionary psychology, p. 579 (Arabic translation).

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Ibid., p. 570.

The world has no meaning. The human being's striving to create meaning for their existence and their life is indeed a striving to overcome their feeling of fear and weakness in the universe in which they were thrown without support. The desire to overcome the death instinct drives humans to create meaning for their life: a sublime goal, some message, or submission to a higher power that they create and confer glorious and great qualities over it.

'Life has no purpose or goal, but it is the purpose and the goal'
(Tariq Shamekh)

3. History Without End - a Critique of the Idea of Salvation

Human existence is a project that has not yet completed

Jean Paul Sartre

- The dream of salvation is old, perhaps since the first appearance of humankind or at least the age of civilization. Looking

forward to salvation initially took a religious form since the dawn of history. Every heavenly religion gave it a form; salvation or deliverance through the crucifixion of Jesus, meaning reconciliation between God and humans, forgiving eating from the forbidden fruit by Adam and Eve. Consequently there will be an opportunity for believers in Christ and those following his teachings to return to Heaven after their worldly life (Dunya). In Islam and Zoroastrianism, salvation is accomplished by following religious teachings to enter heaven after death. In Judaism, salvation will take place when Christ; the Savior comes to earth. Salvation in non-heavenly religions differs. In Buddhism of Buddha salvation is performed by reaching Nirvana, which is the ultimate spiritual goal that consists of a complex of virtue and wisdom, understanding of the self and the world. The purpose is to get rid of the multiple torments of life by the eradication of lust, hatred and ignorance, through deep meditation of the world; in short, the elimination of the desires of the body. Consequently, perfect happiness is found.⁽⁵⁶⁾ There are many Buddhist sects, such as the Jōdo-shū; an ancient sect that viewed salvation in reaching the “*Pure Land*” for Buddha followers,”⁽⁵⁷⁾ which is similar to the Paradise in the heavenly religions. Another sect is Zen, which invites to living in a permanent state of Nirvana with dissolving in the surrounding nature, by union of the self with the surroundings, so that the knowledge of things becomes exactly the knowledge of the self, which is done with deep meditation. The purpose is to know the soul, uncover the unconscious and eliminate the authority.⁽⁵⁸⁾ In Hinduism, salvation is fulfilled by the union of the soul with God (Brahma), by controlling the body and the eradication of lust, evils and desires.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Mysticism schools share one general idea of salvation: deepening in ultimate or

⁽⁵⁶⁾Damien Keown, Buddhism, chapter 4 (Arabic translation).

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Erich Fromm and others, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, footnote p. 3.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Erich Fromm, Principals of Zen Buddhism, in the book: Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Ahmad Shalaby, The Great Indian religions. pp. 60-67 (in Arabic).

hidden truth; union with the absolute; the infinite or God by repressing the body. This union takes place specifically through thinking and meditation. These mechanisms may be successful in attaining a feeling of happiness for the human being. But, if one is a slave, subjected to conditions of oppression, social exploitation and mastery of the sadists, then is the way merely meditation, contentment and suppression of desires? The result will be a false feeling of freedom and happiness; a delusion, or accepting suffering as a destiny. The advocacy of suppressing desires, austerity and the annihilation of the body does not provide a solution for the actual human issues: oppression, exploitation, alienation and neurosis as a result of all this.

Neither meditation nor contentment nor self-knowledge and its liberation in Zen Buddhism will change the human conditions, except if they liberate themselves from the oppressive material and spiritual powers. How does a peasant who is oppressed and deprived of freedom feel free with just meditation and nirvana without first being freed from actual slavery and humiliation? Would the dominant powers give up their interests, greed and narcissism and would they reach Nirvana as well just by giving advice and preaching?! In fact, liberation of the individual is achieved only in a community. All these claims failed to achieve anything mentioned, as 99% of Buddhists have not reached Nirvana.⁽⁶⁰⁾

- Since ancient times, people have been trying to formulate a project for a society they considered ideal, as a way of human salvation on earth. These include various socialist or collaborative projects; Buddhist, Islamic, Christian, etc,⁽⁶¹⁾ in addition to projects for other systems, such as the Republic (Plato), Utopia (Al-Farabi and Thomas More), God's City (Saint Augustine), etc. Moreover, modern socialist attempts; the most important are those of Charles

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, Sapiens, A Brief History of Humankind, p. 206.

⁽⁶¹⁾ Presented by Sameh Saeed Abboud in his book: A Critical Reading in Anarchism (in Arabic).

Fourier, Robert Owen and Saint Simon. Of course, major revolutions should be added, such as the French Revolution, the Paris Commune in 1871,⁽⁶²⁾ the Russian Revolution and the rest of the socialist revolutions, which all ended with counter-revolutions.

Some thinkers and politicians have imagined and pretended that the salvation of humanity has already taken place, and that history has ended in what is best for them. Hegel considered that reason has been actualized in the modern state and that his philosophy is the realized absolute spirit; the Absolute Idea which became “*at home.*” After the end of the Cold War, Fukuyama and his proponents considered that history had come to an end with the victory of capitalism over communism. In addition, in the leftist camp, the Stalinist regime proclaimed that socialism had been actualized, the state had become the state of all the people and all that remained was to reach the communist stage in the Soviet Union. But all this nonsense has been exposed, and the people are still dreaming of a day when they will be liberated from oppression, poverty, injustice and alienation. The socialist left, with its two largest parties, Marxism and Anarchism, is promoting this project. Socialism, in their point of view, is the ideal society without exploitation or oppression; a paradise on earth, although its failure has been evident throughout history. The German philosopher Habermas called for providing suitable conditions for free communication between people as a mechanism for achieving harmony among them, as an alternative to the idea of class struggle. It is unthinkable how the rulers and thieves can agree with the poor and oppressed! Moreover, the revolutionary libertarian movements are still fighting against the oppressive and exploitative forces; they sometimes win and sometimes lose in the pursuit of salvation. Add the Islamists, who are dreaming of the resurrection of the Islamic Caliphate and

⁽⁶²⁾ A popular municipal government that administered Paris and declared its rule over all of France. It lasted for seventy-two days. The government which was elected dissolved the State apparatus and established popular rule without a professional army or police; instead volunteers and senior officials were elected.

liberating the world from the Taghut (Ultimate tyrant entity) by applying the idea of the governance of God. Indeed, they have illusions about the era of the Caliphate as the ideal age for humanity!

This enduring dream of humans derives from their feeling of suffering. Even the promotion of fictitious salvation projects by the clerics and authorities depends on the extreme eagerness of the people to be free from suffering and oppression.

It is meant here the salvation on earth; true and actual; salvation of both body and spirit.

Can salvation of this world be actualized?

In spite of the failure of the socialist revolutions, there are still some socialist ideas that are used as arguments to prove the possibility of salvation of humanity from “evil.” The first idea is that the world now (and since the 19th century) has been producing enough fundamental needs for all human beings. In fact, the world - with the exception of periods of natural disasters- has always been producing enough fundamental needs for all human beings; even has been always producing a surplus, as evidenced by the continuous growth of the sections of non-producing material products: those who do mental work and who have been always getting their fundamental needs at least. The second idea is that people have specific fundamental needs, while these needs are constantly increasing, and people are finding themselves motivated to develop their productive forces and increase production to meet this increase. The third idea is the claim that the squandered portion of production today or in the era of capitalism by and large, is sufficient to meet the needs of the poor. This phenomenon is very old, started since the dawn of history. There have been always military and security expenditures, especially with the emergence of the state and squandering of labor power in producing useless and ridiculous things, such as the pyramids e.g., in addition to what is being destroyed in wars and social conflicts.

In conclusion, there is no new data supporting the Salvation project in the present.

- Because human needs have no ceiling; increasing all the time, the essential needs are not sufficient to satisfy the total needs of humans; accordingly, there will always be repressed needs. In the existence of egoism or selfism, jealousy and envy in human psyche, there will be a physical and psychological basis for aggression, leading to a continuous reappearance of powers looking for domination, compulsion, oppression and exploitation of others. As for the reiteration about the availability of the essential needs; it is deceptive. At the beginning of producing anything new it is not produced in quantities that are sufficient for all people, such as the production of cars, televisions or mobile phones, which were very expensive in the beginning. The world will not produce caviar -for instance- and many other things in satisfactory quantities to the demands of all human beings. Moreover, it has been not possible to easily provide a palace or a private plane for every citizen. So, there will always be shortages, relative poverty and differentiation; all of which are factors that promote aggression, conflict and the pursuit of domination.

- The advancement of humans with civilization did not prevent the emergence of fascism, Stalinism, world wars and genocides. Thus the forces of “evil” have been reproducing. All revolutions failed to achieve their slogans, such as liberty, equality and fraternity, and all ended in counter-revolutions. These slogans have remained a subject to think about for those who are dreaming about salvation in various meanings, according to different interpretations. These dreamers are mainly Marxists and anarchists, considering that socialism is the moment of salvation of the human species from private property, exploitation, oppression, wars, racial and religious intolerance, etc.

- The anarchists proposed neither inevitability nor a “historical” reason for the failure of revolutions. Rather they suggested a problem of knowledge and the experience of the working classes.

Once this experience is gained from previous trials, it becomes possible to expect the victory of the revolution, with mass spontaneity and without fear of falling of the fruit in the mouth of authoritarian elites. This is how their first thinker; Daniel Goren presented the issue.⁽⁶³⁾ Marxists generally favor this interpretation with regard to the socialist revolutions that had taken place, but in regard to the bourgeois revolutions they argue that the historical conditions for achieving their slogans were not available, but their opposite; that's how history must move. In favor of this idea, Marx stated: *“No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.”*⁽⁶⁴⁾ He also thought that wage labor is the last form of exploitation; therefore, its end leads to the emancipation of humankind and the actualization of the dream of salvation, not taking into account that exploitation is possible without the existence of wage labor. For instance, between individual producers via an unequal exchange process for one reason or another, and that a social system made up of free and individual producers or collaborators can supersede capitalism while exploitation may however continue. In addition, a class of technocrats and bureaucrats may dominate (technocrats are technologists; high-level technicians, and bureaucrats are senior administrators both in government and the private sector) or history may go in an unimaginable path.

- The socialist idea of salvation is similar to the religious one. The trilogy: primitive communal society - the stratified society - salvation in communism with the revolution; victory of the proletariat (the class of industrial wage laborers) and defeat and destruction of the bourgeoisie. This is similar to the famous trilogy in some religions: living in heaven and then expulsion to earth; to a

⁽⁶³⁾ Daniel Guérin, *Three Problems of the Revolution*.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Preface.

life replete with suffering, thereafter, the Day of Resurrection; the judgment: heaven for the good and Hell for the evil guys. It is certainly not a deliberate simulation, but the human mind worked in the same way. In fact, the alleged primitive society was neither beautiful nor free of cruelty and the ugliest forms of crimes and brutal wars. There is no evidence that it was free of hierarchy and privileged commanders, and the community's repression of its members was not less cruel and violent than the repression of the modern state and the market.⁽⁶⁵⁾ Furthermore, there will be no eternal bliss if a socialist society is established as it has been witnessed since the 1920s. However, many socialist advocates depict ancient society as an idealistic one, which they call primitive communism, where all were equal, living in love and peace, depending on incompetent (and perhaps ideological), anthropological researches relied on the studying of contemporary tribes which are very few, isolated and besieged by modern countries.⁽⁶⁶⁾ Human civilization emerged contaminated with blood, starting from the genocide of whole animal and plant species, to the extermination of ancient human species, such as the Neanderthals and others, up to the extermination and enslavement of Homo Sapiens tribes to each other. Afterward, the class, national, racial and religious conflicts ensued, associated with carnages and genocide of millions, in addition to the enslavement of peoples by the state and the dominant classes.

- Concerning Islamists; they envision the salvation of humankind by returning to Islam and following its law. In this case wickedness will end and justice & goodness will prevail after returning to the age of the “Righteous caliphs.”⁽⁶⁷⁾ Moreover, God ultimately must support them against the Taghut (Ultimate tyrant entity). Actually,

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, *Sapiens, A Brief History of Humankind*, p. 319.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ It is a term used in Sunni Islam to refer to the first four Caliphs who established the “Rashidun Caliphate.”

there is no need to elaborate the horrors that political Islam committed all over the world, nor the atrocities committed by the “Righteous Caliphs,” as everything is recorded in the history books.

- Moreover, a lot of youth are seeking personal salvation by creating marginal communities, isolated from formal society, in which a life based on cooperation, freedom and equality is practiced. But it is not possible in this era to achieve this dream without regressing to primitiveness and dispensing with modern civilization. There is already that view which is called Anarcho-primitivism. Is this really applicable? Would this primitive society not progress with the same mechanisms and for the same reasons as the ancient societies progressed?

- Some leftists renounce the idea of salvation because of its utopianism: Lenin said: *“it has never entered the head of any socialist to ‘promise’ that the higher phase of the development of communism will arrive; as for the greatest socialists’ forecast that it will arrive, it presupposes not the present ordinary run of people, who, like the seminary students in Pomyalovsky’s stories, are capable of damaging the stocks of public wealth ‘just for fun’, and of demanding the impossible.”*⁽⁶⁸⁾ Moreover, Eric Fromm stated: *“the class struggle might perhaps become less violent, but it cannot disappear as long as greed dominates the human heart. The idea of a classless society in a so called socialist world filled with the spirit of greed is as illusory -and dangerous- as the idea of permanent peace among greedy nations.”*⁽⁶⁹⁾

- Whether the dream of salvation is represented in a return to heaven, to nature, to the old communal society or to the Caliphate; it is a regressive tendency; an escape into the past rather than facing the present and struggling against the obstacles to individual actualization and liberation. It is a condition that occurs sometimes in people having neurosis to escape from an intolerable situation; the situation of estranged & alienated human in the contemporary world.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ The State and Revolution.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ To have or to be, p. 93.

- Theoretically, social salvation can take place if human beings - presumably- agree to abolish coercive factors and carry this out. Is it possible? Even if society reaches the stage of communism, it will need to continue to resist selfishness and criminal tendencies; to a permanent revolution, otherwise a new setback of the human species will take place.

- Humans have not been able through hundreds of thousands or millions of years to live together in cooperation and mutual respect, and all their dreams in this project have failed. So, searching for this mirage is a waste of people's energies, struggles and sacrifices, for the sake of those who reap their fruits every time? Wouldn't it be better to keep the door open; not developing a project that won't be realized? However, the idea of the Permanent Revolution paves the way for the horizons infinitely; implying the hope for perpetual change. However, humans may be able to actualize the dream of an ideal society some day, if something that is not envisaged happened. Until this is achieved -if so- the ideal society will remain a day dream of humans, just as paradise is represented in religious myths.

- Practically, there is no possibility of salvation, which is the starting point of the idea of the Permanent Revolution. It is not a project, but a perpetual revolutionary process without a final goal; strategies that are on the way to be achieved. Actually, what can be achieved are only steps in an infinite process. This is a practical thinking versus dreams that have caused countless disasters to humanity and wasted revolutionary energy.

Discarding the search for salvation frees humans from thinking about impossible or hopeless goals. It would be great if humans could establish an ideal society, but this project is not guaranteed, and if it is performed, its stability is also not guaranteed. This preresquires a change of human psyche before anything else. In addition, there is no guarantee that culture will overcome people's instinctive inclinations. This was analyzed in the previous chapter.

Indeed, there is no such thing as “the end of history” or the beginning of the real history of humankind as the Marxists supposed (i.e., the historical necessity will disappear). Actually, all history of humankind is “real,” the world of necessity will not disappear and the final victory and absolute supremacy of capitalism, as the thinkers of that class claim, will not be accomplished. There is nothing -by and large- fixed or final, especially with regard to human life. This is something that does not need a lot of talk: everything is changing.

Furthermore, any social system is actually a counter-revolution and any call for a definite system is an early call for a counter-revolution. Even fulfilling the goals of anarchism in its multiple views is potentially a project of a counter-revolution.

- Does this imply that the world has to be in chaos and social conflicts all the time?

The answer is clearly: Yes. But not security chaos, rather social mobility and continuous development as well, in addition to running after the conservative forces that are being formed in any circumstances and liquidating them. That means the absence of any stability; this hideous concept which has long been associated with the victory of the counter-revolution everywhere and all the time.

What is meant is a situation of everlasting liquidity or continuous change; a perpetual transition towards freedom, welfare and development, for all peoples.

- As long as society exists, there will be individuals with various abilities and personalities, groups with different interests, some of which have the interest of keeping the social situation stable or access to a fully established system. Additionally, social sections that monopolize some powers, whether cognitive, economic or military, are formed. Hence, the continuation of the revolution is necessary to liquidate the influence of these sections or deprive them of their powers and to achieve the aspirations of human beings towards

more freedom and welfare; since there is no salvation, and there will always be conflicts alongwith cooperation among humans.

- Needless to say, the struggle against the monopolization of any kind of power is a constant goal of the Permanent Revolution. Moreoverbecause of the multiple forms and types of authoritarianism, the Permanent Revolution is multi-directional: political, social, cultural, etc.

- There is an interaction between economic and ideological factors in the movement of history. Notwithstanding the progress of knowledge and abstract thought, humans have never become rational, except from a technical point of view. Even though the economic factor has the decisive role, this rule cannot be separated from the presence of certain human constants; a human nature that has specific characteristics, capabilities and energies; that is, the role of the psychological factor. For instance, the transmutation of the communal society to the system of slavery or feudalism cannot be attributed to mere factors outside humankind. People must be susceptible to accept this transformation, otherwise why similar changes are not seen in other animals? Without greed, avarice, or a desire for domination, the Bedouins would not have attacked the peasants in the past, and the rich would not have persisted - by and large- - throughout all ages to accumulate more wealth without a ceiling. Moreover, the acceptance of the general public of the class system and the domination of ruling elites implies a vulnerability to submission. More importantly, the masses regard the dominant class as their ideal. This conception is corroborated by the end of all revolutions with counter-revolutions.

- It cannot be claimed that people act solely according to their material interests as the thinkers of mechanical materialism depicted the matter. Rather, this is a contemporary phenomenon under capitalism, without being a general phenomenon throughout history. The interest of the poor -according to this theory- is to seize the wealth of the rich; however, revolutionary movements have nonetheless been extinguished. People act according to what they

think is satisfactory to them, whether materially or spiritually. Their mode directly determines their behavior. Instinctive inclinations, motivations, culture and the conditions of reality interact with each other, determining how people behave. There is no single reaction to a stimulus, so one might decide when they see a snake - for instance - to flee, attack it, wait, see what it will do, or not care about it at all, according to the surrounding circumstances and their psychological structure and status at that very moment.

It was decided to begin with the revolution's strategies, not by presenting basic axioms or fundamental analysis or by asserting some facts. Furthermore, neither a systemic view nor a new theory will be presented. All the issues presented herein serve and support the idea of striving for freedom, welfare and development. There is no logical or rational justification for this option. Rather, it is a justified aspiration; a human right that humans have set for themselves.

‘Ideals and building an ideal society are dreams; they will continue to be on the way to exist, never to be fulfilled’

4. Freedom

Free election of masters does not abolish the masters or the slaves

Herbert Marcuse

- The concept of freedom :

What is meant here is the freedom of the individual, not that of the homeland, the state, the nation or any kind of legal personalities.

There is no unanimity on the conception of freedom. Philosophers, thinkers and political theorists have presented it in various meanings. The highest point that bourgeois thought has reached is the theory of the social contract; almost full freedom under the control of a state that is minimized as much as possible. On the other hand, radical socialist thought, Marxism and the entirety of anarchist thought have given the concept of freedom a broader meaning. Accordingly, individual freedom begins with the emancipation of the proletariat, which liberates all of society from the capitalist system; wage labor disappears alongside alienation, and people manage their own affairs. Hence, individuals become liberated and have the opportunity for self-actualization as the development of productive forces continues by imposing their control over nature.

The broadest meaning of freedom can be defined as: the freedom of the self as a whole. The individual is a body and a mind (psyche) or a body that has a mind; not just reason, but also instincts and emotions, with reason being one of the tools of the mind; a faculty. The self represents a union of the conscious and unconscious. As Jung regarded, the total unity of the psyche; its conscious and unconscious, where the unconscious forms the bulk.⁽⁷⁰⁾ The self is neither an entity nor an independent object. Concerning the conscious and unconscious, they exchange positions; the conscious mind becomes the unconscious, and the unconscious becomes conscious. Their interaction composes what is called the Will. The latter is the self desires as a whole. This issue needs some explanation: there are no specters inside the body, but the psyche or the spirit is merely an abstraction of groups of feelings, instincts and behavioral tendencies of the person. These are controlled by genes, hormones and the nervous system. The self is also not a certain

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Jolande Jacobi, *The Psychology of C. G. Jung*, pp. 17-18 (Arabic translation).

essence, neither eternal nor immutable, but an abstraction; the conscious and the unconscious in their interaction, giving rise to what is called Will, as aforementioned. Therefore, the self is not a self-standing essence but something that is formed in the human community; exactly its product. Consequently the individual is the son of the community. While the latter is not a collection of individuals, but formed first and then the individual is born, who recognizes himself and his privacy after grasping his distinction from other community members and his own role in its life. The community exercises authority, and the individual becomes an individual because he resists that authority; he is then a counter-power. In short: it is the community that produces the individual, not the other way around.

- Freedom then is the individual being for himself, not in himself or for the other, so he determines what he “himself” wants; in the sense that he chooses what corresponds to himself without pressure from any party whatsoever. This means uniqueness; each individual becomes a unique being, not a subaltern or a buck private (Nafar in Arabic) or a stereotype, but a creative, actualized self. Because self-liberation is a conscious action, a free person controls himself; his feelings, instincts and even his reason, enjoying all this consciously, by directing all to achieve happiness, without repression, which is - on the contrary- an unconscious act to hide desires and feelings. This necessitates acting against the social system; the superego or the authoritarian conscience (in the words of Erich Fromm), the sacred ideology and the repressive powers, to expand the area of the individual's freedom. Above all and before everything, individuals should have confidence in themselves and their capabilities arising from their own experience and have critical thinking, not relying on anything external.

To be truly free is to be able to choose freely. The individual must make decisions arising from his own convictions; not be subject to the power of society, the media or the ideological institutions of the dominant class. A free person is one who can

answer to himself this question: Why do I choose this or that, being actually existing for himself. A free human is one who is able to choose; a cultured person; since human freeing is a conscious action. In order for a person to exist for himself or be himself, one must discover his unconscious, through meditation and thinking apart from the influences of the authorities. It is in the unconscious that the individual discovers his own desires, tendencies and drives and above all his humanistic conscience. If he is able to acknowledge himself, he reaches maturity; Enlightenment according to the Kantian concept; he can take freely his decisions. He is a committed person who cares about public activity; works in a community to motivate creativity. On the other hand, the selfish person, who is focused on satisfying his immediate pleasures, does not look to the future, is introverted, remains "in himself," does not realize his potential and does not utilize his abilities and capacities. The free individual who is in harmony with the community is not subject but compatible with it (by his free will), so, he can disagree, suggest and initiate; his freedom involves his initiative to participate in drawing the destiny of the community. Briefly, the individual will not be able to create and actualize himself except in reaction with the community.

A free individual is not a "buck private" in the community but its production. So his freedom can only be actualized within the context of the preservation of the community; the free community which respects the individual and devotes its power to protect his freedom; neither the state nor other institutions of repression. Contrariwise, a person who enslaves others, believing that he is free, is not free. While he is oppressing the other, he represses himself in two ways: by negating his belonging to the community and by giving the right to others to oppress him. Likewise, a free person does not get people's love with money, but with love; a person buys with money what he is unable to do on his own.

There is a common theoretical query: Is there such a thing as free will and can a person be really free?

There are no definite innate entities called spirit, self or will. All these are formed for individuals within the community, in the context of the interaction of individuals together and with nature. Consequently, there is no spirit, no self and no independent will except within the limits of the conditions of existence and formation of the individual. This individual is only willing according to his formation and complex associations with the community; as the ego is something that is formed; acquired, not genetic. Like anything acquired, she is governed by the factors of her formation; she is not free in the literal sense of the word. By and large, there is nothing free in the literal sense of the word. Spinoza accurately presented this issue: “For will, like the rest, stands in need of a cause by which it is conditioned to exist and act in a particular manner. And although, when will or intellect be granted, an infinite number of results may follow, yet God cannot on that account be said to act from freedom of the will.”⁽⁷¹⁾

The definition of freedom as doing anything that does not harm others or restrain their freedom is a juridical definition that has no value except within the limits of the laws. Because of the laws, the social system in general, the social conscience or the pressures of others, complete freedom can never be achieved. Under the slogans of freedom, the individual has been subjugated, stereotyped and become a gear inextricably linked in the social system. Even with the advancement of productive forces and reducing labor hours radically, capitalism creates fictitious works to make the people go on alienation, not giving them a chance to revolt. However, it is not necessary that the individual becomes psychopathic but able to oppose the dominating powers in society, whether at its top or inside its folds, that hinder the individual's ability to be himself.

Striving for freedom is not a realization of human nature or the laws of history but rather a choice. In addition to the human tendencies for freedom and domination, there is a tendency to submit to the community; the herd instinct or the clan instinct,

⁽⁷¹⁾ The Ethics, p. 25.

which explains, among other factors, the phenomenon of authoritarianism. Freedom leads to a sense of responsibility; the individual becomes responsible for their actions and cannot blame anyone else for the results. Perhaps this may explain why most people seek liberation only within limits. For this reason, Fromm explained the appearance of sadistic-masochistic characters as a desire to escape the burden of freedom.⁽⁷²⁾

The free decision to live free is essential for the self-realization of the individual, his enjoyment and creativity. This may explain why the ruling classes recruit some of the ingenious persons necessary for its interests and -sometimes- guarantee freedom for them, so that they can perform creative work.

There is a difference between liberation and freedom. It is possible to be liberated from poverty, destitution, endemic diseases and even from the state itself, but you become free utterly only when you are able to choose by yourself and without any pressure. Liberation is a perpetual action, while freedom is something that is on the way to be achieved; the purpose of liberation.

There is no limit to freedom, simply because the complete freedom of the individual can never be fulfilled in the foreseeable future.

- Freedom and Necessity: Humans cannot abolish the laws of matter, but if the ceiling of human ambitions is raised freedom will be the transcending of necessity. The laws of nature are what are formulated by humans, and they do change and be transcended as scientific research grows. For history, there are no strict laws; only mere tendencies. Because the necessity will never disappear, human freedom will be a process that is perpetually being achieved without end. With the advancement of science and technology and dismantling the repressive forces in society, the individual will enjoy more freedom. It is the negation of every repressive power, whether

⁽⁷²⁾ The Fear of Freedom, p. 125 (Arabic translation).

at the level of the individual scale or at the scale of society as a whole. It is also against the domination of commanders, professional politicians and deified persons; “the idols of the masses.” This is another reason why achieving full freedom of the individual is impossible but will still be a purpose. This accords with Durkheim saying: *“I can only be free to the extent that others are forbidden to benefit from their physical, economic or other superiority to the determinant of my liberty.”*⁽⁷³⁾ Moreover, with the development of humanity, two tendencies are looking to arise. First: its technical and moral development may enable the weakest and the least prestigious groups to liberate to some degree or another, so the individuals tend to converge in power and status, the stronger tends to cooperate and sympathize with the weaker and democracy becomes much more actualized than as the current situation. Second: on the other side, technical progress threatens to widen the gap between people in cognitive abilities and the ability to influence others. In addition, the biological revolution threatens to create a more efficient and intelligent human, and the technological revolution threatens to maximize the size of the “human surplus.”

For all of the above, freedom is something that will never be fully actualized, but remains an issue of struggle between the subject and the object; in so far as the individual lives only in a society with all its pressures.

- Spontaneity is essential to be free, just as the child is free, and like the artist; the person who can express himself spontaneously.⁽⁷⁴⁾

Spontaneity is precisely the freedom of the unconscious, i.e., everyone be an artist, but it is meaningless unless it is recognized through the transformation of the unconscious into the conscious. The unconscious, as aforementioned, is the sum of desires, inclinations, ideas and goals that have not been achieved, given that

⁽⁷³⁾ The Division of Labor in Society, p. 3.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ As Balzac defined himself, a quotation from Erich Fromm, The Fear of Freedom, p. 207 (Arabic translation).

they are subject to the Supreme Ego or the conscience, which is an organized part of the mind that is guiding the individual, representing societal standards. It is the authoritarian conscience.

Creating harmony between the unconscious and the superego is precisely what is prescribed here as freedom. This requires deep and multiple social and cultural changes to remove the restrictions over the individual's inclinations while creating harmony between his inclinations and his conscience; thus repression is abolished. This requires making compatibility between the authoritarian and the humanistic conscience. This compatibility can never be fully achieved but can only progress in that direction. However, removing the incompatibility between the two consciences requires extensive and profound social changes. Actually, there is no freedom without emancipation from all forms of alienation; religious, social and economic; from the influence of the so-called laws of history, and from the feeling that one is carrying a mission to humanity and from dogmatism in favor of critical thinking. There is no freedom within the oppressive laws, the “norms,” the “principles” enacted by the state or a domineering power and the institutions of ideological and violent repression. Moreover, free love or freedom of love is spontaneous love; love for love, without a social purpose (e.g., marriage) or interest, requires a degree of equality and freedom for both parties.

- The process of subjugating and suppressing the people by authoritarian forces turns part of their conscious into the unconscious; this repression expresses itself in neurosis, psychopathy, aggressiveness and destructive tendencies in general. Liberation then requires -as mentioned before- the conversion of the unconscious into the conscious, through studying the mind; through introspection and critical thinking, with the unity of spontaneity and reasoning. This will never be fulfilled since the unconscious will remain stronger than the conscious, so the process of self-control and its actualization will continue on its path to be achieved. With this mechanism, rather than repressing instincts, they can be

exercised with conscious guidance, thereby broadening the minds of the people, self-consciousness and self-confidence. This necessitates perpetual struggle to broaden the frontiers of societal conscience; the super ego; in short, to reduce taboos and increase the space for individual freedom. The more the humanistic conscience supersedes the societal conscience, the more the individual becomes freer.

Freedom under any specific system, capitalism or socialism, etc. is restricted by the limits of the system. Therefore, the modern human is not free, notwithstanding he looks to be; he is subject to the system with all its components, in favor of the dominant minority, and is “free” in selling his labor power and in choosing who represses or exploits him. In “democratic” systems he is free to elect who governs him. The system determines his way of life; creates the way to enjoy, even fashion houses create his fashion in clothes. Indeed, he may not feel the repression that is imposed upon him. He is one-dimensional, as Marcuse deemed: a consumer, receptive and deprived of will.

- One of the conditions for liberation is self-employment that is consistent with personal abilities, talents and desires; that is, work for self-realization. Alienated labor and alienation in general are a direct aggression against freedom, and wage labor or working for the market makes the worker be for the other; it is a negation of his freedom. Moreover, the one who is obliged to sell his labor power can not be free, and by and large it is not possible to have freedom without reaching economic justice.

Self-realization is the pinnacle of freedom; the highest need in the hierarchy of needs, can be reached by only a few individuals. The form of self-realization varies from an individual to another, depends on his proclivities, abilities and talents. This requires first of all the freedom of speech, to act, to express oneself, freedom to investigate and seek information, freedom to defend oneself and justice.⁽⁷⁵⁾ Those who realize themselves are characterized –in

⁽⁷⁵⁾ A. H. Maslow (1943), a Theory of Human Motivation.

accordance with humanistic psychologists- with the following: accurate awareness of reality - self-acceptance- acceptance of others - spontaneity - focus on problems and striving to solve them - maintaining privacy - resisting dependency -a strong sense of empathy with people and emotional participation with others during personal or general crisis - peak experiences - democratic behavior - creativity - close social relations with a few individuals - spiritual humor free of hostility - renewing enjoyment with continuous tasting of the basics of life -a high degree of autonomy.⁽⁷⁶⁾

Humans -like all beings- are born truly free. This common saying describes reality. But this is the freedom of what Freud called “*the ID,*”⁽⁷⁷⁾ which can be summarized in: innate instinctive inclinations. The child likes to act spontaneously, according to his instinctive inclinations, and every person always carries this propensity, but he is exposed since birth to multiple forms of repression in the form of prohibitions and orders, whether directly or indirectly. His weakness and need for others oblige him to submit and his resistance fails. Later he becomes exposed to the same attitude by every power around him: society, the state and various institutions. He acts under the drives of fear and desire; fear of punishment and desire in obtaining his material and emotional needs or some of them. Over time, he gets a conscience, which is not actually formed by him, but represents the societal authority infiltrated into his mind. This conscience is an internal control over the mind, representative of the powers of repression within it, notwithstanding its independence from the authority of punishment and reward, resulting from defeat of the mind in the pursuit of freedom. People differ in the extent to which they are subject to this authority. Some adapt and submit to it, and may even feel happy with this

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Brief history of psychology, unknown writer (in Arabic).

⁽⁷⁷⁾ “*It contains everything that is inherited, that is present at birth, that is laid down in the constitution- above all; therefore, the instincts, which originate from the somatic organization and which find a first physical expression here in forms unknown to us,*” An Outline Of Psycho-Analysis, p. 4957.

submission; however, others remain refusing, resisting and revolting. All human beings are afflicted with neurosis because of this suppression and repression of their instinctive freedom, whether they follow their conscience or not.

Because the conscience is the product of civilization, and it is the one who monitors and represses the unconscious inclinations, freedom of the individual is not a granting of civilization, but -in accordance with the words of Freud- was at its most extreme before the emergence of any civilization. Therefore, the civilized person is considered the most capable of restraining himself and being compatible with the prevailing social norms; concern for others; then he is less free. He represses himself for the sake of society and for his own sake as well. He may lose his interests, love, respect of others and his relationship with the surrounding milieu if he unleashes his tongue, his feelings and his instincts. That is why so far freedom and civilization are at odds. Civilization has been associated with repression (human history is the history of his repression - Freud) beginning by teaching a child to repress his instincts under the sword of punishment. Perhaps that is why less urbanized peoples resisted conquest more forcefully than more civilized peoples, who used to be humiliated. For the same reason, an “innocent” person, who has not been domesticated to a large extent, is more able to act spontaneously. Civilization has put limitations on the individual; created a collective superego that occupies a part of the individual's mind, forming the conscience.

The above mentioned conscience is the authoritarian conscience, not the humanistic one. Only if society becomes permissible to realize the freedom of individuals to a significant extent, the conscience becomes less authoritarian and more humane; consistent more with the inclinations of the individual, his humanistic conscience, his capabilities and freely chosen aspirations, not under pressure from the standards imposed by the repressive authorities. This can take place when the repressive powers largely disappear, when people learn to raise their children in a manner that respects

their selves and minds, and when cooperation between the people becomes more powerful than competition. Then the individual becomes -to some extent- an authority over himself, involved in the production of societal values, ethics and standards. It cannot be denied that the conscience currently includes some components of humanism. However, achieving increased degrees of individual freedom will increase the size and the role of these components. To realize more individual freedom, a permanent revolution against the societal conscience is necessary for the sake of the humanistic conscience a revolution against the prevailing culture and values of contemporary society is necessary. Humans will march towards freedom as the societal conscience dissolves into the humanistic conscience, allowing the self to be less subject to repression and more spontaneous and consistent with itself.

Voluntary servitude⁽⁷⁸⁾: It is not possible to explain the submission of an entire people to an individual, a few individuals or a small class with cowardice and fear. Rather, it is cowardice and fear that need interpretation. Human life which is very diverse and full of contradictions cannot go against its nature, which includes innate and flexible reactions and behaviors. This flexibility involves a trade-off between safety and freedom, peace of mind and taking responsibility, depending on the circumstances. In addition to the essential role of ideology -including religion- that controls people's feelings, tendencies and considerations. Essentially, the consciousness of the general population is characterized by conservative inclinations and a fear of change. The dominant classes make use of the masses' limited ambitions, their fear of the unknown, their desire for stability and a feeling of security to disseminate their ideology. This explains the preference for slavery by most people throughout history, as the rejection of oppression may result in loss of life or stability, misery and suffering in various

⁽⁷⁸⁾ This idea was presented by Etienne de la Boétie, The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude. He elaborated on the effects of slavery without interpreting its existence and its people's acceptance that violates human nature, according to him.

respects. Even in some cases, weak personalities may need to be oppressed and dominated (masochism). People could not live long under the shadow of slavery without becoming satisfied or convinced that it is the right or even the ideal option. Moreover, the state could not last unless the people believed in its necessity, and a system could not last unless a part of the people is convinced of its benefit. There are hundreds of examples in this field, the simplest of which is people's conviction with the idea of the divine right of kings for hundreds of years. This can explain why there are people who do not like freedom and people who cannot practice freedom but suffer from neurosis as a result of liberation and reject it because it bears responsibility. It is known that some of the slaves, upon liberation, were resisting the idea; they were devastated by the long oppression.

Certainly, humans are seeking to preserve their species and their lives. This drives them to the pursuit of acquiring power. The interaction between instinctive inclinations and various cultures from one society to another and from one individual to another, as well as the differences in physical and mental capabilities, leads to variant ways and methods of gaining power. This can explain the existence of different and contradictory tendencies among individuals, such as the pursuit of cognitive power, physical strength, social stature and prestige. Besides, voluntary servitude achieves a degree of safety and a false feeling of power as a result of identification with and being protected by actual power. This can also explain why creating the sacred also takes place in the same context. This may explain the emergence of what is described as secular religion after setting aside the theological religions to some extent, in the form of earthly sanctities, including human beings and emblems having almost the same significance as the totems of the primitive tribes. Unfortunately, the peoples' quest for liberation from some authority was only towards submission to a new authority (does this explain the recurrent calls for building

vanguard revolutionary organizations and revolutionary leadership; an authority?).

The seed of voluntary servitude began by subjugating the people to the sacred, before the establishment of the state, where people subjected their will to something outside themselves, which they created by themselves and before the emergence of classes. As Marcel Gauchet argued, the seed of people's acceptance to submit to the state began by submission to the religious sanctities.⁽⁷⁹⁾ This idea seems plausible, revealing that there is a potentiality for voluntary servitude in humans. This does not mean at all that the emergence of the state was an inevitable or an unavoidable path of humanity, but merely a possibility. Creating the sacred begins from describing some person as a mighty scholar, a scientist in a field, a talented artist, a clever footballer, a seasoned politician, a courageous fighter, a leader with charisma, etc. All this is well and acceptable, but when he is transformed into an ideal or a prophet; an icon, a superhuman, an extraordinary personality, the purest person born in the country or the purest personality in history, the genius of the universe, the omniscient, and conferring all the perfect traits upon him, here the voluntary servitude begins. This simply occurs because no individual is free from many complexes, repressed desires, selfish motives and the desire to exercise some kind of authority over others. Likewise, the hidden part of the behavior of any individual is not free from faults that are disapproved by society and sometimes even moral failures and deviations from societal norms. If one looks closely, he will find among the leaders, commanders, heroes, militants and scholars, like all human beings, the other side of the coin. In fact, the infernal state apparatus, authoritarian regimes and fascist movements could not have arisen without this voluntary servitude; the other side of authoritarianism, plus the authoritarian persons.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Archeology of Violence, pp. 173-176 (Arabic translation).

Voluntary servitude is most evident in the relationship between the deified leader and the masses, like hypnosis. The hypnotized party becomes devoid of will, accepting anything its leader dictates and the herd's behavior prevails. Freud described that faith in a leader as implying giving up the ego ideal and replacing it with an external libidinous object. If one puts aside the sexual component in this conception, which may be exaggerated, he will find that the individual replaced an external ideal by his own ego; then submitted himself by himself. His goal is to feel powerful and tantamount to the members of the group under the tyranny of the leader who everyone identifies with him. As for the leader; he is a narcissistic person, loves no one, arrogant and has independent thought; precisely the opposite of the enchanted crowd. Whenever the public feels triviality, insignificance and helplessness, it gives the leader more attributes of genius, transcendence and power. The more it disdains itself, the more respect and sanctifying it feels towards the leader; the same motives of attributing omnipotence and absolute power to God. The individual in such condition can only think in reliance on the "thought" of the leader and can only think of himself while he is repudiating it. On the other side, the leader becomes more arrogant and his ego grows over time. Here, this relationship exalts the leader while degrades his fans; so this public can neither be itself nor united with the leader's self; something similar to the *Unhappy Consciousness* in Hegel's philosophy.⁽⁸⁰⁾ It is the psychologically defeated peoples who worship an inspiring ruthless leader and the authoritarian state. To get out of this division of self and its unhappy consciousness, the defeated self must overcome its defeat by struggling and achieving successes, even small ones, so it does not need a boss, rather, it has to renounce the idea of leadership itself and transforms the leader into an ordinary person, charged with a specific job by the people, able for substitution by another one.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ The Phenomenology of Mind, pp. 207-230.

The history of the Islamic State provides the foremost example, where the masses gave up their freedom and accepted the so-called Sharia (Islamic jurisprudence), which includes all details about the behavior of the individuals; their mode of life and their inter-relations. The masses gave up their freedom to organize themselves for the sake of a highly centralized state ruled by coercive power. Notwithstanding the war of Islam against the tribes, including the wars of apostasy and the imposition of the authority of Quraish by armed force, this project did not miss many supporters voluntarily since its inception, starting by the people of Yathrib (Al-Madina), since a minority can not rule the majority by force alone. Working for the sake of the state is synonymous with Jihad “*in the cause of Allah (God);*” thus God has embodied in the state. In Islamic law (Sharia), jurists translate -usually- the right of God into the right of the state and religion is considered the law. Even all wealth had been considered belonging to God, so, no one has the right to have property except the state, so what is owned by individuals became subject to confiscation at any time and donating some thereof for the “common benefit” became a duty.⁽⁸¹⁾ Good and evil became -in the view of the vast majority of the jurists- what God decided, and obedience to God became the application of “Sharia” orders; the law of the state and the criterion of goodness of the individual is the pleasure of God-State. In this system, the good individual became the one who dies in the way of God-State. Thus, the ruler was in the beginning a messenger from God to the people and after his death, the ruler had been considered the successor of that messenger (Khalifat Rasul Allah). The free human origin of morals and virtues has disappeared, replaced by a divine source. Rather, man has become unable, in the Islamic point of view, to create values;

⁽⁸¹⁾ Ibrahim Al-Shatebi stated: “*each obligation becomes a right of Allah. What is for Allah is for Allah, but what is for the individual is also referred to Allah, from the perspective of the right of Allah being present in it and from the perspective of the right of the individual due to it being the right of Allah, because it is for Allah not to grant a right to individuals at all.*” The reconciliation of the fundamentals of Islamic law, part two, p. 316 in the Arabic text and p. 237 in the English translation.

instead, he has been deriving them from the Sharia. It is exactly the “unhappy consciousness.” The individual has come to think of himself only while nullifying it, in favor of the God-State. The Arab person has turned into a domesticated being, as his character became a mere attachment to a legal personality; the state. This is meanwhile a religious and political alienation. In fact, God was not the goal, nor religion, nor virtue, but only the state; nothing else.

There is another obvious example in the Eastern systems; Oriental Despotism. The people were not obliged and history did not compel them to live under the artificial irrigation system that was the basis of the village communities, which gave the state, when it emerged, the opportunity to practice severe tyranny. Nonetheless, the people had chosen -exactly as Wittfogel regarded- to live under that yoke of drastic oppression because they found it the best option; meaning that its advantages outweigh its drawbacks.⁽⁸²⁾ Moreover, the human choice of the agricultural revolution and a life of stability rather than living on hunting and gathering had the worst consequences for the freedom, comfort and physical and psychological health of the individual. At least it was the forerunner of the submission of the majority to the minority, thanks to the appearance of surplus production, thereafter, the emergence of the state. On the other side, it was a precursor to civilization with all its elements. Moreover, it has achieved a great degree of safety and tranquility for the individual regarding food and shelter. So, human beings had to choose.⁽⁸³⁾

Voluntary servitude takes forms other than submission to political power or dominant classes. It is often manifested in people giving or attributing superhuman traits to specific creative individuals in certain fields, as well as individuals identifying with

⁽⁸²⁾ Oriental Despotism, p. 16.

⁽⁸³⁾ Yuval Noah Harari took up this issue in detail. He proclaimed that the humankind has taken the bad choice and the agricultural revolution was the biggest fraud in history. Sapiens, a Brief History of Humankind, Part Two, the Agricultural Revolution.

famous figures such as athletes, artists and politicians, or engaging in sports fanaticism. This indicates a sense of emptiness and unproductivity in themselves, as they subject themselves to a sacred symbol, even if that symbol is just an ordinary person. Instead of simply enjoying art, sports, or following political issues, individuals may find themselves idolizing or becoming infatuated with a particular person or group. In the contemporary world, individuals may engage in sports not for personal enjoyment or self-realization, but as a profession to satisfy the public and maintain their social status, often for financial gain. This creates a dynamic where both parties become slaves to each other.

One of the most prominent forms of voluntary servitude is the historical injustice faced by women. Despite their physical vulnerability compared to men, women play a crucial role in preserving the human species without receiving due recognition. Throughout history, men have often used their physical strength to oppress women. Women continue to face various forms of oppression in all countries, particularly in less developed regions and across different social classes.⁽⁸⁴⁾ Political power and access to weapons are predominantly controlled by men worldwide. For thousands of years, women have endured male oppression, which has been sustained by an ideology of masculinity that has been internalized by women themselves, particularly within Abrahamic religions. Modern technology has diminished the significance of physical strength in the workforce, leading to a widespread feminization of labor in technologically advanced industries based on modern knowledge.

Manipulating the masses in subtle ways creates the illusion of freedom. Several historical examples illustrate this phenomenon: 1. The 1954 Guatemala coup orchestrated by Edward Bernays, who used psychological and sociological insights to launch propaganda

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Parliamentary Assembly, *Discrimination Against Women in the Workforce and the Workplace*.

campaigns against the Guatemalan government and president on behalf of the United Fruit Company. 2. Promoting female smoking in the United States by associating it with freedom and rebellion through orchestrated public displays. 3. Using various tactics to influence women to accept the color green for cigarette packaging. 4. Prior to the 2011 constitutional referendum in Egypt, Islamists and the state manipulated illiterate masses to vote "yes" by framing it as a vote for Islamic principles.

Electronic programs play a significant role in surveillance and manipulation, capturing individuals' emotions and thoughts through smart devices to control their minds by disseminating specific news and rumors. Companies specialize in promoting individuals or shaping public opinion using this technology. The economist Richard Thaler's Nudge Theory, integrated into artificial intelligence devices, aims to guide individuals towards making the "right" decisions based on external influences with greater knowledge and experience of their interests.⁽⁸⁵⁾

Nearly everything in the world is institutionalized, organized, controlled and directed.

Culture, art, sex, scientific research, crime, begging, entertainment and even conscience and honor have been commodified and standardized. Capitalism has reduced wage laborers to mere cogs in the machinery of work throughout the week, with weekends programmed for leisure activities such as drinking, dancing, engaging in paid sex and shopping to rejuvenate their labor capacity. Leisure activities have become regimented and scheduled.

The forms of hegemony include: promoting a specific lifestyle, such as the type and manner of housing (e.g., living in compounds), methods of promoting certain commodities through repeated advertising, selling in installments or on credit and adding

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Qusayy Al-Safi, reading in a book: surveillance capitalism.

promotional offers. Education and teaching "national" subjects, presenting history from a particular point of view, fashion, models of celebration in various occasions and even creating occasions that people did not care about before. Implanting a feeling of insecurity by publishing horror movies and fake news about the earth being threatened, exaggerating hostility towards others (e.g., demonization of communism and later political Islam, despite being supported by the West), etc.

The most powerful forms of authoritarianism exist today where the individual feels free while being subject to an invisible power that commands their conscience; it is the power of ideology. The unconscious governs, using reason to create a "reasonable" system of stereotyping and control to tighten the authority of the dominant class and the state over individuals.

The intelligentsia⁽⁸⁶⁾ has been recruited to serve the system, with limited exceptions, being produced and programmed for this purpose. It is not neutral, but interested only in its aspirations. Nowadays, scientists and technocrats are working in the service of capitalists, some in the manufacture of weapons, harmful foodstuffs and harmful drugs, and in scientific research to promote all this. Propaganda is being done in a scientific way, "rationally," by implanting certain memes in the public's minds.⁽⁸⁷⁾

Modern systems have promoted ideas that serve them under pretexts like divine instructions, coinciding with human nature, or achieving freedom and happiness for the individual. This includes the common idea that working is a right, a duty, an honor, dignity and value. Obtaining a job has become a sacred goal for the individual, while the worker has been transformed into a gear in the work wheel. Similarly, values such as respecting time and punctuality, etc., are emphasized not to maintain social relations but

⁽⁸⁶⁾ The term is used in this book in the common sense: High-level educated and technicians in general; technocrats, intellectuals in a particular sense; scholars.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Richard Brody took up this subject in: *Virus of The Mind*, Chapter 8.

to maintain market activity since every moment is equivalent to a capital profit. Humans had lived for hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of years, without caring for time or exact dates, and perhaps they were happier and freer.

People are always captive to fantasies and delusions, so they are not free. Examples include national unity, the prestige of the state, various sanctities (ethics, values, ideals, the national anthem, the flag, etc.). They need imaginary models that were the beginning of their rebellion against nature, as mentioned before. These fantasies are necessary for the unity of the community since humans do not behave directly according to their instincts, but according to motives, circumstances and motivations. Humans need rules, systems, ideas, laws, etc., a social system, so that life can proceed. These things are exactly fantasies and delusions. The ruling powers are implanting delusions within the individual's mind, so that they are living for their sake, not for themselves, in the name of the fatherland, the nation, or any other sanctity. Moreover, people cannot abandon a sacred unless they find an alternative; another sacred. There will never be complete freedom. There can be a universal sanctity, humanistic, e.g., human rights, freedom, welfare and development, strategies at the service of the interests of the majority, not the interests of an authoritarian power. Therefore, humans become freer.

Indeed, *"there is no way out of the imagined order. When we break down our prison walls and run towards freedom, we are, in fact, running into the more spacious exercise yard of a bigger prison."*⁽⁸⁸⁾

Freedom and power:

There is a difference between power and authority (or Rulership), clearly and reasonably presented by Max Weber: *"Power*

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, Sapiens, A Brief History of Humankind, p. 112.

is the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out one's own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests"... Rulership [=authority⁽⁸⁹⁾ -Adel] is the probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons. The sociological concept of rulership must hence, be more precise and can only mean the probability that a command will be conformed."⁽⁹⁰⁾ Simply put authority can be defined as accepted power; power that people agree to follow, whether by a deal or under pressure.

It was discussed above the innate phenomenon of seeking status by both individuals and communities. This status means power plus its actualization, whether material or spiritual. It is a mechanism of competition in the context of struggling for survival and comfort in compensation for a feeling of weakness and lack of full security. In the case of failure to gain some kind of actual power, the individual (or the community) may resort to countermeasures, getting potential power, such as showing love, making friendships and other compensatory mechanisms that may amount to accepting submission to power. This is the basis of voluntary servitude. Material interests are not always the supreme goal; rather, there are various forms of status as mentioned earlier. Power is not just a means to achieve material interests, as regarded by Marxism, but a tool to reach status. This may explain most individuals' adherence to their authoritarian status even when they do not benefit materially from them.

A distinction must be made between the types of power and their multiple roles: state power, family power, doctor's power over the patient, prison power, ideological power (including religious power), political power, economic power, violence apparatus, school power, personal or charismatic power exemplified by prophets and leaders who have the power of presence, magicians and sorcerers, and the power of the mother and father, which is derived from personal trust and dependence.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ Two translations of the Garman word: Herrschaft: rulership & authority.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Basic concepts in sociology.

Authority is not a relation of power-powerless, but it is reciprocity with varying degrees of strength at this or that moment. Even a child has an impact on adults, and they use several mechanisms to impose it: showing rebellion, disturbing others, crying, screaming, or showing weakness in various ways. That relation can be described as a relation of powersocietyresistance or powersocietycountersocietypower, according to the stronger and more influential party. All forms of resistance are attempts to impose a countersocietypower. This leads to describe the passive parties, even masochism, as resisting powers, trying to impose their authority with this mechanism: submission plus readiness for rebellion.

The types of powers in the world vary from repression, sovereignty, construction and habilitation, and from violence to soft power.

The power relationships differ between the modern state in the contemporary West, the state of concealed control and the repressive state in the era of feudalism and the backward East or what Foucault called "*disciplinary power in contemporary Western society rather than sovereign power in the era of feudalism.*"⁽⁹¹⁾

It is impossible to disregard that throughout the history of civilization next to primitive societies there has been domination of one class over other classes and human groups over other groups. But power relationships are deeper than this fact. As aforementioned there is an innate tendency towards status, power and authority on the part of all human beings. This explains the presence of authority at the micro level, between groups and individuals, in all social processes; the state, classes, fashions, current opinions, games, family, etc.⁽⁹²⁾ This also answers a puzzling

⁽⁹¹⁾ Philosophy of Power (Arabic translation).

⁽⁹²⁾ As proposed by Roland Part, a quotation from Mohammad Sabeelah, *Orbits of Modernity*, p. 95 (In Arabic).

question: “how is it that people whose interests are not being served can strictly support the existing power structure by demanding a piece of the action.”⁽⁹³⁾

It is true that the prevailing ideology creates and reproduces forms of hegemony and formulates the relations between powers, just as the current domineering power domesticates and pushes the individual to accommodate with the system. However, the motives to authorize precede the nature of the social system. In addition, power has an origin and justification, linked to a particular subject, institution or group; an entity. This is opposite to the view of Michel Foucault, who -notwithstanding his famous deep contribution- conceives power as just an idea hanging in the vacuum, having no justification but itself (power for power!). It is -according to him- neither an institution, nor a structure, nor a certain ability that some people are endowed with. Rather, it is just a name given to a complex strategic situation in a given society, present everywhere, not because it is characterized by assembling everything in its indomitable unity, but because it produces itself at every moment, at every point.⁽⁹⁴⁾ This view is reminiscent of the idea of the Absolute in philosophy, which defines itself by itself and for itself. While Foucault made a great effort to escape from essence, metaphysics and from searching for the Truth, he transformed power into metaphysics and accorded it a kind of truth. Actually, power is neither a matter nor an essence, but rather a relationship between two or more parties, but for Foucault it was treated as an independent entity; an essence. He could present his vague concept of power more realistically and clearly by pointing out that all

⁽⁹³⁾ Gilles Deleuze, *Intellectuals and power: A conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze*. He answered his question as: *“There are investments of desire that mould and distribute power, that make it the property of the policeman as much as of the prime minister; in this context, there is no qualitative difference between the power wielded by the policeman and the prime minister. The nature of these investments of desire in a social group explains why political parties or unions, which might have or should have revolutionary investments in the name of class interests, are so often reform oriented or absolutely reactionary on the level of desire.”*

⁽⁹⁴⁾ *The Will to Knowledge*, p. 126 (Arabic translation).

individuals and social groups are seeking a status; power, as a human natural inclination, but he rejected the idea of human nature and refused to link power to any entity.

The problematic of power stems from its consequence –in most cases- of social inequality and exploitation; subjugation of the majority of people, the dissemination of delusions and false knowledge; with the dominant powers claiming to hold the Truth. In addition, various forms of alienation, using science in the service of the few, repression of the individuals and making them mere “subalterns.” It is thanks to Michel Foucault that he unmasked the relationship between power and knowledge in the contemporary time, or -at least- promoted this idea.

All attempts to transform society are struggles for getting power. Any thinking of pushing people to accept a new situation or new ideas or change their mode of life expresses an attempt to dominate them. Any attempt to lead others or “enlighten” or “educate” them is a pursuit of power. Anyone who tries to become a star, famous or having a particular social stature is - in fact- attempting to extract a degree or some kind of authority. Even those who sacrifice themselves for “supreme” principles get power in the hearts of their fans. Authority is not necessarily “formal,” codified or declared as such, but recognition in any form. The physician exercises authority over the patients, the bureaucratic employee has certain authority, and as well anyone in a leadership position or responsible for anything, no matter how small.

It seems that authoritarianism and anti-authoritarianism are unavoidable and should be recognized. All what can be concluded is that one should not feel remorse for exercising this or that authority should stop contending that he is a candle that consumes itself to light the way for others and that he wants to liberate them completely. Let them continue to call for changing the status quo and reforming the reality according to their conceptions.

Authoritarian power will never disappear, due to the mechanisms of its emergence, but it is possible to increase the area of individual freedom to some degree or another in the existing circumstances. So, the general public can accept indispensable authority at this or that moment. Should the soldier resist the authority of the officer in wartime? Should the patient reject the doctor's authority while dying? Actually, imagining a society without authority is a delusion. However, repressive authorities can be continuously resisted, to try to replace conflict with friendly cooperation as much as possible, making people more self-directed and reducing the degree of repression. This requires fighting against the domineering and repressive powers. It is also possible to dismantle the parasitic and repressive powers, especially the state apparatus and the parasitic classes, and encountering the authoritarian ideologies; such as racism, being aware that all of this is authoritarian practices, in accordance with Engels: *“A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon - authoritarian means.”*⁽⁹⁵⁾ Actually, the revolution is an authoritarian action that aims to supersede one authority by another, even if it is a collective, non-repressive, anti-oppressive; but it stills an authority. Besides, liberation from colonialism and repressive and bloody rules in general, which deprives the individual from realizing himself, may require violence. This is a counter-violence; counter-power, which requires the formation of counter-authoritarian tools; tools of resistance. Moreover, liberation of individuals may be performed by force: by confronting the authoritarian powers that oppose the principles of freedom and are hostile to the principles of human rights. The counter-power carries the seed of the successor repressive power, which is a herald of a new stage of struggle by the revolutionary parties.

Whatever the degree of cooperation, altruism and teamwork, there is no way to avoid the majority rule, even if direct democracy

⁽⁹⁵⁾ On Authority.

is implemented. This principle is unavoidable because of the impossibility of unanimity or even consensus that is adopted and promoted by some anarchists and other currents, in an attempt to get rid of any authority. However, certainly the resistance of the minority is legitimate. It is true that there is something called the Dictatorship of the Majority, but this is a dynamic situation, since the continuation of argumentation and practice may change the stance of the majority and even its members themselves. It is superfluous that the establishment of an actual authority of the majority requires that this majority be well educated, having good knowledge and truly free; at least economically, and endowed with all personal, political and all public freedoms, without the presence of repressive apparatuses, especially the state. Finally, the majority's authority does not necessarily mean that its view is the Truth or the best, but only means that it is appropriate for society at this or that moment.

It is not possible to liberate people who neither desire nor seek freedom. Unfortunately, people who are satisfied with slavery provide help to the tyrannical powers to oppress the rest. So, it is entirely justified for the forces of the permanent revolution to broadcast the call for liberation among the masses and instigate them to struggle, bearing in mind that only people can liberate themselves, and neither a party nor an inspired leader can liberate the populace without developing a new repressive authority over them.

Unfortunately, the normative image of the liberal and libertarian militant in many countries is the image of a person who must be cute, dealing with the other by and large as one just having a different view that must be respected, no matter what it is. He must always be ready to give his life to anyone of the team who bears the opposite opinion. He must also accept the people's choices, whatever they are; fascism or racism, and be happy with them. Any deviation from this virtual image is considered a cause to accuse the

libertarians of betraying their principles and not being democratic, but fascists in the form of liberals.

What is overlooked by this perception is that freedom is taken, not given; taken from society in general; the family, civil society and the state. The respect of freedom of others must be mutual, not unilateral; otherwise the libertarian would have the right to resist and even fight the repressive powers; the state, a party, a sect, a class, etc. One cannot be libertarian if he accepts the right of others to repress him or repress others who do not oppose the principle of freedom. In addition, he is not always a peaceful and lovely person but a militant for freedom. He is not only who says: *I might disagree with your opinion, but I am willing to give my life for your right to express it* (a quotation wrongly attributed to Voltaire) but also by virtue of his own libertarian principle he must resist by all means anyone who restrains freedom and even to suppress, exclude and eliminate them; otherwise, how can the principle of freedom be actualized?

The state:

There is no room here to delve into the various theories of the origin of the state, but it will be addressed briefly.

What is meant is the state apparatus, including the army, security, prisons, etc.

The theories posited to explain the phenomenon of state formation can be summarized as follows: divine theories suggest that the authority of the state comes from God, whether by considering the ruler to be a descendant of God, chosen by God to rule, or chosen by the people inspired by God. Liberal thought adopted the social contract theory where society members give up part of their freedom to the state to organize society and reconcile classes. Some argue that the state was built by the dominant class to subjugate the entire society by force, using the state as a coercive

tool. Another theory looks at the state's authority as an extension of the father's old authority. There are also theories that consider multiple factors, with the primary one being the use of force by one group against the rest of society.

The theories differ in determining the nature of the state, from being just an apparatus for the management of society to an instrument used by one class to subjugate other classes, etc. Some contend that the state is an organization of human community life originating from human nature that carries the social instinct (Stoicism), a tool to reconcile social powers and suppress the enemies of society (Epicurus),⁽⁹⁶⁾ or that it is based on violence, where its disappearance equals the disappearance of the concept of the state in favor of chaos in the literal sense of the word; therefore, it is an instrument of legitimate violence for the purpose of preserving society. In this view, the state is independent of society, not an apparatus in the hands of one party against another, standing over individuals, impartial in front of all.⁽⁹⁷⁾

- In the history of states, it did not happen that the gods did anything, just as no people responded to the advocates of the social contract. All states arose by force and blood, being set up by some powers. The confirmed and prevailing scenario is that tribes invaded each other, subjecting some to a powerful tribe that ruled the rest by force.⁽⁹⁸⁾ Egypt and the eastern countries as a whole are clear examples of this. The second scenario is a group of people using an ideology to gather new supporters and thereafter imposing their control by force over the rest of the surrounding human groups. An ideal example is the Islamic state at its outset, which was later overwhelmed by the Quraysh tribe. The third scenario is just a theoretical possibility: society was divided into classes, and the

⁽⁹⁶⁾ Franz Oppenheimer, *The state*, p. 4.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ This is the viewpoint of Max Weber, *the Politics as a Vocation*.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ According to Max Weber, division of work between tribes led to the appearance of rich and poor ones. The poor tribes conquered the rich and subjugated them, *Op. cit.*

wealthy class imposed its authority by establishing a state apparatus superimposed upon society and under its control. The available instance in this regard is, according to Engels' suspicious analysis the state of Athens.⁽⁹⁹⁾

In all cases, the propertied class and its state arose with blood and fire: conquest of lands, direct robbery and plundering of the peasants by Bedouins, invasions and colonization, enslavement of war prisoners, capturing women, kidnapping and enslaving men, genocide, etc.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ All this was done within the framework of what might be called the primitive accumulation of the exploiting class,

⁽⁹⁹⁾ Karl Kautsky presented important criticisms of Engels on this subject: he criticized his conception of the emergence of the state within the clan. Engels presented three mechanisms for this process: 1. Some people specialized in community administration affairs, and these jobs became hereditary in certain families "as a matter of course" or "in a natural way." However, "in a natural way" is not an explanation for the transformation of a group of people in a communally managed society into a repressive power. This transformation into a class cannot be explained by the independence of those functions from society but by their work in favor of a particular class. 2. Engels also explained the emergence of classes by the distinction in wealth between members of the tribe. But this is not enough; the possessing class, to be so, should depend on the work of others, not be distinguished from them by the amount of what it has. Moreover, it is inconceivable that these differences were significant, especially as the land was under the control of the clan as a whole. These differences were a source of prestige, as much as the rich were providing assistance to the poor and not exploiting them. This generosity motivated the members of the clan to elect those rich people as chiefs, in both Athens and Rome. 3. The emergence of slavery: wars were its source, and not just the emergence of slavery can explain the emergence of classes. Slaves were strangers to society; they were always few, did not constitute a class, and did not pose a threat to the tribe, so it was not necessary to establish a state apparatus.

Regarding why and how most of the population turned into servants of a few, Kautsky interpreted it as invading one tribe to another and enslaving it entirely while living together as one community. Thus, there became a small class of the victorious tribe depending on the work of a wide class of slaves. Besides, the majority of this tribe remained poor and free.

N.B. Kautsky did not deny that the Engels' conception might be realized in some places.

The Materialist Conception of History, pp. 269-272.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Franz Oppenheimer presented this recurrent process of the emergence of the old states in his aforementioned book (The state). Kautsky did the same, Op. cit.

similar to the process of primitive accumulation of capital.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ The dominant class was formed not due to wealth disparity between individuals but when a group of people lived only on the exploitation of other groups. Before that, slavery, tribute and plunder were just additional sources of wealth, not the only or main source of livelihood for the dominant class on the way of formation. After the integration of the invading plunderers with the exploited classes in one human group, unification of regions or tribes,⁽¹⁰²⁾ there became real classes and a real state. This indicates that the state was the first; politics preceded the economy in this respect, contrary to the common Marxist speech on this subject, including Engels' attempts to demonstrate that the classes arose first, for reasons that he could not clearly explain, and then the state was formed. Engels aimed to support the idea of the priority of the economic factor and the idea of the historical role of classes, the doctrine of historical materialism. It will be referred to the research of Pierre Clastres that undermined this perception in chapter eleven. It is worth mentioning that Engels, contrary to his original conception, spoke about the emergence of the state before classes: *“the state, which the natural groups of communities of the same tribe had at first arrived at only to safeguard their common interests (e.g., irrigation in the East) and for protection against external enemies, from this stage onwards acquires just as much the function of maintaining by force the conditions of existence and domination of the ruling class against the subject class.”*⁽¹⁰³⁾ It is clear from this statement that Engels imagined that the state was originally impartial, not an apparatus of class oppression. This is contrary to the famous Marxian idea about the state and contrary to his attempts to demonstrate the priority of class division over the emergence of the state in his book: *The Origin of the Family*.

- Emergence of the state and classes required societal stability, which was not possible in the societies that were living on hunting

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Karl Kautsky, Op. cit., p. 277.

⁽¹⁰²⁾ Ibid., pp. 269-272.

⁽¹⁰³⁾ Anti-Dühring, Part II: Political Economy, I. Subject Matter and Method.

and gathering. What is certain is that the classes and the state had arisen after the stability of human beings, so they lived hundreds of thousands or millions of years without classes or state apparatus. In addition, both the state and the wealthy class have been getting wealth from the work of others. That required some degree of development of production to ensure people's consumption and make it possible for the state and the exploiting class to rob them. The emergence of an economic surplus did not drive the people to cooperate; instead, they had been divided, waged more wars and robbed, looted and plundered each other. Once production increased and surplus appeared, the tendencies for getting authority and conquest of the property of others had exposed. Ultimately, social stratification and the emergence of the state's hideous machine occurred. Actually, the class division had taken place without any historical inevitable justification. There was never any "historical task" for the dominant class and its state. There had never been a contradiction between the forces and relations of communal production as historical materialism assumes. The selfish and aggressive tendencies of humankind had overcome, along with the readiness of the majority to submit and surrender for getting safety and stability; nothing more. It is noticeable that the Bedouins were -in general-the first party and the peasants the second one.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾

- In all cases, the seed of the state, represented by the tribal armies, played the largest role in creating and deepening class division. Even the economic differences within the tribes (especially the Bedouins) were not of great importance before the emergence of the state which practiced invasions, slavery, looting and robbery, in addition to protecting the rich; its allies. Even in modern times, the state had a great role in the primitive accumulation of capital, whether at home or by invading and robbing abroad. The opium war in 1840 that Britain launched against China was an egregious

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ This phenomenon was addressed by many thinkers, including Kautsky (Materialist Conception of History) and Wittfogel in his famous book: Oriental Despotism (many dispersed pages).

example. With regard to the state of Athens; the appearance of disparities in wealth did not lead to real class division. It was the wars that led to the expansion of slavery, the integration of the defeated tribes and the victorious tribe. Thence, wars played the largest role in class division and the emergence of the state, together. Captivity, enslavement of more and more people, then imposing tribute on tribes, formed a stage prior to the state in the full sense of the word; as an organ superimposed upon the people. Thence, the propertied class was formed, not thanks to the disparity of wealth, but when some groups began to exploit others whose labor became the only source of wealth of those groups that became a class. The latter was able to do so thanks to state protection. Thus class struggle and class domination did not appear before the emergence of the state.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ The disparities in ownership before that did not lead to class struggle, but perhaps the largest properties enabled some of their owners to help the poor.

- Although force is the basis for establishing the state, its domination and that of the rich class cannot continue in peace unless significant sections of the people are contented with their legitimacy through an ideology that justifies this domination. Even the rule of the pharaohs needed a religious cover, as well as the modern octopus and evasive state, which needs a political ideology at least and deluding the people into believing that they are free and participating in governance.

- Modern states are interested in creating a feeling of a common identity for their citizens or their nationals. A clear instance is the insistence of the Turkish state that the Kurds are Turks, which is the same stance of the state of Iraq and was the same stance of the state of Sudan, which considered the people of the south (before its secession) as Arabs, and the Saudi state pretends that all its nationals are Saudis, while Aal-Saud is one tribe there.

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Nicos Poulantzas, *State, Power, Socialism*, pp. 37-38 (Arabic translation).

- Ideology as a means of realizing power is not necessarily directly subordinate to the state (Althusser integrated it into the state and called it the ideological state apparatuses).⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ In fact, there are many institutions outside the state that play ideological roles, such as the institutions of religion; the family, schools, the media, etc. These institutions work mainly in their field as well as using some violent repression (such as beating in schools and other places) and non-violent (expulsion, salary cuts, imposing certain uniforms, a specific mode of behavior, etc.). In addition, the state also plays a direct ideological role in activities within the armies, police, and administrative apparatus itself, such as brainwashing and rehabilitation to create alienated and one-directional individuals. By force and ideology the propertied class dominates, aiming to govern, not just to repress, rather outright repression is practiced only at the end if all delicate maneuvers fail.

- With Violence and the emergence of the state with fire and blood, most people became liable to be voluntarily deceived, to avoid troubles and seeking safety. Without submission and surrender - after resistance- a group of criminals such as the Pharaohs, Mamluks or bandits of Tatars and Arabs could not have established states and governed the people. What could promote the public acceptance of the state apparatus and class exploitation is getting some benefits provided to the people by both. There is a mostly unannounced deal (sometimes announced) that consists of the exchange of benefits between the two parties. Examples include the state supervision of public services, social security providing and supporting the people during times of famines. All this is done in exchange for submission, payment of taxes and the engagement in forced labor in the past and wage-labor in our time, conscription in the army, sacrificing life “for the sake of the homeland,” etc.

- In the aforementioned scenarios, the emergence of the state and the division of society into classes cannot be separated. In all cases

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (Arabic translation).

the state arose and became or created the rich dominant class meanwhile (e.g., Egypt, the Islamic state and the Mongolian state...) or supported the existing dominant class supposedly (e.g., Athens and Rome, according to Engels's doubtful conception). In all cases, the state has been repressing who rebels against the system that is appropriate for the wealthy class, and suppressing the revolutions of the populace and always defending the interests of the propertied class or became itself the propertied class.

The state's historical precedence of class division (the most acceptable scenario) does not negate its serving of the possessing class, without forgetting its private interests, taking into account the motivations and desires of the leaders and commanders to dominate and control. There is no reason to hold to any mechanical conception of history. Here the issue of the relationship between economics and politics is faced, or, in general, between the material components of society and the intellectual and institutional components. The state or politics, was the starting point, realizing greed and avarice, but on the long run, it was and still belonging and will be the tool of the exploiters in the class struggle. Moreover, the nature of its formation is consistent with the structure of the dominant class and the nature of the prevailing relations of exploitation. In conclusion, whoever has the gold makes the rules.

- There is a relationship between the structure of the state apparatus and its class nature. Its structure changes according to the dominant class. The foremost instance is the difference between the ancient state and the modern bourgeois state; the state of institutions and separated powers. In the ancient state the ruler was the owner, but in the modern state, there became a separation between politics and economics. In the ancient one the authority was based on personal ties, but in the modern one it became based on functional ties. Since the extraction of the surplus before capitalism was carried out directly; politics governed the economy, but in the capitalist system the surplus is being extracted through the market, without direct coercion. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the

dominant class formats the state fitted exactly to its structure, as there is some free margin for the state, which is not formed according to a detailed plan, but its emergence and composition depend on the overall conditions of social formation. In short, it is distinct from any class in varying degrees. History witnessed even significant independence of the state from all classes, under feudal absolutism and Bonapartism (attributed to the government of Napoleon Bonaparte), while maintaining the same hierarchical social order. Under these regimes, the state was taking a greater share of spoils, in addition to its role in protecting the existing social system. The institutions of the modern state have become more independent, having great interests, especially the “deep state” and the army. It is inconceivable that capitalism would have chosen this formula of the existing state if it had built it by itself, exactly as it was pointed out by Poulantzas.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ However, he denied that the state has any special authority, considering it merely a center for the exercise of authority,⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ as if the state is just a site, a meeting point for the interests of the ruling class; a conception which is against reality. The rulers are firstly not always among the members of the dominant class, but some are even originally from the poor classes. Secondly: they are not just employed by the possessing class, but they have their own aspirations to dominate and achieve their own spiritual or material ambitions; in short: achieving a social stature. The state is an actual entity, having its own interests and views. This explains the relative separation or distinction between the dominant class and the modern state. Moreover, in many underdeveloped countries, the state plays a much greater role; it even possesses a large part of the economy and penetrates every home and every corner, through providing services, subsidies and by direct security supervision. In many countries, the members of the propertied class

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Op. cit., p. 8.

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ He wrote: “*the State is the strategic organization of the dominant class in its relationship with the dominated classes. It is a site and center for exercising power, but it does not have any power in its own side.*” Ibid., p. 148.

can only use their capital with the consent of the state and through its apparatuses. This occurs when the state is only partially modernized and the economic system has significant pre-capitalist features. Anyway, the state is not a mere direct subordinate to the dominant class, nor its instrument or merely a “reflection” -as a constituent of the superstructure- of the infrastructure, as orthodox Marxism contended, but also it has its own power and its own authority.

- It is important to note that the historical division of people into governors and governed has not taken place on the basis of different intelligence and talents, but on several factors. The poor groups had been looking for invading the rich. The Bedouins and the hunters were initiatives, profiting from their experiences in hit and run and pushed by the poverty of their majority. On the other hand, the peasants in general -with exceptions- were having a proclivity towards peaceful life, by virtue of their stability and lack of economic motivations for aggression. In addition, some persons who had leadership capabilities and commandship utilized the social balance of powers. Moreover, undoubtedly the persons who were clever fighters and conquerors used these capabilities, besides, magicians and monks who had special talents were able to make gains and exploit others. With class division and the formation of the state, the rulers recruited the most superior persons in writing, fighting, artistic and intellectual production, magicians and priests on their behalf.

Parasitism of the state:

- If the emergence of the state was merely a response to the needs of society, there wouldn't be a need for ideological institutions, nor would it claim that it is a product of divine right or a social contract. In addition, the rulers would not need to pretend to own the land or claim they are charged with great historical tasks. Rather it is true

that *“the state has forbidden to the individual the practice of wrong doing, not because it desires to abolish it, but because it desires to monopolize it.”*⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

- What is the role of the military other than aggression or facing another army's aggression or suppressing the revolts of the populace? It is nothing. Armies, like all parasitic tools, squander the wealth of society, and their intervention in politics often ruins the economy and society as a whole. They are professional killers; nothing more. The presence of the army means war; the state of peace is -mostly- nothing but a preparation stage for war. States are similar to capitalist companies;⁽¹¹⁰⁾ their competition leads to the destruction and absorption of small and medium interests in favor of the major ones. The state either devours other states or gets devoured by them; either subjugates or is subjugated. Regardless of specific interests, the state leans towards aggression and overcoming other states, when possible, as a mechanism to realize itself and to offer the armies a chance to demonstrate their relevance and achieve status. A neutral state (towards other states) is not found except under general international agreement, in certain power balances, and temporarily.

- In regard to security forces, they work to prevent crime and apprehend criminals, etc. This is true, but there is no need for them to be a professional institution superimposed upon society. This work was being done by the people before the emergence of the state without a professional police. And now this role can also be practiced by a popular police composed of volunteers and professionals under the leadership of popular services or even by conscripted persons. Regarding the role of the state in the economy and the administration of society, it does not require privileged

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ Sigmund Freud, *Thoughts for the Times on War and Death*, complete works, p. 3071.

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ This is an analogy that Mikhail Bakunin has mentioned *“We have demonstrated that to exist, a state must become an invader of other states. Just as the competition which in the economic sphere destroys or absorbs small and even medium-sized enterprises - factories, landholdings. Businesses - so does the immense State likewise devour small and medium-sized states.”* Statism and Anarchy.

employees having authority. Rather, it can be carried out by delegated employees (meaning the seniors), such as civilian supervisors, mayors, neighborhood and municipal leaders, etc. Moreover, with the advancement of technology, society will only need an electronic administration under the supervision of professional programmers who follow governmental instructions.

If standing armies are suppressed and security activity is subjected to a popular police force, there will be no claws for the administrative apparatus, and it can be subordinated to popular institutions.

- In some countries the state developed the production process (e.g., artificial irrigation) but for the benefit of the propertied class. Without this development people were also living. There is nothing mentioned in history that the state arose because of the people's need for artificial irrigation. Why can it be supposed that some group volunteers create a state by force and massacres for irrigation and drainage?! In addition, there are roles that the state has been playing, but it does not need a repressive apparatus to be performed. Moreover, there is no role for the army, the intelligence services and the detention facilities for work such as social insurance. Artificial irrigation that necessitated massive mobilization of people and close cooperation among the peasants was the basis of the system of village communes and the absence of private land ownership, which was the basis for the centralization of the state and oriental despotism. The need for artificial irrigation provided an opportunity for the state to exercise more authority and repression, while it did not necessitate its emergence. Simply, the state also emerged in areas that did not need artificial irrigation. The latter could also go on without a state, by cooperation and under the supervision of village and tribal chiefs.

- In all societies, in all ages and conditions, the state has essentially been a group of armed men, as the great socialists asserted. If strips away the various theories of the state, the complex language, mystical expressions, complicated explanations and

attempts to decorate the phenomenon of the state with incomprehensible conceptions or to deceive the people by using “deep” language, it will be found that the state is truly a group of armed men, robbers and professional criminals. Indeed, it is intended here to use this superficial style because removing the ruffles and the contrived theoretical “depth,” simplifying the language and presenting the concepts in a straightforward way lead to revealing the truth clearly, frankly and shockingly. The state is merely an armed gang that represses society for the benefit of the wealthy class and -of course- for its interests too, to secure robbing the laboring classes. The real face of the state apparatus is scandalized during major uprisings and revolutions; the makeup disappears and it behaves like a gang of explicit professional criminals.

- The key question of every revolution -as Marxists have pointed out- is undoubtedly the question of state power. For a people's revolution to succeed, it must dismantle the state apparatus. The exploiting classes require a state apparatus, while the laboring classes do not. It is possible to transform the army, security and intelligence services to rely on recruits for public service, with reserve forces and professional trainers only, while abolishing the standing professional apparatuses. This idea is partially applied in Israel, which mainly depends on conscripted and reserve forces, with a limited standing army. Administrative apparatuses can be replaced by electronic management. Courts can easily become popular juries with professional judges as consultants. The parliament can be constituted by a board of commissioners delegated by popular committees, as can the cabinet. This was achieved for a short period during the Paris Commune of 1871 and early after the Russian Revolution in October 1917.

Dismantling the state can deprive the class of robbers, exploiters and murderers of protection.

- For all this, one cannot be truly liberated unless they are a fighter against the state apparatus, particularly as it is not

reasonable to talk about freedom under the control of an armed gang over society. Liberation will actually start after the disappearance of this boogeyman called the state, the main enemy of freedom. However, the abolition of the state is not enough to eliminate the ruling class's power and repression in general. Its ideology and institutions, used to hegemonize the masses, must also be undermined.

A recent phenomenon is the partial loss of independence by all countries. The world is gradually becoming one village thanks to the development of communications and globalization. State authorities are being challenged in multiple directions by multinational companies, cooperatives, the shadow economy, non-governmental organizations, various lobbies, multinational armed organizations, etc. Supranational institutions have been formed, subject to major powers but with some influence due to the mutual pressure of companies and states. These include United Nations organizations, the World Trade Organization, the European Union and many others. Selfish interests of companies and states hinder true globalization, resisting the freedom of movement of people and impeding the development of underdeveloped countries by supporting their reactionary rulers to receive foreign investments, in addition to armed conflicts creating instability. Propaganda and slogans against economic liberalization and globalization are considered reactionary calls. On the contrary, abolishing the state's interference in the economy as much as possible is a liberating measure that unleashes the potential of individuals and ensures their dignity.

It can be confirmed that the state and international borders are the greatest enemies of individual freedom.

Democracy:

Democracy is fundamentally incompatible with any closed system of faiths, beliefs or ideas. Therefor, for us, democracy has nothing to do with the current dominant liberal conception of democracy

Murray Bookchin

Democracy, in its broadest definition, means governance by the people. History has never witnessed a truly democratic period in this sense. Some degrees of democracy have been achieved, but its shape and degree have changed over time, often being rejected in favor of autocratic rule.

In Athens, direct democracy was practiced, but without any role for slaves. In the capitalist era, the pinnacle of democracy is representative, supported in some countries by what is called participatory democracy, while direct democracy is only found in Switzerland.

The question of the absence of people's rule does not lie in the form of governance, and there is no recipe for its establishment without profound changes in societal structure. Regardless of the form of government, even direct democracy, the rule of the people cannot truly be actualized unless individuals are free. This means that Ballot-Box Democracy is not true democracy without a democratic culture and social democracy. Additionally, individuals cannot be free without sovereignty over their body, property and conscience. This can only be achieved if the state apparatus disappears and economic and cognitive power differences between individuals vanish. These aspirations may be accomplished in the long run or not fully completed, making democracy a goal that is only partially achieved.

There is no ideal form of democracy, but any step that achieves some degree of individual freedom is a democratic step. Direct democracy is more liberal, i.e., a system of commissioners rather

than representatives; since no one can represent the other. Indeed, when the people choose “their own” representatives, they give up their freedom. Nowadays, the rise and spread of personal computers and the Internet have allowed for the creation of better conditions for individual liberation and the practice of direct democracy.

Libertarianism: This is not a democratic recipe, but a concept that can only be realized through a long struggle.

The goal is individual freedom, not societal or state freedom. Societal institutions should ultimately serve individuals. It is meaningless to ask people to sacrifice themselves for the mere survival of the community or the state unless these entities guarantee freedom and safety. Authoritarian regimes and even “social contract” states promote values where individuals are subject to the supreme interests of the homeland or the state, often sacrificing their own freedom for these “supreme” objectives. This results in the dissolution of the individual within a system that prioritizes the freedom of others, such as the tyrant, the state or the dominant elite. People's lives become dedicated to serving the rulers, and in extreme cases, all power is concentrated in the autocratic ruler. Slogans such as "long live the homeland," "the nation above all else" and "the honorable boss" manipulate individuals and exploit them for the benefit of their oppressors. Leaders who demand individuals sacrifice themselves often do not make any sacrifice themselves. The individual is invited to serve the system faithfully for the glory of those who claim to represent the whole. In allegedly democratic societies, the sacred freedom of the individual is proclaimed, but this often only applies to bourgeois individuals. They are given the freedom to choose employers who exploit them, politicians who deceive them and presidents who prioritize state interests over their promises. Individuals are also given the freedom to support sports stars or teams while glorifying the army that protects the system and suppresses them when necessary. Individuals are constantly reminded of external threats such as potential warfare and "terrorism," which has emerged as a

response to state terrorism. Ultimately, the state reigns supreme over everyone.

If the principles of libertarianism are advanced, there should be a call to struggle against monopoly capitalism, which impedes individual freedom, reducing the individual to a mere gear in the work machine and dominating common sense and people's choices in personal affairs. In addition to the liberation of individuals, there should be a focus on cooperative and collaborative work and gradually dismantling the state apparatus by reducing its authorities, functions and "rights." As an alternative, a Directoire (executive government) formed by popular committees is proposed. This Directoire should not have a standing army, professional police, or judiciary, with the election of senior employees such as governors, mayors, heads of neighborhoods and municipalities as deputies commissioners, not as "representatives" of the people; this is an Open Democracy.

Moreover, the separation between civil and political societies and the distinction of political powers from the people should be abolished. Their association displaces the domination of gangs of politicians and the judiciary and the state in general.

The mechanisms for dismantling the state apparatus include reliance on conscription and reserve forces, as mentioned earlier, in addition to gradually decreasing the size and authority of the professional military. With tremendous technological advancement, it has become possible to dispense with professional military personnel.

Libertarianism rejects discrimination based on religion, ethnicity, nationality, or sexism. Instead, it calls for freedom of minorities, absolute sexual freedom, equality between women and men, the right to abortion, religious freedom, including the freedom to criticize religion and all other personal and political freedoms of all types.

Rather than demanding that the state provide grants and subsidies to the people, individuals must form community institutions that protect them. All authoritarian impediments to people's activities must be abolished. It must be clear that the state is an enemy of freedom.

- It is not possible to develop a final formulation of democracy. New forms may arise from time to time with the development of societies, human capabilities and technology. However, forms of authoritarianism may reappear due to differences in individual capabilities; therefore, the conflict between authoritarians and their victims will continue.

- A justice system that is condescending towards the people does not align with the principles of libertarianism. The judiciary must be popular to be committed to seeking the spirit of justice, not the monotonous and complex texts of the law. The system of popular or revolutionary courts provides a thousand times more democracy than state courts. A criminal should not escape punishment due to "corruption of legal proceedings" or loss of documents, etc. Justice should be achieved by uncovering the truth, restitution and punishing the real culprit.

Democracy remains a goal that must be achieved, re-achieved and developed indefinitely through a steady struggle.

‘Freedom will start to be achieved when the state is demolished; when the people become able to organize themselves; when individuals have the freedom to circulate without a passport or any restrictions; when all authoritarian powers, such as monopolies of the economy, violence and knowledge are vanished; when watching individuals by special apparatuses no longer exists and when peoples' cognitive and economic abilities become virtually equal’

5. Welfare

*Whoever never felt life celebrating him
must vanish like the mist; Who ever never felt
sweeping through him the glow of life
succumbs to nothingness.*

Abu Al-Qasim Al-Shabbi

Human needs have no limits, and there is no such thing as basic needs that can be definitively determined. These needs are endless, with no ceiling, not only due to innate human ambitions but also because every new social situation creates new needs. Examples abound: the emergence of the need for airports with the invention of the plane, the need to develop diagnostic and treatment methods for new diseases or to treat known diseases more effectively, and the pursuit of extending life expectancy through healthy diets, early disease detection, prevention, gene modification, climate control, pollution reduction and more. Therefore, "basic" needs are never fully met, driving progress.

In reality, people do not seek to fulfill their "real" needs but rather the needs they believe are theirs. Influenced by ideas implanted by dominant powers, they consume what benefits these powers, not necessarily what aligns with their own interests, ambitions, talents and potential abilities. Examples include consuming unhealthy foods, wearing harmful clothing, substance abuse and adopting" a lifestyle that numbs the mind, turning individuals into mere cogs in the system's machinery. This does not imply that individuals have specific natural needs, but rather that they determine their "own" needs based on their physical and

psychological characteristics, talents, inclinations and abilities, free from societal pressures.

Welfare does not equate to amassing money, real estate and gold but rather to enjoying life through use-values that enhance individual comfort, develop abilities, enable global exploration, preserve health, extend life, reduce diseases and enhance physical and mental capabilities. Merely accumulating wealth does not constitute welfare. True welfare involves achieving happiness by finding meaning in one's life.

The concept of a "welfare state" emerged in Western countries as a response to the rise of the communist movement during the Cold War. It often refers to efforts to alleviate poverty and provide social care for disadvantaged groups such as the poor, children, the elderly, the disabled and the homeless. However, merely assisting vulnerable individuals in meeting basic needs does not equate to welfare. The state's involvement in social care can increase its power and serve as a tool in class struggles, as evidenced by its decline post-Cold War and the pacification of workers' movements in the West. The welfare state has fostered a welfare ideology, emphasizing the link between consumption and individual happiness. Consequently, individuals are often viewed as mere vessels of physical desires, many of which are artificial and insatiable, leading to a constant pursuit of consumption.

It is noteworthy that, under the guise of the welfare state, environmental pollution has escalated, accompanied by a rise in diseases such as obesity, diabetes, heart diseases and cancer, as well as mental health disorders and substance abuse. Moreover, there have been numerous wars and military coups in the third world, along with the looming threat of global destruction through nuclear weapons.

Welfare does not mean: "I consume; therefore, I am." It does not mean changing the car, mobile phone and clothing with every stylish "fashion" that companies create to increase their sales. Nor is it

about bragging about the abundance of personal possessions that are not being used, do not benefit their owners in any way or cannot even be used by them. It is not about endlessly accumulating wealth. In fact, the hobby of shopping is a compensatory mechanism for self-poverty and emptiness.

In conclusion, welfare does not mean the highest possible consumption, but the use of wealth, science and technology for comfort, enjoyment, and above all, achieving happiness. Furthermore, happiness is not the feeling of fleeting pleasure that is followed by depression, anxiety and despair, as is happening today for the majority of individuals, even bourgeois persons. Instead, it is the feeling that you are yourself; you choose what suits your internal motives and your own needs. This requires the struggle against repression and exploitation, and even against exploiting and dominating others, if any.

Welfare includes having healthy housing, healthy diet, effective and necessary medications, while prohibiting the production of harmful foods and useless medicines, and scientific research in fields that are essential to human life and health, such as cancer prevention and other deadly diseases, gene therapy and preventive medicine. Additionally, the discovery of means to avoid serious genetic diseases and birth defects besides struggling for a comprehensive health insurance system. Achieving all this necessitates opposing environmental polluters, whether on earth or in space. Above all, this requires a struggle against the class of exploiters and criminals who are not concerned with humanity's interests and welfare.

Degrees of welfare levels can be achieved by pressuring companies to reduce working hours and permanently abolish manual work, replacing it with machines and robots. This requires an advanced, free and private non-profit education system to graduate technocrats, programmers and scholars rather than manual workers. Additionally, making the handling of information

open and free and breaking the monopoly of science and technology, including intellectual property rights for long periods.

The way to achieve more welfare is not by begging for subsidies from the state, which only serves to strengthen it. Instead, it involves opposing the state's support of the exploiting classes, reducing its role in the economy, cutting expenses (such as on the army, police, officialdom and corruption), shrinking its size, pushing for the elimination of fictitious capital and combating narcotics. The state and monopolies are the main obstacles to public welfare, as they waste social wealth, exploit the working classes and hinder the adoption of costly technology to maintain high profits.

The revolutionary path to greater welfare is to work and innovate outside the control of monopolies and the state.

This includes breaking the monopoly on funding scientific research, including medical research institutions and major industrial and commercial entities. Establishing cooperatives in these sectors that promote clean, advanced technology and industries that cater to the needs of the masses can be beneficial.

There are no limits to welfare. People will not achieve perfect health, immortality, control over the universe or the prevention of disasters, and human needs will never be fully satisfied. Human needs are endless, with each need met leading to the emergence of new needs and each problem solved giving rise to new problems. Complete welfare is unattainable; there will always be shortages and unmet needs, driving the ongoing pursuit and struggle to meet basic needs.

Whatever scientific and technological progress is achieved, manual work will be abolished and working hours will be reduced, but humans will never stop working. Scientific research will continue and the production and development of more software will

remain necessary. This may require longer working hours, but they will be more enjoyable, blurring the line between work and play.

Furthermore, no matter how long the struggle for equality among individuals in all forms of power continues, differentiation will persist. As a result, personality traits and aspirations will vary, leading to ongoing rivalry and competition, even if classes disappear and cooperation prevails.

All of this challenges the communist slogan: "*from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.*"

‘Welfare will remain a mere aspiration that will not be fulfilled, but a goal on its way to existence’

6. Development

We will get our food in the future as plants get their food from the sun and the more advanced our technologies become more sophisticated and stronger the less, and less our dependence on earth's resources looks like expectations from a science fiction book, and it will only be good validated

Ray Kurzweil

The concept of development evolved during the Age of Enlightenment in Europe and was further solidified in the seventeenth century, particularly with the emergence of the theory of evolution of living organisms. Eventually, both reason and development became among the most cardinal deities, especially as

capitalism drove science and technology to increase profit rate and capital accumulation, as well as to expand colonization efforts for the same purposes.

Concepts of development: There are numerous theories of development, but a brief overview is presented here:

Social development: Jean-Jacques Rousseau proposed a progression from family community to the right of the strongest, to slavery, and ultimately to the social contract in the modern era.⁽¹¹¹⁾ De Condorcet followed a similar approach with some differences.⁽¹¹²⁾ Modern thought also emphasizes the superiority of belonging to a nation over a tribe, the advancement of modern society over old structures, and the development of human values. This perspective was critiqued by Marx, Engels and Nietzsche.

Biological Evolution: founded by Lamarck, and more importantly, Charles Darwin, with his theory of natural selection, which was developed and modified afterward to explain gene metamorphosis after its discovery.

The development of human consciousness: Hegel argued that history is the development of the consciousness of freedom; freedom against irrational and unjust requirements from without, and caprice, passion and sensuality from within.⁽¹¹³⁾ Furthermore, Auguste Comte divided the stages of consciousness into three: theological stage, in three sub-stages; Fetishism, Polytheism, then Monotheism, followed by the stage of Metaphysics, in the sense of philosophy and finally the stage of science or Positivism, that is not matched by any stage in its influence on the changing human

⁽¹¹¹⁾ The Social Contract, pp. 1-10.

⁽¹¹²⁾ The sketch of Marquis de Condorcet was revisioned and presented by Alsaied Mohammad Badawi in his book: Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind (Arabic).

⁽¹¹³⁾ The Philosophy of History, Introduction. In the words of Hegel: *“liberation from outward control -in as much as the law to which it submits has its own explicit sanction- and emancipation from the inward slavery of lust and passion.”*

existence.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Moreover, Giambattista Vico classified development into 3 stages: a primitive divine stage, the heroic stage or the law of force (the Middle Ages), then the stage of humanity in the modern West.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ There is a common concept in Western thought deeming that modern science has transcended myths; a development. As for secularization, it placed human at the center of the universe, which is also regarded by Western thought as a development.

The development of productive forces: This is a Marxian idea that considers the economic factor as the fundamental motivator of history. It is the development of the productive forces that determines the relations of production, mode of production, etc.

By and large, modernism in modern thought is considered a development of pre-modernism or of pre-capitalist society. From the authoritarian state to the state of social contract and institutions, from slavery to free labor, from blood ties to the nation and the national state, from myths to science, etc.

Now there is what is called postmodernism, associated with the post-industrial society.

Development is not a mere abstract concept, not a worshiped deity and does not hold intrinsic value, as advances in science, knowledge and technology may be used to serve a reactionary and anti-human ideology, as is already happening.

A situation can only be considered developed or not if there is a criterion for development; since not everything new in time is necessarily more developed. These are just queries: is science more advanced than myths? Why aren't some of the human current knowledge and ideas just mythoi? Who decided that the market

⁽¹¹⁴⁾Auguste Comte, the Positive Philosophy, Chapter VII-XV.

⁽¹¹⁵⁾ The divine stage is characterized by attributing the nature of things and the life of society to religious concepts. In the heroic stage the honor and adventure were respected, the political aristocracy emerged and the law of force was dominant. The human stage is characterized by political freedom, equality, the sovereignty of civil rights and the spread of democratic regimes. Source: Theories of social change.

economy is superior to the subsistence economy? What is the criterion used to consider the tribal system more or less superior than the nation, and what is the basis for considering higher productivity as a blessing or a curse for humanity? Was humanity not happier before the agricultural revolution? Was their health not 100 times better than the present human?⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Wasn't the air cleaner and the food healthier? Moreover, where is what Hegel pointed out about the consciousness of freedom in light of the rise of fascism (emerged a century after Hegel and now looming again), the military regimes, world wars, etc.? Indeed, the used reference is the current state of the world, which most thinkers consider to be an advanced situation in comparison to the past.

The clear purpose of this normative is to place capitalism at the top of the pyramid of human progress, notwithstanding its committing of moral crimes according to the humanistic conscience. Even those who embrace the idea of “the historical role” of capitalism (Marxists) consider it the pinnacle of civilization and human development hitherto, justifying -implicitly- all its crimes.

Technical advancement under capitalism and the state contributed to devastating wars, the movement of geographical discoveries, colonialism and the enslavement of millions of Africans. Furthermore, industrial development in Europe contributed to the destruction of the industries of the colonial countries, the development of the manufactures of the instruments of repression, facilitated robbing of the working classes by the possessing classes and created a situation that led to the spread of organic and psychological diseases, frustration and alienation. Moreover, the advances of social sciences were used to study peoples' customs and history to support the process of overcoming them. Scientific research has also been used to change the treatment pattern according to companies' pressures, such as the promotion of certain drugs. Demonization of cholesterol is an example, that many

⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Life expectancy was low mainly due to high infant and child mortality.

problems have been ascribed to it (the annual physical cost of statins; lowering cholesterol drugs- according to many sources- are tens of billions of dollars annually, notwithstanding its several side effects.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ And the use of stents became ideological; dealt as a necessity for all patients with heart coronary arterial disease, which is not necessary in many cases. Science has also been used for producing unhealthy foods, such as the expansion of production of wheat, sugar, hydrogenated oils, processed meat, canned and preserved food, feeding animals and fish with fodder other than grass, irrational use of hormones in animal husbandry, use of chemical fertilizers and harmful insecticides, besides poisoning of rivers and seas with mercury and plastic. Science has also been used to produce artificial clothing, harmful types of perfumes, led to the ozone hole, global warming and air pollution, especially in industrial cities, etc.

Increased productivity was originally a prerequisite (not a cause) for the emergence of private property and exploitation, simply because it was responsible for the creation of economic surplus. Afterward it became a necessary condition for the emancipation of human beings or rather achieving more freedom, as shall be addressed.

Science is currently in the service of funders, who only contribute to research that makes profits for them, and the researchers do what ensures funding and bonuses. Some companies even hide the new developments of certain commodities and sell the less developed ones so that every few years they offer a newer model for sale.

Development was associated with Reason, which most of the time was in the service of the dark component of the unconscious; that aspect of the repressed instincts, feelings and desires of selfishness and authoritarianism of a few people who seek to subjugate the majority. In the future, it is possible to produce a superman to

⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Michael W Whitehouse - Desley E Butters, lest we forget: The Darker Side of the Hypocholesterolemic Statin Drugs.

control the poor classes and vulnerable peoples forever or to control their behavior and determine their IQ by changing their genes. But it can also be in the service of humane goals, such as liberation, cooperation and realizing equality between individuals. This depends on the struggle of the populace and their revolutions. It can also serve in treating mental illnesses, unmasking the unconscious and analyzing the desires of the individual, after the project of copying the human mind on the computer is performed.^{(118),(119)} That is because technical development is always linked to goals; authoritarian or libertarian. Important instances of using science in the service of ideology at the expense of scientific facts are the chatter that negates the theory of evolution, the allegations of scientific miracles in the holy books and bending scientific facts in favor of promoting specific products, which is common particularly in medicine.⁽¹²⁰⁾

So, Reason does not make development in all cases, but it is necessarily instrumental, in favor of development or backwardness. It may achieve the goals of the authoritarian few or the majority (or the minority) who are striving for liberation and welfare, as there is no scientific neutrality in the field of technical rationality, rather, it is linked to the political and economic interests of capital. This explains why many critical thinkers are hostile to scientism and positivism (that will be addressed later). The fact that reason is instrumental in nature does not mean that it can be neutral, but that it is always obliged to work in the service of a goal as indicated.

Now development can be defined as all that contributes to achieving the aspirations of human beings for freedom and welfare, which are associated with the realization of the dictates of the humanistic conscience. Not every increase in productivity of labor or the production of more equipment or use-values would achieve

⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Tanya Lewis, *The Singularity Is Near: Mind Uploading by 2045.*

⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Jordan Inafuku and others, *Downloading Consciousness.*

⁽¹²⁰⁾ *Integrating Dark and Light, Big Pharma Is Making Us Sick.*

this. Technical development has already led to beneficial results for humankind, such as resisting some diseases, providing comfortable homes, ensuring food stocks, etc. Many other achievements could also be realized, including modern agriculture without soil and chemicals and animal farms using grass feed and not using hormones or chemicals. Humans can produce healthy and processed animal protein and fat, which makes them able to dispense with their brutal crimes against animals. Rather than military use of nuclear energy, it can be directed to medicine and the production of electricity and hydrogen from water as a clean source of energy. It can also be beneficial from robots and the three-dimensional printer to break free from the influence of technology. So, instead of the workers being subject to the machine, the machine can become subject to the workers, through an application that they set out to start the factory or the enterprise in general (this is being developed nowadays). Likewise, the need for manual and night work can be abolished. Work hours can be reduced or even the work be turned into a hobby, after the disappearance of wage labor, ending discrimination, the separation between the countryside and the city and promoting advocacy for equality between women and men where the importance of physical differences disappear. Besides, nanotechnology and other advances in medicine can make people live as long as they are not killed nor have an accident. Gene therapy and genetic engineering are now being developed, but this needs huge funding.

In fact, the division of labor cannot simply be diminished, as Marx imagined, through continuous technical progress and the growth and diversity of sciences. The inability of the human mind to assimilate this amount of knowledge necessitates division of labor. Nonetheless, with more technological advancement and the development of human capabilities to create external extensions of his mind (artificial intelligence), the division of labor can be constantly narrowed, especially when the individual becomes a mere programmer and a commander of these tools. Moreover, ensuring

opportunities for rapid education provides an opportunity to change the profession. However, the sphere of knowledge will expand constantly, and science will become more sophisticated, making the division of labor a constant phenomenon, while fighting to narrow it continues at the same time; a constant struggle between the two tendencies.

Realizing people's aspirations for freedom and welfare involves making morals consistent with the humanistic conscience, thus subjecting technology to it, instead of what is already happening, i.e., subjugating them to the authoritarian social conscience and using it to humiliate and rob the peoples. This is how development becomes real; including the prevailing values and people's morality.

All this cannot be done by submitting requests to the state or by preaching to the rulers, businessmen and the military, or by appealing to their consciences, since all these ways have failed throughout history. These people have always been seen raising slogans and acting in reverse, even using them to repress their victims, as is the case, for instance, in the issue of human rights; the great powers are using them to blackmail each other and conquer the vulnerable nations. Actually, realizing people's aspirations requires constant struggle; a permanent revolution.

In order for popular movements to be revolutionary, they should seek to solve their problems in the context of preserving and supporting scientific and technological advancement. Movements that seek to stop advancement to provide jobs are reactionary movements that do not deserve support. The increasing liberation from the pressures of nature requires the achievement of technical advancement. Therefore, it is possible in certain circumstances to support -temporarily-"bourgeois" revolutions or authoritarian measures that lead to technical advancement. Development is the basis for long-term liberation, provided not to ignore to trying to subject this development to the humanistic conscience.

The call for returning to nature: There are small anarchist groups that embrace anarcho-primitivism,⁽¹²¹⁾ considering it a more morally developed ideology. They advocate for a return to savagery or a connection to the natural environment. These are anti-civilization views, some of which involve nudity, vegan food, living in small villages and rejecting technology.

Certainly, some modernist theories link technology to general moral degeneration. However, primitive societies were not free of brutality, aggression and carnage. Therefore, returning to nature is not a guarantee to rid society of moral decay. Moreover, to implement this project, there would be a need to exterminate the vast majority of the population to make natural resources sufficient for the remaining people, destroy all cities and villages, close farms, release all animals and discard modern medicine, education, writing, etc. This is an impossible daydream. Some tourism companies have picked up the idea and organized short tourist trips to artificial primitive villages. It is easier to use technology for the sake of humanistic conscience through the struggle to destroy repressive powers, primarily the state and capitalism.

Critics of modernity often highlight phenomena such as environmental destruction, depletion of natural resources, water and arable land shortages, oxygen depletion and global warming. However, there are no final limits to science and development. Creating artificial materials and nanotechnology reduces the need for raw materials in products, which can be recycled. Fusion energy production, hydrogen as a substitute for petroleum and coal, unlimited desalination of seawater, soil-less cultivation, agricultural production multiplication, genetic engineering and birth control can address these issues. Advances in medicine can also treat many diseases without medications. Rejecting technological advancement and presenting impossible solutions is a mechanism of regression to the past to avoid confronting present problems.

⁽¹²¹⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, *Contemporary Anarchistic Currents*.

Development and abundance form the material basis for greater freedom and welfare. Technological advancement can lead to overcoming the system of capital and wage labor. Among the indicators of this are the proliferation of free electronic media, which has made it possible to exchange information and cultures across the world without capital intervention, the possibility of spreading individual projects thanks to three-dimensional printing, robots and electronic applications, as well as the spread of the cooperative economy (which provided a hundred million jobs worldwide until 2008, 20% more than what multinational companies provide.⁽¹²²⁾ Additionally, working from home is growing.

With technological advancements, cash money could become obsolete, replaced by digital (electronic) currency. There may even be a single global currency, and banks could transform into electronic applications owned and managed by individuals or a few entities, or possibly not owned by anyone and managed through voluntary work. The physical buildings and complex administrative structures of traditional banks could disappear, with transactions conducted solely through computers. This shift could result in significant cost savings, increased transparency in all transactions, and the ability to electronically process payments and taxes.

In addition to rejecting instrumentalism, which involves the separation of work from moral values and viewing work purely from a technical perspective without considering its underlying motives, there is a need to question the content and purpose of work. This can be achieved by separating technical work from its objectives. For example, atomic scientists may work on energy projects or nuclear weapons without making a moral distinction between the two, just as construction workers may build houses for landowners or participate in constructing settlements on disputed land. If technocrats do not align their work with the ethical goals of their actions, they are considered instrumentalists. This

⁽¹²²⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, *Cooperative Economics and Development*.

phenomenon is prevalent in today's world, encompassing many scientists and researchers across various fields. By following a humanistic conscience, individuals can choose to dedicate their energy and knowledge to endeavors that promote freedom and well-being for humanity, rather than blindly pursuing progress for its own sake.

Instrumentalism can also manifest on an individual level when a person views others or situations solely as a means to achieve personal goals. For instance, a physician may see a patient as a mere case to be treated to gain professional and financial rewards, or a teacher may view educating students as a means to earn income. This self-centered approach is pervasive in contemporary society.

Discarding Scientism: Scientism considers science as the only source of knowledge and the only way to understand reality. It implies the application of science in situations that are not considered amenable to the scientific method or scientific standards, such as normative and epistemological values, and what are called social sciences. Therefore, art, literature and self-reflection are discarded as sources of knowledge because they do not follow the scientific method. Thus, science itself becomes an ideology.

‘The slogan of development presented here neither denote worshipping technology, nor does it mean that science or technology are neutral, but puts advancement in the service of freedom and welfare of the general public ‘

7. Ideology

The theory is practice but not vice versa, and it is pointless to know theories that do not serve or are far from reality

Schelling

The concept of ideology:

“Ideology” is a Greek word consisting of two syllables. The first syllable is “Idea” and the second syllable is “Logos,” which means science. So, the literal translation is the science of ideas⁽¹²³⁾. However, the common meaning is a system of ideas that provide a final interpretation of the universe, society and the individual. Some scholars use it to denote comprehensive theories, such as Kant's or Hegel's philosophy, and Hegel used it in this sense. It is also used to denote any intellectual choice without reasonable justification. Afterward it took on other meanings and became a notorious word, meaning false or nonscientific. The prevailing current meaning is conceptions that have nothing to do with knowledge and ideas that cannot be validated; beliefs not amenable to reasoning. Among the typical instances of ideology in the latter sense is the divine right of kings; the belief that relations between classes had been established by divine command, have nothing to do with the historical development of society and that humans are divided by nature into masters and slaves. It includes not only ideas but also options in the fields of technological, social, and physical sciences. This may involve developing specific research in various areas such as spaceflight, weapons, medicine for the prevention and treatment of threatening diseases and the education of specific sciences to qualify the labor force according to market needs. It may also involve

⁽¹²³⁾ Ahmad Anwar, *Social Theory and Ideology*, p. 5.

producing certain foods, among other possibilities. More importantly, ideology is not only a set of ideas, but it also includes the psychological motivations, collective unconscious and values that lie behind its adoption.

Intellectuals differ in presenting an agreed definition or meaning of ideology, as it is defined from different perspectives. The following definition is more accurate and practical to a great extent: Ideology is a set of ideas and judgments that are defined and systematic by and large, used to describe, explain, interpret or justify the situation of a collectivity or a group of people, inspired by the conceptions of values in general, and determines the direction of the historical action of this collectivity or group.⁽¹²⁴⁾ However, it is an insufficient definition, as it applies exclusively to comprehensive theories, excluding particular ideas. Another component can be added to that definition: there are components or ideological backgrounds to this or that idea, even without being a part of a comprehensive theory. Individuals make judgments and create particular conceptions from their perspective, influenced by their values and cultural background; generally unconsciously. Any judgment or opinion about any issue or any social phenomenon includes a background of values or psychological tendencies. This and that are ideological.

Marxian conception: The term ‘ideology’ became famous since Marx and Engels used it, although it appeared long before them. Therefore, some attention will be paid to the concept of Marxism about itself.

Marx considered religion an inverted consciousness in his criticism of Hegel's Philosophy of Right.⁽¹²⁵⁾ However, he used this concept to describe ideology in general; *“If in all ideology men and their*

⁽¹²⁴⁾ J. Roche, a quotation from Ahmed Anwar, Social Theory and Ideology, p. 9 (in Arabic).

⁽¹²⁵⁾ *“This state and this society produce religion, which is an inverted consciousness of the world, because they are an inverted world.”*

circumstances appear upside-down as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process.” Engels used the term “false consciousness” and considered it as intentional counterfeiting: “Ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously, indeed, but with a false consciousness.”⁽¹²⁶⁾ (our emphasis). Marx attributed ideology to the classes and their interests, but added that it has subdivisions inside the class: “Everyone believes his craft to be the true one,” “Illusions regarding the connection between their craft and reality are more likely to be cherished by them because of the very nature of the craft.”⁽¹²⁷⁾ He also gave the division of labor into mental and manual a special attention: the thinker who creates ideology regards that reality is ruled by thought and the material forces that are actually ruling are unknown to him.⁽¹²⁸⁾ He did not clearly indicate its existence before classes, except religion. Engels also pointed out clearly the same thing about religion: “All religion, however, is nothing but the fantastic reflection in men's minds of those external forces which control their daily life, a reflection in which the terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces. In the beginnings of history it was the forces of nature which were first so reflected and which in the course of further evolution underwent the most manifold and varied personifications among the various peoples, etc. But it is not long before, side by side with the forces of nature, social forces begin to be active - forces which confront man as equally alien and at first equally inexplicable, dominating him with the same apparent natural necessity as the forces of nature themselves, etc.”⁽¹²⁹⁾ Marx emphasized that the end of religion requires that the conditions of work and life provide the persons with transparent relationships with their peers and with nature.⁽¹³⁰⁾ Then what about other components of ideology? It can be concluded from his various writings that they would also disappear with the

⁽¹²⁶⁾ Engels to Franz Mehring, London, July 14, 1893.

⁽¹²⁷⁾ The German Ideology, The influence of the division of labor on science.

⁽¹²⁸⁾ The German Ideology, [II. 1. Preconditions of the Real Liberation of Man], Ruling Class and Ruling Ideas.

⁽¹²⁹⁾ Anti-Dühring, V., State, Family, Education.

⁽¹³⁰⁾ Faysal Daraj, Marxism and religion. p. 67 (Arabic).

disappearance of the class division of society, as people will consciously make their history, and the representation of public interests by the interests of one class will cease.

Throughout the writings of Marx and Engels, they considered ideology not only a negative reflection of the socio-economic reality but also has an impact on it, as well, and this is frequently repeated in their writings.⁽¹³¹⁾ But in “The German Ideology” which is an early book; just a draft, there are texts that might suggest the opposite, as: *“In direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, here we ascend from earth to heaven. That is to say, we do not set out from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as narrated, thought of, imagined ... Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life.”⁽¹³²⁾ (our emphasis). The idea that ideology has no history implies that it is reproduced whenever the social reality changes, which is not the case. Ideology does not change immediately or comfortably, rather some of its elements are kept in the next and following ideologies. This is in addition to its role and impact on social reality and its change as Marx and Engels mentioned as referred above; it changes while retaining old elements and affects thought, just as it does in physical reality. All this means that it has a history.*

Marxism was presented in the beginning, through its founders, as previous theories did; as the Truth, not an ideology, but considered that, for this reason, its socialism Scientific, and Engels considered dialectics a science.⁽¹³³⁾ Lenin afterward described Marx's doctrine as:

⁽¹³¹⁾ *“The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brains of the living.”* The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, I.

⁽¹³²⁾ The German Ideology, 4., The Essence of the Materialist Conception of History.

⁽¹³³⁾ The literally meaning of Dialectics is dialogue; exchange of argumentations and discussion between two parties in defense of a particular point of view. The dialectical

“The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. It is comprehensive and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world outlook.”⁽¹³⁴⁾ But then the problem arose: Lenin considered that ideology is related only to the classes; therefore, he described the theory of the proletariat as an ideology,⁽¹³⁵⁾ but a ‘true’ ideology, and it was ascribed to him the use of the term *“scientific ideology”* as a description of Marxism.⁽¹³⁶⁾ This implies that ideology as such will disappear with the disappearance of classes. Most of the subsequent Marxist thinkers, from Kautsky onwards, followed that way. Georg Lukács was clear when he denoted that the ideology of the proletariat *“is no banner to follow into battle, nor is it a cover for its true objectives: it is the objective and the weapon itself.”*⁽¹³⁷⁾ He presented the Orthodox Marxism in his book *History and Class Consciousness as the Truth*; being the theory of the proletariat, as the latter is a class that bears the historical task of abolishing all classes, including itself. Michel Fadé reiterated Lenin's statement when he considered Marxism to be a scientific ideology of the proletariat, with the same argument as Lukács, and described Marxism-Leninism as *“according to its scientific content, it is a compendium of the most important philosophical, historical and economic sciences.”*⁽¹³⁸⁾ Here class consciousness becomes not a false consciousness but a science. Stalinist Marxism went further, describing *Marxism as a “scientific philosophy...” “scientific view of the world.”*⁽¹³⁹⁾

method will be dealt with later. In short, it is an approach that addresses phenomena with monitoring of their movement, their contradictions and their transformations.

⁽¹³⁴⁾ The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism.

⁽¹³⁵⁾ What is to be done? PDF file, p. 23.

⁽¹³⁶⁾ Malek Abo Alia, *Ideology and delusion* (Arabic).

⁽¹³⁷⁾ *History & Class Consciousness*, Class Consciousness, 4.

⁽¹³⁸⁾ Michel Fadé, *Ideology, documents from philosophical origins*, pp. 86-87 (Arabic translation).

⁽¹³⁹⁾ Georges Politzer, Guy Besse et Maurice Caveing, *Principes fondamentaux de philosophie*, Part I. Enterence (Arabic translation).

Thus, Marxism looked to ideology as a false consciousness, but when it came to present itself, it pretended that it is the Truth or a scientific ideology; similar to a square circle!

Indeed, Marxism cannot be considered a science. Neither dialectics, nor the laws of historical materialism, nor “scientific” socialism are products of scientific research in the real sense, nor can it be considered the “Truth” as long as it is a perspective; a consequence of a specific social situation like every ideology. Therefore, Marxists resorted to “developing” Marxism – as shall be seen- and many of them resorted to reducing it, from eliminating dialectics and other ideas (such as Kautsky) to eliminating dialectical materialism, then eliminating the principle of historical inevitability (many scholars), to eliminating the whole theory except dialectical method (Lukács), then the disposal of the young Marx in favor of the old Marx (Althusser). Frankfurt school thinkers also endeavored to “rebuild” the theory, resorting to Hegel, psychology and sociology. Most of them resorted to repudiation of the socialist systems that collapsed and considered them not truly socialist, but revisionist, plus discarding Stalinism.

Althusser argued that ideology is only remotely related to consciousness. Paradoxically, it is unconscious despite containing concepts.⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ Moreover, it is necessarily an illusional distortion of reality.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ In ideology, men represent their real conditions of existence to themselves in an imaginary form. They basically drive through their imaginary conceptualization of their relationship to the conditions of existence that they represent for themselves in that imagination. In conclusion, all ideology represents in its necessarily imaginary distortion not the existing relations of production (and the other relations that derive from them), but above all, the imaginary relationship of individuals to the relations of production and the relations that derive from them. What is represented in

⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ For Marx, *On the Materialist Dialectics*.

⁽¹⁴¹⁾ *Marxism as a Finite Theory*, an interview with Luis Althusser.

ideology is therefore not the system of the real relations that govern the existence of individuals, but the imaginary relation of those individuals to the real relations in which they live.⁽¹⁴²⁾

Like many other scholars, he believed that a class cannot possess the power of a state for a long time without simultaneously practicing its ideological hegemony. He differentiated the state apparatus into a repressive apparatus and ideological apparatuses; religious, educational, family, legal system, political (political system with all its components), trade unions, media and cultural. The repressive state apparatus operates intensively and forcefully with the use of repression, while it acts secondarily using ideology, as there is no pure repressive apparatus. For instance, the army and the police use ideology to ensure their cohesion, to reproduce themselves, and for both ideology is manifested in the norms that they promote. On the other hand, the ideological state apparatuses work heavily and strongly with ideology, but they work secondarily with the use of repression. For instance, schools and churches use certain methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to impose discipline and educate their workers and audiences. Althusser also contended that ideology is prior to classes.⁽¹⁴³⁾

There is no plausible justification for considering ideological institutions a part of the state. In this case, society as a whole becomes a state, including economic institutions because they also have an ideological and repressive role. The distinction between the state and the various organs and institutions of society is closer to reality and easier to analyze. It is not reasonable to consider the family institution as part of the state, nor charities, nor factories and stores, etc. Ideological institutions are also prior to the emergence of the state, appeared with the emergence of civilization, starting with the education of children to adhere to the norms and customs of society. Similarly, ideology itself is prior to its specialized

⁽¹⁴²⁾ Ideology and ideological state apparatuses.

⁽¹⁴³⁾ Ibid.

institutions. The latter are based on ideology, not the other way around, then it reproduces, modifies and disseminate it. The human community generally creates its members; conveys its thoughts, beliefs and values to them; subject them to its rules even before being divided into classes, and sometimes ideologize them with violence and physical torture.⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ With the emergence of values, traditions and ideas that justify class exploitation, the family, educational and religious institutions and tribal and clan leaders contributed to their consolidation, in alliance -objectively- with the repressive apparatus. After the emergence of the state, a joint between them (the state and the ideological apparatuses) began to appear. For instance, the religious institutions became an ally, and sometimes subordinated to the state. In many cases, the state places some ideological bodies under its direct supervision, such as schools, religious institutions and the media. Almost all states have security services within civil society institutions.

Above all, a revolutionary ideology (utopia) is produced that is opposing the system and the state, often backed by revolutionary apparatuses; organizations. This issue will be discussed later.

Mannheim's opinion: Karl Mannheim took another step in defining the concept of ideology, providing a pertinent concept. He pointed out that *“the first point which we now have to emphasize is that the approach of the sociology of knowledge intentionally does not start with the single individual and his thinking in order then to proceed directly in the manner of the philosopher to the abstract heights of 'thought as such'. Rather, the sociology of knowledge seeks to comprehend thought in the concrete setting of a historical-social situation out of which individual differentiated thought only very gradually emerges: Thus, it is not men in general who think or even isolated individuals who do the thinking, but men in certain groups who have developed, a particular style of thought in an endless series of responses to certain typical*

⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ Pierre Clastres presented this issue in Latin American tribes, *Society against the State*, pp. 178-181 (Arabic translation). Dorkheim also elaborated it for the Australian tribes in his book: *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*.

situations characterizing their common position.”⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ He categorized ideology into two; particular and total conception. The particular conception is implied when the term denotes that one is skeptical of the ideas and representations advanced by his opponent. So, they are regarded as more or less conscious disguises of the real nature of a situation, the true recognition of which would not be in accord with his interests. These distortions range from conscious lies to half-conscious and unwitting disguises; from calculated attempts to dupe others to self-deception. This conception of ideology equates to the concept of Marxism: false consciousness. As for the total conception, which is more inclusive, it is that we refer to the ideology of an age or of a concrete historico-social group; e.g., of a class, when we are concerned with the characteristics and composition of the total structure of the mind of this epoch or of this group.⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ This conception equates ideology with the conception of a particular group or what he called a perspective. In the particular conception, according to Mannheim, work is done on the psychological level, while in the total conception we deal with various intellectual systems, patterns of experience and interpretations. In the first conception, we deal with the assumption of lying or deception, while in the second meaning we deal with a correspondence between a given social situation and a given perspective.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Certainly, each individual has his unique imprints, so it cannot be prospected that all members of a particular group use the ideology of the group as a whole. It is clear that Mannheim distinguished between ideology as an expression of a historical group, and the contributions of individuals and sections of that group. He thus presented a broader concept of ideology than the traditional Marxian concept. In addition, Mannheim distinguished between ideology and utopia as shall be seen.

⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: an introduction to the sociology of knowledge*, pp. 2-3.

⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.

The Role of ideology:

It has already been pointed out that the human mind does not always follow logic and that the unconscious prevails over the conscious. Even the conscious mind contains illusions, dogma and delusions as integral components. This makes its perceptions and judgments inconsistent with reality in many, or even, most cases.

Moreover, every group looks at reality from a special point of view related to its social position, own interests and norms during a particular period of history, in addition to its aspirations to achieve power, status and safety. This view is consistent with the extent of its knowledge of nature and society, the level of development of this relationship and the level of development of productive forces. Here reason is used in favor of psychological motives and goals. For specific, partial definite facts, people mostly do not disagree, but the views of different groups vary, even regarding dealing with one subject in the same time period. Human cultures also vary also for the same reason.

This is because belief precedes reasoning; rather belief in reason and science is a necessary condition for acting according to them. This belief in science and reason is a non-rational attitude. Ultimately, the unconscious governs the conscious.

Therefore, it is not easy for purely rational argumentation to be carried out between ideologists and even most people, no matter how much factual information they provide each other. Ideas do not only express actual reality; rather, because they do not change mechanically after reality changes, they often remain largely coincided with a previous situation that has ended and been sublated. Illusions, dogmas and delusions constitute the mediator between the social situation of the individual and the community, and their perceptions of reality, history and the future. For instance, history is presented in different ways and with different judgments,

depending on the nature and conditions of each party. What formulates these differences is ideology. Since each group has a specific social situation, it is imperative that it has a perspective; an ideology, which is an element in human thinking that cannot be eliminated. Regarding ideas of the individual, they cannot be separated from the ideas of the group. The individuals think based not only on their social position but also on the basis of inherited ideas, the collective unconscious that they hold and the prevalent ideas within the community to which they belong. Ideology, then is the person's perception of their relationship with nature, the rest of the people and themselves in a fictional form, which are illusions, dogmas and delusions. The nature of them differs from one time to another, according to the changes in the relationship of the subject to nature and social relations.

For instance, primitive humans understood the world through occultism, myths, dreams and fantasies, and magic was among their most important means of controlling nature. On the contrary, modern humans believe in science more than occultism. Just as the individual deceives himself and other individuals, different groups, including classes, practice the same thing; since various groups and strata have their own ideological ideas. That is ideology is not only a product of classes, and its roles vary according to the power it expresses, its social position and its level of development according to whether society is stratified or not or if the class system disappeared. Its roles also vary in the relationship between various social and human groups in general.

People's opinions and ideas contain information that is identical to the facts, not considered parts of the ideology, but they use it to serve their ideological perspectives. All this does not negate that the exploiting classes produce an ideology -whether intentionally or unintentionally- that deludes the exploited classes, being the prevailing ideology, but not the only one in the era of the domination of those classes.

Moreover, ideology is not an expression of interests in all cases.

Rather, an expression of ambitions, which are not an expression of interests in all cases, but an expression of the conception of this or that group of its interests and its aspirations. In addition, there is no specific yardstick for social interests.

Thus, it cannot be considered an intentional deception in all cases, as well as it was not and will not be only of class basis. Even the ideology of the dominant class is not necessarily contrived with the intent to deceive others, but includes self-deception as well, since the mind inevitably contains fantasies as aforementioned. As for the idea of false consciousness, it means that there is Real consciousness. However, this in itself is a fantasy. Every perspective stems from a societal situation + the level of development of the productive forces. There are no perspectives independent of the individual or group that produces them, except for actual facts that no one disagrees with, such as the laws of physics, nobody disagrees on their change. Ideology is a form of consciousness that is relative to a particular social context, not a false one. This does not negate the fact that different groups and individuals may resort to direct lying, pretending, concealing facts and falsifying data to promote their ideas. But this willful lie is only a secondary mechanism of producing ideology and -for this reason- its refuting does not refute the ideology itself.

The production of ideology cannot be referred to a specific central source. Some of its components exist in the collective unconscious, and there are those produced by specialists in mental work, in addition to specific contributions from individuals or societal institutions. Therefore, it is found in both the conscious and the unconscious, since the conscious -not only the unconscious- contains illusions, delusions and dogmas.

As aforementioned, the individual also produces his own ideology, which does not express the group but his personal perspective on dispersed issues, which do not belong to the group as a whole but to himself. This ideology or perspective does not constitute a sophisticated system or theory. For instance, a person's

interpretation of his choices in life or the behavior of his friends and acquaintances towards him, such as his dismissal or ridiculing. This is based on the ideology of his community, which is firmly immersed in his mind, especially in his unconscious. In addition, his deep psychological motives and motivations should not be overlooked.

It is not possible to judge the falsehood or the genuineness of an ideology because the judgment itself is influenced by the point of view of the judges; that is, it will be ideological. If ideology is false consciousness, then human consciousness is generally false. This is part of what explains that argumentation between the upholders of various ideologies often contains insults and accusations of delinquency, opportunism, Satan following, betrayal, disloyalty, etc., rather than merely providing ideas, proofs and true information and accepting the changing of ideas. Moreover, the dominant class resorts to all kinds of coercion -including violence- to disseminate its ideology, relying on the tendency of the masses to submit to get rid of responsibility and to feel safety and security. However, it is sometimes possible to find falsehood regarding individual perceptions, as the relationship between a person's motives and his conclusions may be clear. However, it is only possible to reveal the relationship between judgments and concepts from a particular viewpoint, and even this itself cannot be considered a true or false conclusion, but just a perspective.

Is it possible for ideology to end?

The idea of eliminating ideology has been advocated repeatedly. The first to do so was Edward Shils. Auguste Comte and the positivists, by and large, also called for the substitution of science for philosophy, preaching scientism, which is also ideological. Comte believed that organization could replace ideology. Marx also promised the end of alienation, making history consciously and the end of inverted or false consciousness; ideology in this sense. Max

Weber and many others also called for the establishment of a scientific and objective sociology, separating it from values, having nothing to do with ideology. Moreover, Mannheim made an incoherent attempt to reach objective truth far from ideology in his most important book “Ideology and Utopia,” without claiming that it is possible to transcend both ideology and utopia, especially the latter. Attempts by sociologists to arrive at a scientific theory or to reveal the objective truth in the field of sociology were reiterated without success.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾

The idea of the end of ideology has been presented as a perspective for technocrats aspiring to seize social and political power. Daniel Bell and Martin Lipst presented this, promising a post-industrial society ruled by technocrats, not businessmen.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ They spoke in the name of public welfare, just as both the bourgeoisie (in liberalism) and the communists and bureaucracy (in Marxism) spoke in the name of the public interest of society.

Some American advocates of the end of ideology pointed out that political parties abandoned their ideologies and became mere political organizations, and the difference between liberals and conservatives has decreased a lot.⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ Some others contended that the political stance of the average citizen lacks logical and internal cohesion, there is no psychological difference between the left and the right currents and the majority of people do not act under ideological motives.⁽¹⁵¹⁾ This -even if true- means only that ideological pluralism has declined without disappearing the ideology as such. Moreover, these allegations lack a definition of the concept of ideology.

⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ Ian Craib discussed and analyzed this problem in his fascinating book: modern social theory from parsons to Habermas.

⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ Amer Hasan and Emad Ahmad, The future of Ideology and Utopia in the modern western social thought. pp. 35-37 (Arabic).

⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ Seymour Martin Lipset, Political Man: the social bases of politics.

⁽¹⁵¹⁾ John T Jost, the End of the End of Ideology, p. 650.

It is clear from the writings of all of those and others that the devastating impact of fascism and Stalinism prompted some Western thinkers to try to reject major ideologies, which are already gradually fading away. In addition, the tremendous technological advancement and the rise of technocrats and bureaucrats at the expense of both capitalism and the proletariat have strengthened their position in society. In all cases, the claims to transcend ideology can be seen as a mere ideological attitude. They are merely attempts to realize the interests of capitalism or the interests of technocrats and bureaucrats, by putting an end to the class struggle and international conflicts, aiming to perpetuate a status quo.

Ideology is essential and indispensable for every society. It is a way in which groups (and individuals) define themselves and define the nature of their relationship with society, determine their future prospects and set frameworks for their movement and struggles. Above all, it is a way to define the world meaning from the perspective of its upholders, and finally, it is a tool for the dominant powers to govern society and a tool for vulnerable people's resistance. Ideology will continue to exist because people simply opt and aspire, consequently they think on this basis. Moreover, human desires are not determined by scientific laws but depend on their social position and capabilities in this or that period. The laws of science do not determine a person's destiny, but it is their choices that determine their path. Despite science and reason being able to perceive objective facts, there is no way to convert morality, art and love into real sciences, just as the individual cannot be converted into a machine. Similarly, there is no way to convert humans into pure reason which is -by nature- instrumental and guided mainly by the unconscious. Moreover, technology cannot replace ideology; simply because this means the abolition of values that are indispensable for every society. In addition, machinery cannot use themselves, but people use them in this or that way. Many myths, delusions and metaphysics can certainly be abolished, and even

contemplative philosophy, but ideology and more illusions and fantasies will continue and be reproduced.

Science and ideology:

Science differs from ideology. The first is based on observation and experience in the physical sciences, deduction in the case of mathematical science and follows both approaches to judge the validity of knowledge.⁽¹⁵²⁾ On the other hand, ideology is based on principles, ideas and “axioms” that are not discovered by the methods of science; based on belief and faith. Science can negate and sublate its theories while carrying out new research, without whining of the scientists and the general public. However, ideology remains a belief and subject to faith, whatever new facts, accurate and clear data emerge. It is difficult for its upholders to abandon it, except after major changes in the social conditions. While pure science simply accepts new information as soon as it appears, and scientific theories change after they become unable to explain the new facts. Contrariwise, ideology takes too long to change, even after changing the social conditions, and it continues to resist even after all of its rationales are demolished. Yet ideology uses factual issues in the course of justifying itself.

However, science itself may become an ideology when Scientism is embraced, contending that science can replace ideology, and considered it the only source of knowledge. Moreover, science is also sometimes used directly in the service of ideology. For instance some geneticists "substantiated" the superiority of genes of white human, the benefits of camel's urine or the superiority of men over women. The correct results of scientific research may also be explained in a

⁽¹⁵²⁾ Abdurrahman Badawi, *Methods of Scientific Research*. He added what is called: “retrospective” or historical method in the Sciences of History and Geology, “The Statistical method” in Statistics (p. 16) and Dialectics “*which determines the approaches of debate and dialogue in scientific groups or in scientific discussions,*” p. 19 (Arabic).

way supporting an ideology. The opposite also occurred; scientific progress inflicted successive defeats upon religion and racist theories. Ideology also can influence the paths and interpretations of science, impeding it as happened throughout the Middle Ages in Europe, or pushes it forward. There is the example of capitalism which is seeking always to increase profit, has played a tremendous role in the development of science and technology.

All this does not mean that science is an alternative to ideology, as each has its sphere of work and social role.

Ideology and Power:

There is an important aspect of ideology: its influence depends not on its validity but on its possession of power;⁽¹⁵³⁾ its subordinate to a certain authority or a social power having an important stature and influence. This explains -as Marx pointed out- the supremacy of the ideology of the economically and politically dominant class. It is possible for different ideas to emerge in any era, but they only disseminate and prevail in the presence of social powers that are compatible with and support them.

Therefore, any ideology is necessarily reactionary: Formulating the world in a sophisticated system or a few 'laws' represents a barrier to the mind and restrains it within bounds that it cannot cross. The perpetual pursuit towards an intellectual system that summarizes the world, a specific method of research or a specific way of thinking forms an impediment to freely understanding reality. Thus, it forms an impediment to its change and hinders even the development of thought. Indeed, revolutionary thinking always rebels against any idea that it produces or espouses, to override it. And until it can do this, it remains skeptic and ready to rebel against it.

⁽¹⁵³⁾ Abdallah Al-Arawi, The concept of Ideology, p. 32 (Arabic).

The dominant class cannot rule by force alone. Rather, an ideology, especially religion, must be used to justify its rule. The clergy may do what heavily armed forces cannot. That class retains the option of direct violence for the last moment, when all other means of domination are exhausted. Furthermore, the dissemination of an ideology depends on the susceptibility of the general public to voluntary servitude, as aforementioned. It is even possible to create an ideology willfully, especially in the time of modernity, where the media and education have become an advanced industry supervised by psychologists and sociologists.

Ideology has been used since primitive society by the authorities of the clan and the tribe over individuals: the tribe's council - the priests - different forms of education - customs and traditions, etc. besides force, including violence, to subdue its members to the “public” authority.

Later, the dominant class ideology is disseminated through institutions: the family, religious institutions, the army, the media, schools, etc. Regulations, laws and systems are made, funding is directed in certain ways and at certain amounts and supporters are purchased. The impact of ideology is greater if it is accompanied by rationalized and organized repression, in addition to providing services and bribes to certain social groups. In this way an ideological repression is created.

Even imperialism cannot govern the world by force alone, not even by depending on the state apparatus of the dependent countries. Rather, ideological hegemony must be imposed on the peoples of those countries. Therefore, it establishes and finances global institutions, organs and mechanisms for the manufacture and diffusion of ideology. Among the most important are: the media; global or local satellite networks - publishing and translation houses - cultural centers - international schools and universities - funded human rights organizations and their counterparts - religious missionary groups - service projects - army financing - global fashion houses - major companies and their role in the rehabilitation

of the workers and technicians in the underdeveloped countries - diffusing the Western consumer lifestyle (supermarket chains, restaurants, international hotels, etc.); a mechanism that played a key role in pushing the underdeveloped economies to expand commodity production and integrating them into the global market - tied aid to poor countries and domestic institutions. There is also an important mechanism: the demands of the global market, which force fragile countries to produce certain commodities, necessitating accommodation of the infrastructure, worker skills, legislation and community culture to this trend.

There are also international non-imperialist institutions, the most important of which are the institutions of political Islam, missionary groups and pressure groups (lobbies).

The top of deception and disinformation is reached when a system pretends to present the Truth. The idea of Truth itself is one of the most common forms of authoritarianism and intellectual repression. Here the *raison d'être* or the Absolute Idea becomes the absolute power.

The ideological struggle is a struggle for power; it is a social or political struggle in terms of content. Even if ideology is the direct field of conflict or its basis in some historical circumstances or periods, the purpose of this conflict is to impose domination by this or that group; whether ideological or social. The triumph does not belong to the holders of Truth; rather, it is gained by those who have the strongest material and organizational facilities and are most able to influence the crowds.

The Utopia:

It is necessary to distinguish between two types of ideology: the conservative, which is actual, and the potentially existing, that stimulates the change of reality. This is one of Mannheim's creations that he called Utopia. Ideology is not only a product of the socio-historical situation, but also plays a role in its change, having a

relative independence. Ideas and theories that are future choices or an achievable project are also ideological, but they are only so potentially. That is because they represent future scenarios, although they involve actual ideological elements, i.e., related to the present reality, and transformed into an actual ideology after being realized. The Utopia is also indispensable for humans unless they lose all their aspirations for the future. This Utopia differs from the common meaning of the word, which is a dream of a project or something impossible to realize. Utopia in the new sense is a practical, achievable project; an instrument of rebellion against the established system. Furthermore it is not possible to be certain that this is a Utopia in the aforementioned sense until it is realized.

The socialist theory was a Utopia with ideological elements, not the Truth as Marxists depicted and called it “*scientific socialism.*” It is the perspective of a certain class, not a neutral view. When it was realized, it was transformed from a popular Utopia into exactly an ideology; a mere justification of the reality, expressing the new bureaucratic class that was formed in the socialist societies.

Anarchist theories may also be considered a Utopia; someday they may be realized.

The strategies of the permanent revolution are presented here as a Utopia, also never-ending because they will not be fully realized. This means that there will be no moment when its ultimate triumph is announced. Thus, it constitutes a break with ideology; instead, a perpetual struggle against it. It is not presented herein as a science or as the Truth, but merely a project of perpetual struggle; a Dream.

‘Ideology will not disappear. Otherwise, it will continue to be produced and reproduced as long as human society and the variable positions of various social powers continue to exist, along with the

persistence of knowledge insufficiency. For this reason, there will be a constant need to criticize, transcend and re-transcend it‘

8. The Phenomenon of Religion

The more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself

Karl Marx

The concept of Religion:

1. There is no comprehensive theory about the concept of religion. Like every theoretical topic, orientations and determinants have diverged, and countless “sciences” have emerged. These involve the history of religions, the science of religions, religious anthropology, religious ethnology, sociology of religions, the psychology of religion, the philosophy of religions, etc. All of these present just views and opinions, most of which are based on speculation. There is still nothing to resolve the continued debate about the relationship between religion and art, magic and myth (all of which have endless “sciences”) and about the origin of religion, its factors of emergence, its evolution and its social role, etc. Of course, an additional theory in religion is not going to be presented here, but just addressing the subject -based also on speculation- within its relationship with the project of the permanent revolution, briefly.

2. Some determinants of the concept of religion:

* Hegel described religion as: *“The very consciousness by finite spirit of its inherent incompleteness is implicitly a consciousness of the Absolute Spirit. The consciousness of Absolute Spirit is the attitude of experience known as Religion.”*⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ He thought that the infinite; the absolute, is found within the finite and mentioned that: *“God is the absolute Truth, the Truth of everything and that religion alone is absolutely true knowledge.”*⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ He agreed and opposed the definition of the materialist Feuerbach: *“religion is the consciousness of the infinite; hence, it is and cannot be anything other than, man's consciousness of his own essential nature.”*⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ Both are very abstract definitions. The first proceeds from the Absolute; from heaven and the second is anthropological; proceeds from human; from earth. Nonetheless, they agree that religion is the consciousness of the infinite. It is a definition that narrows the concept of religion and disregards religions that do not recognize the absolute, as shall be discussed.

* Durkheim presented another definition of religion that is broader and more comprehensive: *“A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them.”*⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ It contains the sacred that is used to unify a group of people and distinguishes it from other groups. But this definition does not involve forms of modern religion that sanctify things temporarily and transiently, that deny sanctifying anything or that involve a group not based on a certain moral system (such as the Ultras, e.g.).

* According to the induction of the interreligious factor, including religions that do not recognize neither the existence of

⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ The Phenomenology of Mind, p. 231.

⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ Lectures on the philosophy of religion, Vol. I, p. 89.

⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ Essence of Christianity: Introduction, 1, The Being of Man in General.

⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ The Elementary Forms of Religious Life, p. 44. He defined the church as: *“A society whose members are united because they imagine the sacred world and its relations with the profane world in the same way and because they translate this common representation into identical practices, is what is called a Church,”* p. 41.

gods nor any supernatural high beings (including Buddhism and Jainism), religion is defined as: *“the belief of human beings in a greater power which leads and not submits to them.”*⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ It is simpler and more immediate than Durkheim's definition. Moreover, it applies to all what are considered religions of all kinds, but it must be added that this power is either imaginary or fictitious. Erich Fromm provided a definition that specifically takes into account modern “secular” religions (he was interested in them): *“Any doctrine of thought and action in which a group participates and gives the individual a framework for guidance and a subject for worship.”* Based on this definition, he concluded that there was no and will not be a civilization without a religion.⁽¹⁵⁹⁾

3. Indeed, there is no preliminary determination of religion a priori. It is better to grasp the common component of the commonly recognized religions of each type which are already existing, i.e., by induction. This component is a supreme or terrestrial power that inspires its followers and considered sacred by them, cannot be questioned or criticized. This sacredness differs from one society to another, due to the same factors that create different cultures: geographical factors, historical experience and expertise, social formation, level and type of productive forces, fields and level of knowledge, etc. This definition includes religions that have or do not have rituals or ceremonies, a specific value system or may not be stable.

The sacred is something that is isolated and surrounded by various prohibitions. It can be differentiated into three types: 1. Something metaphysical; supernatural, 2. Something natural but superhuman and 3. A human being that is advantaged compared to the rest of humanity and has a special status. The common factor among them is a social belief or anything, such as a person, animal, place or time, to which a supreme power and status are attributed, in comparison with everything that is a worldly existence, including

⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ Taha Al-Hashimy, history and philosophy of religions, p. 30 (Arabic).

⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ Psychoanalysis and Religion, p. 25 (Arabic translation).

human populations. Examples include: God - the angels - the prophets - saints - the deified ruler - the religious text - the holy land - the days of religious festivals - an animal such as the cow in Hinduism, etc.

There is also what can be called the counter-sacred or the impure sacred.⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ It is the thing that is strongly avoided or hated; the completely opposite of the sacred. It may be among the components of the religion itself, such as Satan, alcohol in Islam and the menstrual cycle of women in some religions. Or it may be a counter-religion, such as the swastika in Germany after the defeat of Nazi, all that is demonized by certain groups or countries, such as the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt now and communism in an earlier period, etc.

4. According to the definition presented above, all the comprehensive theories and philosophies, racist claims, nationalist and scientific theories are religions. They are presented as the final Truth of the world. Some of them promised the end of history and some promised to achieve human salvation from injustice, backwardness and oppression. In general, philosophers endeavored to reveal the Truth of being and tried to uncover the *raison d'être*; the law that governs it, and to create ethics that are consistent with this law or with human nature. Even philosophers who adopted relativism and denied the Truth presented their ideas as the Truth, even if they did not proclaim it. Hence, humans have created sanctities that have nothing to do with gods and the other world or spirits. Even they are often not referred to as sacred, but treated as such. Among those secular religions: Marxism which was promising a Communist Salvation – Zionism and the Holocaust (anyone who touches this belief is tried and imprisoned in certain European countries) - Liberalism - Arab Nationalism (“one Arab nation with an eternal mission”) - the nation in general - the state flag - the national anthem - sometimes the revolution, etc. Don't individuals

⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ Lona Al-Husseiny, the sacred and the profane.

sacrifice themselves and their lives for these things? Were not bloody wars waged in the name of this or that? Did not millions were killed under the slogan “*Deutschland Uber Alles*”? Does a citizen of Germany or France dare to announce that he is reconsidering the Holocaust? Wasn't everyone who criticized Gaddafi or Saddam Hussein executed? Did the world forget the execution of tens of thousands during Robespierre reign because they were “enemies of the revolution,” and some of them were killed as a precaution, including 1200 criminal prisoners? Can a fundamental difference between the totem and the flags of modern countries be seen?

5. With the development of societies and the emergence of human motivations to embrace values and morals, the content of the sacred has changed. So, the “secular” sacred became more powerful, such as the nation, the homeland, the race, the state besides modern theories such as liberalism and communism. The deification of Reason gradually superseded God in the developed world with the onset of Enlightenment. Moreover, the Jacobins tried in the time of the French revolution to inaugurate reason or the “Supreme Being” officially as god and worshiped him in the churches. Additionally, there are the phenomena of reverence of the leader or the hero, reverence towards the social star, reverence for the football team, obsession with an artist, etc.

Actually, modern civilization includes no less irrationality than what existed in the social life of primitive peoples. Indeed, there is still a strong presence of ancient religions of every kind, in addition to similar rituals, such as funeral rites and burial rituals. Moreover, the contemporary liberal believes that market forces are capable of achieving the balance and prosperity of society. The Marxist believes that the laws of the universe (dialectics and others) govern humans and that they must harmonize with them (The Islamic fundamentalist Sayyid Qutb spoke exactly in the same way⁽¹⁶¹⁾).

⁽¹⁶¹⁾ *“The growth of human being, his conditions of health and disease, and his life and death are under the scheme of natural laws that come from God; even in the consequences of his voluntary actions he is helpless before the universal laws. Man cannot change the practice of*

Nationalist movements that have a racial orientation pretend to carry a mission to the world. Humanists consider humans the yardstick of perfection, although the behavior of some animal species appears more humane than the behavior of human beings. Advocates of globalization also pretend that they are achieving development in the world. Zionism also deems itself fulfilling the Lord's promise.

6. Many religions imply fake stories and supernatural events, creatures and things whose existence cannot be corroborated. More significantly, many of these religions state clearly that these things cannot be verified and that one must only believe in them. Thus, the sacred is a part of the realm of the irrational or the absurd, although it performs a certain social function, and from this angle it falls into the sphere of reasonableness.

7. Any religion is an ideology, but not every ideology is a religion. The sacred is not necessarily among the contents of every ideology or at least those who uphold the sacred in this case do not recognize it as such. The ideology may not be sacred in some cases, so it is considered a broader concept than religion. The components of most religions include a conception of the creation of the world, the nature of humans, the meaning of existence and a moral theory; it is a comprehensive ideology. Whether or not religion is an ideology is a controversial issue for most thinkers and theorists. Even being part of the infrastructure or superstructure is not unanimously agreed upon. There are those who consider it a different thing, with various claims. Incomprehensible explanations for this separation between them have been often encountered.⁽¹⁶²⁾ Others believe that

God in the laws prevailing in the universe. It is therefore desirable that he should follow Islam in those aspects of his life in which he is given a choice and should make the divine law the arbiter of all matters of life so that there will be harmony between man and the rest of the universe.” Milestones, chapter 4.

⁽¹⁶²⁾ For examples: the opinion of Bruno Étienne. Mohammad Sabeelah and Abdel Salam Ben Abdel Alaaly, Ideology - philosophical notes, pp. 25-26.

religion is a divine product; therefore, it does not come under the heading of ideology, rather, its human interpretation is the ideology.⁽¹⁶³⁾ This separation between religion and ideology is clearly contrived. Nobody can verify that religion is a science or Truth, or those sacred things are not just a belief. Religion is the most immutable form of ideology and the most resistant to change, thanks to its sacred component deemed untouchable. In addition to the difficulty of refuting ideology, criticism of religion -usually- provokes the indignation and hostility of its upholders.

It is a perspective like any ideology but a sacred one. Therefore, the upholders of every religion believe that it is the absolute Truth, even if some of its components are considered mere symbols, and none of them thinks that it is a myth or a superstition.

8. There are many types of religions. Some of them are heavenly and others are terrestrial. Some believe in the existence of gods, spirits and divine instructions (the positive religion as termed by Hegel) and some deny this. There are also religions described as secular as aforementioned,⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ including the so-called natural religion; a religion based on the basis of human reason and experience apart from miraculous or supernatural revelation. It believes in the existence of a god who has made the universe, set it in motion and then stepped away. This perspective was espoused by the philosophers of the Enlightenment by and large, deriving its roots from Aristotle. Other secular religions include civil religion or the religion of human nature,⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ political religion, such as

An example of the distinction between religion and ideology this opinion of Burhan Ghalioun in his debate with Samir Amin: he contended that *“religion has its own structure and the religious issue has its own and genuine theme that does not mix with others, which forms a deep and fundamental root in the emergence of any civilization or culture.”* A debate about religion and the state, p. III.

⁽¹⁶³⁾ Hasan Soleiman, Religion and Ideology.

⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ Khazaal Al-Majdy, science of Religions, pp. 517-527.

⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ Founded by Jean Jacques Rousseau: *“doesn’t have temples, or altars or rites and is confined to the purely internal worship of the supreme God and the eternal obligations of*

communism, fascism, Zionism, nationalism, liberalism, political Islam, etc. Even, there was a cult of the revolution during the French Revolution.⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ In the era of the modern state, the judiciary and the law have been revered although they may be unjust. Some philosophers also, including Auguste Comte⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ and Hegel,⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ advocated for a religion of humanity; a worldly one that does not look to heaven but to earthly life. Feuerbach, Erich Fromm and Carl Jung also advocated for a human religion, with differences in the details. Notwithstanding the difference in their analysis of what religion is, their religious projects come close and participate in rejecting theology and the next world and considering earthly life as religion. All have failed miserably in disseminating their secular religious advocacies.

Origin and the essence of religion:

Most religious scholars, psychologists and philosophers have pointed out that religion is innate. They include Max Müller, the founder of the science of religion, who argued that the essence and

morality; it is the religion of the Gospel pure and simple, the true theism, what may be called natural divine law.” The Social Contract, p. 70.

⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ Described by Dorkheim as: “*Nowhere has society's ability to make itself a god or to create gods been more in evidence than during the first years of the Revolution. In the general enthusiasm of that time, things that were by nature purely secular were transformed by public opinion into sacred things: Fatherland, Liberty and Reason.*” The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life, pp. 215-216.

⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ While he adopted positivism, he did not declare that the age of religion was over, but called for a new religion, with no metaphysics or theology; a religion based on the facts of science. Since people need a religion to make them love something more than themselves, as society needs religion because it needs a spiritual power, thus the religion that achieves both purposes is the religion of humanity. Instead of God, the humanity itself, the people, becomes the god. In this religion there is no separation between the sacred and the profane, and the life itself is worship. Kemal Atman, Religion of Humanity, Revisited.

⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ “*Religion should not be confined to rigid doctrines, taught from books, or be theological. It should be a living power that thrives in the real life of the people, encompassing customs, traditions, works and celebrations. Religion should not be heavenly but earthy and human, praising joy and terrestrial life, rather than pain, torment and the hell of other life.*” A quotation from Ahmad Abdel Haleem Attia, introduction to his Arabic translation of Feurcach, Origin of Religion, p. 12.

basis of religion are myths that arise from language and cannot be completely compatible with thought; therefore, religion will remain forever.⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ Similarly, Carl Gustav Jung, Erich Fromm, Feuerbach, Hegel and others have supported this idea. Some have argued the opposite, including Wilhelm Reich and Freud. The latter considered religion a mere myth and illusion that deprives individuals of critical thinking, arising from human inability to confront nature and instincts, resembling an obsessional neurosis even in the details; therefore, devout believers are safeguarded against certain neurotic illnesses by accepting the universal neurosis, sparing them from constructing a personal one.⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ Philosophers of the Enlightenment also interpreted the emergence of religion as stemming from human ignorance of natural phenomena, which religion then perpetuates with myths and superstitions that defy logic. Religion demands full submission to doctrines lacking evidence of validity, leading to stagnation of thought and absence of critical sense. Marx and Engels supported the Enlightenment philosophers' view, adding the role of the social factor, considering religion an inverted consciousness resulting from class division and exploitation, predicting its disappearance with the disappearance of its reasons for existence⁽¹⁷¹⁾.

Religion has deep psychological and social roots and cannot be treated as an individual product or solely as a product of the exploiting class. So why does ideology take the form of religion? It actually predates the formation of social classes, emerging hundreds of thousands of years before the Agricultural Revolution, in the time of *Homo erectus*,⁽¹⁷²⁾ Neanderthals, African dwarves, Peking

⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ Khazaal Al-Majdy, Op. cit., pp. 121-122.

⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ The Future of an Illusion, p. 63 (Arabic translation).

⁽¹⁷¹⁾ Engels wrote: “*Religion arose in very primitive times from erroneous, primitive conceptions of men about their own nature and external nature surrounding them.*” Ludwig Feuerbach And The End of Classical German Philosophy, Part 4.

⁽¹⁷²⁾ Khazaal Al-Majdy, Prehistorical Religions and Beliefs, p. 35.

humans, etc., according to various research.^{(173),(174)} Priests and magicians, the predecessors of prophets and messengers, also appeared very early, long before the formation of social classes.

There is evidence that religion was important for achieving communal unity. After the agricultural revolution that led to the growth of the size of human aggregates, it became necessary to create fictions, such as deities, homelands and afterward joint-stock companies, to build and support social links.⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ According to some anthropologists, humans can form a group of people who directly know each other personally within the limits of 150 persons. When the number exceeds that, they resort to creating a fiction for this collection, such as the name of a tribe or village, a totem, a site name, etc., so that they can belong to each other through it. This number is called the Dunbar number.⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ It is thus a mechanism of unifying the human community and stimulating the spirit of cooperation among its members. The purpose is to overcome selfishness and to set rules to prompt the individual to work for the sake of the group, after the blood bond becomes unable to support its cohesion. There is an additional incentive; in a large community, punishment alone cannot act as a deterrent factor for revolting against its traditions, as its large size makes it difficult to know the outlaws. So, a moral incentive is required to promote cooperation and compliance with the law and to reduce the level of tension among its members. The more the members of society, the more tension and bickering exist, consequently the more religious rituals become necessary. It also requires the production of gods and the idea of divine punishment and reward to deter those who contravene the social system, as a mechanism for more control of

⁽¹⁷³⁾ Taha Al-Hashmy, *history and Philosophy of Religions*, pp. 180-189.

⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ Khazaal Al-Majdy, *Op. cit.*, p. 31 ff.

⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, *Sapiens, a Brief History of Humankind*, p. 98.

⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ Aleks Krotoski, *Robin Dunbar: we can only ever have 150 friends at most.*

people in large gatherings.⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ Thus, the human imagination created things it considered sacred to unite the various groups of great numbers. Thousands or millions of people can feel belongingness only if they are rallied around something more or less imaginary, sacred to this or that extent: the totem, nation, state, religion, law, or any “mission,” such as medicine, the struggle for humanity, etc. Even Hammurabi pretended that his law was a divine teaching. The goal is to stabilize the community and secure the authority. These mechanisms for attaining group cohesion do not take place willingly but spontaneously, under the guidance of the collective unconscious. This does not negate the existence of intentional utilization of this unconscious by the authorities, starting from ancient magicians and ending with the contemporary ideological apparatuses. As for the creation of the Almighty and Absolute God, it is the pursuit of the weak human to create an external power and attempt to identify with it.

Religion is not merely a product of human perception of nature and ignorance, but it has a social basis, as elaborated by Durkheim. This is determined at a certain level of development of the productive forces, based on human knowledge, and evidenced by the fact that the majority of people still adhere to it, including many scholars. Even in one of the most advanced countries (Israel), many people believe in biblical myths. Secularism is the separation of religion from the social system and considering it a personal issue without eliminating it. This idea resolves the contradiction between religion and daily life. Religion is not just an illusion; it has social roots like any form of ideology, in addition to the role of ignorance of nature and misinformation, as well as the psychological motives of humans.

Religion is also a product of power; communal authority such as a tribe, nation or class. Because it is a tool of power, influential powers throughout history have used it for their interests, involving

⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ R. I. M. Dunbar, the Origin of Religion as a Small -Scale Phenomenon.

priests, magicians, tribal leaders, dominant classes, rulers and states. On the other hand, various oppressed groups have used it as a tool of resistance. Examples include Christianity in its early years, the militants of South America (Liberation Theology) and revolutionary movements in the history of Islam, such as the Shias and the Kharijites.

Ancient religion emerged when human groups were small, before the emergence of villages and cities, indicating a link between religion and man's relationship with nature, in addition to social motives.

The role of psychological factors and lack of knowledge in the emergence and continuation of religion cannot be overlooked. These factors include dreams, incomprehensible natural phenomena, delusions, fear, human feelings of weakness towards nature and the terror of death in particular. These factors may be behind the doctrine of resurrection and the immortality of the soul, mostly created by Neanderthals.⁽¹⁷⁸⁾

Since its inception, the need for religion has stemmed from greed and fear, hope in and fear of nature, especially fear of death. Greed and fear have evolved in major religions to the desire to please God and fear his punishment. Phenomena such as dreams, nightmares and natural disasters have puzzled and bewildered humans. Some contemporary scholars even believe in and promote parapsychology, such as Gustav Jung.

Humans have always been interested in exploring the world to control it and defend themselves. They first created magic for this purpose, then rituals, and eventually gods.

He also created religion in its beginning as a mechanism to control nature, by creating a supreme power and identifying with it. It was a pursuit to feel safeguarded and secure, to justify their actions, to seek salvation from life's torments, and to create meaning

⁽¹⁷⁸⁾ Khazaal Al-Majdy, Op. cit., p. 31.

for their existence. The affiliation of humans to a higher power affords meaning and purpose for their lives and justifies their actions: these are God's commands - the motherland is above all - the interests of the nation, etc. Only if the individual can say: I see or want to do so will he become not in need of the sacred. This expresses the human psyche as a species, which includes a feeling of weakness and fear of the universe and death. However, the deliberate deception of priests and magicians in their favor and their masters must not be overlooked.

Confining religion to the social factor (Durkheim's doctrine) is not sufficient, as there is a relationship between ideology and the level of the productive forces as well. This explains the diversity of the forms of religion and their superstitious contents. Why did people worship gods such as the goddess of fertility, the god of war, the god of rain, etc.? Why did religions develop towards monotheism, then some of them abandoned the gods and many rituals? Indeed, in the history of all peoples, nature was the first original subject of religion.⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ Here is a specific example demonstrating that the source of religion is dual; sociological and cognitive: fire was sanctified in various primitive societies; it posed a dangerous source of destruction and an essential source of life. So, neglecting it might lead to either being extinguished or burning the forest, caves, or the group dwellings. Therefore, it became a sanctity having priests and even worship and rituals in many regions. It is very important for society, but difficult to be controlled except at a certain level of development of the productive forces. If the primitive people knew how to set fire easily in times of need and how to prevent or control fires, they would deal with it just as they dealt with anything in their life, without reverence, as it is done nowadays. Likewise, if people knew that the sun has nothing of its own, they would not worship it. This applies to all the sanctities in history.

⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ Feurbach, the Origin of Religion, p. 41.

Likewise, religion cannot be viewed as a mere expression of society as a whole (Durkheim's doctrine). Societies are divided into various groups, including the primitive ones. Consequently, one has to link the contents of primitive religion, such as rituals and other contents, with the interests of priests, wizards and clan leaders. Likewise, the contents of the more recent religions must be interpreted in their relationship to the interests of the ruling class. There is a very clear instance: the ritual of the pilgrimage to Mecca before Islam which yielded considerable revenue for the Quraish masters. Moreover, is it possible to overlook the clear relationship between the heavenly religions' promise to the believers in paradise as compensation for them for accepting injustice in terrestrial life?

Then the origins of religion can be summarized in six factors:

- **Human ignorance of natural phenomena such as dreams, various disasters and death.**

- **Need of the communities for cohesion by gathering around a symbol or symbols.**

- **The leaders, witches and the ruling classes make use of people's ignorance. So, religion plays the role of a misleading ideology, which advocates the acceptance of social injustice.**

- **It has been used as a weapon of the masses' resistance to the dominant classes and the oppressive and exploiting authorities; as a weapon of protest; an ideological weapon and a guide to struggle in some cases.**

- **At the individual's level, there are psychological drives for reverence of persons, things and phenomena. Feelings of weakness, powerlessness or failure stand behind this tendency. The sacred offers something that the individual needs psychologically: a kind of safety, something of powerfulness, some degree of optimism of a better future or a feeling of belonging to a powerful group.**

- Moreover, the sacred gives the individual, and even the community, something of great importance: a Meaning to existence and to life that humans are missing unless they create it themselves.

Criticism of religion:

1. Criticism of the origins of religion:

There is no more comprehensive and accurate statement like Marx's famous phrase: "*the criticism of religion is the prerequisite of all criticism.*"⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ The first prerequisite for critical mentality is to make everything subject to analysis, debate and criticism. Since religion is the most static and petrified ideology, its criticism is a necessary condition for liberating the mind and thought, whether "heavenly" or earthly religions. Especially the positive religions (in Hegeliansense), which draw for the human being everything related to his behavior and relationships with others. The individual can get rid of the sacred when he can rely on himself and think critically.

Criticism of religion must focus on its origin and its relationship to the level of productive forces, which have advanced enough to discard myths, and most importantly its origin in social relations as an ideology. Besides, revealing its role in suppressing social struggle and deceiving the masses. This is what Feuerbach, the first critic of Christianity, neglected. The main issue regarding religion is not whether it is a fact or a myth. The most important thing is to reveal its relationship to human misery, disruption and alienation. It is not an independent entity, nor a product of an alleged human essence, but it has a psychological drive as well as being a social product. So, it should not and cannot be dealt with except in relation to all aspects of social reality.

If the unification of human groups stimulates the creation of symbols and sacred things, involving superstition, then illusion and forms of alienation will perpetuate. Consequently, the action against illusion and superstition, and dismantling the sacred will continue;

⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Introduction.

both divine and secular. Rather than an illusion, the unity of groups should depend on the unity of universal goals or rather: strategies. In this respect the strategies of the permanent revolution can serve as a unifying mechanism. Since doctrines and slogans are often transformed into idols worshiped by the people, the slogans of the permanent revolution may become as well. In this case, religion becomes the rebellion, annihilating itself perpetually.

2. Alienation and misery:

Humans create by themselves what they then consider alien to them, authoritative over their heads and submit themselves to it. These sanctities include gods, transforming the homeland, the nation, the state, or the market into self-standing entities with their own laws and standing above the people, while these terms originally denote social relations. Thus, people alienate themselves and convey what is inside them into the sacred. Hegel described this precisely and clearly: *“The conception of God; therefore, constitutes the general basis of a people's character.”*⁽¹⁸¹⁾ Each group makes the sacred its own character, attributes to it what it desires and then imagines that it is transcendent over it; a higher authority. This is how positive religions are made, where the sacred thinks and decides instead of its believers. Thus, the self suffers unhappiness. It becomes divided, neither able to be independent from the sacred nor able to unite with it, so it remains in a state of estrangement.

Feuerbach is one of the most significant figures who dealt with the phenomenon of religious alienation. According to his view, God is the essence of mankind, as he is the final Truth, and God or religion differs according to the way that humans understand his essence.⁽¹⁸²⁾ He stated that humans created God and religion, placing their own essence in him.⁽¹⁸³⁾ But this human essence is something completely illusory. The human being has no essence, but he is a

⁽¹⁸¹⁾ The Philosophy of History, p. 66.

⁽¹⁸²⁾ Essence of Christianity: Introduction, 2, The Essence of Religion in General.

⁽¹⁸³⁾ Ibid., Chapter XXVII, Concluding Application.

product of the grand total of his social relationships. Humans do not lay down their essence; that illusion, in the sacred, but put their fear, helplessness and aspirations. Accordingly, religious alienation is really an image of realistic alienation. So, it is not possible to liberate from religious alienation except after freeing from alienation in reality, consequently, criticism of religion is necessary to reveal this alienation.

The creation of the sacred is associated with the creation of the profane, including human beings. The more humans put into the sacred, the less they retain in themselves, exactly as Marx pointed out. Thus, they lose self-respect and all people merge into one. This is used to justify the realization of the power of the state, the nation or any entity as the objective, while the individual is nothing but a cog in a machine; unworthy. Altruism in this context implies annihilation of the individual for the sake of the sacred. This becomes very conspicuous in the moments of worship, as the devout believer enters a state of self-unconsciousness and dissolves temporarily in the sacred, especially during the rituals of collective worship, where the collective unconscious prevails. This is found clearly during pilgrimage, Sufi rituals, celebrations that involve self-assault and in commemoration of the hero's anniversary, etc. It is also found in totalitarian regimes. For instance, sacrificing an entire generation or any number of individuals for the sake of the state or the leader who considers the people immature, vicious, opportunist and having only the right to obey and adore him. Moreover, in religion the human being lives for the sake of the other, not for himself; he is being realized through self-annihilation into the sacred, becoming liable to submission to the priest, the state, the dominant class and the leader, etc. The person who gives up his mind and identifies with another person cannot easily change his opinion, no matter what information and facts are presented to him. A person who submits himself to some sacred is unable to take responsibility for his decisions but attributes it to an absolute power; thus, he is not actually realized, but broken.

Religiousness may reach a state of mania. One may become unable to live without faith and meanwhile unable to become a true believer; then the “moral infidelity” intertwines with superficial religiosity. One is obligated to practice “moral disbelief” to carry on his life in the surrounding circumstances, but meanwhile, he seeks to obtain the pleasure of God; so he knows only the way of ritual religiosity without abandoning moral disbelief and remains in this whirl; increasing both moral disbelief and superficial religiosity, reaching a state of Religious mania, which is now prevalent in some countries of the Middle East. This may explain why the religious person is usually more selfish and aggressive than the non-religious one; a common phenomenon.

The authoritarian religion carries a sadistic-masochistic relationship. Human has removed from himself all goodness and every capability to get knowledge & comprehension and deposited them into the mighty. The god or deity leader is then portrayed as bossy and narcissistic; demanding the individuals to devote themselves to his obedience and die for his sake, deeming disobeying his orders the greatest sin, while he is enjoying this situation. The more a person praises God, the more he feels emptiness, the more he commits evil and the more he becomes alienated and waiting for God's protection. He suffers all the time from being detached from himself; suffering from his alienation. Moreover, the authoritarian religion is often linked to social power; most likely the terrifying instrument; the state. It adds to its repressive power the blessing of the deity, whether the Lord of the heavens or any other sacred.

In the revealed religions –allegedly- in particular, the people escape from this alienation to unify with the sacred in another imaginary world; a mere imagination. So, it is an escape from estrangement to another. Even in non-theological religions, an imaginary future of an ideal world is created; Heaven on Earth that remains a mirage.

Even if human as a species becomes the sacred, religious alienation will continue. “Human” in this case -as a notion- will

seem as an entity that is separate from all human beings; just as a nation or homeland is regarded.

3. Religion is a double-edged weapon, but it is mostly in the hands of authoritarian powers:

Like any ideology, religion has an influence on the social system; not just a negative reflection. Meanwhile, this role varies; the same religion may be used by different powers in different ways. There is the authoritarian religion, a religion that calls for endurance and surrender and a religion whose goal is the integration of the individuals into nothingness -exactly as Hegel described Buddhism- and seldom becomes a weapon of revolt, rather prepared to serve the dominant class and the reactionary forces. It is like any ideology, an instrument in the hands of some power, whether the power of priests, the power of the state or the power of the individual over other individuals. It is an arm for power and counter-power. Even rituals express authority. For instance, congregational prayer is a mechanism for subjecting the people in addition to reducing tensions within society.

Often, amendments to religious instructions are made to justify a particular policy. Such as permitting murder, lying, theft and plunder in the name of God. Actually, it can change and adapt to any social system. The “Holy Book” was used in the past to justify colonialism and the enslavement of Africans, and afterward those amendments were developed and adjusted -after resistance- with capitalism and with science. Islam was also used to justify the rule of sultans by force, while it was used by the poor and the persecuted to raise emancipatory slogans. This does not depend on the texts of religions, but rather it is related to the nature of social powers in this era or that, which produce whatever texts or interpretations they need. As long as the ruling class is economically stronger, it is more able to manipulate religion, so its ideology -including its perspective of religion- mostly prevails. Just as positive religion is a reflection of social and economic alienation; it also tends to perpetuate this alienation. Thus religion usually plays a role in

justifying and legitimizing the existing social relations, and in preserving the social institutions that embody them.

As usual, throughout history religion has been hindering freedom, development and reaching welfare. By being a sacred ideology, it is not easy to be criticized and transcended. Hence, its conservative character comes. So far, sexual freedom has been sharply rejected from a religious standpoint. Millions are still against eating beef and many other things under the same pretext. Clerics -especially Muslims and Jews- domineer over women, imposing certain clothes and forbidding them from intermingling with men. Many even oppose bank interest from a religious point of view. Others refuse the representation of many historical figures in drama, for being deemed sacred.

The first step towards eliminating the use of religion for the benefit of authoritarian forces is separating it from the state, public affairs and morals, and making it a mere choice and a personal practice. In this way, cultural pluralism and equality of people before the law will be available and the way for critical and creative thinking is paved.

This secularism unites the human community much more than religion. Religion was almost always a factor in the dissemination of feelings of hatred, wars and mutual massacres, even within the same country, unlike the countries that were secularized, which are more coherent and stable.

Secularization has been fulfilled in most countries of the world, but still far-fetched in most countries with a Muslim majority, especially the Arab ones. The phenomenon of political Islam, with its fascist features and its influence over the minds of most people, is persistent in those countries. This means that those masses are still numbed, incapable of thinking freely, defeated, broken and narrow-minded. Hence, they will remain incapable of achieving any deliberate revolutionary steps. Their protests will continue to take place randomly, lacking the desire for real change, not having the

spontaneity of self-conscious masses. Consequently, it would be easy for any organized power to defeat it in the end. It is not enough to attribute the failure of those peoples' revolutions to the absence of a revolutionary organization or leadership. As Aristotle pointed out; asking the right question is half of the answer. The meaningful question now is: why do these metaphysical perspectives that are still living in the caves of the past prevail till now and why do huge masses support these attitudes so far despite all the disasters they have wrought? Why do those sections of the masses not have revolutionary tendencies? These masses are still searching for those who think for them and lead them; a Savior, Christ, Mahdi, a prophet mandated by Heaven or; an "Absolute Idea" that illuminates their path. They neither possess self-confidence, nor even love of themselves. Rather, they feel themselves defiled enough to voluntarily surrender to whomever they believe is pure and represents the absolute goodness. The individual in this case is crushed, does not distinguish himself from those masses with a fascist character. He is just a subaltern or buck private in the herd, moving according to the command of his leader, averting critical thinking, hates those who disagree with his absolute idea and declaring that he is ready to die for the sake of the sacred. That is, he has no ambition, but dissolved in the group whose reason has resigned, to achieve the victory of the Absolute Idea. He exists for the other not for himself, a self that is completely alienated.

This applies to a large extent to the Jews who immigrated to Palestine in response to the call of their leaders. Although most of them are atheists, they are preached to in the name of the Torah and the promise of the Lord. They have been committing all crimes against the Palestinians to seize a piece of land, a small house, an orchard, or Al-Aqsa Mosque, to realize the alleged Lord's promise. They never ask themselves: Why did the Lord not act on his promise himself? Why would the Zionist Jews have to live in all this anguish and horror to carry out a task that God is supposed to do himself?! This is a suppressed person seeking dissolution in a group

carrying a holy idea. The explanation of the phenomenon of Zionism cannot be confined to the persecution of the Jews, neither interests nor conspiracies, as easier solutions have been possible. The existence of those masses, composed of groups that were throughout history oppressed, absent-minded, lacking the ability to choose with free thinking, was necessary to actualize the Zionist dream. Moreover, those human masses, especially East European Jews, who were ready to accept this holy idea, cannot be exonerated from responsibility. They lived throughout their history alien, hating the rest of humanity. Likewise, Judaism itself is not responsible; rather, on the contrary, it is expressing the reality of the Jew himself.⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ In Eastern Europe, for many centuries, the Jewish people played the role of winemaker, the merchant-usurer, money-lender for the nobility, the servant of the feudal lord to extract the blood of the peasants, the pimp, the speculator and the slave trader. They had been a people-class, in Abraham Leon's expression,⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ practicing occupations that were hated and despised by other peoples, which was a basis for transforming those feelings towards the Jews as such. In doing so, the Jews of Eastern Europe lived as a foreign body, hated, outcast and scorned, representing evil in the eyes of the other population most of the time. It was reasonable for that people (Jews) to be ready to seek salvation from their miserable situation and from the persecution of the other population. Whoever was unable or refused to emigrate to the West and integrate with the population remained waiting for the Savior and succumbed to the advocates of Zionism. After the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine, it played the same dirty intermediary role in favor of Western capitalism: supporting countries such as racist South Africa, dictatorships everywhere in the world, fighting national liberation movements, even acting as a stockpile of American

⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ As Marx wrote: *“Let us not look for the secret of the Jew in his religion, but let us look for the secret of his religion in the real Jew.”* On the Jewish Question.

⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation.

weapons and ammunition and conspiring and waging wars to help prevent Arab countries' progress.

Indeed, the texts of religion are used in both cases (political Islam and Zionism) by leaders who aspire to be armed with a sacred idea and supported by absolute power. This is a result of their inability to produce a progressive idea that can attract the masses who are absent-minded and thirsty for mythical salvation, as a substitute for their inability to envision a realistic way out of their torments. This is how leaders connect with masses that are potentially identified with them.

Rational argumentation alone can not change this type of mindset. It is necessary to expose and debunk the incoherence, banality and degradation of their values and absolute ideas directly, while also revealing the motives behind their choices. However, they will not change until the revolutionary forces become strong and tough enough. These masses are already anti-revolutionary, serving as a reserve for counter-revolutions.

4. A compensatory mechanism for suffering:

The heavenly religion equalizes people before the sacred and in the judgment day. It compensates for inequality, persecution and oppression, promising that one day it will restore the rights of individuals. Worship is equal for all believers, and in congregational prayers, everyone stands equal (except in certain cases, mostly for security reasons), and the rules of divine reckoning are the same for all.

Regarding the production of fantasies, such as the image of heaven, it is a mechanism for escaping from reality and a dream that is repressed in the unconscious. It may be a regressive desire to the prehistoric era when primitive humans lived in the forests of Africa, where all their needs were available and they did not need to make a big effort to obtain food .⁽¹⁸⁶⁾

⁽¹⁸⁶⁾ This idea was proposed by the Russian scientist Sergey Saveliev,

Religion also answers unanswered human questions, thus making life meaningful. Humans actually suffer from what Sartre called Anguish, Abandonment and Despair, due to their evolution in the world without a supporter, which are motives for escaping into religion. It is an escape from freedom, in Erich Fromm's expression. This is a pursuit of a feeling of security and creating a value for existence. Actually, it does bring some feelings of reassurance.

Striving to unite with or submit to an omnipotent deity gives humans a feeling of reassurance and false power. It is not much different from identifying with an inspiring leader, belonging to a powerful state, or an absolute power. This explains the dissemination of mysticism, especially among the most oppressed peoples, particularly in East Asian religions.

Religion is truly calming for the miserable, estranged human being who is unable to realize himself. It is the opium of the people - as Marx stated - from two angles: a narcotic element and a healing element; comforting for the tormented self. Revealing this fact is a necessary condition for pushing people to strive to transcend their reality of misery and alienation.

5. Cognitive Criticism:

Dual religion solves the problem of good and evil, but it faces the problem of world order. How do the Lord of Good and the Lord of Evil deal and on what basis? Do they rule the world with two different systems? Regarding monotheistic religion, it solves the problem of world order but faces the problem of evil. How does Satan work outside the divine will? How does the Lord need human help to resist evil?⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ This problem is insoluble from within religion. Regarding secular religions, they cannot yet provide an explanation and a way out of nationalist wars and racism. They cannot even confront the rise of religious fundamentalism worldwide that is hostile to science and critical thinking, nor confront the rising

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YCm9bWxXgbY>

⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, *Sapiens, a Brief History of Humankind*, p. 200.

fascism worldwide. Neoliberal religion and globalization lead to near-planned marginalization in the world and the decline of respect for "human rights."

The theory of evolution still faces resistance on a religious basis. Conservatives, in the name of religion, often have reservations about scientific research in genetics, particularly cloning. Therefore, a revolution against all these myths is needed, while exposing their relationship with the exploited and dominating powers in the world.

'Eventually, religion cannot be fought by argumentation and providing rational proofs when the general public believes in it with certainty. However, it is possible to debunk some religious teachings, expose the inhuman character in some religious texts, scandalize the clergy, disseminate logic and the scientific method and advocate values that achieve liberty, equality and fraternity. Above all, revealing the relationship between religion in all its varieties with exploitation and tyrant rulers'

9. Morality

*We need a critique of moral values,
the value of these values should itself, for once, be examined - and so we need
to know about the conditions and circumstances under which the values
grew up, developed and changed (morality as result, as symptom, as mask,*

as tartuffery, as sickness, as misunderstanding; but also morality as cause remedy, stimulant, inhibition, poison), since we have neither had this knowledge up till now nor even desired it

Nietzsche

The concept of morality:

This is a social product that refers to the ideas, feelings, customs, judgments and a set of values and norms in respect to the rights and duties of people towards each other, that are acceptable to them in a particular society at this or that period. Morality encapsulates good vs. bad, virtuous vs. evil, righteousness vs. wickedness and virtue versus vice. This differs from people's behavior, which may or may not follow moral values.

An individual cannot behave within himself in a manner that can be described as moral. Rather, morals are principles of behavior produced and approved by the community to follow. In history, morality was not chosen by reason but formed spontaneously. However, many thinkers tried to establish rational moral rules. Among the mechanisms of creating morality are what religions called for in terms of definite codes of morals and what the “science” of morality provided in terms of determining the value of characteristics and optional behaviors and the necessity of their existence in human life. It also provides a table of reasonable and perverse acts and characteristics according to the discretion of each scientist. Some researchers claim that they study the conditions necessary for the consistency of behavior with the Ideals.⁽¹⁸⁸⁾

⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ Mustafa Abdu, the Moral Philosophy, p. 17 (Arabic).

Spinoza in his famous book: The Ethics, established certain rules for morality summarized in: “men do all things for an end, namely, for that which is useful to them, and which they seek” (p. 30) – “Everything which conduces to health and the worship of God they have called good, everything which hinders these objects they have styled bad” (p. 33) – “As for the terms good and bad, they indicate no positive quality in things regarded in themselves, but are

However, this does not contain any of the characteristics of science and it is irrelevant. People do not act according to the “science of morality” but according to their internal motives and the pressures of the community conscience (Freud's Superego) that set standards for goodness and ugliness, righteousness and wickedness, right and duty and ideals. Likewise, moral philosophy, which is a philosophical (rational) investigation of the conceptual and authentication principles⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ of the science of morality, determines how to define the rules of morality, deriving it allegedly from reason or from human nature. But people always follow what is consistent with their social conditions and stronger centers of power, whether the rules that arose spontaneously or that were consciously created. This took place especially since the law and punishment started to play an important role in pushing the people towards certain behaviors and accustoming them to it. At least, for fear of punishment in the beginning, before it became a moral rule. An instance is abstaining from killing (except in “legitimate” cases). This does not deny that most people transgress societal morals in all periods and societies.

Morality is distinct from customs; not all customs are moral, while all moral behavior is customary. But customs share in some way the special respect accorded to moral behavior.⁽¹⁹⁰⁾

Morality differs from instincts. They are optional acts, found even in animals besides instincts. Many situations and behaviors have been observed, such as the attempts of an animal to rescue

merely modes of thinking, or notions which we form from the comparison of things one with another. The good is which we certainly know to be a means of approaching more nearly to the type of human nature, which we have set before ourselves,” and the bad is the opposite (p. 138) – “*Good is that which we certainly know to be useful to us., and evil is we certainly know to be a hindrance to us in the attainment of any good.*” (p. 139). Yet, where is Science in this talk!?

⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ The conceptual and authentication principles of a science are a set of solid issues that are demonstrated in another science, and it depends on as an introduction to its own experience, to reach the results related to its purpose.

⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ Durkheim, *Moral Education*, p. 28.

another animal even of a different kind, the avoidance of a predator of preying on a child, cooperation, compassion and the phenomenon of emotional empathy in chimpanzees, for example.^{(191),(192)}

Usually, a question comes to mind: is morality what a person follows for fear of punishment or under an internal drive; his conscience? The question itself is deficient. The more important thing is how the individual conscience is formed? Is it not under the pressure of society? Is submitting to this conscience different from submitting to law, custom and fear of punishment? In fact, there are categories of morality: those that express the fear of society, those that express submission to the collective conscience and those that express consistency with the humanistic conscience.

Origin of Morality:

The scholars differed widely on this matter:

Absolute morality theories: These claim that there are objective rules of morality, valid for every time and place. Among the most famous of these theories are religions, including secular ones (mentioned in chapter 8). They look to the superego as being divine, implanted within the individual. In addition, some sociologists tried to establish a conception of morality on a scientific basis. Some philosophers also argued that moral rules are not acquired, but innate; a product of human nature, the world of ideals (Plato) or of Reason. Kant, e.g., considered the main source of the basic ideas of morality is pure reason and called it the doctrine of duty for duty's sake. Consequently, he distinguished between morality and behavior,⁽¹⁹³⁾ which has nothing to do with utility. Nietzsche rejected

⁽¹⁹¹⁾ Mark Rowlands, Can animals be moral?

⁽¹⁹²⁾ Ahmad El Saady, Morals in Humans (Arabic).

⁽¹⁹³⁾ *“Everyone must admit that if a law is to hold morally (i.e. as a basis for someone’s being obliged to do something), it must imply absolute necessity; that the command: You are not to lie doesn’t apply only to human beings, as though it had no force for other rational beings (and similarly with all other moral laws properly so called); that the basis for obligation here*

the idea of moral truths.⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ In return he presented an absolute standard for good, evil and happiness: 1. Good is all that heightens the feelings of power, the will to power, power itself in man. 2. Evil is everything that has a negative effect on human potential and vitality by promoting the weakness in the spirit and suppressing the strong. 3. Happiness stems from feeling that human power grows and magnifies.⁽¹⁹⁵⁾ He was obviously in favor of what he called: the morals of masters, nobles and the aristocracy versus the morals of slaves. The first categorize people into good and bad, while the second categorize actions into good and evil. He attributed their source to the difference between masters and slaves in strength, ambition and courage. Eventually, he attributed moral judgments to human nature, as he denied the existence of moral actions in and of themselves, but only judgments that depend on who initiated them and not on the act itself.⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ Despite this relativism of his moral judgments, he preferred one type of them over the other, and thus he set a standard for better moral judgments, according to their source. Whatever achieves strength was considered good, so the standard he put was the source of morality: the masters.

The dominant powers in societies by and large have tended to attribute the origin of morality to higher powers such as gods or to human nature, and have been presenting it to the people in the name of some identity (such as “constants of the nation”), in favor of its interests. The morals of the dominant power are presented to the people as if they are a supreme law that came from behind the backs of the people; as a metaphysical power.

mustn't be looked for in people's natures or their circumstances, but must be found a priori solely in the concepts of pure reason; and that any precept resting on principles of mere experience may be called a practical rule but never a moral law.” Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, p. 1-2.

⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ Twilight of the idols, p. 57 (Arabic translation).

⁽¹⁹⁵⁾ Abdel Monem Shiha, Reading in Nietzsche genealogy of Morality, p. 12. (Arabic).

⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ Abdurrahman Badawi, Nietzsche, p. 163 ff. (Arabic).

It is clear that any attempt to set objective, absolute or “right” standards of morals creates authoritarian norms.

Vitually no one throughout history adhered to these theories. The various social powers used to raise general moral slogans to be committed by others. The masters promoted the “*morality of slaves*” without committing themselves to it, and in wars and political conflicts the various parties used to accuse each other of moral transgression, even though every party transgressed them.⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ Despite what the Holy Gospels say: “*Love your enemies,*” no one has been loving his enemy.

The absolute morality stimulated fanaticism, racism and devastating wars. Despite the paramount role of the economic-social factor behind these phenomena, absolute values played a role in fueling them. To uphold certain values, other values are transgressed. For instance, the colonial wars, which, despite their economic motivations, used moral slogans to mobilize people in a war in which they have no interest. Under the pretext of spreading civilization or religion, all brutal atrocities were committed. The end created the means and justified it all the time and setting abstract moral rules was just a necessary element in the mechanisms of social conflict.

Moral relativism theories: According to these theories, moral judgments are affected by the psychological structure, the culture of the individual, the culture of society (the societal conscience), by social conditions and by the interaction of all these factors. Greed, envy and seeking status are inherent human tendencies. However, they are matched by the tendency to cooperate and integrate into a community in search of protection and safety. All of this aims to achieve power. And all of these factors and these influence human

⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ Leon Trotsky in his article: their morals and ours exposed the liberal moralists, debunking their propaganda against Russian Bolsheviks. But because everyone uses the same methods in conflicts, this was justified by the revolutionaries on the pretext that the end was noble; therefore the means was noble.

behavior according to the nature of the social formation and the situation of different social forces vis-à-vis each other.

Consequently good and evil are relative; what is good for one group of people is evil in the eyes of another group, just as the norms vary from time to time, according to the interest that an action brings to this or that party. Morality is relative, socially and historically, and it is a product of civilization, completely different from instinctive behavior. If morality were absolute, you would not find in reality the multiplicity of moral systems from one culture to another. Rather, the same community adopts certain values in one circumstance and their opposite in another; in peace, murder is a crime, but in war it becomes a virtue!

Accordingly, there is no such thing as right and wrong morals or values, but they are completely relative and historical. Therefore, there are no standard values or an absolute basis for judgment. Each community selects its own values and considers them a yardstick, including religion. Values are generally a social product that appears and becomes socially acceptable through the interaction of people's interests and cultural heritage. Moreover, one's social position affects the meanings of values and perceptions he has. For instance, the meaning of justice differs according to one's social affiliation and cultural heritage.

Consequently, there is no natural, normative, or metaphysical morality; rather, it is a part of the superstructure (in the Marxian concept), since it is of social origin; relative. The prevailing morality differs from one society to another and from one era to another in the same society. Among the most obvious examples are the relationship between women and men that has varied in different societies throughout history, as well as homosexuality. The phenomena of enslavement and killing captives were accepted traditions in the ancient world without arousing anyone's disapproval.

Accordingly, there are no absolute vices and virtues. For instance, should the spy in the enemy camp tell the truth? Is lying, evasion and espionage in this case considered virtues or vices?! The events of history and sociology research have confirmed that the system of values has differed in different times and differed and differs in the same era according to societal conditions.

Relative morality denies the existence of general objective standards of morals, considering all moral opinions equally valid. This view dealing with relativism as absolute resulted from the separation of morality from religion with its fixed values, which nobody adhered to -except rarely- besides the failure of the so-called science of morality and moral philosophy to establish a moral system binding to all human beings.

The social conscience (authoritarian) or the superego:

A distinction between customs, traditions and morality was mentioned before. Morality is something related to the conscience; an inner sense of what is wrong or right that represses and permits certain behaviors according to its structure. The conscience is formed gradually since childhood, as a distinct part of the ego; the superego according to psychoanalysis. It is formed under the pressures of society so that it becomes an internal authority within individuals, formulating the moral standards for them. That conscience acts as an internal repressive tool representing the authority of the social system over individuals, whose components differ from one society to another. This theory was adopted by many, including Freud and Fromm. On the other hand, Durkheim, in favor of the collective conscience, argued that the values of society are transcendent to the conscience of the individual and his goals. He aimed like most sociologists to subject individuals to the collective conscience; ultimately the social system.⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ Consequently a good individual in his view is one who is subject to society and its norms. Among what the societal authorities instill within the

⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ Op. cit., lesson 2 (Arabic translation).

individual's mind starts from the unfitness of touching some of his body organs, to the way of eating, to the way of sitting and even the style of addressing masters within the family, the community and society as a whole. All this includes the discrimination between male and female. It is an integrated process of domestication, which starts since birth and takes place without discussion, analysis or criticism.

Since the conscience belongs to each society and varies from one society to another (globalization has not helped unify the collective conscience worldwide!), this conscience or that belongs solely to specific groups of people. Therefore, the “crime” of murder becomes a virtue if practiced against enemies, and plundering and theft transform from crimes to rights if practiced against certain societies or classes. In some societies, males are privileged over females in inheritance rights, having sex outside marriage and receiving remuneration for the same work. The public is indoctrinated that contentment and satisfaction are moral treasures, but the wealthy do not adhere to that. The examples are endless: Western capitalism exports industries that pollute the environment to underdeveloped countries - indifference to wars and mutual extermination between African or Arab peoples and even encouraging them - exercising double standards between Arabs and Israel - national liberation is a right for Arabs, but not allowed for Kurds, etc.

In summary, the societal conscience differs from one society to another and represents the power of societal repression.

This absolute relativism in the issue of societal conscience excludes any tendency for cooperation between humans, but the opposite is actually happening, as shall be seen.

Humanistic morality and the humanistic conscience:

The concept of this conscience was aforementioned in the second chapter. This forms the basis of what can be called the philosophy of human morals, comprehensive moral philosophy or immanent

ethics.⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ It is because it is a unified standard for moral rules. According to Erich Fromm it may agree with human nature;⁽²⁰⁰⁾ humans are inherently good, and destructiveness is not an integral part of their nature, but a product of an un-lived life. Therefore, there is no independent existence of evil; rather it is the absence of good and humans become evil if suitable circumstances for their development do not exist.⁽²⁰¹⁾

These ideas deserve criticism: how did evil prevail throughout history, and why did people not cooperate rather than dividing into classes and waging wars? Was all human history an absence of good?! Nevertheless, this view may have some degree of truth. It has been noticed how higher animals have moral values, but it is not certain whether they are acquired or innate. These include empathy which stems from brain formation,⁽²⁰²⁾ and may indicate the presence of an innate propensity in humans to form it. There is evidence of the presence of a feeling of belonging to the human species. But most likely it is just an innate predisposition; otherwise, why did people not follow their nature? This can be explained by the fact that human nature is intricate, with multiple inclinations.

There has never been a human community that can be described as following “human” morality. In the old communal society, supposedly anarchist humans used to fight or even eat the meat of their fathers or grandfathers when they became fruitless, and some of them used to kill some of their children, as well as the sick, even if they were bothering them or if they were funny-looking⁽²⁰³⁾. They also used to fight each other for pastures and water or to kill captives, thereafter began to use them as slaves. All this was before

⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ Erich Fromm, *Man for Himself*, pp. 269-272 (Arabic translation) - *The sane society*, p. 124 (Arabic translation).

⁽²⁰⁰⁾ *Ibid.*, chapter 2.

⁽²⁰¹⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 147-148.

⁽²⁰²⁾ Ahmad El Saady, *Op. cit.*

⁽²⁰³⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, *Sapiens, A Brief History of Humankind*, pp. 54-55

the emergence of classes and the state. It was only with the French Revolution that such a thing called human rights was declared, and it was only decades ago and in certain countries that the hideousness of the death penalty was recognized.

Nevertheless, there have also been various degrees of empathy in the human world throughout history. This included feelings of guilt after the end of the war between tribes in the past (aforementioned in chapter 2), adoption of individuals who were expelled from their tribes by other tribes and treaties and covenants approving abstinence from war in certain times and places, etc. Over time and with the development of civilization, the pace of human cooperation and solidarity increased and the rate of wars and murder decreased.

⁽²⁰⁴⁾ A lot of occupation soldiers were witnessed refusing to kill the peoples of the colonies. Moreover, the Zionists can exterminate the Palestinian people, but they do not dare thanks to the humanistic conscience. Additionally, a scientist such as Oppenheimer, the father of the atomic bomb, refused, out of his conscience, to participate in the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb after the USA actually used the atomic bomb. Demonstrations of millions in protest against wars have also been seen. Although “human rights” are used as a tool to pressure weak governments, they sometimes backfire on the powerful states. Even the animal rights movement became active, calling to refrain from torturing animals for entertainment in menageries and killing them for feeding; a trend that began to add to the humanistic conscience. All these instances reveal the existence of a non-societal conscience; Humanitarian.

These human morals appeared for the interests of the human species, not a specific group, as absolute morality.

Adopting humanistic morals does not require any biological or a priori metaphysical justification. It is a fait accompli; something that has already been formed, not just an invitation or a project. As for the project, it is to submit that conscience to critique, with the

⁽²⁰⁴⁾ Ibid., pp. 326-328.

aim of constantly reconciling it with the development of human needs and relations. Human rights are not written either in genes or in heaven, but they are a free and changeable choice.

The humanistic conscience differs from the authoritarian conscience; the former results from individuals themselves as human beings, while the latter results from an authority that determines how one should behave.

Morals and religion:

Morals have been ingrained in people's minds through adherence to societal norms. Moral rules serve as the supreme authority that influences the behavior of individuals and groups. They reach their peak of influence in authoritarian religions. In this context, the sacred serves as the reference and standard for human behavior, often accompanied by the fear of Judgment Day in some religions. It acts as an authority imposed on individuals from a young age, without their involvement in its creation and with limited alternatives. In various secular belief systems, the concept of God is replaced by a natural sacred entity, often the state or revered figures such as Buddha and Confucius. In this case, the sacred is revered for its intrinsic value and as the source of all values, rather than being considered sacred because it aligns with moral values; goodness is derived from it, not the other way around.⁽²⁰⁵⁾ Generally speaking, in religion, good comes from the sacred and evil comes from human beings.

Since the dawn of humanity, religion has been associated with morals, a bond that is vanishing in secular countries but still very strong in the Middle East.

Religious morality links the good with the permissible and evil with the prohibited, having nothing to do with choice and not subject to critique, especially in positive religions. Even the law

⁽²⁰⁵⁾ In Islam, various sects differ, such as Mu'tazilism, Karramiyya, Brahmin. They considered the good and evil self-descriptions of acts, some perceived by reason, such as lying and some by involving the Islamic jurisprudence, such as purity and prayer.

imposed by the state is not different in its essence from what is permissible and prohibited, so human actions are not described as human or inhuman but as permissible or prohibited, legal or unlawful. A person does not have to satisfy their humanistic conscience, but has to follow the instructions of religion. There is no difference between the authoritarian conscience and the authoritarian religion except in the degree of the pressure it puts on individuals. In particular, the heavenly religions trigger the utmost degenerate tendencies in humans: greed and fear. Even the primitive religions were just like that, worshiping gods to avoid their evil and seeking their help. Oblations were made for the same purpose, and the priests used this rite to amass wealth. Thus, more pressure is added to the authoritarian conscience, which relies on promise and threat. Authoritarian religion even adds more repression over the individual's humanistic conscience, forcing them to follow instructions that do not satisfy this conscience, under the pretext that there is some divine wisdom behind them. These religions are teeming with norms that cannot be accepted by the general public now, even the most ruthless and arrogant (such as some hideous punishments, mass murder, rape of captives, etc.).

Because religion presents a structure of absolute values, all those who adhere to a religion consider themselves as carrying the absolute Truth, which contributes to fueling feelings of hatred, arrogance, racism and escalating bloody conflicts. It is true that there are social underpinnings for all of this; even religion itself is a social product, but what is happening is fueling those phenomena and pushing them to the extreme.

Therefore, linking religion to morality poses a threat to the latter, exactly as Freud argued. In addition to addressing greed and avarice by many religions, hypocrisy and cowardice are born; dealing with morals with a market rationale, and even the ideas of repentance and forgiveness create comfort for the conscience of the evildoers. On the contrary, linking morals with a meaning of life, a sense of self-respect and independence motivates the individual to

listen to the voice of the humanistic conscience. This can explain, by and large, that the more religious individuals are, the less connected they are to the humanistic conscience, more selfish and aggressive, including those adhering to theological religions, even the divine, not because of the content of religious instructions, but because of the structure of religion itself.

The separation between religion and morality makes the latter unholy and opens to critique from a humanistic point of view. Besides, the self-suppression that characterizes morals derived from the sacred is eliminated, so the separation between the sacred and the profane is transcended. Most importantly, the authoritarian conscience becomes weaker, which makes it easier to criticize and overcome.

This separation has come a long way in the West.

Morality and Power:

Like all components of the superstructure in the Marxian sense, morality results as a mechanism for influencing individuals, expressing the forces that govern society as a whole or even the power of the whole society if it is not stratified into classes. In the last case, it comes as the result of human interactions together, so all individuals work to impose certain values, but the value system in the end expresses the stronger parties. Thus, the authority of community conscience consists of the collaborative power of multiple parties. Moral authority subordinates man's will, *“that makes us feel that we are not free to do as we wish.”*⁽²⁰⁶⁾ As for the authority of the humanistic conscience, it is formed automatically as a result of the interaction of people together, outside any compulsive power.

The individual may be convinced of what he is doing and does it automatically, or he may be compelled and aware that he is doing something while dissatisfied, unconvinced and uncomfortable. This is the effect of power on people's behavior. Persons may act in a way

⁽²⁰⁶⁾ Durkheim, *Moral Education*, p. 29.

they are not satisfied with, but do it for an interest or to prevent some loss. Because the authoritarian conscience contradicts the humanistic conscience in many instances, the struggle and discomfort within the individual do not stop, by virtue of his exposure to an invisible apparatus of oppression, implanted in him since childhood.

Critique of Morality:

Most philosophers and sociologists tend to accept the idea of the necessity of the individual's submission to society, arguing that the community conscience is necessarily moral and higher than the conscience of individuals. Some of them call for the individual to also enjoy this submission.⁽²⁰⁷⁾ This can be translated as placing duty above right, placing the freedom of society above the freedom of the individual, and perpetuating the current social conditions in all countries.

However, individuals have not always adhered to these calls. Societal values have been broken and have changed throughout history. No one is fully committed to what social scientists and philosophers propose in terms of morality. Even what is permissible and prohibited in religion has been transgressed everywhere and at every time to some extent, with only a few people adhering to it. The social consciences, laws, traditions, customs of the community and oppression have always been the most powerful factors in determining people's behavior. Even many prophets did not adhere to the morals prescribed by their religions. The possibility of impunity has been a significant factor in violating the moral codes of the community. In some religions, the ideas of repentance and

⁽²⁰⁷⁾ For example, Durkheim, according to Qalamin Sabbah, lectures in the moral philosophy, pp. 27-28.

balancing misdeeds with good deeds are introduced. Thus, conscience is only a contributing factor in determining people's behavior. In most cases, people contradict their consciences to cope with life and its problems.⁽²⁰⁸⁾ This contradiction is one of the sources of their misery; their unhappy consciousness.

The aim of critiquing morality is to overcome the torments of conscience and to expand the freedom of the individual. The repression imposed by the community conscience, the social system morality, restrains individuals and separates them from their humanistic conscience. Since authoritarian morality is a social product, relative and linked to the interests of influential forces in society, critiquing it begins with revealing this foundation. Exposing the divergence or contradiction between it and humanistic morality is the immediate next step. This is not an advocacy for creating a science of morality; rather, general humanistic values and human rights principles are sufficient. Criticizing the social order, exposing falsehood and alienation are enough.

The advocacy is to deconstruct societal conscience and reveal its roots in authoritarian relations and its resistance to the humanistic conscience. Moral critique aims to reconstruct humanistic morality, not to promote destructive moral nihilism. The goal is critique, not undermining, meaning deconstructing and constructing. This is also related to critiquing customs, analyzing their origins and determining whether they align with contemporary needs. For instance: marriage as an idea and its associated customs, the pattern of sexual relations, the nature of discourse among people, fashion, dieting, times of sleep and awakening, the phenomenon of female

⁽²⁰⁸⁾Nietzsche made a bold attempt, which is worth critiquing, to criticize what he called the morality of slaves, as embodied in the teachings of the Jewish and Christian religions. He did this under the slogan "*re-evaluation of all values*," with the goal of achieving the triumph of a new morality of masters, which he referred to as "*the philosophy of the future*." Nietzsche believed in the transformation of humans into Supermen who would become creators of values. He also rejected what he considered to be the so-called human, viewing them as the morals of slaves.

mutilation and determining the extent of societal need for these behaviors. Professional morals, which involve rejecting personal considerations in professional work while upholding humanistic values to avoid instrumentalism, deserve attention. The treatment of animals is also crucial for developing human morals. Their feelings, emotional, and physical needs should be respected, and all forms of cruel treatment of animals in pastures, circuses and zoos should be prohibited. Animal persecution is a precursor to human persecution.

Protesting and violating societal habits, of course, provoke social discontent, which requires collective action.

Let morals follow the humanistic conscience, separated from religion (which ultimately represents the authoritarian conscience) and subject to critique and re-critique. This approach makes the individual freer to choose their morals without feeling remorse. The humanistic conscience is present in every individual without coercion or intimidation, unlike the social conscience, which is authoritarian. In this context, ideals reflect principles of cooperation, altruism, respect for others and empathy. This also opens horizons to new ideals consistent with the ongoing development of science, technology and social organization. Critical thinking becomes essential for moral values not derived from repressive power, allowing everything to be subject to critique. It becomes possible to develop morals in line with the humanistic conscience, critiquing old traditions and rigidity. In this way, rights become duties and duties become rights; egoism and altruism merge into unity.

Critique of the humanistic conscience is also necessary to separate it from the community conscience and to develop it in accordance with societal changes.

In fact, preaching and counseling are not the way to manage the issue of morals. An effective solution can be achieved through socio-political and ideological struggle. If humans could achieve greater

equality, equal opportunities to achieve status and a high degree of individual freedom, then the strength of altruism can come closer to that of egoism, so people can adopt more humanistic morals, i.e., be closer to cooperating and exchanging interests and feelings. This necessitates a social struggle against the authoritarian forces with their societal morals. History has demonstrated that money or material need, lack of equal opportunity, the domination of private property and sexual issues are the utmost important sources of mankind's bloody struggles and most forms of greed, avarice, treachery, betrayal and aggression. On top of these factors, money is sitting, which was described by Marx's wonderful saying: *“Money, then appears as this distorting power both against the individual and against the bonds of society, etc., which claim to be entities in themselves. It transforms fidelity into infidelity, love into hate, hate into love, virtue into vice, vice into virtue, servant into master, master into servant, idiocy into intelligence and intelligence into idiocy.”*⁽²⁰⁹⁾

Achieving abundance and equal opportunity, freedom - including sexual freedom - progress and prosperity guarantee the elimination of most social conflicts. The abolition of repressive laws, the state and classism, as they are the greatest enemies of the humanistic conscience, while promoting critical mentality in all fields of life, ensures - to a large extent - the removal of the blockade on the humanistic conscience. All these are long-term aspirations.

Self-revision, introspection and meditation are also useful means of self-knowledge and critique of both morals and the authoritarian conscience. This can be performed by people with strong personalities who tend to rebel, initiate and attain status.

Towards a Permanent Moral Revolution:

Advocating for humanistic morals does not mean compatibility of the individual with his society, but - contrariwise - the compatibility of society with the needs of humans; the individual-species. More clearly: the compatibility of society or the community

⁽²⁰⁹⁾ Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.

conscience with the humanistic conscience; the values and ideals that humanity as a whole has created throughout history and practiced only in the narrowest range. This state means complete realization of freedom, which is an ambition that cannot be fulfilled but remains a moral strategy; a subject of the permanent revolution in the field of morality. Development on the level of morality can be considered as the trend of communal morals towards consistency with the humanistic conscience.

The change of morals by simply subjecting them to critique cannot be predicted, but criticizing them and opening the doors of revolt is one of the axes of the permanent revolution. This critique is only a moment in the revolutionary process. It is the struggle for liberating the individuals through changing society, not submitting to it.

The conformity of the individual's behavior with the humanistic conscience, his union with humanity as a species, the union of his egoism with his altruism and his right with his duty, lead to his liberation as if humanity as a whole is liberated. This process is difficult to fulfill, by virtue of the diversity of the propensities of the human psyche. It will, therefore, remain a perpetual attempt.

‘The natural person is rebellious and the rebellious person is natural’

10-Marxism

The defense of Marxism is reaching its final stage of decline

The importance of the exposition of Marxism originates from the fact that it has been the most influential theory in the history of revolutionary movements worldwide. Its influence can be observed in various aspects of society, including social sciences and psychology. Marxism is not a speculative philosophy; it is a project for socialist revolution that has inspired many individuals seeking a better world and human salvation on earth. Therefore, a critical presentation of Marxism is crucial.

Marx did not develop a speculative theory or a comprehensive philosophy; his primary focus was on analyzing the capitalist economy. While he touched on various philosophical criticisms, especially of German philosophy, he did not present a complete theory with specific features. His students later expanded, modified and developed his ideas, leading to multiple schools and currents of thought that all claim to be Marxism. This has resulted in an orthodox edition of Marxism that encompasses various fields such as philosophy, economics, politics, knowledge, art, aesthetics, sociology, revolution theory and even psychology, as well as serving as a revolutionary organization. Marx's own writings, which were not always coherent (as he developed his ideas over time and many were drafts), can be interpreted differently depending on the reader's philosophical and political background.

Marx and Engels did not explicitly state that their scientific socialism is a philosophy; instead, it replaced bourgeois idealist philosophy and philosophy in general.⁽²¹⁰⁾ This implies that they

⁽²¹⁰⁾ Karl Korsch, *Marxism and Philosophy*.

created a science with laws. But as Karl Korsch remarked *“it is easy to see that philosophy itself is not abolished by a mere abolition of its name.”*⁽²¹¹⁾ In addition, there are famous statements by Marx that indicate he presented a philosophy: e.g., *“Philosophy cannot be abolished without being realized.”*⁽²¹²⁾, *“Philosophy finds its material weapon in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its spiritual weapon in philosophy.”*⁽²¹³⁾ The one who actually presented Marxism as a philosophy was Engels, who was content with describing the matter as a mere link to German philosophy, calling this the philosophical aspect of science. This indicates -most likely- a feeling of having a problem in his theory. He could not say that it is a science and did not meanwhile call it philosophy, so he created this strange expression. Moreover, he created the term *“historical materialism”*⁽²¹⁴⁾ (Marx did not use this term but used, in his co-written works, the term *“materialist concept of history”*).⁽²¹⁵⁾ He also transformed Marxism into a comprehensive theory, including a method, general laws of existence, a theory of political economy and a theory of the socialist revolution. Indeed, Engels is credited with presenting Marxism clearly and extensively to the public. However, some successors considered that he developed Marxism by explaining these topics, while others decided that he distorted Marx's original thought. But Engels himself claimed that Marx read and approved his works on the *Dialectics of Nature* and *Anti-Dühring* (his main book on Marxism). The orthodox disciples of Marx and Engels continued to consider Marx's doctrine *“omnipotent because it is true. It is comprehensive and harmonious and provides men with an integral world outlook irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction or defense of bourgeois oppression. It is the legitimate*

⁽²¹¹⁾ Ibid.

⁽²¹²⁾ Ibid.

⁽²¹³⁾ Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Introduction.

⁽²¹⁴⁾ Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Historical Materialism*.

⁽²¹⁵⁾ *The German Ideology*, 4, *the Essence of the Materialist Conception of History, Social Being and Social Consciousness*.

successor to the best that man produced in the nineteenth century, as represented by German philosophy, English political economy and French socialism."⁽²¹⁶⁾

A brief presentation of the theory of Marx and Engels can be summarized as follows:

1. Marxian dialectics:

Marx wrote a quick criticism of Hegel's doctrine,⁽²¹⁷⁾ criticizing his idealism that gave priority to thought over reality and isolated abstract thought within a system that is not linked to tangible existence. In short, he criticized it from a materialistic point of view, influenced by Feuerbach. He contended that he made Hegel's logic stand on its feet instead of its head.⁽²¹⁸⁾ What is meant is that he transformed it from an idealistic method to a materialistic dialectics, dealing with thought as the product of reality. In fact he was deluding the readers here; Hegel's method is a pure head -so to speak- it is the dialogue of pure reason with itself, or it is pure reason. In fact, Hegel's dialectics is a (logical) moment in his doctrine as a whole, not a formal method of analysis. It constitutes an analysis of pure reason and, at the same time, a tool for its analysis because it is pure reasons itself. Actually, Marx turned Hegel's method -perhaps unintentionally- into a formal; instrumental logic or a method of presenting his ideas, considering it a mere method of research and applied this idea - to a large extent - in his analysis of capitalism. By and large, he did not present any clear theoretical view of his method, while Engels did so hastily.

Engels conceptualized dialectics as a method that deals with the world as a complex, intertwined and changing whole, where its parts interact and transform from one state to another, characterized by perpetual movement in nature and society and the struggle of opposites. This makes it necessary to study the part in connection

⁽²¹⁶⁾ Lenin, The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism.

⁽²¹⁷⁾ Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.

⁽²¹⁸⁾ Capital, Vol. I, Afterward To the Second German Edition.

with the whole, to take into account the interaction and mutual influence between things and phenomena, and to see things and their reflections in the human mind in their interdependence, movement and becoming; in their emergence and demise. He summarized it in three laws (the law of the transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa, the law of the interpenetration of opposites and the law of the negation of the negation ⁽²¹⁹⁾). Hence, he described it as: *“the general nature of dialectics to be developed as the science of interconnections, in contrast to metaphysics”... “The science of the general laws of change, not only in society and in human thought, but in the external world which is mirrored by human thought. That is to say it can be applied to problems of ‘pure’ science as well as to the social relations of science.”*⁽²²⁰⁾ and *“the science of dialectics.”*⁽²²¹⁾ (our emphasis). He applied his dialectics to nature in a famous book, in a way of setting examples, nothing more. He also applied his method to society while linking it to materialism; the materialist conception of history or historical materialism. Engels considered that the three laws are the laws of the entire existence, not just the laws of thought, transforming Hegel's logic into something resembling science, without sufficient proof of the validity of these laws. Consequently it is a new metaphysics, not a science. Hence, Engels divided dialectics into two parts: the first: general and correct laws of existence (resembling Hegel's Reason that is not conscious of itself). The second: a certain way of thinking; a formal or an instrumental logic whose laws agree with the objective reason of Hegel or the laws of existence as he called. This was an attempt to make Hegelian dialectics materialistic. But it is clear that escaping from Hegelian idealism was not achieved. He presented the laws of dialectics not as a view of the world or merely as a formulation of what is considered to be the mutable laws of the world, but as objective laws governing the world that have simply to be

⁽²¹⁹⁾ Dialectics of Nature, p. 19.

⁽²²⁰⁾ Dialectics of Nature, II. Dialectics, p. 3.

⁽²²¹⁾ Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, the Science of Dialectics.

discovered. That is why he spoke in his book: *Dialectics of Nature*, about the development of nature as if it is moving in a drawn purposeful path. Despite this attempt to transform Hegel's dialectics from idealistic to materialistic, he praised the revolutionary content of Hegelian dialectics and his philosophy as a whole, objecting to the conservative side, and he benefited from it in developing a method of analysis that looks at things in their emergence, development, impact on their surroundings and in the interaction of contradictions.

Most Marxists followed this conception. While Marx - practically- transformed dialectics into a formal logic and a method of presenting conceptions, Engels transformed it into a doctrine: the laws of existence. This was the beginning of transforming Marxism into a closed system that includes dialectical materialism, historical materialism and political economy (sometimes the theory of socialist revolution is added), until a stage of criticism and review came by many Marxists.

2. The materialist conception of history:

Marx's theory of historical materialism is summed up in his famous statement:

“In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material means of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or - this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms - with the property relations within the framework

of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters.”⁽²²²⁾

This is a similar statement by Engels: “then it was seen that all past history, with the exception of its primitive stages, was the history of class struggles; that these warring classes of society are always the products of the modes of production and of exchange - in a word, of the economic conditions of their time; that the economic structure of society always furnishes the real basis, starting from which we can alone work out the ultimate explanation of the whole superstructure of juridical and political institutions as well as of the religious, philosophical and other ideas of a given historical period.”⁽²²³⁾

This statement and that were used as the basis and source of the idea of economic materialism that prevailed among many Marxists, even in the life of Marx himself. However, there are many affirmations by Marx and Engels on the role of the superstructure in the work of the substructure, and that the economic factor is not

⁽²²²⁾ A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, preface. The rest of the statement is: “Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic - in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society. Mankind thus inevitably sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the course of formation. In broad outline, the Asiatic, ancient,[A] feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as epochs marking progress in the economic development of society. The bourgeois mode of production is the last antagonistic form of the social process of production - antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism but of an antagonism that emanates from the individuals' social conditions of existence - but the productive forces developing within bourgeois society create also the material conditions for a solution of this antagonism. The prehistory of human society accordingly closes with this social formation.”

⁽²²³⁾ Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, The Science of Dialectics.

the only factor in the movement of history. Marx himself disavowed that vulgar materialistic Marxism, and Engels repeatedly ridiculed those who insist on the economic interpretation of all phenomena and events, insisting that the relationship between the two structures is an interaction and there is no temporal sequence between them, although the substructure is the final reference; ultimately, as he stated: *“the economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure - political forms of the class struggle and its results, to wit: constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc., juridical forms and even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the participants, political, juristic, philosophical theories, religious views and their further development into systems of dogmas - also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form.”*⁽²²⁴⁾ The same is true for the relationship between forces and relations of production. This statement by Engels is clearly explaining it all:

“Political, juridical, philosophical religious, literary, artistic, etc., development is based on economic development. But all these react upon one another and also upon the economic base. It is not that the economic position is the ‘cause and alone active’, while everything else only has a passive effect. There is, rather, interaction on the basis of the economic necessity, which ‘ultimately’ always asserts itself.”⁽²²⁵⁾

Marx, Engels and the great Marxists who followed them, such as Kautsky and Plekhanov, always highlighted and confirmed this meaning of the materialist conception of history and elaborated it clearly.⁽²²⁶⁾ The economic factor, according to their view, is the determining factor in history, and the division of people into classes is deeper than their division on other bases, which is only a general tendency. Yet something different may happen; people's division on religious or ethnic grounds may be stronger at certain periods, as

⁽²²⁴⁾ Letter from Engels to Joseph Bloch on 21-22 September, 1890.

⁽²²⁵⁾ Engels to Starkenburg, London, 25 Jan., 1894.

⁽²²⁶⁾ For example, Kautsky, Exchange on Historical Materialism – Plekhanov, The Materialist Conception of History.

the events of history showed. While economic materialism simply means that the economic factor is always the decisive factor at every moment, but this idea has never been demonstrated in history. On the other hand, Marx, Engels and their disciples argued that class division is deeper in the long run; in the distant or deep background of events, not in every moment of societal life. Religious division may play a significant role in the historical movement in a given period, but the source of this division itself is historically and ultimately the economic-social factor, through various mediations. Moreover, profound changes in the social system are determined according to the economic factor. This paragraph clearly shows Marx's view of the matter: *“the mode of production determines the character of the social, political and intellectual life generally, all this is very true for our own times, in which material interests preponderate, but not for the middle ages, in which Catholicism, nor for Athens and Rome, where politics reigned supreme. In the first place, it strikes one as an odd thing for anyone to suppose that these well-worn phrases about the Middle Ages and the ancient world are unknown to anyone else. This much, however, is clear, that the Middle Ages could not live on Catholicism, nor the ancient world on politics. On the contrary, it is the mode in which they gained a livelihood that explains why here politics and there Catholicism played the chief part”*.⁽²²⁷⁾

Marx and Engels also emphasized repeatedly that they did not draw up a general historical sketch for history, but the orthodox students made such a scheme. Yet Stalin went on to devise the theory of the five stages of societal development.⁽²²⁸⁾ It is enough to read this statement of Marx to understand his view clearly: *“If Russia is tending to become a capitalist nation after the example of the Western European countries and during the last years she has been taking a lot of trouble in this direction - she will not succeed without having first transformed a good part of her peasants into proletarians; and after that, once taken to the bosom of the capitalist regime, she will experience its pitiless laws like other profane peoples. That is all. But that is not enough for my critic. He feels himself obliged*

⁽²²⁷⁾ Capital, Vol. I, chapter one, footnote 34.

⁽²²⁸⁾ These are: The primitive commune-slavery -feudalism - capitalism.

Source: Dialectical and Historical Materialism.

to metamorphose my historical sketch of the genesis of capitalism in Western Europe into a historico-philosophic theory of the marche generale [general path] imposed by fate upon every people, whatever the historic circumstances in which it finds itself, in order that it may ultimately arrive at the form of economy which will ensure, together with the greatest expansion of the productive powers of social labor, the most complete development of man, etc.⁽²²⁹⁾”

It is important to refer to the theory of Marx and Engels about the state. Engels summarized an explanation of the emergence of the state as follows:

“The state is therefore by no means a power imposed on society from without; just as little is it “the reality of the moral idea,” “the image and the reality of reason,” as Hegel maintains. Rather, it is a product of society at a particular stage of development; it is the admission that this society has involved itself in insoluble self-contradiction and is cleft into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to exorcise. But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, shall not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power, apparently standing above society, has become necessary to moderate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of 'order'; and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state.”⁽²³⁰⁾

Marx also thought that “the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy.”⁽²³¹⁾ Moreover, he described the state as a parasitic superfluity that feeds at the expense of society and impedes its free progress. Since the bourgeois state is an apparatus of oppression of other classes, its composition as an apparatus corresponds to the nature of its task. That is why it is not sufficient for the proletariat to seize it, but it must destroy it and establish its own state. This is what Marx concluded after the experience of the Paris Commune. Furthermore, He distinguished between the state apparatus and the tools of spiritual enslavement; all of which are tools in the hands of the dominant classes.

⁽²²⁹⁾ Letter from Marx to Editor of the Otecestvenniye Zapisky.

⁽²³⁰⁾ The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Chapter IX.

⁽²³¹⁾ The Civil war in France.

As for the situation of the state after the socialist revolution; the original stance was summed up in what was stated in the Communist Manifesto in 1848: *“The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degree, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible.”* The statement did not specify the form of this state. It should be taken into account that the bourgeoisie is also “organized as the ruling class” and its state is an oppressive bureaucratic-military machine.

In the “Critique of the Gotha Program,” Marx stated: *“Freedom consists in converting the state from an organ superimposed upon society into one completely subordinate to it.”* Thus without any hint about destroying this apparatus.

However, after the Paris Commune, which actually destroyed the state apparatus, the view of Marx and Engels changed temporarily; Marx praised the Commune: On April 12, 1871, that is, in the very days of the Commune, he wrote to Kugelmann:

“If you look at the last chapter of my Eighteenth Brumaire you will find that I say that the next attempt of the French revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to another, but to smash it, and this is essential for every real people's revolution on the Continent. And this is what our heroic Party comrades in Paris are attempting” (Marx's emphasis). However, Marx's statement in “The Eighteenth Brumaire” was: *“All revolutions perfected this machine instead of breaking it.”* Afterward, he wrote in “The Civil War in France”: *“The unity of the nation was not to be broken, but, on the contrary, to be organized by Communal Constitution and to become a reality by the destruction of the state power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity independent of and superior to, the nation itself, from which it was but a parasitic excrescence.”* - *“Thus, this new Commune, which breaks with the modern state power, has been mistaken for a reproduction of the medieval Communes, which first preceded and afterward became the substratum of, that very state power.”* - *“The first decree of the Commune; therefore, was the suppression of the standing army and the substitution for it of the armed people.”* - *“Instead of continuing to be the agent of the Central Government, the police was at once stripped of its*

political attributes and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable, agent of the Commune.”

Marx and Engels also pointed out in the preface to the Communist Manifesto in 1872 that the program had been antiquated in some details, adding a sentence from Marx's book: “The Civil War in France”: *“the working class cannot simply lay hold of ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes.”*

This sentence can be understood in more than one sense: the necessity of destroying the state apparatus only or replacing it with a different one. It is astonishing that this statement was not added to the body of the manifesto, although it was reprinted several times afterward. It is also amazing; if Marx and Engels really had decided to accept the anarchist thesis; that is, what the Commune did, so why is it not declared explicitly: the immediate abolition of the state per se?

Engels did the same, claiming that the Commune had established the dictatorship of the proletariat: *“Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.”*⁽²³²⁾

Later a retreat from favoring the idea of completely destroying the state apparatus was noticed:

“Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.”⁽²³³⁾ Once again, the word 'state' is mentioned, in the context of 1848.

Engels stated:

“The free people's state is transformed into the free state. Grammatically speaking, a free state is one in which the state is free vis-a-vis its citizens, a state, that is, with a despotic government. All the palaver about the state ought to be dropped, especially after the Commune, which had ceased to be a state in the

⁽²³²⁾ The Civil war in France, Introduction of 1891.

⁽²³³⁾ Critique of the Gotha Programme.

true sense of the term. The people's state has been flung in our teeth ad nauseam by the anarchists, although Marx's anti-Proudhon piece and after it the Communist Manifesto declare outright that, with the introduction of the socialist order of society, the state will dissolve of itself and disappear. Now, since the state is merely a transitional institution of which use is made in the struggle, in the revolution, to keep down one's enemies by force, it is utter nonsense to speak of a free people's state; so long as the proletariat still makes use of the state, it makes use of it, not for the purpose of freedom, but of keeping down its enemies and, as soon as there can be any question of freedom, the state as such ceases to exist. We would therefore suggest that Gemeinwesen ["commonalty"] be universally substituted for state; it is a good old German word that can very well do service for the French Commune."⁽²³⁴⁾

Engels here is content with the promise of the state's demise after achieving socialism and prefers to use the word commune instead of the state. Therefore, one must rely on his promise and be satisfied with word replacements.

In his introduction to the 1891 edition of Marx's book *Civil War in France*, Engels wrote:

"at best an evil inherited by the proletariat after its victorious struggle for class supremacy, whose worst sides the proletariat, just like the Commune, cannot avoid having to lop off at the earliest possible moment, until such time as a new generation, reared in new and free social conditions, will be able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap-heap." (our emphasis).

This is clear reference to 1848.

The explanation that Lenin referred to in Engels' book *Anti - Dühring*, is: *"The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production in the first instance into state property. But, in doing this, it abolishes itself as proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, abolishes also the state as state."*⁽²³⁵⁾ Afterwards, Engels and later Lenin spoke about the tendency of the state to vanish.

This attitude towards the idea of state abolition was a subject of intense theoretical and political conflict between Marxists and

⁽²³⁴⁾ Engels to August Bebel, in Zwickau, 18-28 March, 1875.

⁽²³⁵⁾ *Anti -Dühring*, Part III: Socialism, Theoretical.

anarchists. The Marxian view lacked any conception of the possibility of the proletarian state turning into a bureaucracy dominating even the proletariat itself, as envisioned by the anarchists. Does a state, an armed repression apparatus, fade away without attempting to continue as an independent power over society? This recalls Bakunin's prediction, made decades before the emergence of the Soviet Union in 1873: “Let us ask, if the proletariat is to be the ruling class, over whom is it to rule? In short, there will remain another proletariat which will be subdued to this new rule, to this new state.”⁽²³⁶⁾ This implies that the leaders will replace the ruling class against which they fought.

The fatal weakness of the Marxian perception of the state is viewing it merely as a machinery of the dominant class, performing a specific function and automatically dissolving once this function disappears.

Historical inevitability:

This topic has always been controversial among Marxists and between them and their opponents.

This idea differs from inevitability in nature, as the laws of history for Marx and Engels are tendencies rather than laws, different from the laws of physics. History does not move according to physical laws but under the interaction between necessity and freedom or the “laws” of history and human choice.

In the writings of Marx and Engels, there is evidence of their belief in the principle of historical inevitability. The idea that in the social production of their existence, humans inevitably enter into definite relations, independent of their will, includes the idea of historical inevitability, based on the sum of the wills of individuals that are inevitably determined under the pressure of the economic factor. This is widely included in Marxian literature. Engels wrote

⁽²³⁶⁾ Statism and Anarchy.

in this regard: “*it was necessary to present the capitalistic method of production in its historical connection and its inevitableness during a particular historical period, and therefore, also to present its inevitable downfall.*”⁽²³⁷⁾ (our emphasis). There are also many references in the works of Marx and Engels about the historical role of the bourgeoisie, then the proletariat, and about the specific relationship between the productive forces and the relations of production, including the famous statement about the hand-mill and the steam-engine.⁽²³⁸⁾ Another statement came much later: “*Of all the instruments of production, the greatest productive power is the revolutionary class itself.*”⁽²³⁹⁾ But Marx and Engels and many of their devout disciples always denied the fatalism of the historical movement, just as they did not negate the role of chance and the role of the individual, following Hegel's idea: “*Substance is accordingly the totality of the Accidents, revealing itself in them.*”⁽²⁴⁰⁾

Moreover, it is understood from the writings of Marx and Engels that socialism is the fate of humanity as a historical inevitability. However, there are Marxists who deny this principle and its proposition by Marx. Some of them pretend -opposite to the truth- that he did not explicitly mention this term, and therefore, special attention will be paid to this matter.

The theory of “scientific socialism” includes this inevitability. This fundamental component of Marxism signifies something significant: Marxism is a science and fact, not just a point of view. It is a well-established idea that this theory belongs to the proletariat, representing the Truth because the proletariat has a historical mission, which is the emancipation of the world while emancipating itself. Marx and Engels wrote early: “*Communism is for us not a state of*

⁽²³⁷⁾ Anti -Dühring, Introduction.

⁽²³⁸⁾ “*The hand -mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam -mill, society with the industrial capitalist.*” Karl Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy, chapter two: the metaphysics of political economy, the method, second observation.

⁽²³⁹⁾ Ibid., Strikes and Combinations of Workers.

⁽²⁴⁰⁾ Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences, paragraph 151.

affairs which is to be established, an ideal to which reality [will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence, etc.”⁽²⁴¹⁾ The concept is that communism is the outcome of the current reality, not a proposed project. Isn't this a prelude to the idea of historical inevitability? Marx then took the readers in a more frank way: *“What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.”*⁽²⁴²⁾ (our emphasis) Afterward: *“At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or - this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms - with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution, etc.”*... *“The bourgeois mode of production is the last antagonistic form of the social process of production.”*⁽²⁴³⁾ In a letter to Zasulich, he used the term historical inevitability, regarding the emergence of the capitalist method of production, stating: *“The ‘historical inevitability’ of this course is therefore expressly restricted to the countries of Western Europe.”*⁽²⁴⁴⁾ (our emphasis). Furthermore, in one of his letters: *“The class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat.”*⁽²⁴⁵⁾ In his few references to the nature and the role of the revolutionary party, Marx tended to give priority to the role of the economy and workers' spontaneity in the revolution, implying that the consciousness and struggle of the proletariat are inevitable (this will

⁽²⁴¹⁾ The German Ideology, Volume I, 5. Development of the Productive Forces as a Material Premise of Communism.

⁽²⁴²⁾ Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1848, Bourgeois and Proletarians.

⁽²⁴³⁾ A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, preface.

⁽²⁴⁴⁾ Marx -Zasulich Correspondence February/March 1881.

⁽²⁴⁵⁾ Abstract from Marx to J. Weydemeyer in New York:

“What I did that was new was to prove: (1) that the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production (historische Entwicklungsphasen der Production), (2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, (3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society.”

be highlighted later). The same applies to Kautsky⁽²⁴⁶⁾ and Trotsky.⁽²⁴⁷⁾ Afterward, Engels belatedly criticized this clearly: *“Marx and I are ourselves partly to blame for the fact that the younger people sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it. We had to emphasize the main principle vis -à -vis our adversaries, who denied it and we had not always the time, the place or the opportunity to give their due to the other elements involved in the interaction.”*⁽²⁴⁸⁾

But Marx and Engels repeatedly stressed the importance of the class struggle and workers' consciousness for the realization of the socialist project. The third thesis of Marx on Feuerbach states: *“The materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and upbringing forgets that circumstances are changed by men and that it is essential to educate the educator himself. This doctrine must; therefore, divide society into two parts, one of which is superior to society. The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionary practice.”* What is understood from the words of Marx and Engels is that capitalism is the last form of exploitation, and if the proletariat becomes conscious of the nature of this system and the nature of its historical role in the emancipation of human beings and practices class struggle, the result will be the implementation of communism. Both of them already predicted this outcome.

It is clear that there is an ambiguity about the concept of historical inevitability. The Marxist literature objecting to this concept presented some incomprehensible emotional talk about socialism vs. barbarism, considering socialism as the only way out from the fate of barbarism and from the tragedies of capitalism. Some of them used the concepts of “relative determinism” and

⁽²⁴⁶⁾ The road to power, pp. 8-9 (Arabic translation).

⁽²⁴⁷⁾ He stated: *“The revolutionary social democrat is convinced not only of the inevitable (!) growth of the political party of the proletariat, but also of the inevitable (!) victory of the ideas of revolutionary socialism within this party.”* Ernest Mandel, the Leninist theory of organization, II. Proletarian class struggle and proletarian class consciousness.

⁽²⁴⁸⁾ Engels to J. Bloch In Königsberg.

“probabilistic determinism” (meaning inevitability),⁽²⁴⁹⁾ as an interpretation of historical inevitability. This is a concept that combines the “laws” of history with the necessity of being conscious of them and the struggle for socialism. The concept means that Marxist inevitability is historical not physical (even modern physics is not mechanical), that is, it is just a tendency, not a solid law. But what is clear in Marxist literature is a definite prediction of the world's fate, which is socialism.

The proponents of economic or historical inevitability have been waiting for a long time without capitalism reaching a dead end and none of their predictions have come true. Socialism did not triumph nor did barbarism appear.

Finally, one wonders if the idea of historical inevitability is not included in Marxism. Then what is the need for all this dialectics, historical materialism, laws of history and the relationship between the forces and relations of production and between the substructure and the superstructure? In this case the socialist project with its theoretical simplicity becomes quite sufficient. The confusion most likely comes from Marxism's distinction between historical inevitability and inevitability in nature. The first is a historical tendency that may be prevented by a natural disaster, e.g., or a war of mutual annihilation between countries or classes, as stated in the Communist Manifesto, in contrast to inevitability in nature. This concept finds its origin in the idea of dialectical historical materialism, which rejects mechanical materialism. Marx cited the example of ancient Rome, where it had the factors of transformation to capitalism, but what happened in reality was the disintegration of its economy, *“but one will never arrive there by the universal passport of a general historico-philosophical theory, the supreme virtue of which consists in being super-historical.”*⁽²⁵⁰⁾

⁽²⁴⁹⁾ John Molyneux, Is Marxism deterministic?

⁽²⁵⁰⁾ Letter from Marx to Editor of the Otecestvenniye Zapisky.

Would it not be better for the consistency of the theory if Marx and Engels used the concept of historical necessity and renounced the concept of historical inevitability? This would involve considering necessity to include both the objective element, which is the contradictions of capitalism, and the subjective element, which is the workers' consciousness.

Marxism demonstrated the necessity (not saying inevitability!) of socialism as follows:

- There is an exacerbating contradiction within capitalism, which is the contradiction between the socialist nature of the productive process and the individual ownership of the means of production. Marx explained this process: *“capitalist property, resting as it actually does already on a form of collective production, cannot do other than transform itself into social property,”*⁽²⁵¹⁾ *“The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labor of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisition of the capitalist era: i.e., on cooperation and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production. The transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labor, into capitalist private property is, naturally, a process, incomparably more protracted, violent and difficult, than the transformation of capitalistic private property, already practically resting on socialized production, into socialized property. In the former case, we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people, etc.”*⁽²⁵²⁾ There is also a contradiction between the orderly nature of the production process at the enterprise level and the anarchy of production at the community level. It looks like the concept of the necessity of socialism is presented here according to the laws of history and the dialectical method as a solution to the contradictions of capitalism. Marx and

⁽²⁵¹⁾ Ibid.

⁽²⁵²⁾ Capital, Vol. I, ch. 32.

Engels elaborated this contradiction and explained its solution by the transition to the socialist mode of production.

- The contradiction between the interests of capitalism and the proletariat; the impoverishment is increasing and the wealth is also increasing;⁽²⁵³⁾ meaning relative impoverishment. Marx also imagined that the capitalist society is constantly increasing polarization with the transformation of the petty bourgeoisie or most of its members into the proletariat, then the number of laborers in society is constantly increasing, which stimulates the possibility of their victory (Kautsky also argued that the large number of laborers is their main weapon⁽²⁵⁴⁾). That is capitalism producing its own gravedigger; the proletariat.

- Among the important evidences is the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall over time, due to the increase in the value of constant capital (means of production) in exchange for wages, regardless of the presence of other incidental factors. Marx posed several mathematical models. In short, with scientific progress, the value of capital invested in equipment increases in relation to wages, as it is possible to operate a larger amount of constant capital with the same number of working hours. In conclusion, the rate of surplus value (the difference between the value of a worker's labor and the wages paid to him) does not change or may increase with the accumulation of capital and the increase in productivity, thanks to the decrease in the number of workers per unit of machinery, but the rate of profit extracted from them decreases. Indeed, with progress, the laborer can, with fewer hours of work, produce more and use more expensive machines, thus the organic composition of capital (the ratio of constant capital to variable capital [wages]) is increased. Nevertheless, the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall does not negate the possibility of increasing the amount of profit and the amount of surplus value. The decrease in the rate of

⁽²⁵³⁾ Capital, Vol. I. Chapter 25.

⁽²⁵⁴⁾ The Struggle of the Masses.

profit is due to the decrease in the ratio of variable capital (wages) to constant capital.⁽²⁵⁵⁾

However, there are other factors that counter the tendency of the rate of profit to decline. Therefore, the law is only a tendency of the rate of profit to decline without a final catastrophe. These are in short:⁽²⁵⁶⁾

*** Raising the rate of exploitation of the laborers, by increasing working hours, intensifying the work and increasing its productivity.**

*** Reducing the value of wages to be less than the value of the labor power.**

*** Reducing the value of constant capital, if calculated by working hours, by raising productivity.**

*** Overpopulation leads to an abundance of labor power, leading to reining wages.**

*** Expansion of foreign trade to expand the market. Thus, it becomes possible to increase the size of the production unit, so the cost of producing goods can be reduced by taking advantage of the economy of large scale. But Marx considered that this leads to an increase in the rate of profit in the short run, but leads to its decrease in the long run.**

In another context, Marx referred to the possibility of a decrease in the value of labor power due to the decrease in the value of means of subsistence, leading to an increase in the rate of surplus value; therefore, the rate of profit.⁽²⁵⁷⁾

The capitalist resorts to raising the rate of exploitation, decreasing the value of constant capital in relation to the variable and decreasing the value of labor power, to overcome the tendency of

⁽²⁵⁵⁾ Capital, Vol. III, Chapter 13.

⁽²⁵⁶⁾ Ibid., Chapter 14.

⁽²⁵⁷⁾ Ibid., Chapter 6.

the rate of profit to decline. All this constitutes factors for the mounting of class struggle and increasing the consciousness of the proletariat. But Marx did not refer to the possibility of a final crisis of capitalism due to the tendency of the rate of profit to decline, nor its automatic transformation to socialism, but he always stressed the importance of workers' consciousness and their struggle to play their historical role.

In conclusion, the capitalist mode of production is unstable and carries within it the factors of crisis, for which there is only - according to the Marxian conception- one solution; socialism.

3. The Socialist Revolution:

* Marx did not develop an integrated theory in socialism; on the contrary, he emphasized that such work is tantamount to an idealistic and unrealistic endeavor, and all that is possible is to draw mere preliminary features of the prospective system. He proposed two phases of the successor system; socialism, where capitalist ownership is nationalized, appropriated by the state, which will become a workers' state, and each individual will work according to his ability and take according to his work. The second stage is communism; a golden age -as he predicted- that will come in the distant future, when the state disappears, work will cease to be a necessity and each individual will give according to his ability and take according to his needs. Marx did not consider socialism just as a new system of ownership in which the worker gets a greater share and will cease to be a slave to the capitalist. Rather, the goal is not only to transfer the ownership of the capitalist to the workers, but it is a system in which all human beings are emancipated from alienation, even the capitalists themselves. So, production will be directed to satisfy both the material and spiritual needs of the people and will not be for the sake of profits, accumulation of wealth or increasing consumption. Moreover, work will be like a hobby, in

which a person realizes himself and highlights his creativity. The division of labor will no longer exist, so one can change his work whenever he wants, from farmer to shepherd to artist, etc. The market will disappear (everyone will get what he needs as mentioned), production will no longer be governed by blind market laws or competition, but by people's needs, so it will take place consciously, planned with the participation of individuals and the fetishism of commodities will disappear. In short, in communism, humanity will finally take its first step in the kingdom of freedom. Then the real history of human beings begins, as they will consciously make it, jumping from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom.

It is noticeable that Marx described his socialism as scientific socialism in contrast to what he called utopian socialism. Moreover, he did not base his advocacy for communism on a moral standpoint, but “*upon the inevitable collapse of the capitalist mode of production.*”⁽²⁵⁸⁾ Engels again emphasized this meaning: “*Socialism was no longer an accidental discovery of this or that ingenious brain, but the necessary outcome of the struggle between two historically developed classes - the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.*”⁽²⁵⁹⁾ What is perceived here from the concept of “necessary outcome” is: historical necessity; compatibility with the laws of history, etc. Again: “*Since the historical appearance of the capitalist mode of production, the appropriation by society of all the means of production has often been dreamed of, more or less vaguely, by individuals, as well as by sects, as the ideal of the future. But it could become possible, could become a historical necessity, only when the actual conditions for its realization were there. Like every other social advance, it becomes practicable, not by men understanding that the existence of classes is in contradiction to justice, equality, etc., not by the mere willingness to abolish these classes, but by virtue of certain new economic conditions.*”⁽²⁶⁰⁾ (our emphasis).

⁽²⁵⁸⁾ The Poverty of Philosophy, introduction by Engels.

⁽²⁵⁹⁾ Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, The Science of Dialectics.

⁽²⁶⁰⁾ Ibid., Historical Materialism.

*** Capitalism will not -according to Marx and Engels- automatically transform into socialism despite its alleged historical necessity. But this must be performed by the organized proletariat; by a revolution that overthrows that system. That can happen when it becomes conscious of itself ⁽²⁶¹⁾ and realizes that its historical role has come (Kautsky added that it will be obliged to undertake this task). In addition, it must destroy the bourgeois state apparatus immediately and establish its own state in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which requires violence, meaning mass violence not individual terrorism. The dictatorship of the proletariat needs a special state apparatus; a proletarian apparatus, whose task is to liquidate capitalism as a class and all its institutions; thereafter it withers and vanishes. Destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus is a prerequisite for the success of the revolution, as it is, by virtue of its special formation of authoritarian institutions, superimposed upon society; the most important stronghold of capitalism: *“the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes.”*⁽²⁶²⁾ Thus the beginning of the proletarian revolution is politics; seizure of political power first, not the economy as was the case with the bourgeois revolution. Here they sharply criticized the anarchist's plan; to abolish the state apparatus immediately without establishing another one. Marx and Engels believed that the transition from capitalism to communism needs an intermediate stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Moreover, the success of the proletarian revolution prerequisites appropriate social conditions; the degree of progress of the**

⁽²⁶¹⁾ This is originally the idea of Marx: *“this mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have noted only a few phases, this mass becomes united and constitutes itself as a class for itself. The interests it defends become class interests. But the struggle of class against class is a political struggle.”* “The Poverty of Philosophy, Strikes and Combinations of Workers.

⁽²⁶²⁾ The Civil War in France. Marx used here the word “destruction” as mentioned before: *“The unity of the nation was not to be broken, but, on the contrary, to be organized by Communal Constitution and to become a reality by the destruction of the state power.”* (our emphasis).

productive forces should be the maximum possible under capitalism. Therefore, they believed that revolution will take place in the most advanced capitalist countries. In addition, the proletarian revolution is an international revolution, as the workers have no country according to Marx and Engels. Therefore, they participated in the International Workers Association, or the “International,” the First and Engels only after the death of Marx in the Second, to involve the workers' organizations in the world. So, if the revolution takes place in one country, the cooperation of the workers of the world will continue, whether in the socialist countries or under the yoke of capitalism, so that the series of the proletarian revolution will continue.⁽²⁶³⁾

* Marx and Engels did not explain in detail the nature of the proletarian state, but described it as a semi-state, a state that “withers away” to give way to a fully communist system, where people run their own affairs. Marx described the Paris Commune, showing great sympathy with this type of government: suppression of the standing army and the attributes of officials - the Commune was formed of the municipal councilors, chosen by universal suffrage in the various wards of the town, responsible and revocable at short terms - establishment of self-administration of the regions - the vested interests and the representation allowances of the high dignitaries of state disappeared with the high dignitaries themselves - the public service had to be done at workman's wage and public offices ceased to be the private property of officials appointed by the central government - the Commune took in not only the municipal administration but also the whole initiative which the state had hitherto exercised - the whole educational institutions were opened to the people gratuitously and placed outside the influence of the Church - the judicial functionaries were to be divested of that sham independence which had but served to mask their abject subservience to all succeeding governments to which, in turn, they

⁽²⁶³⁾ Frederick Engels, *The Principles of Communism*.

had taken and broken the oaths of allegiance - like the rest of public servants, magistrates and judges were to be elective, responsible and revocable.⁽²⁶⁴⁾ All this included the abolition of the principle of separation of powers. This is also called a state-commune which was more democratic than bourgeois democracy because it was the dictatorship of the majority.

The revolution of the proletariat does not emancipate the workers only, but emancipates the whole society, so classes disappear in the end and then the state becomes no longer necessary and it dies out with time.⁽²⁶⁵⁾

4. Marxian political economy:

Marx presented his analysis of capitalism in a number of books, the most important of which is “Capital,” which is the pinnacle of his theoretical creativity.

The seed of capitalism is found in a small cell; the commodity. It consists of use-value and exchange-value since it is produced for the market. Marx espoused Ricardo's theory, which holds that the value of a commodity is determined by the time used in its production. As a worker's labor power is a commodity, its value is determined in the same way. Marx's deed was in his discovery that labor power, not labor, is the commodity that the worker sells, and this commodity can produce labor hours more than its own value. This difference is what the capitalist wins, called by Marx “surplus value.” He analyzed the process of producing surplus value in detail and its realization through exchange. Therefore, it becomes profit and then converted into capital in the process of expanded reproduction or capital accumulation. The process of exchange appears as if it takes place between things while it expresses a social relationship; a phenomenon which Marx called “commodity fetishism.” Thus he explained that capitalism is based on the

⁽²⁶⁴⁾ Op. cit.

⁽²⁶⁵⁾ Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Historical Materialism.*

exploitation of workers and the accumulation of wealth at the expense of their work. In this system, the worker eventually produces the capital that conquers him and he is alienated from the product of his labor. The accumulation of capital is achieved on one hand and the misery of the worker on the other, forming a contradiction that characterizes capitalist society. In addition, the worker was stripped of his ownership in favor of the capitalist since the labor process became collective or socialist instead of the old handicraft work, while the ownership of the tools of production has become in the hands of a few. Marx also explained the role of capitalism in revolutionizing production and stimulating scientific progress to increase its profits, and that this was its historical role. However, the capitalist mode of production will reach a stage at which it becomes less capable of achieving further growth, progress and accumulation of capital, as the rate of profit tends to decline. Therefore, the social revolution becomes necessary to change the capitalist relations of production to resume the process of development. Hence, capitalism becomes just a parasitic class and its historical role ends, to give way to another class. Marx's economic writings are full of highlighting the operations of capital, from producing surplus value, converting it into profit for the capitalist, rent for the real estate owner and bank interest. Additionally, the mechanisms of the process of capitalist accumulation and the efforts of capitalism to raise the rate of surplus value by various means, including developing the production process plus other mechanisms. As well as the analysis of the periodic crises resulting from the anarchy of capitalist production that results in a commodity surplus that is difficult to market, so the crisis occurs. Ultimately, the proletariat has to replace capitalism as a revolutionary class, emancipating itself and - in the context- the whole society from exploitation and alienation, and then it will cease to be a proletariat and capitalism will disappear as well. Thus the stratification will disappear from society. This is socialism.

Critical Remarks on Marx-Engels Theory:

Dialectics:

- **Hegelian Dialectics:** Hegelianism is based on the idea that the world is reasonable (without any “reasonable” justification for this idea itself). That is, it has a reason not needing justification from outside, which is God himself in religion. The whole aim of his philosophy is to find out the reason of the rational world according to his conception. The reason of the world in itself is not an object but a pure reason that is not conscious of itself or a petrified reason and described by Hegel as a piece of bone (Hegel did not believe in the existence of a higher being), i.e., objective and unconscious. In its realization it becomes the Spirit, meaning the human spirit. Pure reason logically goes forth into its opposite: Nature and then returns to itself in the Spirit, which represents the unity of pure reason with nature. In the Spirit moment, reason becomes realized; for itself. Ultimately, in the last concept in Hegelian philosophy; the concept of Philosophy, reason becomes conscious of itself. He considered the universe to be nothing but thought. Meanwhile, concrete (physical) things are mere representations of this thought, existing accidentally and without logical necessity. Every movement in the world is nothing but the movement of thought, history is nothing but “*the progression of consciousness of freedom*” and the Spirit is the absolute idea (pure reason at its highest concept) in its unity with nature. All those moments are logical moments, not temporal.

Hegel achieved a leap in metaphysics after Kant. The latter revealed the categories of reason, while he considered that what is known about the world is only what is accomplished through experience, without reaching the status of objects as they are; the real meaning of things, and he called this the “thing-in-itself” (=Noumena). What Hegel did was deeming the categories of reason as the same as the thing-in-itself, and thus it is not considered in-

itself. Human reason is the same reason that is embedded in the world, the real existence which is thought. Thanks to this unity between the two reasons it became possible to know the truth of things. It is important here to point out that the categories of pure reason for Kant are thematically related concepts but not connected in a logical system. Hegel decided to link these categories in a logical chain by deducing them from each other, starting from the category of “pure being,” and presented them in his two books: *The Science of Logic* and *the Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*.

However, Hegel could not actually solve the dilemma of the thing-in-itself: as he denied even the real existence of the concrete things; the subjects of Experience of Kant (according to Hegel: what is rational is real and what is real is rational).⁽²⁶⁶⁾

According to Hegel, dialectics is implied in the whole doctrine which begins with the science of logic. It is not a formal logic such as Aristotle's. Rather, it cannot stop except at the last category in Hegel's philosophy. So, he moved from the absolute idea to the philosophy of nature, then the philosophy of the spirit which ends with the category “Philosophy,” where philosophy becomes “*at home*,” in Hegel's expression. The logical transitions between the categories of logic imply the method of dialectics. What is meant is that Hegel did not start with the method and applied it to create the science of logic or his whole doctrine. According to his doctrine, he just presented reason, reviewing the logical movement of the categories. This movement that is carried out by the categories of logic themselves is the Dialectics. In another way dialectics is the way in which the categories derive from each other, which is only discovered. Therefore, dialectics is the dialogue of pure reason with itself, and the method of logic is its content not something external to it. The categories move from the thesis to antithesis to the synthesis; from the subject to the negation and then negation of the negation; from the immediate to the mediate to the unity of both; from the

⁽²⁶⁶⁾ *Philosophy of Right*, preface.

abstract to another abstract that negates the first abstract to the concrete (their synthesis); from being-in-itself to being-within-itself to being-for-itself; from the universal to the particular to individual, and so on. This triple rhythm is the method by which the categories move. The first moment in the triad is always the moment of immediacy and being in-itself, the second moment is its opposite and the third is a synthesis of both. All that one does is revealing the movement of these categories from one to another, starting from “pure being.” Nothing disappears from these categories, but they are “sublated” in the sense of negating and retaining meanwhile, that is, moving from one logical moment to another that negates and encompasses the previous moment. The conclusion is that the method is implied in the logic not just a means of presenting it. This is Hegel's conception of his method and doctrine. He did not use the concept of “laws” of dialectics as Engels did, but categories; Notions (all Hegelian categories are notions except the first two; pure being and pure nothing).

But this is the claim of Hegel himself. Actually, he did not present any deduction or deduce any category. All he did actually was abstracting the world into categories and then coordinating them in a certain system. He used dialectics as a mere way to present his philosophy, since he decided from the beginning to present the categories of the world in this way. There is no sense in saying that the categories deduce themselves, especially that he did not show any deduction convincingly. Nor were his conclusions for each of the preceding arguments convincing at all, which forced him to digress and give examples from the concrete reality, which he considered an unreal existence. Moreover, he used a Sufi language to present his ideas and violated even the rules of ordinary logic in deduction (deduction requires two premises and hence a judgment). He also resorted to using more concrete statements, before “deducing” them, to explain more abstract categories, such as using the category of “determination” in the first line of the body of his book “The Science of Logic” in the course of defining pure being, while the

explanation of the category of determination came in the second chapter of the book! Thus, his method, as he actually used was merely a method of presenting the categories of the world that were actually arrived at by induction. Of course, this is the writer's own perception, and many admitted the same opinion. This view justifies the use of Hegel's dialectics by Marx to present concrete categories such as the categories of capital, although Hegel claimed that it is the method of philosophy only to present the universal categories; rationally deduced, allegedly.

- Hegel's philosophy was the ultimate attempt to reach metaphysics to its culmination. He actually achieved that, but at the same moment, metaphysics demonstrated its final impotence. The colossal attempt to reveal the deep Truth of the world clearly failed. When one reads Hegel, they get dizzy from the enormous effort he made to reveal the final Truth, and meanwhile, they do not find that this doctrine is succeeding in convincing them. He claimed to deduce the world from a single simple category: Pure Being, then he proceeded from one category to another or displayed how the categories allegedly are deducing themselves. However, in facing the impossibility of that, he was obliged to resort to giving examples from ordinary physical events and often posed explanations and additional Remarks that he considered -implicitly- outside the system he presented. All this to seem committed to his famous triad (Theses - Antitheses - Syntheses). Despite all this, he could not commit to his triad in some steps.⁽²⁶⁷⁾ One of the most prominent examples of the weakness and disintegration of his method is deducing everything from pure being. If pure being is absolutely abstract as he deemed, how can it contain anything else?! That is why one feels when he reaches the category of "Becoming" - e.g.- and many others, that Hegel was implicated in this attempt. Therefore, he wrote long paragraphs that he called: Additions and

⁽²⁶⁷⁾ For example, in his book: The science of Logic, Part II (subjective logic), first section (subjectivity), Chapter II (Judgment).

Remarks as aforementioned to justify this strange triad; the first triad of his method and doctrine: Pure being - Nothing - Becoming.

The fatal weakness in Hegel's philosophy is the alleged and completely illusory deduction of the categories. Just exposing this illusion, the issue of the categories becomes the product of ordinary abstraction and the issue of the priority of thought over matter becomes a mere illusion. Thus, dialectics becomes a mere method for analyzing phenomena and a method for presenting the results of the analysis. There is nothing wrong with that, but it is neither the Truth of the world nor the laws of existence, as Engels claimed afterward. In fact, beings do not move from something into their opposite into their synthesis, and their movement does not include the moment of negation and then negation of the negation. Of course, thousands of examples of the validity of Engels' words can be cited, but thousands of counterexamples can also be given. Dialectics's content is the movement of thought; humans thought while arranging their conception of phenomena, nothing else.

- Hegelianism eventually stood helpless in front of the material world, concrete beings which are allegedly not real, i.e., not reasonable. Therefore, they are not a subject of philosophy and not considered something that can be understood rationally. Material existence on this basis is absurdly empty and meaningless. If it is admitted that thought is nothing but a human product, then all existence is absurd, without any reason or purpose. Hegel himself faced a dilemma when the philosopher Wilhelm Traugott Krug challenged the philosopher Schelling to deduce his quill or pen from German idealism's philosophy of nature and Hegel read the statement; the problem remained stuck in his mind. The response was repeatedly: tangible things cannot be deduced from abstract thought.⁽²⁶⁸⁾ This response includes an admission that concrete

⁽²⁶⁸⁾ Leonardo Abramovich, Hegel and Profess or Krug's Pen: The Erfahrung as Principle of the Logical Movement.

(Erfahrung = a German word meaning experience).

things have the Kantian thing-in-itself that Hegel dedicated great effort to overcome, thus falling into Kant's net. However, he did not give up; rather he considered that dealing with concrete beings is the subject of science, not philosophy. Nevertheless, this solution is also not convincing because physical science does not justify material things rationally, but follows the experimental method and direct observation. Hence, the problem of the thing-in-itself remains.

Marx rejected Hegel's dialectics and doctrine, seized his method, separated it from the doctrine as a whole and used it as if it is composed of natural laws of society. Then he used it as a method of presenting capitalism. This is understandable. But to claim that it became walking on its feet and that he discovered the rational kernel within the mystical shell; this is what is not understood; it is just a literary description. More importantly, he was supposed to write and explain his materialistic dialectical method. What is clear from expressions such as: “to walk on foot” and “to discover the rational kernel” is that it was considered by Marx -exactly like Engels as shall be seen- the law of the universe, not merely as a method of analysis or presentation. Engels clearly declared that dialectics is a tool for analysis as well as a law of the whole existence. The problem lies exactly in this idea. For instance, everything for Engels indicates that quantity turns into quality, citing many examples, but counter-examples can be given, without proving the existence of a logical necessity for this alleged law. Sartre and others criticized this in sufficient detail. ⁽²⁶⁹⁾For Hegel, quantity turns into quality (in the category of Measure) as two categories in the science of logic, but this applies to abstract thought only, not to concrete things. Yet he gave many examples of concrete things and phenomena allegedly just to clarify. If it is easy to refute Hegel's method, it is even easier to refute Engels' dialectics. It simply does not apply to everything, that is, it cannot be considered a general law. Hegel's method is a method of philosophy only and does not

⁽²⁶⁹⁾ Materialism and Revolution.

apply -according to his words- to concrete things, but the Marxists used it to analyze the concrete reality of nature and society, even without its induction, contenting by setting out examples. Dialectics of Hegel is metaphysics; the reason of the world, and for Marx, it is also metaphysics but without disclosure. Moreover, Engels dealt with dialectics as metaphysics as well. When he tried to escape from metaphysics, he went again to metaphysics, but unfortunately, it was poorer than that of Hegel. Laws lying outside the world and logically precede it are unconnected and only justified by giving examples. Engels evaded directly explaining the origin and relationship between the three laws of dialectics in his manuscripts, which were printed after a long time under the title: *Dialectics of Nature*: “*We are not concerned here with writing a handbook of dialectics, but only with showing that the dialectical laws are really laws of development of nature; therefore, are valid also for theoretical natural science. Hence, we cannot go into the inner interconnection of these laws with one another.*”⁽²⁷⁰⁾ Although there are many Marxist articles and pamphlets about the alleged materialist dialectics, none of them presented it as a method or as a coherent intellectual system. Only the Three Laws and some poetic phrases about the rational kernel within the mystical shell and stopping Hegel's method on its feet instead of its head. It is also strange that Engels misunderstood Hegelian dialectics and distorted Hegel's doctrine as well, without any necessity: the absolute idea existed somewhere - preceded the existence of earth - its movement took place since eternity in an unknown place - the prior existence of logical categories, etc. These strange ideas were repeated in a number of his writings. While the minimal understanding of Hegel requires knowing that he provided a logical philosophical analysis of the world, including human history; there was no any concept before the other temporally, but only in logic, and even he did not present the philosophy of history chronologically, but logically, from his point of view. He never said anything like that the Absolute Idea existed and thereafter created the world.

⁽²⁷⁰⁾ *Dialectics of Nature*, II, *Dialectics*, p. 19.

If Marx and Engels used Hegel's dialectics as a method of presentation and analysis, the matter would be clear and comprehensible. However, the pretense of turning it into a materialistic dialectics, as a general law of existence, that it is reduced to three laws in tandem with using some categories as appendices to those laws; this is what created the problems which are referred to. The application of dialectics to both nature and society let the concept of Dialectical Materialism emerges, which was never used by Marx or Engels, but was sculpted by Plekhanov in his explanation of the materialist concept of history,⁽²⁷¹⁾ thereafter, Lenin, who elaborated this materialism and presented a materialism in a way that deserves criticism as will be seen. Afterward, it was inherited by Stalinism and its proponents, with some minor expansions and additions. But, Rosa Luxemburg used the term "*materialist-dialectical conception of history*,"⁽²⁷²⁾ which is more accurate compared to all of the above.

Actually, speaking about materialistic dialectics is like talking about a square circle. Dialectics is the movement of thought, whether in human production of abstract thought or in perceptions and the analysis of phenomena. Stating that dialectics exists in things, society and history immediately leads to Hegel's metaphysics, not to the supposed materialism of Marx.

In reality, the world is a place where things exist in utter chaos and a delicate balance of powers. This balance, being limited, does not prevent cosmic catastrophes, from the collisions and collapse of stars and galaxies, to the formation of black holes and new stars, the death of cells, the disintegration of genes, etc. This applies to every point in the universe. The partial balances result from collisions that occur all the time, with the inability of the colliding forces to completely crush each other. What results from these balances is called a law or rules that seem to govern matter. These rules are

⁽²⁷¹⁾ He used this expression 12 times in his book: *The Materialist Conception of History*.

⁽²⁷²⁾ *Stagnation and Progress of Marxism*.

human perceptions and descriptions of the aforementioned equilibrium phenomena. Because humans' knowledge of things and phenomena is always incomplete, they cannot formulate their final relationships with each other, and the more they know about the world, the laws that they formulate are changed to understand the world better. That is why the idea that there are laws governing the entire universe, like dialectics, is described as metaphysics.

This does not lead to "the thing-in-itself," but to the fact that the knowledge of the truth is not complete; going on in the best case, without end. So, it is not possible to separate what is perceived and human current ability to perceive, which expands with the advancement of science and knowledge in general.

However, Hegel's dialectics is more consistent with his doctrine than with Marx's theory. His dialectics deals with abstract ideas, not with concrete things. Therefore, it can be claimed that the notion of Quality is transmitted to Quantity and vice versa (noting that the rational justification of Hegel is completely illusory). On the other hand, it cannot be proven that this is a rule including everything, simply because it cannot be substantiated by the trick of Hegelian deduction. What can be appropriate here is to give examples as Engels did, which is a very weak proof because there are many counter-examples as well.

This part is ended with a comparison between Marxism and Hegelianism in a very significant issue: for Hegel, philosophy is the final realization of the Absolute Idea, meaning that the philosopher becomes the embodiment of this Idea, possessing authority over the rest of humanity. In spite of prevailing the idea that Hegelianism is a speculative philosophy, in fact, it was not just so; Hegel himself stated clearly: "*With us philosophy is not practiced as a private art, as it was by the Greeks, but has a public place and should therefore, be employed only in the service of the state.*"⁽²⁷³⁾ In fact, Hegel himself became the official philosopher of the state. Hence, the principal idea in Marxism is

⁽²⁷³⁾ Philosophy of right, 24.

recalled: linking theory with praxis. For Marx and all Marxists, intellectuals -not the workers- are who produce the theory of the proletariat. Since the communists “*have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the lines of march, the conditions and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement,*”⁽²⁷⁴⁾ and that “*theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses.*”⁽²⁷⁵⁾ So, the intellectual master is the one who defines their theory for them and knows their interests as a class more than themselves. This prompted Marxist organizations in countries without a working class to declare that they are workers' parties. It was very significant that some submitted this solution to that problem: they are parties that carry the ideology of the international working class. Therefore, the parties became representatives of The Idea, not the class itself! Thence if those parties seize power, then, accordingly, the Idea will govern society, and the party is nothing but a torch-bearer of Truth, without any relationship to the already existing social powers. Therefore, the working class will be in power before it even exists! Lenin, following Marx and Engels and through Kautsky,⁽²⁷⁶⁾ stressed the idea saying that intellectuals only who can produce political consciousness of the proletariat because it cannot produce it by itself.⁽²⁷⁷⁾ Thence intellectuals' authority over the masses of workers comes. An idea that refutes Marx and Engels's saying of the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves. In both cases, the Spirit is realized in history through conveying thought from the elite to the people. Both Hegel and Marx believed that his philosophy or the Truth should be realized in a specific system. Hegel saw it in his lifetime and Marx expected it in the communist society in the future. In practice, the Spirit was actualized in the monarchical Prussian state in the first case; as “*The*

⁽²⁷⁴⁾ Manifesto of the Communist Party, Proletarians and Communists

⁽²⁷⁵⁾ Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Introduction.

⁽²⁷⁶⁾ The Class Struggle.

⁽²⁷⁷⁾ What is to be done? PDF file, pp. 17-18.

march of God in the world that is what the state is. The basis of the state is the power of reason actualizing itself as will” ⁽²⁷⁸⁾ and in the Soviet state (and similar ones) in the second case. To eschew injustice, let it be pointed out that Hegel's state was less ugly than the state of Marx, who -like Hegel- appointed himself the philosopher of the Soviet state, although each was not responsible for their establishment. Indeed, certainly the Soviet state was never Marx's dream, but its opposite.

The weakness of the two systems lies in claiming to know the final Truth. In fact, humans know “facts,” aspects and sides of the truth of the world; a knowledge that is never fulfilled, as was argued before.

Nevertheless, Marxism differs from Hegelianism in its claim about how it discovered dialectics. Hegel claimed that he just unmasked it in the movement of categories while they deduce each other, but Marx, and Engels in particular, rejected this deduction and considered dialectics to be the laws of the world by induction, according to the latter's words, ⁽²⁷⁹⁾ while actually he extracted his dialectics from the folds of dialectics of Hegel, claiming that it is the law of the universe.

Dealing with dialectics as it is; an instrumental method -among other possible ones- can be useful and solves the problem completely. There is no absolute idea, no universal laws, no spirit, but living human powers. Yet presenting dialectics in the form of the absolute Truth, leads to the idea of historical teleology, hence, historical inevitability.

Historical Materialism:

⁽²⁷⁸⁾Hegel, Op. cit., 258.

⁽²⁷⁹⁾ Engels wrote in his book: *Dialectics of Nature: “It is; therefore from the history of nature and human society that the laws of dialectics are abstracted.”* (p. 19), and elaborated the same before in: *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, part 2.

*** One of the most important ideas added by Marx is his conception of the relationship between the forces and relations of production, and his sketch of the social formation as a whole. In short, the level of the productive forces determines the social relations of production, which together form the mode of production; the substructure, which results in the so-called superstructure, including the social institutions; the state and various forms of organizations, ideology and juridical forms, etc. When the productive forces advance to a point where the existing relations of production become fetters to this progress, the social revolution becomes necessary to pave the way to resume the advancement of the productive forces. Therefore new relations of production are formed that open the door to the advancement of the productive forces, just as the superstructure changes to suit the new substructure.**

History has been moving -as it seems- in the direction of the advancement of the productive forces and removal of the relations that hinder this tendency in only one case: the transformation of Western Europe to capitalism. In primitive communal societies, for example, there was no contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production. But human envy and greed stirred conflicts between tribes, leading to the emergence of the state and the division of people into classes. There was no objective necessity for this historical change in the social system. In that case, the development of productive forces preceded the change of relations of production in time, but it was neither justifying nor a cause for it. In Europe, it was not the development of the productive forces that led to the transformation of the slave system into feudalism, but the Germanic invasion. On the other hand, it was the capitalist transformation that took place thanks to the development of industry thereafter. Nevertheless, regarding capitalism outside Western Europe there was no direct relationship between the forces and relations of production on the lines of the aforementioned idea of the hand-mill and the steam engine, but rather just a tendency.

China and India were more advanced than Europe before its capitalist transformation, yet this transformation took place in Europe. Collective servitude was practiced in the Soviet Union despite the continued development of the productive forces throughout decades of the Soviet era. Modernization in the Third World took place thanks to colonialism, not because of the contradiction of forces and relations of production. This aligns with Marx's assertions that his sketch for the emergence of capitalism is limited to Western Europe, but it contradicts his repeated statements about revolutions being the locomotives of history and the relationship between the forces and relations of production in general. Besides, setbacks, counter-revolutions and the impact of natural disasters are always possible and have happened repeatedly. Just as there are no definite stages in history, and there is no happy ending or salvation for mankind; there is no inevitability of socialist transformation.

*** As Marx pointed out, the difference between stratified systems lies in the form of extracting surplus, which is determined by the level of productive forces. For example, it is not possible for individuals to be forced to work as space science researchers, just as it would have been impossible to force people not to collect fruits and instead build a large house for a leader, as they would have starved. As technology continues to advance, the necessity for a proletariat class diminishes, leading to the eventual collapse of capitalism. There is a correlation between the level of productive forces and the relations of production, but there is not always a clear independent or dependent variable. Social transformation occurs in a complex and uneven manner without a specific law. The change in relations of production may precede or follow the development of productive forces, depending on various circumstances and contingent factors in the history of societies, each requiring a unique analysis. When comparing the transformation of old communes into the slavery system in Western Europe, then slavery into feudalism**

and finally feudalism into capitalism, a clear difference in the initial factor of transformation can be observed.

* The superstructure plays an essential role in reproducing the substructure, assuming that the substructure represents the material component and the superstructure represents the spiritual component of society according to the Marxian conception. This is a point that Marx and Engels emphasized repeatedly.

In reality, the substructure cannot reproduce itself independently within the confines of the economy alone; it is more than just that. Labor power is not merely a machine but a complex entity imbued with experience, values, concepts and beliefs that belong to the superstructure. Therefore, the superstructure plays a crucial role in shaping and reprogramming labor power. How can labor power be reproduced without education, for example? The distinction between the components of the socio-economic formation -the substructure and the superstructure- is not a rigid and fixed separation of specific institutions or components as posited by Marxism, but a distinction that overlaps with the functions of these components. For instance, the state serves as a productive force in riverine societies in addition to its role in the superstructure. Political relations and religion can also have a role in the substructure, such as mobilizing people to serve the ruler as a deity. In many societies, including Egypt throughout its history, the creation of wealth primarily occurs through affiliation with the state apparatus.

In essence, the same apparatus or institution may belong to both the substructure and the superstructure, and each organization or system fulfills multiple roles. There is no purely ideological or repressive institution; even the repressive state apparatus, such as the army, plays significant ideological roles. The school, in addition to its teaching function, also has a repressive and educational role, indoctrinating children with desired norms. Religious institutions in some countries may have police and repressive functions, such as the Committee for the Promotion of Virtue in Saudi Arabia, which had

the authority to arrest and beat individuals. Al-Azhar, for example, played a role in censoring literary and artistic works and inciting the state to suppress critics of the official religion and morals. When people were gathered for forced labor, they underwent direct cultural reprogramming. The army participates in re-educating recruits through a process of brainwashing. It is important to note that each component of the socio-economic formation has a degree of relative independence. Therefore, not all components change simultaneously; elements of the superstructure may persist long after changes in the substructure, particularly ideology. This principle applies to all components of the social formation, as the relations of production are crucial in the practice and reproduction of productive forces, along with the interactive relationship between religion and the state. Transformations in the superstructure, in the Marxian sense, have occurred frequently in history without corresponding changes in the substructure. One notable example is the shift in religion among the inhabitants of the Middle East after the Arab invasion, while the substructure remained unchanged, influenced by shifts in political power and governance. In conclusion, the concepts of substructure and superstructure are more fluid than presented in Marxism, involving a combination and separation of specific instances and functions.

* There are no metaphysical principles beyond the historical movement. There are no laws, no inevitability and no final intrinsic purpose of history. All there is: first: constants (as Althusser argued): the constant of conflict and cooperation between humans and nature, the constant of conflict and cooperation between humans, plus psychological and biological constants in humans. Secondly, there is an escalation of human needs that follow one another. Satisfaction of a need creates a new need, as a constant tendency. The latter entails thirdly: a tendency for the development of the productive forces, the relations of production and the superstructure; just a general tendency with undefined features.

*** Marx was not concerned with explaining human behavior: why some people sought to dominate the rest of the people, why people accepted division into classes and why the rich are often seeking more wealth. He was interested in reviewing what happened and what is happening in society, according to “laws,” which he did not specify how he arrived at. These include the laws of the relationship between the forces and relations of production and between the substructure and the superstructure, just indicating that the matter takes place without the will of the people, as if they are metaphysical laws. This is the positivist aspect of Marxism. Indeed, society is formed and its general structure changes without a prior plan, without people's will. However, people in this state follow certain inclinations, which are precisely what they have as a special nature; specific responses to changes in reality and reactions of a certain kind that need to be understood. This is not a mere missed point, but a great inadequacy. As the answer to these questions responds in advance to subsequent questions related to how to build and ensure the establishment of socialism, the withering away of the state and the disappearance of classes. Kautsky later attempted to fill this loophole. Nevertheless, the writings of Marx and Engels -especially the earlier ones- are not devoid of quick references to human selfishness or to this psychological element within human formation and to envy and greed, as factors for the emergence and continuity of classes, the state and oppression. But they did not provide a specific analysis or a way to overcome these inclinations. Engels described the transformation of primitive communism into the class system as: “*The power of this primitive community had to be broken and it was broken. But it was broken by influences which from the very start appear as degradation, a fall from the simple moral greatness of the old gentile society. The lowest interests, base greed, brutal appetites, sordid avarice, selfish robbery of the common wealth, inaugurate the new civilized, class society. It is by the vilest means theft, violence, fraud, treason that the old classless gentile society is undermined and overthrown. And the new society itself, during all the two and a half thousand years of its existence, has never been anything else but the***

development of the small minority at the expense of the great exploited and oppressed majority; today it is so more than ever before.” ⁽²⁸⁰⁾

Many questions were left unanswered by historical materialism, such as: What ensures that bosses and leaders are dedicated to achieving the goals of the class they represent? What guarantees the commitment of the proletarian state to dissolve itself after achieving its supposed goals? What explains the tendency of intellectuals to betray their revolutionary slogans? (This query was raised by Lenin, Kautsky, and many others).

Marx criticized fetishism but created a great fetishism: the fetishism of the economic factor. He portrayed the emergence of classes, the movement of capital and the movement of society in general as if they were the movement of things: value, surplus value, the accumulation of capital and resistance to the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. However, he never asked the question: Why do people act in this way? Why do rulers seek more power, and why do the wealthy seek to hoard more wealth when they already have enough to live luxuriously for their entire lives? Why have people embraced capitalist values and rejected values of self-sufficiency, etc.? While he highlighted that capital is a social relationship, not just a quantity of money, he depicted the movement of history as if it follows laws, labeling this the materialistic concept of history; people create relationships and systems without their will. He was aware of the actual mechanism of historical movement, but his formulation included the aforementioned fetishism. He insisted on presenting a socio-economic science that his students called historical materialism.

* As Kautsky righteously noted, the history of the world before the capitalist era was not the history of the class struggle as stated in the Communist Manifesto. Did a revolutionary class emerge and transform primitive communalism into a slavery system? Was there a revolution during that period? Engels corrected this issue in the

⁽²⁸⁰⁾ The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, III.

1883 edition of the Manifesto by excluding the stage of primitiveness from this rule. However, it should be noted that the Germanic invasion of the Roman Empire led to feudalism, the Arab invasion of the Middle East and elsewhere caused significant social transformations, followed by the Ottoman invasion. Moreover, it was the European colonization of the world that dismantled the pre-capitalist system and introduced modernity and even private property in some countries. America did not become capitalist as a result of a serf revolt against feudalism, but as a result of the European invasion and extermination of the indigenous population. In ancient and medieval times, history proceeded under the influence of the struggle and wars of states and nations, not the very faint struggle of classes: the struggle among the Persians, the Romans and the Byzantines, afterward the Arab Muslims appeared on the scene, later the Tartars and then the Crusaders from Europe, etc. It is very easy to notice that the transformation of communal societies into class societies took place without revolution or class struggle, as there were no classes. Simply, society was divided into classes with the development of the productive forces, which made theft and plunder possible rather than inevitable. Tribal conflicts were the prelude to the emergence of states and classes. Additionally, these conflicts preceded any emergence of economic surplus to the extent that the killing of captives was the rule because there was no benefit in enslaving them before the possibility of producing a surplus appeared. More importantly the social struggle before capitalism was not a class struggle. Rather, it involved a struggle of the poor against the rich. Even according to Marx and Engels: “*Every class struggle is a political struggle.*”⁽²⁸¹⁾ In fact the struggle of the exploited classes against their masters did not take the form of a political struggle before the emergence of the capitalist class. Among other forms of social conflict were the conflicts of states and ethnicities. Just recall how the Abbasid state, which lived for

⁽²⁸¹⁾ Manifesto of the Communist Party - Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy, p. 29.

centuries and the various tribal states that followed on the throne of Islamic countries throughout the Middle Ages, were established.

* The emergence of classes, exploitation and oppression within a single society must inevitably be due to the existence of selfish tendencies in humans. If they were innocent they would cooperate and communal society would continue with a fair division of labor. This goes hand in hand with having a psychological predisposition to submit as well. There is a problematic idea that depicts the emergence of classes and the state as an objective necessity and that the dominant classes have fulfilled their “historical” role (this seems to be implied in some writings of Marx and Engels)⁽²⁸²⁾. It is an idea that averts a conception of another situation that would be possible if human beings were to cooperate rather than exploit each other. It was the appearance of surplus production in society and its ever-increasing that made the emergence of classes and exploitation possible. Without the development of the productive forces to the extent of producing a surplus, classes and the state would not have appeared (this is one of the manifestations of relationship between the forces and relations of production). It is evident that the imposition of a mode of production based on the exploitation of humans by human has always necessitated the use of violence as a substitute for cooperation between people. It is not conceivable that a class of people would have accepted a life of slavery for purely economic reasons. At the beginning of slavery, wars and the process of capturing played a crucial role in creating the slave class. Throughout history, the state played the role of supporting the propertied class and oppressing the poor classes, including the formation and development of capitalism. Violence was a prerequisite for the formation and re-formation of hierarchical systems, in the presence of economic conditions suitable for exploitation. There is no doubt that the economic factor is a crucial factor in history, but violence and -of course- ideology; especially

⁽²⁸²⁾ For example; the book: Anti-Dühring, chapter: Theory of Force.

religion, are equally important factors. It is worth noting that the hierarchical systems before capitalism were characterized by extracting the surplus by non-economic means; direct authoritarianism backed -of course- by ideology. As for human selfishness, it is, first of all, only one of their inclinations among others, on top of which is their tendency to cooperate and work collectively, in tandem with sympathizing with the suffering, etc. Secondly, it is not necessarily equal to following their material interests at every moment. In addition, the ideas and social habits inherited from their ancestors influence their behavior. Of course, ideology plays an important role in this regard; otherwise, the people would have fought like hell against the corrupt governments and exploiting classes long ago. This does not negate, of course, that material interests play an essential role in people's behavior, within their understanding of these interests, especially in the capitalist era, when everything became offered in the market. Moreover, there is no doubt that voluntary servitude played a fundamental role in the emergence of the state and classes, but its existence was linked and still linked to the existence of violence and cruelty on the other hand. This voluntary servitude is not explained by historical materialism.

* As for the occurrence of a contradiction between forces and relations of production, its alleged effect was not witnessed before the emergence of the bourgeoisie. How is the emergence of this contradiction in the communal society conceived? What makes people fight rather than cooperate since surplus production appeared? Why did that society not continue (assuming that it was really egalitarian) and why do people not now communicate and go beyond the systems of exploitation, discrimination, racism, etc.? Does the mere emergence of the possibility of exploiting people each other inevitably lead to the emergence of class systems? Can it be concluded from Marx's words that there is a "historical inevitability" for the transformation of the primitive egalitarian society into a class society without taking into consideration that constant psychological factor? The advancement of the productive

forces did not make the continuation of that egalitarian system impossible, nor did crises develop in that system that led to the necessity of its transformation into a slavery or feudal system. It lacks an analysis of the human element itself; its probabilities and inclinations. It is necessary for human beings to go beyond competition, conflict and the pursuit of excellence, for their culture to change and for their selfish tendencies to be overcome. Is it possible? What can certainly be done is the pursuit of this; a perpetual pursuit. To make the matter clearer, it can be said that the constant human element is the existence of a selfish inclination in humans and their tendency towards acquiring status and power, not necessarily by obtaining wealth or achieving material interests. Rather, the wealthy in ancient societies often achieved status at the expense of their material interests by providing assistance to the poor. Without that constant, some of them would not have decided to enslave others. For clarification, the issue is summarized in two queries: Why did people prefer to switch to the class system with its struggles and battles throughout history over continuing the old egalitarian system? What is the crisis that occurred in that system and forced the people to prefer stratification and conflict? There is an element that is only implicit in Marxian analysis; the decisive factor in all social transformations: the psychology of humans themselves. Certainly, culture and experience alter or modify the inclinations, but the latter are still present and may take over in some circumstances. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that culture is what distinguishes human beings from other creatures, and it is, of course, a consequence of the environmental and social reality; the variable element. It cannot be decided that the selfishness of humans is an eternally fixed element, but it remains –so far- an independent element.

* Marxists tend to divide society into classes, considering other sections as mere appendages to them, such as state employees, the marginalized, the middle sections and the intelligentsia. Now it has become clear that the intelligentsia with its various categories has

become a huge power in number and influence, not all of them are in the service of capitalism, but even some are marginalized as well. The marginalized people of every kind have become an important social power. Just as the bureaucracy has become a privileged section with its own interests and sharing capitalism its profits. The military, as well, in many countries has become a social section that has huge interests, not just a servant of capitalism.

* The materialist conception of history is ultimately a perspective. Although orthodox Marxists claimed that it is the correct one, they acknowledged that it is the perspective of the proletariat, on the basis that the latter is the revolutionary class that has the historical role in establishing socialism. Thus, conveniently forgetting that the bourgeoisie -according to their logic- was also the class that had a historical role in liberating labor and achieving modernity, so was its view also the Truth?! Some Marxists say: yes, the bourgeoisie adopted dialectics in its revolutionary phase and then gave it up to the proletariat (this dialectics was already addressed above). Where is the dialectical truth about the contradictions of capitalism and the inevitability of socialism when the proletariat began to disintegrate as a class after the tremendous scientific development, giving way to automation and robotics? In fact, history is cumulative, in the sense that the succeeding stage finds its roots in the preceding stage. The results are found in the premises, but it is not possible to predict a specific and determined path for the stages of development of societies except in general terms; a historical development in this sense alone. Regardless of incidental factors (such as the occurrence of a catastrophe that changes the course of a society or a conflict between two countries that may lead to results which cannot be attributed to the reality of each of them isolated from the course of the conflict and its interactions), the will of human beings has a decisive role in the movement of history and their consciousness has some independence from their social status.

*** One of the well-established ideas of Marxism is that each class has a specific historical mission or at least the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Even if it is unable to do it, another class or section can do it on its behalf, as is the case in Bonapartism, the permanent revolution of the Trotskyist theory and in the case of the workers and petty bourgeoisie carrying out the bourgeois revolution in France. Rather, the state also has a historical mission, defined by Engels, as aforementioned, in controlling the class struggle to maintain the social system. This idea finds its basis in the idea of historical inevitability, which is ambiguous and disputed among Marxists. It is a metaphysical idea and seems very theological, arming the Marxists with the weapon of faith in the inevitability of triumph, which pushes them to interpret the events of history in a non-materialistic way. Here the example of Rosa Luxemburg's analysis of the Russian Revolution is recalled (she rejected historical inevitability). She attributed what happened there, not to “*Russia's unripeness which has been proved by the events of the war and the Russian Revolution, but the unripeness of the German proletariat for the fulfillment of its historic tasks.*”⁽²⁸³⁾ The conception of Marxists -in general-at that time is summarized as: the socialist revolution is international and it must take place in the most advanced countries. While, the Bolsheviks imagined that it could start in Russia (the Leninist “weak link” theory⁽²⁸⁴⁾) and then extend to Europe. So that revolutions in Europe would rush to help Russia to quickly overcome its backwardness. Since this did not happen, the German proletariat would have lagged behind or not ripened to carry out its historical mission! On the other hand, the Russian Mensheviks and their proponents in Europe rejected the idea of the proletariat seizing power in Russia under the pretext that the nature of the revolution was bourgeois, although the political circumstance allowed that,**

⁽²⁸³⁾ The Russian Revolution 1917, p. 1.

⁽²⁸⁴⁾ Lenin argued that the imperialist countries are links in one coherent chain and Russia was the weakest link in the chain. So if this link is broken the whole chain will break. Because Russia is the weakest ring, it is easy to be broken; therefore the revolution will extend to the rest of the chain.

which is what actually happened under the leadership of the Bolsheviks. As for the idea of a class playing a role in history on behalf of another class, it is a clear example of the metaphysical character of the theory of historical inevitability. Instead of analyzing the facts in the light of the actual balance of power, a specific path of history and specific historical tasks are envisioned for each class à priori.

The idea that the bourgeoisie has a historical role is conservative, even counter-revolutionary. Firstly, it includes a specific timing for revolutions that cannot succeed before it; when the so-called objective conditions for the establishment of new relations of production are ripe. Secondly: justifies the domination of those classes at a stage called their historical rise. Thirdly, it calls on the popular classes to walk behind or ally with those who exploit them in their alleged historical rise.

* The idea of historical inevitability involves appealing for help from history; from the laws of existence, to justify the struggle of the proletariat, exactly as some religions do. As if the struggle for freedom, progress and welfare needs an objective justification, while it is enough to criticize the status quo and bourgeois ideology to call on the masses to fight for their emancipation.

* The idea of historical inevitability reminds one of the famous Islamic problematic question, "Are human beings free or determined?" which has been a topic of disagreement regarding its meaning and limits. There is no definitive answer provided by the Marxists. However, the next question may determine the matter: Does Marxism envision other possible paths of history besides the communist end? The only response given by Rosa Luxemburg is: socialism or barbarism, and Lenin's elusive answer suggests that capitalism will always find a way out unless it is destroyed by the conscious intervention of the revolutionary party. This implies that capitalism can only transition into socialism, which is the essence of historical inevitability. Many Marxist thinkers have analyzed and

argued that capitalism has reached a dead end and is on the brink of collapse.⁽²⁸⁵⁾

According to all of the above, the idea of historical inevitability contradicts Marxian materialism, as it depicts history as being governed by independent laws that define tasks for the various social powers and define a specific path for the world with a happy ending. Thus, the Absolute Idea is ruling the world.

* Marx refused to draw up a socio-historical model for the world, limiting his sketch to Western Europe. Based on the previous analysis, it can be added that the scheme of historical materialism as a whole, not just its historical model, is not suitable for explaining the movement of societies in general, but applies only to the capitalist stage in Western Europe, and there is no alternative scheme. An attempt to summarize the world in a pattern will not always succeed in explaining the various historical phenomena, so its proponents will be obligated to use the Procrustes method.⁽²⁸⁶⁾

* Marxism depicts the working class as one international class by virtue of the unity of its interest in achieving the socialist revolution. This idea formed the basis for presenting Marxism as the theory of the world proletariat. Accordingly, international organizations were established one after the other in the wake of successive failures.

⁽²⁸⁵⁾ Many examples are available. e.g., Lenin's book: *Imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism*. The title itself implies this meaning - the manifesto of the fourth international 1946 - Trotsky, *The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, where he said in part I: *"The economic prerequisite for the proletarian revolution has already in general achieved the highest point of fruition that can be reached under capitalism. Mankind's productive forces stagnate. Already new inventions and improvements fail to raise the level of material wealth. Conjunctural crises under the conditions of the social crisis of the whole capitalist system inflict ever heavier deprivations and sufferings upon the masses. Growing unemployment, in its turn, deepens the financial crisis of the state and undermines the unstable monetary systems. Democratic regimes, as well as fascist, stagger on from one bankruptcy to another."* - Recently a research titled: *World perspectives: 2018 - a year of capitalist crisis*.

⁽²⁸⁶⁾ This is a Greek mythos about a rogue smith and bandit from Attica who attacked people by stretching them or cutting off their legs, so as to force them to fit the size of an iron bed.

One often reads the statement: workers have no country, as if denying reality is enough to annihilate its existence! This idea formed the basis for creating Marxist parties in countries without workers, presenting themselves to the world as workers' parties. Likewise, the Marxists in Russia anticipated that their revolution would receive support from the European proletariat when it also would carry out its revolution. Any phenomenon that contradicts this perception was depicted as an opportunistic deviation, as a result of workers' lack of consciousness or the betrayal of the labor movement by its bureaucratic leaders.

In actual reality, the workers are engaging in the armies of colonialism and supporting their countries in their colonial foreign wars, which aimed to suck the blood of the peoples of other countries. As shall be seen, it was the Zionist socialist left that played the greatest role in the establishment of the apartheid state of Israel. Today, the workers of the West are fighting to prevent the “illegal” immigration of the unemployed and the proletariat of Eastern Europe and the Third World. The examples are countless that the workers have national affiliation and national interests just like the capitalists, who also have no country but they fight over profit taking advantage of patriotic slogans.

*** Marxism insists that the division of people into classes is deeper than any other division. This view is only an imagination of what it must be from its point of view. Reality indicates otherwise while the Marxists interpret this metaphysically: the objective interests of the proletariat define it as one international class and the other divisions are the result of the deceptions of capitalism. Instead of launching from the ground; from concrete reality, Marxism proceeds from heaven; from a metaphysical idea, contrary to its claim that it proceeds from earth to heaven. As if the proletariat must be one class and must believe in communism because this and that are the absolute Truth. This claim would have been believed if the proletariat violated this Marxian idea only a few times, but when it violates it along the line except for short moments and scattered**

actions, this refers to a metaphysical character of Marxism. It presented an idea and prospecting that reality should correspond with it.

Using the same reasoning, most of the orthodox Marxists imagine capitalism as one global class and the local capitalisms are but its arms and branches, despite the commercial and military wars between them all the time. The existence of global capitalism cannot be denied, but it is never the sum of local capitalisms (this issue will be addressed later).

Actually, social groups do not think about “historical” interests and do not seek to sacrifice their interests in the foreseeable future for the sake of imaginary interests in unforeseen prospects. Otherwise, the propertied classes would donate their wealth, dissolve their armies and sit down with the rest of the people at the table of public dialogue on the future of humanity to achieve beautiful and more comfortable cooperation and happiness for all! All human beings are looking to the foreseeable future. For this reason they are divided into classes, peoples, nations, ethnicities and so on, to varying degrees. That is the reality.

The root of Marxian metaphysics is monitored at this point in its conception of the relationship between the substructure and the superstructure and even in the definition of each. The economic factor, according to Marxism, is the ultimate determinant of the superstructure, which includes the intellectual and organizational products of human beings. Thus, Marxism neglected the inclinations inherent in the structure of the human psyche, despite their essential role in social formation and the historical movement in the long run, which is more than and standing behind the economic factor itself. There is also ignoring of the role of the forms of social organization since human appearance on earth, such as the division of labor based on gender and age differences and the distribution of powers within the clan. This is in addition to what was referred to before about the division of people into classes, rulers and the ruled because of the bloody conflict between the tribes; that is, the division

into tribes was earlier and deeper than the division into classes. The emergence of the state and classes resulted from tendencies to plunder and conquest of others side by side with voluntary servitude, not as a result of economic development. In conclusion, the division of people on non-economic grounds is an “authentic” human reality, not the product of an alleged trick or opportunistic behavior by leaders, without denying the role of this and that. Thus, the Marxian superstructure preceded the substructure. This perception does not negate the primacy of reality over thought, but not especially the mode of production. Elements such as material needs, the need for security, fear of the future and some forms of social organization constitute an objective reality.

* If the dialectics of Marx and Engels is considered the law of existence, in addition to historical materialism with its laws governing history and the historical missions of classes, an objective idealism philosophy is revealed, contrary to the portrayal of Marxism as a materialistic theory. According to this philosophy, the world is governed by laws, and history progresses in a specific direction due to the laws of dialectics. Consequently, it is inferred that thought (or the Absolute Idea) governs the world.

It is also more practical and "materialistic" to address social phenomena based on actual facts rather than relying on a Procrustes bed-like system.

Scientific socialism:

* Neither the class of slaves nor the class of serfs achieved victory in a revolution. Even when slaves succeeded in their revolts, they ended up with new slave systems. Similarly, peasant and worker revolutions led to the dominance of capitalism, which is why Marxists refer to them as bourgeois revolutions. Therefore, how can it be extrapolated that the workers' struggle will result in a socialist system rather than the emergence of a new ruling class? This is precisely what occurred in Russia and all former socialist countries.

*** It is a curious phenomenon that instead of defeating the bourgeoisie, capitalism is gradually eradicating the proletariat. The advancement of machinery and production equipment is rapidly displacing labor, and the increasing prevalence of three-dimensional printers, robotics and artificial intelligence is a new development. Individual private work is becoming more common, and the progress in technology now allows individual projects to potentially replace capitalist enterprises. Marx himself alluded to the growth of automation as a sign of the impending end of capitalism. In a complex and challenging draft, he wrote: *“it is the machine which possesses skill and strength in place of the worker.” “The worker’s activity, reduced to a mere abstraction of activity,”* meaning mental work, etc. *“The increase of the productive force of labor and the greatest possible negation of necessary labor is the necessary tendency of capital, as we have seen”...* *Capital thus works towards its own dissolution as the form dominating production.*”⁽²⁸⁷⁾**

Huge blocs of the marginalized and semi-marginalized have emerged, most of whom are working and producing, but they represent the greatest threat to the capitalist system and third world systems. Marx’s theory did not anticipate or assimilate the possibility of the emergence of these blocs as a new “class” of huge size and radical thinking, working in production, distribution and exchange, and encompassing various disciplines (this issue will be analyzed in a following chapter). Nor did Marx’s theory assimilate or imagine the transformation of technocratic groups into a huge class that contributes significantly to added value, making blue-collar workers much less important in the production process.

Furthermore, there is a decline in the phenomenon of the anarchy of production to some extent with the growth of trusts, cartels, multinational corporations and other entities such as feasibility study offices.

Furthermore, there is a decline in the phenomenon of the anarchy of production to some extent with the growth of trusts,

⁽²⁸⁷⁾ The Fragment on Machines.

cartels, multinational corporations and other entities such as feasibility study offices.

Besides, Marx's theory about the tendency of the rate of profit to decline under the capitalist mode of production contains a fallacy. Wages are decreasing if calculated in terms of working hours, as a result of the development of productivity, just as the value of constant capital is decreasing in terms of working hours as a result of the same factor. Thus, the rate of surplus value is increasing as a result of the change in the organic composition of capital. Marx himself referred to this as aforementioned, without giving it appropriate value. He assumed what he called the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, considering that its tendency to rise is affected by the mechanisms which he called the opposite factors. As if the tendency to decline is the basic tendency, while -in fact- both tendencies are basic in the performance of capital, which, according to Marx himself, tends to develop means of production and raise labor productivity as an inherent feature. There is no basic tendency for the rate of profit to decline, but mechanisms of capital accumulation that maintain its rate or raise it or hinder its decline. This is if the accidental or “induced” opposite factors are put aside, such as lowering wages below the value of the labor power or increasing working hours. Economic studies that were carried out to reveal the tendency of the rate of profit showed that it does not tend to decline continuously, but it rises and falls according to several factors.⁽²⁸⁸⁾ What is certain is that the worker's wage, if calculated in terms of the worker's hours, is constantly decreasing, as the worker's needs of goods and services cost less and less of labor hours. Indeed, the same applies to the value of equipment and raw materials, which have been decreasing if calculated by the labor hours needed to produce them, thanks to the continuous rise in productivity of both the machines and the labor power. The employment of a single worker today needs a huge capital which

⁽²⁸⁸⁾ For example, Michel Husson, The debate on the rate of profit.

increases with progress, not resulting in decrease of the rate of profit, since the rate of surplus-value rises astonishingly. One of the new phenomena in the world of capitalism today is the rising role of science and knowledge in production, meaning that the worker pumps a large part of the value into the production of commodities and services and even the required amount of raw materials has become less, thanks to nanotechnology and other new technologies. All this led to an increase in the rate of surplus value. Moreover, the extraordinary rise in the degree of work skill made and makes the hours of work, if calculated by simple work hour, enormous, so the skilled worker; the advanced technician provides much more work than the simple old worker, and then the percentage of unpaid work from his work became very large and increasing. It is noticeable that Marx monitored a phenomenon that was occurring in his time, which is the expulsion skilled labor by simple labor thanks to the development of mechanization. But what happened afterward is the contrary; since the simple worker no longer has a significant place in the production process, but there is a much greater role for scientists, researchers, and the most efficient technocrats, and the software has taken a privileged position in production and distribution. In short, the capitalist economy should not be treated as a fixed item, but the development of the productive forces, the skill and productivity of the worker and the rate of consumption of constant capital must be taken into account. All this is subject to change: isn't this the dialectics?! Any figure in the equations set by Marx, Rosa Luxemburg and the successor Marxists can be changed according to the rate and directions of the development of the productive forces, which was not imaginable by Luxemburg.

Finally, a remark is added about the transformation of capitalism into a planned (or socialist) economy: will it stop the accumulation of “capital”? Or will this accumulation continue? If it continues, will this lead to a decrease in the rate of “profit”? Will the progress of the productive forces continue or will it stagnate? These are queries presented to the Marxists.

Another remark is added here: the studies carried out by Marxists confirm the tendency of the rate of profit to decline in the major capitalist countries. Being generally the most interested in this issue, therefore, the existence of ideological motivations is suspected (exactly as their studies on the origin of the state confirm the theory of Marx and Engels). From a practical point of view, it is impossible to test Marx's theoretical hypothesis for various reasons, including the intentional inaccuracy of corporate statistics and the large number of accidental factors affecting the work of capital. It should be taken into account that the rate of profit showed a decline in the West in the era of the welfare state, which resulted from the pressures of socialist movements and then as a result of the phenomenon of capital surplus in recent years. This has nothing to do with the rise of the organic composition of capital.

It is therefore possible -contrary to Rosa Luxemburg's view- that capitalist accumulation continues in the presence of a purely capitalist mode of production, with the accumulation of tools of production in the hands of the capitalists and the increase in their rate of luxury. There is no reasonable equation confirming the collapse of capitalism after the capitalist mode of production became almost unique. The development of productivity makes it possible to reduce the worker's share of his working hours, as shown. Thus, it cannot be conceived that a final collapse of capitalism will occur unless the development of the productive forces leads to the dispensation of wage labor. This is entirely probable with the growth of automation, expansion of robotics and consequently the reduction of the number of workers. It is predicted that the process of production and provision of services will proceed without workers, under the supervision of the owner of the facility or its few owners in the case of large enterprises. As for the following society, there is no evidence that it must be socialist. The emergence of modes of production that are more compatible with the advancement of the productive forces is what actually happened in reality, but the inevitability of the transformation of capitalism into

socialism has no evidence. Most likely, post-capitalism will be a system based on self-employment with the continuation of the market or a class of technocrats may dominate. This subject will be addressed later.

* The expression of “scientific socialism” is deceptive. The word “scientific” suggests that this is the “correct” project, not just a goal, but a goal that achieves a historical purpose; a “scientific” project that has nothing to do with ideology. Indeed, the starting point of Marx and Engels was the project of socialism and sympathy for workers. However, to create “scientific” foundations for this project, they endeavored to analyze capital and devise historical materialism. It has been seen that there is no evidence for the inevitability of socialism, nor for the adherence of the proletariat to this project, which may eventually dissolve spontaneously. If one accepts -for the sake of argument- the Marxian analysis of capitalism and that it will inevitably transform into communism, he still has the choice to support this project or not; a position having nothing to do with science, but with ideology. Hence, Marxism depicted that there is a hidden historical purpose -despite the disciple’s denial-and that the communists are mandated by history or its teleological content to achieve this goal. This is not different from any “divine message,” but in the language of reason. Marx’s linking the theory with praxis and surpassing speculative philosophy inevitably leads to this conclusion: which practice do you choose? The choice is necessarily ideological. It can also be considered that the rejection of exploitation and oppression is an ideological choice rather than the “correct” one.

The idea of linking the socialist project to the laws of history or of thought inevitably expresses the desire to submit to some power outside oneself. So, human does not want socialism, but it is the will of history or the laws of existence. Human here is weak, crushed and obligated to submit to a higher power. Just like talking about the historical role of classes; capitalism -for instance- achieves a historical purpose; it is not criminal, but otherwise it was

revolutionary, compelled to realize itself as a carrier of a historical mission.

* Engels indicated that scientific socialism differs from utopian socialism in that the first is linked by a thread with German idealism, meaning dialectics, i.e., philosophy. Then, where is the scientificity in this case!?

* The idea of the inevitability of socialism necessarily implies that there is a purpose in history and a certain end. This reminds of Hegel's ideas in this field. Reason governs history and history is nothing but the progression of consciousness of freedom, that is, the movement of history is teleological, ending with the realization the consciousness of freedom. This teleology necessarily presupposes the existence of either a self-unconscious reason (Hegel) or a conscious reason that controls the world, an idea rejected in Marxian materialism. Engels replaced Hegel's reason with the three laws of dialectics, thus transforming Marxian materialism into idealism. As Hegel regarded history as the progression of the consciousness of freedom, Marxism considered that history is moving towards communism; a society of freedom, where people consciously make their history after liberation from exploitation and alienation with the disappearance of classes and the state. It is the same idealistic perspective, which recalls what Marx said: *"Philosophy cannot be abolished without being realized."* Communism is then the realization of philosophy; of dialectics embedded in the movement of history.

* The socialist revolution did indeed take place, but contrary to Marx's perceptions. It took place in backward countries and the intensification of class struggle resulted in the case of Russia from its defeat in the war, not -according to the theory- from exacerbation of the contradictions of capitalism. This necessitated the creation of the Leninist "weak link" preceded by the Trotskyist "permanent revolution" theories; two theories that contradicted the foundations of Marxism and neither of them achieved the predicted result.

State's role in the functioning of the system:

Marx did not present a clear theory about the state in general. Moreover, he neglected -to a large extent- the role of the state in the functioning of the capitalist system. He also overlooked the role of politics by and large in the development of capitalism, except in passing references and statements, without providing an adequate explanation. However, one exception is there; a chapter in his book “Capital” elaborated the role of the state in the primitive accumulation of capital, i.e., the early historical stage of capital formation. But generally he just considered the state a parasitic body. Although the role of the state was clear in his time in achieving the primitive accumulation of capital, opening the colonies' markets by armed force and in many countries the state strongly supported the capitalist transformation, as in Germany, Japan and even Napoleonic France. In many countries the state played a role in capitalist investment, such as Russia and Japan, in partnership with the capitalists. If one reviews the history of capitalism, he will find that the role of the state was essential in the growth and protection of capitalism. The state has an effective role in the production and reproduction of social classes in general. In the capitalist system as a whole, the role of the state in the working and the turnover of capital cannot be overlooked. So it is not enough to look at the state as just a tool of oppression. To be effective, this oppression needs to provide some crumbs to the people, according to the strength of the popular pressures, the state must intervene in the production and reproduction of ideology and all components of the Marxian superstructure in addition to its role in the formation and reformation of the substructure. It plays a role in developing the productive forces, intervenes in the social and even technical division of labor and contributes to the reproduction of the relations of production, exchange, distribution and consumption. These three roles work together to stabilize the system. Oppression alone is not sufficient to achieve this stability and even ideology or deception does not produce an effect unless it appears as if it is the Truth, and this requires providing some advantages to the populace. Even the state may repress the dominant classes to one degree or another to

satisfy the masses in certain circumstances to maintain the stability of the regime. This was evident -for instance - in the case of Nazism in Germany and in the case of Nasserite Bonapartism in Egypt.⁽²⁸⁹⁾ All this does not exclude the fact that the state is eventually a parasitic body and just an armed gang of professional killers and thieves, dragging groups of servants of bureaucrats and technocrats and adorning its face with many powders and colors to appear as a socially impartial institution. All the roles it plays in society are in favor of its bureaucracy as a special class and in favor of the ruling class in one way or another. The true face of the state does not appear with complete unveiling except during major social and political conflicts; it is the moment of truth.

One of the well-established ideas of Marxism is that the state is a product of class contradictions, resulting from the formation of classes. Engels tried to prove that the division of people into classes appeared first, followed by the emergence of the state within the ancient communal societies, without providing convincing clues or evidence. While the available information tells that the emergence of classes and the state occurred as a result of the invasions that took place between the tribes, which ended either with the extermination of some of them or with the domination of one over the others, forming a ruling class and meanwhile a state. Kautsky later refuted Engels' ideas in detail.⁽²⁹⁰⁾

While Marx described the state as a parasitic excrescence in society that impedes its free development, when he spoke about the state of the proletariat, his words were reversed. So, the state became: “*the proletariat organized as the ruling class.*” He did not speak of parasitic excrescence or preventing the development of a free

⁽²⁸⁹⁾ This was elaborated in the author's book: *Nasserism in the counter-revolution.*

⁽²⁹⁰⁾ *The Materialist Conception of History*, part 3, section 2, chapter 2.

society. Here the state became a progressive power. There is nothing to add to Bakunin's criticism of Marx on this issue.⁽²⁹¹⁾

As a result of Marx's ignoring of posing a theory of the state, he could not envisage the possibility of the emergence of a modern statistic system, which actually happened and did not formulate the prerequisites and mechanisms for establishing a withering proletarian state.

In addition, Marxism's adherence to the distinctive role of leaders and bosses; the bearers of the proletarian consciousness, contributed -eventually and among other factors- to the domestication of the proletariat, represented by its unions and parties which have bureaucratized and ended up in alliance with capitalism.

Scientism-Positivism:

Marxism presented itself as a science, not just a mere science. Dialectics, historical materialism and socialism are sciences that present Truth, not mere choices. The idea of ideology was violently criticized, and when Lenin recognized Marxism as an ideology, he created the expression of “scientific ideology,” followed by orthodox Marxists. It presents scientific truth as the product of scientific research, not just a subjective desire to change the world. “Utopian” socialism was criticized precisely because it is “unscientific.” This impossible project to replace ideology with science and transform ideology itself into a science, explains how Marxism has turned into a rigid, poor theory that is incapable of dealing with changing reality. This scientism was also used to crush the individual in socialist systems and make the supreme goal building society and the state, without taking the human subject into account. It should be highlighted that Marx's early writings; the manuscripts of 1844,

⁽²⁹¹⁾ “Every state power, every government, by its very nature places itself outside and over the people and inevitably subordinates them to an organization and to aims which are foreign to and opposed to the real needs and aspirations of the people.” Critique of the Marxist Theory of the State.

were published much after the formation of Marxism as a “science” (1932) and they are what Althusser considered the ideological stage in Marx's thought, before he made a break with Hegelianism. In those manuscripts, Marx was a “humanist” before embarking on building his “scientific” theory.

In fact, this Scientism of Marxism includes its tendency to present itself as an objective truth that is not subject to falsehood, and whoever contradicts it is ideological, in the sense of having false consciousness, something akin to disbelief. This alleged truth is not different from religion, but it is specifically a secular religion; its sanctities are the proletariat, the allegedly workers' state and the Marxist party. Regarding the other, the profane, it includes everything else. Some were called apostates (such as Kautsky) or narrow-minded petty bourgeois, opportunist, etc., as if this other knows the Truth while denying it.

‘All the criticisms that have dealt with Marx's thought do not negate that his ideas contain a way of analyzing history and society that is still vibrant. His method of analyzing the workings of capital is genius, though it deserves criticism. The critical and revolutionary tendency and theoretical depth deserve no disdain but full respect. The mature Marx was a materialist, considering the economic factor to be the fundamental motivator of history, without being the only factor. Meanwhile he rejected the conception of a multiplicity of factors. What is meant is that the productive forces are the starting point. They have priority in effect and not precedent in time. Many factors play their role in the movement of history, but the productive forces are the first building block and the superstructure is compatible with the substructure in general, although human society is a single entity. The importance of this idea is not diminished by the existence of factors that precede the productive forces. Man is not merely a labor power, but a subject. Biological formation and psychological inclinations precede the means of production, and history could not proceed in this way except because man has certain psychological inclinations which

were virtually ignored by Marx. It must be noted that Marx himself has evolved or changed. At the height of his maturity he wrote Capital, which also deserves some criticism as done. Although Marx presented great ideas that are still usable, Marxism as a concept is no longer defined in any way, and one can no longer understand the meaning of someone describing himself as a Marxist. Actually Marxism was sublated in the Hegelian sense of the word sublate. It has been digested and incorporated into other ideas that do not necessarily constitute a comprehensive system or theory'

11. Post-Marx and Post-Marxism

It is perfect to realize your imperfection and imperfection to think that you are perfect

Willis Carrier

The century following Marx's death witnessed the emergence of a large number of different and conflicting schools of Marxism, each claiming to be the genuine one. Therefore, many Marxists started seeking the origin of Marxism or what they sometimes called a return to the pure teachings of genuine or true Marxism.⁽²⁹²⁾ To avoid the terminology, they claimed that Marxism is only a method, not a closed theory, without explaining this alleged method, which is called dialectical materialism. Moreover, many attempts were made to rebuild or develop Marxism, especially in Europe.

⁽²⁹²⁾ Examples: Georg Lukács, History & Class Consciousness, chapter titled: What is Orthodox Marxism? - Karl Korsch, Marxism and philosophy - Louis Althusser, Reading Capital.

Some Marxists consider this theory limited to dialectical materialism, some adopt only historical materialism and others connect them together with Marxian political economy. There is unanimity that Marxism is a thought and praxis or a theory of praxis. Much is written about the role of the party and the role of mass spontaneity in the proletarian revolution.

Marxist schools also differed greatly in their practical scenarios, from adopting the idea of internationalism to the idea of socialism in one country, and from proletarian revolution to armed revolution, to changing through the parliament, from proletarian struggle to struggle in the countryside, to a class alliance between workers and the middle class, etc. There are Leninism, Trotskyism, Stalinism, Maoism, Guevarism, orthodox Marxism, reformist Marxism, Gramsci theories, the ideas of the Frankfurt School and attempts to humanize Marxism and reintegrate it with dialectics. Actually, the topic is endless. Some of these schools consider themselves genuine Marxism and sometimes declare others to be infidels. So that a specific theory cannot be found that is agreed upon as Marxism unless returning to Marx's own theories. It will be found that it is summed up in his method of the analysis of capitalism, which ended -logically- by approving the inevitability of socialism and communism as an end to human suffering and the beginning of consciously making history for the benefit of all human beings.

Saad Muhammad Rahim⁽²⁹³⁾ wrote: There is a qualitative difference between the concept of “Marxism after Marx,” which is the title of a book by Pierre Choueiri, and the concept of “post-Marxism.” This statement, looking reasonable, means that “Marxism after Marx” includes what was added and modified by orthodox Marxists such as Kautsky, Lenin, Mao, under the title of

⁽²⁹³⁾ After Marx, preface.

Marxism, adhering to Marx's basic ideas. While post-Marxism encompasses many attempts to make substantive adjustments to Marxism. In fact, the two concepts can never be distinguished, and possibly because there is no specific and agreed upon thing called Marxism, the concept of “post-Marxism” was devised to be broad and to involve all forms of modifications and additions. But in reality there is no general agreement about the meaning of post-Marxism, just as there is no clear agreement about what Marxism is. Indeed Engels himself has his own ideas and his own “Marxism” that is different from the Marxism of Marx. One of his most important additions is his theory of the dialectics of nature, the theory of dialectical materialism and his dialectical method, which is not similar to Marx's method implied in his main book “Capital.” These ideas are incompatible with the thought of Marx himself, but Engels claimed that Marx briefed on his writings, and the readers are obliged to believe.

Here, the previous division of Saad Muhammad Rahim will be accepted for the purpose of clarification as much as possible.

After Marx:

The attempts to add to and modify Marxism of Marx and Engels undertaken by Marxist thinkers and leaders can be summarized in the following section:

- Kautsky: Made important reservations about dialectics, criticizing Hegel and Engels and describing the latter as idealistic. He rejected the idea that considers dialectics a general à priori law of the World. He also considered the dialectical triad as just one of the ways that illuminate the paths of research, but it is not existing in everything; rather many social and natural phenomena proceed

without the “law” of this triad.⁽²⁹⁴⁾ With regard to stopping dialectics on its head, he argued: “*It is evident that Hegeliandialectical scheme is not generally, but often only in a very forced manner and frequently not at all, applicable to nature and society if one simply ‘inverts’ it. For its materialist application, it is not enough merely to turn it off its head and place it upon its feet, but one must also completely change the path which the feet follow.*”⁽²⁹⁵⁾ As well, he provided a detailed explanation of historical materialism,⁽²⁹⁶⁾ providing it with a broader, more coherent and comprehensible presentation than what Marx and Engels presented. He rejected the idea of Marx and Engels that revolutions are the locomotives of history, pointing out that no revolution succeeded before the bourgeois revolutions and a transition from one mode of production to another took place in Europe thanks to the Germanic invasion, not the peasants’ revolutions. He also rejected their notion that material interests are the driving force behind human movements and that their ideas and habits result from their economic conditions. Since the people inherit their ideas and habits from the older generation, which consequently plays a role alongside economic factors in moving them, but the change of those ideas and habits takes place with the change of their economic conditions. Among his most prominent additions to historical materialism is the idea that the human mind is conservative. Therefore, it does not change unless there is a change in the environment, while the change in consciousness takes time because of this conservative nature, which only occurs when consciousness becomes completely inconsistent with the new reality. This explains the impotence of the economic interpretation of the cultural and spiritual content of a particular era, so it is necessary to go back to the previous era to find the appropriate explanation. He also argued that the productive forces are not fit to be the starting point, but it is the factor that

⁽²⁹⁴⁾ The Materialist Conception of History, part 5, section 5, chapter 1. Later Sartre did the same against Engels.

⁽²⁹⁵⁾ Ibid., p. 38.

⁽²⁹⁶⁾ Ibid.

leads to their development, which is the growth of people's needs and their desire to obtain the requirements of life, i.e., their struggle with nature. Furthermore, Kautsky considered that any special phenomenon in history, whether economic, ideological or otherwise, plays in some respects as a substructure and in others as a superstructure. While the conception of Marx and Engels of the relationship between the two structures applies only to the new phenomena.⁽²⁹⁷⁾ This is one of the most prominent of his modifications to historical materialism. Thus, he changed the well-established Marxian notion of the substructure as being economic and the superstructure as an intellectual and organizational nature. Moreover, one of his important additions is the incorporation of the psychological composition of human beings into the analysis of society and history. He also rejected the Marxian analysis of the emergence of classes and the state, criticizing Engels who displayed the emergence of both with internal mechanisms in the old society, revealing that their emergence occurred under the effect of the invasion and wars that led to the emergence of a class-tribe against another class-tribe, which had become working in the service of the first. Consequently, the victorious tribe had become the state in the full sense of the word; therefore, the state and classes emerged together.⁽²⁹⁸⁾ About the nature of the state in the capitalist period, he argued that it is truly supporting capitalist exploitation, but meanwhile it provides services to other classes. Hence, it is no longer just a tool of repression in favor of the ruling class as it was in the past, so the proletariat can, through the ballot boxes, take power.⁽²⁹⁹⁾ Kautsky criticized Marx and Engels' prediction of the imminence of the socialist revolution⁽³⁰⁰⁾ (Marx reserved after the failure of the Paris Commune). Regarding historical inevitability, he took a

⁽²⁹⁷⁾ Ibid., part 3, section 4, chapter 2.

⁽²⁹⁸⁾ Ibid., part 4, section 2, chapter 1-4.

⁽²⁹⁹⁾ Ibid., part 4, section 7, chapter 12.

⁽³⁰⁰⁾ The Road to power, pp. 10-11 (Arabic translation).

fatalistic view, arguing that the economic development of bourgeois society inevitably pushes the proletariat to form its own independent party and its contradiction with the bourgeoisie has no solution except through its seizure of power.⁽³⁰¹⁾ Since the 1890s, Kautsky abandoned the idea of revolution and instead espoused the struggle of the proletariat for the acquisition of state power through parliamentary elections.⁽³⁰²⁾ Thus, he became a reformist. Despite his significant role in dismantling basic traditional Marxian concepts, he left little impact on orthodox Marxism, possibly due to the delay in publishing his important book “The Materialist Concept of History” and its lack of dissemination.

- Trotsky: Added the concept of “uneven and compound development.” The first means varying levels of development and the second means the intertwining of social systems belonging to two historical eras; pre-capitalist and capitalist. This is taking place whether on a global level or in the underdeveloped countries, where foreign capital stimulates the growth of the proletariat faster than the local bourgeoisie. Therefore, the ability of the latter to carry out a bourgeois revolution is not possible, so the proletariat undertakes this task, but it will not be able to stop at the bourgeois stage, so the revolution continues towards the establishment of socialism. He called this process the “Permanent Revolution.” This model was achieved exactly in Russia, although the victorious proletariat did not succeed in the accomplishment of socialism as envisaged by neither Trotsky nor any Marxist. While the Trotskyists believed that he had developed Marxism with its historical materialism and solved the dilemma of the impossibility of carrying out a bourgeois revolution by the bourgeoisie in the underdeveloped countries, by providing a vision that leapfrogs this stage. In doing so, he dealt a major blow to the conceptions of Marx. Since he considered that the establishment of socialism is possible in an underdeveloped country,

⁽³⁰¹⁾ The Class Struggle.

⁽³⁰²⁾ Ibid.

the law of the relationship between the forces and relations of production was violated. However, the magic solution was ready: the socialist revolution can only begin, but socialism is not accomplished in a backward country or in one country, but it must take place on a global level. So, the victorious proletariat has no choice but to maintain its power until this is done. It must -of course- work on extending the revolution to developed countries. Trotsky was quite definite in his words about the impossibility of socialism in Russia alone: “*Without the direct State support of the European proletariat, the working class of Russia cannot remain in power and convert its temporary domination into a lasting socialistic dictatorship. Of this there cannot for one moment be any doubt.*”⁽³⁰³⁾ There is no answer to many of the queries that can be raised in this situation, while the Leninists and Trotskyists took pains to justify the proletarian revolution in Russia and not in Europe without providing any answer consistent with historical materialism, except for lengthy elaboration in theoretical explanations. History already answered them in the fate of the socialist countries; socialism was - simply- not accomplished in Russia.

The most notable achievement of Trotskyism was the undermining of Stalinism, exposing and debunking its contradictions and brutal practices.

- Lenin: Regarding philosophy, in a short passage on dialectics, he defined it as “*The splitting of a single whole and the cognition of its contradictory parts,*” prioritizing the contradiction over other elements of dialectics, in contrast to Engels. The proof of the validity of this law should be -in his view- done through the history of science. Then he gave examples in nature and society, summing up the definition of dialectics: “*dialectics is the theory of knowledge of (Hegel and) Marxism. This is the “aspect” of the matter (it is not “an aspect” but the essence of the matter) to which Plekhanov, not to speak of other Marxists, paid no attention.*” He also added to dialectics “*The unity (coincidence, identity, equal action) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory and relative. The struggle of*

⁽³⁰³⁾ Results and Prospectives.

mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute,⁽³⁰⁴⁾ exactly as development and movement are absolute, which Engels did not refer to and is completely against Hegel. However, in the rest of his book “Materialism and Empirio Criticism” and other small texts, he focused on distinguishing Marxian materialism from idealism without caring about the Hegelian-dialectical component;⁽³⁰⁵⁾ an idea which was criticized later by Korsh and then the Frankfurt School. He also provided a dubious definition of matter: “*Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them.*”⁽³⁰⁶⁾ (our emphasis). So, matter is an objective philosophical category. Isn't this similar to Hegel's objective idealism? In fact, there is here an implicit return to Kant: “*given to man by his sensations,*” etc. What about the objects not perceived by senses? What about ultrasound and many types of rays? Actually, not everything of matter can be perceived by senses. Subsequently, he advocated and emphasized the importance of philosophy in the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie in the field of thought: “*No natural science and no materialism can hold its own in the struggle against the onslaught of bourgeois ideas and the restoration of the bourgeois world outlook unless it stands on solid philosophical ground. To hold his own in this struggle and carry it to a victorious finish, the natural scientist must be a modern materialist, a conscious adherent of the materialism represented by Marx, i.e., he must be a dialectical materialist.*”⁽³⁰⁷⁾ He also presented a theory of imperialism as the monopolistic phase of capitalism; the domination of financial capital, the division of the world and the export of

⁽³⁰⁴⁾ Collected works, volume 38.

⁽³⁰⁵⁾ Of what he said: “*The philosophy of Marxism is materialism.*” The Three Sources And Three Component Parts of Marxism.

⁽³⁰⁶⁾ Materialism and Empirio Criticism, Chapter one, 4. Does Objective Truth Exist? He provided another definition in the same book, Chapter Three, 1. What Is Matter? What Is Experience? “*matter is that which, acting upon our sense-organs, produces sensation; matter is the objective reality given to us in sensation and so forth... matter, nature, being, the physical—is primary and spirit, consciousness, sensation, the psychical—is secondary.*”

⁽³⁰⁷⁾ On the Significance of Militant Materialism.

capital, other than what Kautsky argued that it is the *“striving of every industrial capitalist nation to bring under its control or to annex all large areas of agrarian territory, irrespective of what nations inhabit it.”* Thus, Lenin's definition confused imperialism as a relationship with monopoly capitalism as an economic formation.⁽³⁰⁸⁾ He also devised the “weak link” theory, which is summed up in the possibility of the outbreak of socialist revolution in the weakest link in what he called the imperialist chain, then it extends to the rest of the chain to become an international revolution. This is contrary to Marx's conviction of the outbreak of socialist revolution in developed countries. It is clear that this idea is an extension of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution. Lenin also divided Marxism into three components (dialectical materialism, historical materialism and political economy) and identified three sources for it (German philosophy, French socialism and English political economy). In addition, he provided a special opinion on the final crisis of capitalism, arguing that there is no such thing as the emergence of an insoluble situation, and that going beyond capitalism requires effective revolutionary action on the part of the proletariat.

- Under Stalin, Marxism was divided into four components: dialectical materialism, historical materialism, political economy and scientific socialism. He devised the theory of “socialism in one country” and the theory of the five stages of social development (abandoning the debate over the Asiatic mode of production), among other ideas known as Stalinism. He established the foundations of Soviet Marxism, which embraced socialism in one country and a “non-capitalist” path of development. In terms of philosophy, he introduced a dialectics different from that of Lenin, with the following components:

⁽³⁰⁸⁾ We presented (in a joint work) a critique of the Leninist theory of Imperialism titled: Lenin's approach to Imperialism (Arabic).

1. Nature is a connected and integral whole, where things and phenomena are organically linked, dependent on each other and determined by each other.

2. Nature is in a constant state of movement and change.

3. The transition from slow quantitative changes to rapid and abrupt qualitative changes is a law of development.

4. Internal contradictions are inherent in all things and phenomena of nature. They all have their negative and positive aspects, a past and a future, something dying away and something developing. The struggle between these opposites, the struggle between the old and the new, between that which is dying away and that which is being born, between that which is disappearing and that which is developing, constitutes the internal content of the process of development; the internal content of the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative changes.⁽³⁰⁹⁾

However, Stalin did not mention the concept of Negation of the Negation, unlike Engels. He also did not explain how he arrived at these laws, unlike other Marxists.

The significance of Stalin's theses lies in the strong influence he had on Soviet Marxism.

- Rosa Luxemburg: Criticized Marx's theory about the tendency of the rate of capital accumulation under capitalism. She developed a new conception: accumulation in the pure capitalist mode of production is not possible. She also provided a criticism of Marx's mathematical equations and demonstrated other equations showing capitalism's inability to achieve capital accumulation except through trade with pre-capitalist countries or modes of production. Hence, capitalism owes its continuity to the pre-capitalist formations; consequently, she expected its collapse when they end. What can be said here is what was already mentioned regarding Marx's theory of accumulation, adding that reality has demonstrated the error of

⁽³⁰⁹⁾ Dialectical and Historical Materialism.

Luxemburg's theory. The accumulation of capital continued after the transformation of pre-capitalist modes of production into capitalism in most regions. Indeed, the movement of capital and international trade is concentrated among the developed capitalist countries, while the share of underdeveloped countries, which have pre-capitalist remnants, is very small.

She was also concerned with revealing the working mechanisms of capitalism (that is, the capitalist system as a whole) not the working mechanisms of capital; something that Lenin also did in his book Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.

Rosa rejected Lenin's theory of the party; a party led by a vanguard of professional revolutionaries, which she considered a danger to the revolution. Her alternative was a broad mass party and spontaneous revolution. Consequently, she contributed to considering spontaneity at the expense of the professional party.

- Mao Zedong: The most important thing he wrote on dialectics is the book: On Contradiction. Among what he said: the law of contradiction in things, i.e., the law of unity of opposites, is the first basic law in materialist dialectics. The contradictions inherent in the interior of things are what cause their development; i.e. the primary cause of the development of a thing lies within, not outside it. While the existing link and mutual influence between one thing and another is a secondary cause. Indeed, even the mechanical movement caused by external forces is also achieved under the effect of the internal contradiction of things. Materialist dialectics considers that the external causes are the factors of change and the internal causes are the basis of change. He did not differentiate between nature and society, as dialectics is working in both. Thereafter, he focused on determining the specificity of the contradiction in each phenomenon, hence the method of resolving each contradiction based on defining its specificity.

There is no noticeable add-on here. But Mao elaborated the connection between the issues of the Chinese revolution with its party and the law of contradiction in the details he explained.

The basic addition of Mao in Marxism is the theory of new democracy,⁽³¹⁰⁾ summarized as follows: in colonial and semi-colonial countries, the bourgeoisie cannot lead the democratic revolution and national liberation. Only the proletariat can accomplish this task in alliance with the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie, and then establish the republic under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes under the leadership of the communist party. After they accomplish the bourgeois democratic revolution, the stage of building socialism starts. Following the First World War, October Revolution in Russia and building of socialism in the Soviet Union, the national liberation movement in the colonies became a part of the world socialist revolution, not a part of the world bourgeois revolution.

It is clear that Mao's theory included a combination of Trotsky's theory of the “permanent revolution” and Gramsci's theory of the “historical bloc,” with a special Maoist addition, as this concept was limited to colonies and semi-colonies and their struggle for liberation from imperialism.

- Georg Lukács: The founder of Western Marxism as an alternative to official Soviet Marxism. He reduced Marxism in the Method without texts, books and theories. This method is that of Hegel without its mystical formula, which is in line with Marx's idea that he stopped Hegelian dialectics on its feet and extracted the rational kernel from the mystical shell. Engels' theses on dialectics were criticized in terms of neglecting the relationship between subject and object. From here, he set out to reconsider the subject versus the object, criticizing the economism of scholastic Marxism. Lukács's conception of dialectics emphasizes the general law of movement in reality and thought, highlighting the struggle between

⁽³¹⁰⁾ On New Democracy.

contradictions that transform into each other and the understanding that the part can only be known within the framework of the whole. He placed significant emphasis on the historical vision of social movements. The goal of dialectics, according to him is not just to interpret the world but to change it; otherwise, it would be merely a formal logic that does not delve into the essence of phenomena. Therefore, the dialectical relationship between phenomena and their essence should be revealed. Lukács also emphasized the importance of linking dialectics with the proletariat, as the class historically qualified to carry the Truth and achieve a dialectical interaction between the subject and the object. This connection between theory and praxis in Marxism is crucial, as dialectics is considered the science of the proletariat.

Lukács was not interested in what is commonly referred to as dialectical materialism, except in the context of society and history, and he criticized Engels and his dialectics of nature⁽³¹¹⁾ before being subjected to harsh criticism by orthodox Marxists.

- Karl Korsch: Criticized that version of orthodox Marxism that abandoned its philosophical component and turned it into a purely scientific theory. For Korsch, Marxism is a science, specifically scientific socialism, but he emphasized that this science also has a philosophical aspect, particularly materialistic dialectics (he frequently referred to dialectical materialism). He believed that shedding light on this philosophical aspect is crucial for understanding the issue of the state in Marxism. While Marx and Engels distanced themselves from traditional philosophy, Korsch argued that they actually developed a philosophy based on dialectics, which he viewed as both a science and a philosophy. He believed that this philosophy was not merely a formal logic but a reflection of the dynamic nature of the world, encompassing nature, society and human understanding. In this sense, Korsch

⁽³¹¹⁾ History & Class Consciousness, What is Orthodox Marxism? 5. Note 6.

reintroduced Hegelian ideas into Marxism, expanding on Engels' theses in this area.

Korsch found support for his perspective in Marx's statement that "*Philosophy cannot be abolished without being realized,*" suggesting that philosophy is essential for achieving communism. Building on this idea, he considered Marxism as a philosophy of praxis, emphasizing the importance of putting theory into practice before it can truly be realized before it fades away.

- **Gramsci**: Modified the conception of Marx about the state. He considered it not just a tool of oppression but a complex organic structure that plays an effective role in influencing social values. In short, it strives to dominate through conviction, not violence; ideological hegemony through civil society. He differentiated it into: political society (the police, the army, legal system, etc.) - the arena of political institutions and legal constitutional control - civil society (the family, the education system, trade unions, etc.). However, he presented his concept with much confusion and contradictions. Sometimes he integrated civil society into the state, and at other passages he wrote about it: "*resists before the final assault on the state.*"

Gramsci also used the concept of the "organic intellectual" as opposed to the "traditional intellectual," such as the writer, journalist, researcher and others, who seem neutral even though he belongs to a class, and can be called the professional intellectual. The organic intellectual is not only a professional but also characterized by expressing a class, without submitting to it; he thinks and works to identify this class with its true interests and endeavors to achieve them, without being influenced by the contrary ideas it may believe. Moreover, he carries the concerns of the people of the class whose interests he defends. This is the real intellectual who is linked to the issues of his class.⁽³¹²⁾ The organic intellectual can be defined as the ideological intellectual while the traditional as the professional intellectual. It is clear that Gramsci separated the

⁽³¹²⁾ Haidar Ali Mohammad, Gramsci and the Intellectual's problematic (Arabic).

interests of the class from the perception of its members or the public about these interests, considering that the organic intellectual is the one who deals with this separation. He also devised the concept of the “*historical bloc*,” which means the formation of a class alliance under the hegemony of the Communist Party, including workers and peasants, plus syndicates, federations and bodies that represent the popular classes. Hegemony for him means to disseminate and circulate ideas and perceptions among the historical bloc by conviction, not by force; the ideological hegemony of the proletariat over the classes of the historical bloc, as opposed to the ideological domination of the state. He emphasized the role of intellectuals and the party in forming the bond between the components of the historical bloc. Gramsci's concept differs radically from the idea of an alliance or front consisting of different parties. Rather, he called for convincing the popular classes with communism. What is new in this respect is disseminating communism among the non-worker masses. He also emphasized the necessity of the party for the working class to transform it from a class “in-itself;” lacking political consciousness, to a class “for-itself;” politically conscious.

He also rejected personality cult, Marxist fundamentalism and the totalitarian nature of Marxism, as an attempt to democratize the communist movement. One of his important contributions is his short analysis of the Russian Revolution. He argued that it defeated the theory of historical inevitability and was even against Marx's book “*Capital*,” which put a prerequisite for the socialist revolution, which is the development of capitalism and the proletariat. In this matter he transcended the idea of the laws of history and reconsidered the role of human beings in making their own reality, despite the failure of the socialist project in Russia.⁽³¹³⁾

⁽³¹³⁾ He stated: “*The Bolshevik revolution is based more on ideology than actual events (therefore, at the end of the day, we really do not need to know any more than we know already). It's a revolution against Karl Marx's Capital. In Russia, Marx's Capital was the book of the bourgeoisie, more than of the proletariat. It was the crucial proof needed to show*

The most significant things Gramsci presented were his criticism of vulgar Marxism of Stalin, the idea of historical inevitability and the mechanical relationship between the substructure and the superstructure.

- The writer presented (in a joint work) -while he was Marxist⁽³¹⁴⁾- an analysis of the logical synthesis of the concept of the mode of production, starting from the concept of labor power, then means of production, then the process of work, etc. The sequence ended with the mode of production. It was an attempt to use the dialectics of Hegel in analyzing the mode of production as a notion, by detecting the element of logical necessity in its synthesis. More accurately, dialectics of Hegel was transformed into a research tool, providing a coordinated presentation of the concept of the mode of production. The research did not come out of Marx and Engels' idea about the relationship between the forces and relations of production, but it was presented as a detailed logical process. The attempt was strongly influenced by Hegel's idea of rational-logical necessity in deducing notions from each other. But putting aside this illusory metaphysical aspect, there was just a dialectical presentation of the mentioned notion.

Post-Marxism:

1. The Frankfurt School or Critical Theory:

that, in Russia, there had to be a bourgeoisie, there had to be a capitalist era and there had to be a Western-style of progression, before the proletariat could even think about making a comeback, about their class demands, about revolution. Events overcame ideology. Events have blown out of the water all critical notions which stated Russia would have to develop according to the laws of historical materialism. The Bolsheviks renounce Karl Marx and they assert, through their clear statement of action, through what they have achieved, that the laws of historical materialism are not as set in stone, as one may think, or one may have thought previously.” The revolution against “Capital.”

⁽³¹⁴⁾ Logical formation of the notion of mode of production.

It is a school of social theory and critical philosophy, established in 1923 at the “Institute for Social Research” at Goethe University in Frankfurt, Germany.

It presented itself as a theory of criticism vs. traditional theories that were only concerned with producing consistent and self-sufficient systems of thought as the ultimate Truth, while critical theory had special definite aims:

*** Criticism of Positivism. This is one of the most remarkable achievements of the critical school.**

Positivism is mainly concerned with the scientific study of social phenomena, based on experiment, observation and repetition, with connecting cause and effect, to understand phenomena objectively. It stops at describing and analyzing phenomena without explaining them, under the pretext of avoiding philosophical and metaphysical meditations. Thus, positivism excludes humanist and value dimensions in the research process, separating the process of knowledge from moral dimensions and excludes the moral view of the researcher, by claiming that sociology is a science devoid of value. Consequently it denies the role of the subject, morality and interest in the formulation of the world. Rather it considers human beings as merely subject to deterministic scientific imperatives; therefore, they do not play a role in changing or making history. Hence, the individual stands in front of society as an à priori reality to which he must submit. It claims -according to this approach- scientific objectivity, ideological neutrality, while in fact it works within the framework of the existing social system without criticizing it, but even accepting it as a fait accompli. Moreover, positivist sociology does not take into account the historical dimension of social systems, thus rejecting the possibility of changing them. This means that this alleged science itself is a mere tool for the contemporary powers of domination; just a tool of hegemony.

*** It rejected the notion of objectivity in knowledge; the object of knowledge is itself embedded in a historical and social process. Therefore, knowledge is relative, while science is merely a practical procedure related to the organization of society through a theory linked to praxis. Hence it denied that there is an ultimate Truth and applied this to itself.**

*** The Frankfurt School criticized the European Enlightenment and modernity which, in the viewpoint of the school, turned into a technological rationality lacking an ethical component. In addition, rationalism did not emancipate humans from fear and oppression; on the contrary, it established alienation, reification and the supremacy of the modern state and capitalism.**

*** Taking advantage of the positive aspects of Enlightenment, it endeavored to resume the project of rationalization; with a non-neutral and teleological reason that aims to actually emancipate humans.**

*** Criticism of bourgeois democracy as practiced; how the modern totalitarian state dominated the collective conscience and unloaded the masses' capacity of rejection in both the capitalist and socialist world and its hidden control mechanisms over individuals.**

*** Criticism of orthodox and scholastic Marxism and what it considered its scientific or instrumental component, which was presented as a science, in addition to using psychoanalysis and sociology. Moreover, philosophy was linked to the social and human sciences. It also rejected the "metaphysical materialism" of orthodox Marxism, which presented itself as a preliminary truth preceding experience.**

*** It was also concerned with the reconsideration of Hegel's philosophy in its relationship to Marxism, with an emphasis on rejecting Hegel's reconciling subject-object and reason-existence (i.e., as a philosophy of Truth). It also superseded his dialectics to Marx's materialistic dialectics. Meanwhile, it highlighted the revolutionary aspects in Hegel's philosophy: its historical tendency,**

linking the movement to existence (Becoming) and its deep critical tendency (Negation), with an emphasis on going beyond speculative philosophy to a social theory and criticizing both metaphysics and systemic tendency in general. Reconsideration of Hegel was a response to the transformation of Marx's dialectical and materialistic conceptions into mere mechanical historical materialism by orthodox Marxism.

* Connecting the theory to praxis and class struggle. Since critical theory is “*just a prelude to the right action,*” to build a society consistent with reason; a reason with humanistic content, which achieves freedom, justice and happiness. Hence, Hegel's idealism, which the critical school sought to reject, reared its head again.

* Highlighting the role of marginalized people in changing the existing system, especially by Herbert Marcuse as shall be seen.

This school did not pay attention to the issue of organization and political action, which was criticized by the opponents. This was not an oversight, but critical theory aimed at separating itself from the party and from the state, meaning the ideological party and the fascism and Stalinist states. In sum, Horkheimer; the founder of the critical theory, identified the most important core meanings of the theory in the following elements: critical theory looks at individuals as producers of all forms of life within society and throughout history, thus re-considering the individual - it considers the realities inseparable from human action – it looks to the different pattern of perception as witness to human activity and to an influencing force which it exercises on its reality - it directs consciousness to regulate the activity of individuals according to reason - it consciously strives to organize individuals' activities according to reason, and its mission is to clarify and legitimize the benefits of consciousness for individuals and to release it from restrictions - it preserves the heritage of philosophy and constantly revises it - it has a main

purpose: creating a suitable world for human needs and faculties and in overcoming the obstacles of social development - it rejects every mind that allies with the repressive authority against the people - it proceeds from emphasizing the importance of starting from criticism of the economy because it is the origin of all evil.⁽³¹⁵⁾

Although critical theory declared a rejection of speculative philosophy, it ended up as a speculative theory, refraining from advocating for social transformation. Instead, it called for resorting to art and beauty as the only way for criticism, to express the rejection of the prevailing culture and to utopia for emancipation from the tyranny of reason, which has become -in itself- a subject of criticism by the critical theory. Instead of criticizing capitalism, it focused on criticizing Western civilization with its two parts: capitalism and socialism. Horkheimer, one of the founders of the school, ended up cooperating with the German state, despairing of any possible social change.

The main thinkers of that school will be briefly referred to.

Horkheimer: The founder of the Frankfurt School, wrote in the school's manifesto: *“If experience and theory contradict each other, one of the two must be reexamined. Either the scientist has failed to observe correctly or something is wrong with the principles of the theory. In relation to facts; therefore a theory always remains a hypothesis. One must be ready to change it if its weaknesses begin to show as one works through the material.”*⁽³¹⁶⁾ This was the outset of critical theory, presenting itself as a mere perspective. He considered that the rationalist tendency of the Age of Enlightenment viewed nature as a subject to command and control. a perception that extended to a similar view of human beings as subjects of domination. Enlightenment destroyed itself in

⁽³¹⁵⁾ Ibrahim Nizar, potential and Limits of societal Criticism - the model of Max Horkheimer (Arabic).

⁽³¹⁶⁾ Critical theory, selected essays, p. 188.

this way and now the hopes of the past must be fulfilled; what was not achieved by Enlightenment. He also called for rejecting the instrumentalization of science and linking it to humanitarianism, instead of gaining clear supremacy over the rest of the population by the groups specialized in that science. Moreover, Horkheimer accused Marxism of belonging to this enlightenment, the subject under criticism,⁽³¹⁷⁾ under the influence of the shock of Stalinism.

For him, criticism of instrumental reason did not mean falling into irrationality. Rather, he considered that instrumental reason is in itself irrational or false rationality, calling for a reason that is consistent with the interests of the community.

However, he ultimately transformed into idealism: *“The purpose of a society organized according to reason, which at present seems to exist only in fiction, is really engraved in the soul of every human being.”*⁽³¹⁸⁾ Horkheimer also came to the conclusion that it is necessary to disengage Marxism and the proletariat, considering that the interests of the latter are born within it only, not above it, in the sense that it is not determined from without.

In the end, he declared the impossibility of emancipation from capitalism by virtue of the control of monopolies and the tremendous progress in the means of production. Therefore, it would be better to seek to improve the situation of the masses within the framework of the same system, while he decided at the outset that the goal of critical theory is to abolish class society. Thus, he began with critical theory and ended as a bourgeois reformist; the same destiny of his colleague Adorno.

Herbert Marcuse: Belongs to the generation of Horkheimer. He connected Marx's work in economics with his philosophical perspective and considered his criticism of political economy to be a “philosophical criticism.” He was also interested in revealing the

⁽³¹⁷⁾ Dialectics of enlightenment, p. 16.

⁽³¹⁸⁾ Luc Ferry-Alan Renault, Max Horkheimer and the critical theory (Arabic translation).

humanist depth in Marx's analysis of capital, especially in his early writings, the depth of his idea about alienated labor, the alienation of human (not the worker) and the inhuman content of private property. Based on this, he regarded that the overthrow of capitalism should start from this issue. He also revealed the relationship between theory and praxis in Marx's thought, so *"the theory is in itself a practical one; praxis does not only come at the end but is already present in the beginning of the theory."*⁽³¹⁹⁾

Marcuse contrasted the dialectics of Hegel with that of Marx. The first is an ontological dialectics, in which history was patterned on the metaphysical process of being. In contrast, with Marx, it became a social condition associated with a particular historical form of society. The totality that the Marxian dialectics gets to is the totality of class struggle, and the negativity that underlies its contradictions and shapes its every content is the negativity of class relations. The dialectical totality again includes nature, but only in so far as the latter enters and conditions the historical process of social reproduction. On the other, hand it is a historical controversy because it deals with a specific stage of the historical path, which is the capitalist stage. Concerning historical inevitability (or necessity), Marcuse denied that this idea existed in Marxism; furthermore, he argued: *"the transition from capitalism's inevitable death to socialism is necessary, but only in the sense that the full development of the individual is necessary...The revolution depends indeed upon a totality of objective conditions: it requires a certain attained level of material and intellectual culture, a self-conscious and organized working class on an international scale, acute class struggle."*⁽³²⁰⁾ Regarding historical materialism, he tried to explain history using the economic factor, the biological factor and the psychological factor together.

Marcuse directed strong criticisms towards the instrumentalist mentality in industrial society, whether in the capitalist West or the socialist East. Since there are two prominent phenomena in the most

⁽³¹⁹⁾ The Foundation of Historical Materialism.

⁽³²⁰⁾ Reason and Revolution - Hegel and the rise of social theory, pp. 314-323.

advanced sectors of industrial society: on the one hand, rationality expresses itself in the tendency towards technical perfection, and on the other hand all possible efforts are made to imprison this tendency in the existing institutions. Scientific progress has become a tool of control in industrial society, and freedoms (in the West) such as freedom of thought, speech and conscience have been institutionalized and have become part of that society. In conclusion, there is a lack of freedom in a democratic framework. A language naked out of tension, contradiction and becoming was created; e.g., the word rebellion became an accusation. The existing language is a global, behavioral language, without history or dimensions and self-centered.

He expected that after the integration of the proletariat into the capitalist system, the most important threat to the latter comes from the outcasts and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colors, the unemployed and the unemployable, the persecuted collared races and the inmates of prisons and mental institutions. But these powers are primitive and their siege of modern civilization is similar to the siege of ancient civilizations by barbarians. However, contrary to what is commonly believed, Marcuse did not consider the minorities and the marginalized as the new revolutionary forces, but rather saw them just a threat to the system, *“it is of course nonsense to say that middle-class opposition is replacing the proletariat as the revolutionary class and that the Lumpenproletariat is becoming a radical political force.”*⁽³²¹⁾ But the proletariat remains the historical revolutionary factor.⁽³²²⁾ Nevertheless, wherever the traditional working class ceases to be the grave-digger of capitalism, this function remains suspended. All that the working class needs is to turn into a class for-itself through the conveyance of

⁽³²¹⁾ An Essay on Liberation.

⁽³²²⁾ One-dimensional man, pp. 56-57.

consciousness to it from intellectuals, thus emphasizing the historical role of the proletariat.⁽³²³⁾

The advanced industrial society system -according to Marcuse- is putting obstacles in front of social transformation, and the integration of opposing forces is the result of this phenomenon and meanwhile its first cause.

Marcuse used normative concepts to describe the situation of people in developed societies, such as false consciousness, immediate unreal interests, false needs and real needs.⁽³²⁴⁾

Erich Fromm played the main role in integrating psychology into the critical theory. Concerning Marxism,⁽³²⁵⁾ he argued that Marx erred regarding the degree to which capitalism could develop itself and the extent to which it could meet the economic needs of the industrialized nations. In addition, he failed to provide an integrated view of the dangers of bureaucracy, the tendency of centralization in the state apparatus and the economy and in defining the possibility of the emergence of bureaucratic systems as an alternative to socialism.

Fromm was interested in revealing what he called the humane side in Marx's theory (which Althusser called the philosophical side, as will be addressed) represented in the "Manuscripts of 1844" and "The German Ideology." However, he did not mention a break between the young Marx and the old Marx, so he made several comparisons about alienation and reification between the manuscripts of 1844 and the book titled "Capital." Fromm described Marxism as a spiritual existential doctrine in a non-religious sense, which espoused the noble human aspirations of the great religions in their first origins. Marxism aimed at emancipating the people, not increasing workers' income or improving their

⁽³²³⁾ Towards a new revolution, pp. 91-94.

⁽³²⁴⁾ One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society.

⁽³²⁵⁾ In his book: Marx's Concept of Man, he presented Marxism from his point of view.

economic situation or their living conditions, by overcoming alienation and reification, after establishing socialism. The latter has no market, competition or specialization. Its economy proceeds in favor of people's real needs, not imaginary ones and not for profit. All individuals participate in making human history, without the individual being specialized in one work, with the actualization of one's complete freedom. In communism, man must be its own end.

He also criticized Soviet socialism, accusing it of distorting Marxism and obscuring its human side to justify its brutal character that Marx would not have accepted.

Fromm's project ended up monitoring no difference between socialism and capitalism under the influence of state power and its authoritarianism in both cases. He did not suggest an alternative to both except "humanity," which he did not tell how to be separate from the nature of the social system. This tendency to abandon the project of the socialist revolution and the supposed tasks of the proletariat is a common element among thinkers of the Frankfurt School.

Habermas: represented the second generation of the Frankfurt School Critical Theory. He tried to save it from its crisis. While the first stage was concerned with saving the individual from authoritarianism, Habermas is concerned with rationalizing society in his way. He emphatically criticized the first stage, describing it as primitive perceptions, as well as its reliance on Hegel's concept of Truth.⁽³²⁶⁾

The importance of Habermas's role in contemporary thought is due to his reconsideration of philosophy and its integration into any critical theory of society. Along with his defense of modernity as an unfinished project despite his criticism of the disasters it generated. Furthermore, his adherence to the critical capacity of Enlightenment reason, against the theories that call for putting it

⁽³²⁶⁾ Abo El-Nour Hamdy Abo El-Nour Hasan, Jürgen Habermas-morality and communication, p. 44 (Arabic).

aside. He also criticized the philosophies of postmodernism -despite their influence upon him- considering them a part of the modernity which they criticized. Since they did not develop a vision for the future of society and did not distinguish between professional-instrumental reason and reason that emancipated human from the slavery to nature and things, transcended superstition and religion and made human more capable of understanding the world. Instead, he promised with the “*communicative reason*” and completing the project of modernity. He also believes that modernity or rationality includes three components: cognitive instrumental reason, moral practical reason and aesthetic-expressive reason.

Regarding philosophy, he advocated for a philosophy that does not concern itself with the absolute, has nothing to do with metaphysics which he vehemently attacked, does not claim to know the Truth and that plays a positive and effective role within the entire human sciences in an integrative framework. That is a philosophy which criticizes the relationship subject/object, replacing it with intersubjectivity; communication between human beings. In tandem with the addition of a new area that fills the void created by the contemporary rationalism and creates elements of pluralism that establish a new critical theory that critiques the philosophical heritage revolving around reason, by proposing the concept of “communicative action.” Instead of the Truth that precedes human existence; the perception that is corresponding to reality, he presented another conception of truth. That is a product of a process of mutual understanding among individuals; communication and the exchange of opinions and arguments; the culmination of an agreement of social nature which he calls the “*consensus theory of truth*,” as it requires consensus on the results of dialogue and theoretical discourse. Thus, according to his theory, the relationship between human species and nature should be replaced by a relationship between a pure identity of the subject and a pure identity of the object. Thus, all knowledge is constituted through one of three cognitive interests: the technical cognitive

interest (anthropologically deep-seated interest, subject to the technical reason) - the practical interest (relating to the relationship between humans) - the emancipatory interest. They correspond to three worlds: the objective world, the social world and the subjective world, three types of cognitive research: experimental-analytical science, experimental-analytical sciences, historical and interpretive sciences that are based on practical interest and critical sciences that are based on the interest in emancipation.

He advocates for respecting each other's cultures. *“In a constitutional democracy the majority may also not prescribe for minorities aspects of its own cultural form of life (beyond the common political cultural of the country) by claiming for its culture an authoritative guiding function.”*⁽³²⁷⁾

His philosophy aims to establish *“communicative ethics”* based on tolerance, reciprocal recognition and dialogue with the other, without claiming of either party the possession of the absolute Truth, within a bourgeois public sphere (mentioning that the public sphere was brought on by the European bourgeois, in the period from the seventeenth century to the outset of the eighteenth century). He considers the model of European bourgeois public sphere the ideal, defining it as *“The field of social life through which public opinion is formed and approached”*⁽³²⁸⁾ ... *“made up of private people gathered together as a public and articulating the needs of society with the state.”*⁽³²⁹⁾ It is mediating between the individuals and the state, which *“defines rational and critical exchanges between subjects (individual and collective) seeking to achieve consensus on issues related to democratic practice.”*⁽³³⁰⁾ This public sphere consists of social interaction facilitated by a network of institutions comprising physical locations and mediated discourses: dialogue arenas, clubs, literary salons, the press, etc. This is the communicative reason; a relationship between subjects instead of the subject-object relationship as in modernism,

⁽³²⁷⁾ The future of human nature, p. 3.

⁽³²⁸⁾ Muhannad Mustafa, the concept and limits of public sphere (Arabic).

⁽³²⁹⁾ Marshall Soules, Jürgen Habermas and the Public Sphere.

⁽³³⁰⁾ Nour El-Din Alloush, Public Sphere Transformations in Political Philosophy (Arabic).

aiming to replace the goal the goal of knowing the Truth with the goal of understanding. Therefore, language is given great importance, which is considered the factor that distinguishes humans from nature. It is reason, and then it plays the role of the regulator; the law that regulates the communicative process because if the linguistic use includes well-built arguments, it will inevitably lead to achieving a common agreement. Regarding communicative action, it is a critical philosophical activity based on ethical, rational, demonstrative and purposeful argumentation, encompassing economic, political and other relations. Habermas distinguishes between agreement resulting from understanding and influence resulting from pressure and coercion, where communicative action can be subjected to hegemony. Understanding is synonymous with communicative action as it aims to achieve agreement or consensus which is essential for the success of communicative action. The goal of engaging in argumentation is to achieve full communication through mutual understanding or agreement without any pressure.⁽³³¹⁾

There are conditions for argumentation to achieve rational consensus:

1. No one capable of making a relevant contribution is excluded.
2. Participants have an equal voice.
3. They are internally free to express their honest opinions without deception or self-deception.
4. There are no sources of coercion built into the process and procedures of discourse.

In terms of Marxism, Habermas rejected the notion of reaching Truth and historical inevitability. He criticized what he saw as an instrumental and scientific tendency in Marxism, based on a theory of knowledge that emphasizes the subject/object relationship.⁽³³²⁾ He

⁽³³¹⁾ Salem Yafout, Habermas's philosophy of communication.

⁽³³²⁾ Knowledge and Human Interests, part I., 3.

attempted to reconstruct historical materialism by developing a *"theory of communicative action,"* which focuses on ethical rules such as truth, legitimacy, comprehensibility and sincerity in interactions between people.

Habermas argued that the relationship between the forces and relations of production should be replaced by the relationship of labor-communication, emphasizing labor, interaction, technics, ethics and human-to-human relations.⁽³³³⁾ Thus, the relations of production are not determined by the means of production. Instead, they are a necessary condition for the development of means of production themselves, and each of them operates in an independent field: the field of work for the productive forces and the field of social interaction for the relations of production. Additionally, norms and social relations have a unique way of developing that is independent of the economic system's development in societies. Habermas also argued that Marx and Engels limited their method to capitalist societies,⁽³³⁴⁾ suggesting that only the critical energy of Marxism remained. He also rejected Marx's claim that he used Hegel's method materialistically, asserting that he did not primarily need this approach.⁽³³⁵⁾

Habermas is not hostile to capitalism, but he envisions that it may be a great evil. Moreover, he called for a revision of the theory of surplus value, the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to decline and other Marx's analyses of capitalism.

He described his democratic project as "deliberative" or "discursive" democracy, meaning creating a public sphere for societal argumentation, free from any kind of economic or state

⁽³³³⁾ Ingo Elbe, Habermas's Critique of the Production Paradigm.

⁽³³⁴⁾ From his point of view, Marx *"viewed historical materialism as a general theory of social development and he saw the theory of capitalism as a sub-unit of that theory,"* after Marx, p. 55. Then he wrote: *"each particular economic structure can be analyzed in an evolutionary context according to the different modes of production that represented a hierarchical integration within a historically defined anthropomorphic society,"* p. 75.

⁽³³⁵⁾ After Marx.

domination or hegemony. It should be created by citizens themselves, in which they discuss together before any decision is taken. This necessitates steering of the government's laws and policies by the public sphere considering that the only legitimate governments are those that listen to it. It is noted that he did not call for the dissolution of the bureaucratic state apparatus or suppression of the authoritarian legislative and executive authority, the authoritarian judiciary, nor the representative parliamentary apparatus, but stipulated that the state be constitutional.

Habermas is satisfied with the bourgeois public sphere, ignoring the marginalized, the workers, the peasants, etc. Moreover, he does not expect that public opinion may exercise hegemony over state apparatuses, but only that it can participate and recommend.

It is funny that a repressive state like Morocco acknowledges this kind of democracy!

Belatedly, Habermas called for involving the religious establishment in the public sphere. In 2004 he stated that *“Egalitarian universalism, from which sprang the ideas of freedom and social solidarity, of an autonomous conduct of life and emancipation, of the individual morality of conscience, human rights and democracy, is the direct heir of the Judaic ethic of justice and the Christian ethic of love. This legacy, substantially unchanged, has been the object of continual critical reappropriation and reinterpretation. Up to this very day there is no alternative to it. And in light of the current challenges of a post-national constellation, we must draw sustenance now, as in the past, from this substance. Everything else is idle postmodern talk.”*⁽³³⁶⁾ He thinks that the world is in a “post-secular” stage, where it is divided between religious fundamentalism and secular fundamentalism, and that this matter needs treatment, thus believing that religion can contribute to the dissemination of values of tolerance and cooperation.

Criticism:

This democracy requires that stakeholders and people in power act rationally and morally. So, it is just a moral advocacy that can

⁽³³⁶⁾An interview with the Pope on 14 January, 2004.

be implemented in a society without classes or repressive apparatuses. As for preaching to ruling classes, it is useless. Moreover, the idea of consensus is practically unimaginable in practice. Moreover, is consensus necessary to reach understandings? Then how can one conceive that all classes or political and social forces agree despite their contradictory interests, and what is the share of the marginalized and peasantry in that kind of democracy?! It is clear that Habermas's theory of communication is an alternative to class struggle, i.e., surrender of the oppressed classes which he excluded from his bourgeois public sphere. In practice, it does not change anything of the painful reality of human beings.

It was not a coincidence that German foreign minister Joschka Fischer called him "*The Philosopher of the New German Republic.*" It is remarkable that Habermas did not analyze the reason for the shortcomings of modernity or specifically the dominance of the instrumental mind, alienation and reification, ignoring the role of capitalism, its state and its management of this instrumental mind. Indeed, the tool never runs itself.

Lastly, there is a contradiction: if Habermas aims to transcend the subject-object relationship in favor of the subject-to-subject relationship, isn't a mere development of a theory on his part of a relationship between a subject and an object? Isn't a "truth" what he presented of ideas from his point of view? Did he reach his ideas by communication and consensus as well as ideas that are put forward in public argumentation; is it not derived from the subject-object relationship?

Critical theory has made significant advancements in critiquing orthodox Marxism, advanced capitalism and Stalinist socialism. It has also directed sharp criticism towards positivist philosophy and sociology. However, it ultimately failed to initiate revolutionary

change. The first generation of critical theorists gave up and expressed their despair. Additionally, one of the founders, Adorno, suggested that individual emancipation could be achieved through authentic art, avoiding social and political conflict. The second generation, represented by Habermas, proposed the establishment of a democratic system that ensures freedom and mass participation, aiming to overcome instrumental reason under capitalism with unclear practical mechanisms. The school did not offer a concrete plan for struggle or a vision for overcoming current reactionary social systems. It criticized bourgeois culture without directly challenging capitalism itself. Critical theory aimed to critique systemic issues without embracing absolute relativism. Habermas attempted to address this issue theoretically with the concept of communicative reason, but both Horkheimer and Habermas eventually fell into idealism.

It is, as Ian Craib noticed, often phrased in deliberately vague terms that do not express authenticity in thought or difficulty in the matters dealt with, as much as it expresses the savoring of those writers with such vagueness. Much of what they say does not make sense logically, even if it could be translated into understandable terms.⁽³³⁷⁾

2. Slavoj Žižek: Changed the traditional Marxian concept of class. He considered that there is a global symbolic class of business managers, journalists, professors, experts, and further down the social scale, what he called “the cursed man”: the marginalized inhabitants of shanty towns. Then comes the middle class, which is the working class that is on the road to near extinction.⁽³³⁸⁾

⁽³³⁷⁾ The social theory, p. 294 (Arabic translation).

⁽³³⁸⁾ Ali Mahmoud Almuhammadawi, Western Marxism and beyond, p. 23. (Arabic)

3. Louis Althusser: Attempted to provide a structuralist reading of Marxism, based on reading Marx. He also criticized the humanism apparent in Marx's early writings. Furthermore, he rejected the existence of what Engels called the laws of dialectics, as well as the laws of history: *"The real materialist conception of history entails abandoning the idea that history is dominated and governed by laws whose knowledge is sufficient for achieving triumph over non-history."*⁽³³⁹⁾ Among his significant criticisms of Marxism is its materialism, which he considered metaphysics, where matter replaced the spirit or the absolute idea of Hegel. A different concept of materialism was presented: Aleatory Materialism, which in Althusser's point of view is a philosophy for the sake of Marxism, not the philosophy of Marxism; the possible philosophy of Marxism. It means that before the formation of the world, there was no meaning, reason, purpose, logic or non-logic. This is a refutation of all teleology; logical, moral, political or artistic. This materialism is materialism not according to an active subject (whether it is a god or the proletariat) but according to a Becoming -without an active subject- that dominates the system of its development without any specific end. This means that the origin of every world or reality, every necessity or meaning, is due to a coincidental deviation. It is only after the world is established that logic, necessity and meaning follow. The present history is subject to a constant, not to a law; the class struggle constant.⁽³⁴⁰⁾ Actually, it is not possible to conceive a stage *"before the*

⁽³³⁹⁾ Marxism and philosophy (Arabic translation).

⁽³⁴⁰⁾ Althusser presented an example to differentiate idealism and aleatory materialism: *"...the train that is already moving when the materialist philosopher climbs aboard, without knowing where he came from and where he is going. The idealist philosopher, in contrast, knows where the train is coming from and where it is going. He is getting off at Lyon and never doubts this. The materialist philosopher starts by knowing nothing (he does not even know that the earth is round) and consequently has to speak with the other passengers and look out of the window to find out about the journey. The idealist philosopher knows the path in advance, and dives into Le Monde or his correspondence work during the journey. The*

world is established.” Althusser often means that the world is material and that everything happens in it according to chance, so that it is not governed by law, principle or purpose. But it would be more reasonable to say that it is just an absurdity, not governed by an idea or law, but humans are the ones who set the rules and draw the goals according to what suits them. That aleatory materialism is just a view that contradicts the metaphysical component of Marxian materialism, which involves the laws of dialectics, the laws of history and historical inevitability, in favor of a materialism that is not based on any prior principle. It could clear materialism of all traces of idealism.

Althusser was inspired by Gramsci's doctrine on the state. He did not consider the latter merely a tool of repression but also dominates through ideology, adding to it what he called “*ideological state apparatuses*,” which include religious, educational, family, legal, political, trade union, media and cultural institutions.⁽³⁴¹⁾

Regarding his final stance on Marxian “philosophy,” Althusser favored an alternative project that aligned with what Marx wrote in “Capital.” He believed that Marx did not need Hegelian dialectics because Hegel's philosophy was not suitable for his goals. Althusser argued that Marx's dialectics in “Capital is compatible with some different philosophy, his dialectics is “*completely contrary*” to that of Hegel.⁽³⁴²⁾ Thus, he believed that the writings of the young Marx were influenced by Hegel, which he tried to transcend them in

idealist philosopher will leave the train the same person as he arrived. The materialist, however, will have changed because of his encounters. Idealism purports to know the start and the end, and thus the journey is irrelevant. Materialism knows neither the start nor the end, and thus the events of the journey become important. The raw materials that the materialist scientist has to work on are not absolutes, the keys to unlocking the whole, but contingencies, the contingency of what the capitalist class struggle, the capitalist mode of production and the dominant ideology make visible. The idealist treats those contingencies as givens, as if they could have been no other way.” Aleatory Materialism: Louis Althusser and the Necessity of Contingency, pp.164-165.

⁽³⁴¹⁾ Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, 1.

⁽³⁴²⁾ Reading Capital, p. 71.

“Capital;” the genuine Marxism, commenting: “the great text of Marx, I mean Capital, is the excellent place in which we can read his philosophy itself.” His goal in “reading Capital” was to reveal Marx’s true method and philosophy; Marx the holder of the method, not Marx the holder of the ideology, presenting an epistemological break between the two stages.⁽³⁴³⁾ He viewed the Marxian theory as “finite”, “limited to analyzing the capitalist mode of production and its contradictory tendency, which opens up the possibility of moving to the abolition of capitalism and its replacement with ‘something else’ which already appears implicitly in capitalist society.”⁽³⁴⁴⁾ However, Althusser eventually recognized his failure to incorporate Marxism into a structural reading and acknowledged that Marx had not completely freed himself from Hegel 's influence, even as he developed historical materialism. He then explicitly stated: “we have fabricated an 'imaginary' philosophy of Marx, a philosophy that is not found in his work if one clings to every letter of his texts.”⁽³⁴⁵⁾ Thus, leading to a realization that much of his philosophical efforts had been misguided. Despite these shortcomings, Althusser's concept of aleatory materialism remains significant, challenging traditional Marxian metaphysics and offering a new perspective on materialist philosophy.

Concerning the proletarian revolution, he believed that the role of revolutionary intellectuals is to lead and educate the proletariat and produce its theory, so that it does not miss its true interests.

4. Maurice Godelier (a structuralist and Marxist anthropologist): Expressed reservations about the law that Marx mentioned regarding the relationship between forces and relations of production. One example of his criticism is the role of kinship

⁽³⁴³⁾ He explained these ideas in his book: Reading capital and in his interview with fernanda Navarro as published in: Marxism and philosophy.

⁽³⁴⁴⁾ Marxism as a Finite Theory.

⁽³⁴⁵⁾ Marxism and philosophy.

relationships in pre-capitalist societies, which were part of the relations of production and the superstructure. They generally did not result from the level of the productive forces. Yet they had an independent material basis: the biological relations between sexes and between generations, the material conditions for having children which are given meaning by the origins of kinship and intermarriage in the various systems of kinship and transform them into social norms. Marx's vision of a classless society was also considered a utopian idea. Moreover, Godelier reversed the relationship between the means of production and social forms of production.⁽³⁴⁶⁾ He also rejected Althusser's categorization of infrastructure, superstructures and ideology as “instances” or independent levels; institutional divisions. Society does not have a top or a bottom or even levels. This is because the distinction between infrastructure and superstructure is not a distinction between institutions but between functions. Kinship relationships in pre-capitalist societies functioned as relations of production. Religious relations also played a role in production relations in ancient Sumerian society, where the land was considered the property of the idol. In the case of the Greek city-state, membership of the city-state by birth conferred free citizen public and private rights over the land of the city. Politics, in the Greek sense of the word (the art of managing the city-state), operated here from within as a relation of production. The distinction between infrastructure and superstructures is not a distinction between institutions but essentially a distinction between functions. He concluded that every social relation is born and exists inside and outside human thought and that every social relationship has an ideal part from the outset; an ideal element that is not a posteriori reflection but a condition for

⁽³⁴⁶⁾ Symposium of Post Marxism (Arabic). He stated: “*It is not the development of new productive forces that generates new forms of social production, but the emergence and development of new forms of social production that result in the development of the productive forces. In general, the productive forces, both material and spiritual, do not develop by themselves but in a specific historical context and for social reasons, whatever their nature.*”

its emergence and ultimately an essential component.⁽³⁴⁷⁾ This idea is close to the aforementioned idea of Kautsky.

Concerning the state and classes, he thought that *“The power of domination consists of two indissoluble elements whose combination constitutes its strength: violence and consent. At the risk of shocking a certain number of readers, I would go so far as to say that, of these two components of power, the stronger is not the violence of the dominant, but the consent of the dominated to their domination. I am perfectly aware of the differences between consent obtained under duress, passive acceptance, lukewarm adherence and shared conviction. I realize that in any society, even a classless one, not all individuals or groups are equally consenting in their acceptance of the social order. Even when active, their consent is not always given without reservations or contradictions. Reason lies beyond the realm of thought, in the fact that all societies, including the most egalitarian classless ones, contain a mixture of common and particular interests that are constantly conflicting and compromising. Without this, we would never have had any history... I should now like to formulate the following hypothesis: for relations of domination and exploitation to have arisen and reproduced themselves durably in formerly classless societies, such relations must have presented themselves as an exchange and as an exchange of services.”*⁽³⁴⁸⁾

However, Godelier's words about the role of religion and kinship as relations of production are ambiguous, as he did not explain why that happened. Is it not reasonable to consider this role ultimately as a product of the status of the “Marxian” Infrastructure?

The structuralist Marxists generally tried to transform that theory into a science by ridding it of humanitarian and utopian elements. In addition, they presented a different conception of the state; a structure that is independent of the capitalist class, concerned with achieving its long-term general interests before anything else, i.e., it serves the capitalist system more than it serves the capitalist class.

⁽³⁴⁷⁾ Infrastructures, Societies and History, p. 767. *“Social relations, therefore, are simultaneously a material and an ideal reality.”*

⁽³⁴⁸⁾ Ibid.

5. Roger Garaudy: He criticized the absence of the humane dimension in Marxism as it was actually applied. Therefore, he called for exerting pressure to make the socialist system more humane, as well as maintaining pressure to make capitalism more humane without aspiring to transform it into socialism. He also advocated for socialist pluralism without any commitment that the Soviet Union be the model. Regarding the theory itself, he argued for inoculating Marxism with religion to humanize and moralize it. He also believed that the new conditions in the world necessitated replacing the concept of the “new historical bloc” with the concept of the proletariat. This bloc includes the workers, peasants and intellectuals, unlike that of Gramsci.

6. Libertarian Marxism: These various currents are economic and political philosophies that emphasize the anti-authoritarian aspects of Marxism while abandoning its authoritarian features.⁽³⁴⁹⁾ Among them is a current known as left-wing communism, which includes: Luxemburgism, council communism (it considers that workers’ councils are the only authority that should manage the state and the economy, consisting of delegates elected in workplaces and can be summoned at any moment), the “socialism or barbarism” group, international socialism, situationist international, autonomism and the new left. In addition to De Leonism (Marxism of Daniel De Leon), which considers the industrial federations, especially the trade unions, as the locomotive of class struggle that should bring about the change required to establish the socialist system, there is a key difference from anarcho-syndicalism. Daniel De Leon believed that the revolutionary political party was also necessary for the political struggle on behalf of the proletariat, in

⁽³⁴⁹⁾ Daniel Guérin, Libertarian Marxism?

addition to the revolutionary union. These currents rejected the reformist positions of Social Democracy, based on some works of Marx and Engels. They emphasized the belief in the ability of the working class to formulate its own destiny without the need for a revolutionary party, a state, or the help of a vanguard to liberate it. They stand in this view side by side with anarchism. Therefore, libertarian Marxism is one of the main currents in libertarian socialism.⁽³⁵⁰⁾

7. Pierre Clastres: Presented a viewpoint opposite to that of Marxism regarding the state and the relationship between the infrastructure and the superstructure in general, considering that the superstructure determines the infrastructure. He conducted extensive research on primitive tribes in America, based on accurate observations. His conclusion was that the division of people into classes occurred by compulsion, not automatically. Furthermore, the emergence of the state was not related to either the development of productive forces or the emergence of classes. There existed societies without a state and others having a state with an equal level of the means of production.⁽³⁵¹⁾ Among his arguments is that the emergence of classes in itself does not justify the formation of the state because as long as the possessing class exists, it is able to protect itself without an unnecessary state apparatus.⁽³⁵²⁾

8. The Marxian concept of power, in particular, has been repeatedly criticized by various theoretical schools. This concept is summarized as follows: class power is the basis of all powers in any class society, political power occupies a primary importance, and its change is a priority in achieving every fundamental change in the

⁽³⁵⁰⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, the libertarian Marxist currents (Arabic).

⁽³⁵¹⁾ Society against the state, pp. 198-199 (Arabic translation).

⁽³⁵²⁾ Ibid., p. 200.

rights of other powers, especially in capitalist society. Power is concentrated and embodied mainly in the state.⁽³⁵³⁾ The criticism focused on the separation between the state and ideological institutions, the origin of the state and the nature of power in general (Foucault, for example). Marx and Engels were often slandered in this regard.

' All attempts to beautify, modify, develop and add did not lead to the rescue of Marxism or to devise a new systemic theory, prompting the flourishing of anarchist currents, the emergence of the concept of the "Left" that has no specific identity or features, and the dissemination of postmodern ideas'

12. Critique of the project of socialist revolution

The most nefarious union that can happen is the union of socialism with autocratic rule. That is, the people's struggle for freedom and material well-being through dictatorship and the concentration of all political and social powers in the state. May the future protect us from the preferences of the authoritarian rule; let it protect us from the dire consequences of sectarian socialism or state socialism and its corruptions

Proudhon

The socialist revolution in Marxist theory should end with a socialist system that is transformed into communism at the end. This marks the end of history or, in the words of Marx and Engels, the beginning of the real history of humankind. Engels, after a lengthy

⁽³⁵³⁾ Nicos Poulantzas, *State, Power, Socialism*, p. 42 (Arabic translation).

explanation of socialism, described it as: *“The leap of humanity from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom.”*⁽³⁵⁴⁾

Socialism requires the existence of general societal planning to overcome the anarchy of production. This inevitably leads to the need for a central authority that strictly controls all societal activities and can impose its conception without considering individual desires; a state apparatus. The supposed transition to a communist system (socialism without a state where production and distribution of wealth are based on the principle of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs”) does not address the central mechanism for planning economic activity. The need for people to exchange products and services necessitates the existence of a market for exchange, especially in a global community without armies or national conflicts. In a large society, a system of exchange other than the market cannot be established; it can either be a central “non-market” system (under state control) or a free market. However, the idea of a “market” without exchange values and the disappearance of the state is a fictional concept. In such a system, individual or cooperative investment can only be allowed under the supervision of a central authority and within a planned framework. Regarding product prices, they are not determined based on production costs because they are not exchange values. Therefore, they must be set by the state or a central authority, which does not necessarily have to be repressive. Achieving the principle of “to each according to his needs” is only possible if each individual's needs are predetermined, like a ration set by an authority (similar to a soldier's daily food portion). Furthermore, individuals cannot determine their needs on their own and fulfill them in Paradise alone. Human needs are unlimited and constantly increasing, driving technological advancements. Additionally, Marx and Engels did not specify the form of workers' authority they referred to as the dictatorship of the proletariat, defined as *“the organized proletariat as*

⁽³⁵⁴⁾ Anti-Dühring, Part III: Socialism.

the ruling class." While there are mentions of the Paris Commune as a model for this dictatorship, the commune dismantled the state apparatus, contradicting the unchanged Marxist thesis. There was no plan in place to prevent the prospective workers' state from resembling that of Stalin.

Failure of state socialism to achieve the goals of the revolution:

This issue will be presented considering the Soviet Union as a model.

The course of the Russian Revolution gave rise to a social class system and a bureaucratic mode of production that demonstrated to be less advanced than capitalism and ultimately collapsed by virtue of its internal contradictions besides Western pressures.

Before the revolution, Russia witnessed a major industrial advancement accompanied by tangible backwardness of agriculture. Besides, there was educational and scientific progress, represented in the proliferation of schools, even in the countryside, respectable universities and valuable scientific research. While the majority of the population still lived in the countryside (82% in 1917), the number of workers in large industry did not exceed three million workers, most of whom were ordinary manual workers, carrying workers-peasant traditions, and they were linked to the countryside to one degree or another. That is, they did not constitute a mature or consolidated working class, even as a class "in itself," at the socioeconomic level, but a class on the way of formation.

It also had major civilized cities, as centers of advanced industry, where a highly cultural intelligentsia was living. The latter inspired liberalist and socialist theories, in addition to the role of its members as skilled technocrats necessary for modern industry and scientific research. So, both agriculture and industry belonged to different historical eras; the intelligentsia and some industrial workers

belonged to modern times, while the rest of the population lived in the early modern period.

As a result of this situation, the ambitions and dreams of the different classes varied. In the countryside, peasants looked for bourgeois reform, while the urban industrial workers and radical intellectuals looked for socialism. Because the class of the large landowners was stronger than the bourgeoisie, the latter was unable to wage an effective struggle against the existing system, which was in a faltering transitional stage from feudalism to capitalism. Ironically, the working class was politically stronger than capitalism. It was not Russian capitalism that guided the process of capitalist transformation, but the feudal state played a fundamental role in establishing advanced industry in cooperation with foreign investors, driving the capitalist growth at a rate exceeding the rate of growth of domestic capitalism itself. Thus, the rate of growth of the working class exceeded that of domestic capitalism.

However, because agriculture was not capitalized yet but was in a transition to capitalism, and even industry in cities was still limited for the whole of the Russian economy, the idea of the socialist transformation that workers and Marxists demanded was not possible according to the Marxian theory, which asserted that this transformation necessitates an advanced capitalist economy, i.e., in Western Europe.

The tsarist state was markedly centralized, surrounded by a large number of external enemies which prompted it to build a strong and modern army. That required disseminating education to form sufficient administrative and technical cadres with a high degree of efficiency (the same as what happened in the era of Muhammad Ali in Egypt). This exhausted the economic surplus, contributing to impeding its economic growth.

The Russian Workers' Party had split into two factions (then two parties): the Bolsheviks (left wing) and Mensheviks (a conservative wing similar to the Socialist parties in Europe). Besides, other small

socialist groups were present. Unskilled workers formed the rank and file of the Bolsheviks, while skilled and educated workers formed that of the Mensheviks. Other opposition parties also were found; the most important of which was the Cadet Party; the bourgeois liberal party and the Socialist Revolutionary Party, which was essentially a peasant party.

These were, in short, the social-political conditions of Russia before the revolution.

This uneven and combined development of Russian economics and culture was reflected in the political level; savage Russia, as called in Europe, was more mature than the latter in the sphere of class struggle. In Lenin's famous expression, Russia was the weakest link in the imperialist chain; consequently, this less advanced country was closest to the socialist revolution than Europe. This was a dilemma for the Marxists, which will consolidate and explode during the revolution of 1917. The class of large landowners was disintegrating, while the bourgeoisie was not able to lead an accomplished bourgeois revolution. That situation is reminiscent of France just before its revolution from a certain point: weakness of the bourgeoisie, while the revolution was brewing. In Russia this situation gave the fiercely rebellious peasants and workers the opportunity to overthrow the large landowners without enabling the bourgeoisie to rule. At this point the situation differed from that of France on the eve of its revolution. Russia was experiencing a very strong workers' movement having a well-organized political party, and the peasants also had their large and radical party (one million members in 1917), while Russian capitalism was -relatively- much weaker than French capitalism.

The aforementioned dilemma of Russia consolidated during and after its revolution. The pre-revolution situation had -according to Marxian theory- only the potential of a bourgeois revolution, which

was taken for granted by Russian Marxists.⁽³⁵⁵⁾ Thus, the role of peasants in the revolution must be essential, not merely an addition to the role of the workers. Lenin translated this in the slogan of “Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry,” without this slogan specifying which of them would have the superior authority,⁽³⁵⁶⁾ which he changed later insisting and affirming that the workers must be the leading power.

To overcome this dilemma, Trotsky proposed the aforementioned theory of the Permanent Revolution: a bourgeois revolution led by the workers and supported by the peasantry, which establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat backed by the peasants. Since the workers will rule, they will, after accomplishing the tasks of the bourgeois revolution, build socialism without the need for a new revolution.⁽³⁵⁷⁾ Thus, the revolution will be peasant-proletarian- meanwhile, in terms of its political content; bourgeois with socialist aspirations. This theory holds a clear problematic: the proletariat in power fulfills the tasks of the bourgeois revolution then builds socialism: how can socialism be built before the means of production develop to the maximum extent possible under the capitalist system? Can the capitalist system grow under the rule of the proletariat, not capitalists? What can be inferred from this plan is that the workers carry out a socialist revolution that accomplishes the historical tasks of the bourgeoisie instead of the latter, in the pathway of building socialism.

⁽³⁵⁵⁾ The idea of a socialist revolution in Russia was brought up by Marx in a much earlier period, before the great transformations that the Russian countryside witnessed and led to the disintegration of the village communities. Marx wrote in his letter from to editor of the *Otecestvenniye Zapisky*: “*If Russia continues to pursue the path she has followed since 1861, she will lose the finest chance ever offered by history to a nation, to undergo all the fatal vicissitudes of the capitalist regime.*”

⁽³⁵⁶⁾ The Revolutionary-Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Peasantry, April, 1905 - Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, July, 1905.

⁽³⁵⁷⁾ He presented this theory in his book “Results and prospects” issued in 1906 and then dedicated to it a book entitled “The Permanent Revolution” in 1928.

The role of the proletariat in the case of Russia, according to Marxian theoretical ideas, is a subsidiary element of a bourgeois revolution in the first place, as it was in the French Revolution. However, to lead a bourgeois revolution and take over power, not temporarily (this is always possible in history), but permanently, governs and establishes socialism, means one thing: violating the theory of the relationship between the forces and relations of production, which is fundamental in Marxism. Certainly, there are Marxist explanations of this theory, trying to justify it by ideas such as the Permanent Revolution and the New Democracy (Mao), etc. But all that can be found is twisting and turning around the subject, with extensive elaboration without real approaching the issue at hand. The conclusion being that socialism can be built in a backward country provided getting aid by developed countries.⁽³⁵⁸⁾

In the Russian revolution, the peasants were the most numerous, the most powerful in terms of their role in the economic system and the most present in the army. So, they imposed their program: distributing the land to the peasants (against the original Bolshevik program: confiscation of all the land), as well as the Bolshevik slogan: peace and an immediate ending of the war. The first matter led to dangerous conflicts later.

At last, the workers were able to establish their authority in the cities; the dominant classes were quickly liquidated, losing the land, factories and the state apparatus itself. A workers-peasant power was established, which Lenin had previously referred to as the Democratic Dictatorship. In reality, official power was concentrated in the Petrograd Soviet, the strongest one. The peasant soviets were weak and absent in small and dispersed peasant communities, to the point that on June 3, 1917, the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers and Soldiers' deputies was launched in Petrograd, and a central executive committee was elected without inviting the soviets

⁽³⁵⁸⁾ Trotsky proposed an example of such explanations in his book: Results and prospects, chapter 7.

of peasants' deputies. However, in December 1917, a meeting of the Soviets of peasants was held, and the overwhelming majority of delegates voted in favor of the October Revolution, declaring their union with the soviets of soldiers and workers.

As an extension of the dilemma of the Russian revolution, the post-revolution situation of the workers was weak enough to fail to efficiently manage the country. After allocating lands to the peasants, the latter became economically stronger than the proletariat, as their industries were not able to balance with the huge agriculture. Moreover, in the Civil War and the wars of intervention, Russia witnessed massive devastation, especially in the cities. Many workers were killed, and most of the remaining fled to the countryside to seek food and guaranteed work in the land. The few that remained in the cities showed a failure to manage the economy due to lacking expertise. The proletariat lacked the ability to manage what was supposed to be its economy. While all that changed in the countryside was the right to own land for the benefit of the peasants. This new situation led to a higher standard of living for them and their control of most of the national production, including food, and they could now control the working class economically in reality. Thus, the stronger peasant component imposed itself on the revolution as a whole, even in the major cities.

These changes had several consequences: First, the labor base of the Labor party became limited, while the party's cadres found themselves in power, not only responsible for managing their own economy but also had to work to rebuild the working class that had corroded in the civil war and the war of intervention. Secondly: The Bolshevik Party, while holding the state power, found itself in a state of war with the developed world (14 countries participated in the conquest of Russia), without having a coherent social support at home. Thirdly: the Bolsheviks (according to their theory of the social revolution in the weak link of the imperialist chain) looked for a proletarian revolution in Europe to help them, but their calculations were mistaken, as the workers' revolutions in Europe

failed. Fourthly: What made matters worse was the obligatory concession granted to the peasants by the Bolsheviks in 1921, by following the liberal “New Economic Policy,” which led to the growth of the “kulaks;” the rich peasants, whom Stalin later resorted to confiscate their lands by force and killed millions of them.⁽³⁵⁹⁾

In these circumstances, the social structure of the Soviet Union began to be formed.

The social transformations achieved by the revolution led to an increase in the standard of living of the peasants, absence of rent and the lack of agricultural surplus. The peasants consumed almost all their production, so they could no longer save at their will. Moreover, the industry deteriorated drastically; its production was not sufficient to rebuild the country or provide the army supplies, nor was it enough to exchange for food for city dwellers, resulting in famine.

The revolutionary proletariat was unable to control the countryside. The influence of the Bolshevik Party was very weak among the peasants and in their soviets, prompting the Bolshevik government to give the worker five votes to one vote for each peasant in the soviet elections, to maintain the official status of workers and achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This was a strange historical precedent, expressing the dilemma of the revolution that had bourgeois potentials with socialist aspirations. Likewise, the workers themselves were unable to impose

⁽³⁵⁹⁾ This policy liberated domestic trade, encouraged foreign capital to work in the Soviet Union and established the right to private property that was previously abolished by the Bolshevik government. It also abolished the policy of forcibly seizing crops and replaced it by a tax on agricultural production, in addition to abolishing forced labor. This policy resulted in private sector recovery; artisan workshops, trade and agriculture and led to a significant improvement in the economic status as a whole.

their authority; even within the cities because they lacked the efficiency. Thus the workers' authority did not last more than a few weeks or months in the large cities. Actually, the destruction of the old system was relatively easy, but the process of building a new system was the Russian dilemma as it was being consolidated. Hence, everything began to change, especially after the failure of the dream of extending the revolution to the entire imperialist chain. However, the revolution was victorious in the war of intervention and the civil war, and the Bolsheviks could crush the right and left opposition completely. Finally, the party's political authority became omnipotent in the cities.

Due to this dilemma, everything began to change. The revolution gradually declined during the period from 1917-1928. Each step was taken under pressure from the economic and military conditions that the Bolsheviks and their allies exploited in their favor. The Bolshevik party completely dominated thanks to the balance between the workers and peasants. Moreover, the party used this balance deliberately even before the rise of Stalin, which means that the objective conditions were a favorable climate for the forces of “wicked” in the heart of the new political power and the new deep state. The supposed party of the proletariat had become based on a small proletariat; rather, it had to recreate the working class to operate the industry. To strengthen its corroded base, it appealed to the help of the old administrators and the Tsar's officers; the deep tsarist state, with the utmost use of violence to transform the peasants into workers and compel them to work. This step was the first sign of the failure of the socialist revolution and the beginning of the counter-revolution.

The emergence of “villains” inside and at the head of the new state power had old seeds: the party that looked to itself as the bearer of the consciousness of the proletariat, carrying Truth and the pioneer of socialism. It now considers its absolute power the most necessary guarantee for the stability of the revolutionary regime that would build socialism. Therefore, the Bolshevik party,

using the social and political contradictions, was hitting here and there, supporting its absolute power and gradually centralizing it in the hands of a single leader. To achieve this goal, it practiced all forms of “evil,” from killing opponents, stripping all rights of workers and peasants and using methods and men of czarism, pretending that it had been making great sacrifices for the sake of the Great Principles.

That is how the state was re-established in Russia with iron and fire against the will of the population, supported by the ignorance of the workers, the greed and the narrow mind of the peasants and -of course- the aspirations of the new leaders of the party. In fact, the Russians never ruled themselves during or after the revolution. The workers' soviets were concentrated in major cities and the peasants' soviets were also in the larger villages and towns, most of which were formed after the October Revolution by the government. The power was effectively transferred from the Tsar's hands to the Kerensky government, to the Bolsheviks, initially supported by workers, soldiers and peasants. Thereafter it ended up in the hands of a few Bolshevik party leaders.

Notwithstanding all circumstances, one cannot find any objective justification for the new rulers to suppress the peasants by armed gangs formed of workers, abolish the trade union authority, suppress the workers-peasant left, monopolize the political power, brutally liquidate the other revolutionary parties and then select the bossy Stalin as a leader. Lastly, the plots performed to liquidate the most revolutionary elements of the Bolshevik party itself. However, the greed of the few for power, the narrow mind of the Russian people as a whole and their liability to submit in exchange for a piece of land constituted the deep foundation of Stalinism.

The idea of organizing a revolution, while relying on the support of another possible revolution is an absolutely utopian one. The Russian Marxists were unanimous that socialism could not be established in Russia without direct assistance from proletarian revolutions in Western Europe. However, it is totally impractical to

start a revolution on the basis that others will complete it. Since this process of support must continue for several decades to advance the relatively backward Russian economy, a period that is sufficient for the bureaucratization of the Soviet power and the separation of the workers' party from workers. Just as this aid can only be conceived as subsidiary aid, it does not immediately create a proletariat capable of self-administration, which also means the strengthening of the authority of the state and the ruling party. Likewise, this support cannot be free of charge; so who will provide free support to a country with a population of 130 million people for ideological or moral motivations? This perception is based on a Marxist firm belief in the unity of the interests of the “world proletariat,” which no pragmatic politician can conceive. Moreover, the peasant component here is neglected; that is the supposed support would be provided mainly to the Russian peasants because they are the majority of the Russians. So, why would European workers provide support to Russian peasants in huge quantities for a long time? For the sake of Russian workers?! If this is possible, capitalism can also give up its private property in favor of an egalitarian-autonomous society, by mere discussion and persuasion for the benefit of all humanity. Finally, it was never possible to ascertain the success of the revolution in Europe and then it was necessary to precisely conceptualize the situation of revolutionary Russia in this case. Kautsky commented on this perception, saying about Lenin : *“although he lived for decades as an emigrant in Western Europe, still never achieved a full understanding of its political and social peculiarities. His politics, which was completely adapted to the peculiarities within Russia, was with regard to foreign countries based on the expectation of a world revolution, which to anyone who knew Western Europe must have appeared from the start as an illusion.”*⁽³⁶⁰⁾ The more utopian was Trotsky's additional perception: that the Russian revolution would transfer the revolution to Europe.
(361)

⁽³⁶⁰⁾ Epitaph of Lenin.

⁽³⁶¹⁾ Results and Prospects, chapter 9.

Many factors prompted the revolutionary authorities to resort to repression to stabilize the system: the disability of the Russian proletariat - its lack of educated and trained cadres to run the country - the party became entrusted with its rehabilitation and indeed with its restructuring, as a necessity to preserve the new system - the scarcity of economic surplus - the inability of the industry to provide goods to the peasants in exchange for food. The authorities resorted to seizing crops from the peasants by force; the police force. In the beginning, the Bolshevik party formed gangs of city workers to plunder the agricultural surplus at gunpoint. Afterward this process was organized in a better and more efficient way. The oppression extended up to deprive the masses of workers from any exercise of authority.

Oppression definitely required specialized apparatuses, after the shrinking of the number of workers and the industry's need for them. These apparatuses should require expenses and their members must look for a share of the economic surplus. Therefore, the task of rebuilding the degenerated state appeared (Lenin described the Soviet power in March 1923 as: “*Our state apparatus is so deplorable, not to say wretched*”⁽³⁶²⁾).

The state found itself obligated to extract the surplus by itself and concentrate it in its hands. Thus, the people found themselves in front of the new Soviet state: the leaders of the party which Stalin had opened to non-workers; technocrats whom Lenin had to return to their positions in 1919 and generously rewarded with lucrative bonuses,⁽³⁶³⁾ old and new senior statesmen, senior officers recruited from the old Tsar's army and new ones and a mixture of Bolsheviks and Tsarist elements. That clique began working to build the new system. Its excellent position was codified by special decrees. The theory was “developed” from Marxism-Leninism to Stalinism, to suit the new system, and became the official philosophy of the state.

⁽³⁶²⁾ Better Fewer, But Better, March 2, 1923.

⁽³⁶³⁾ Six Theses on the Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government.

The new plan of the new Bolsheviks became: Socialism in One Country and thereafter they declared: “*the state of the whole people*”! Rather than making Russia a mere base of the international revolution as Lenin and Trotsky aimed at, the world communist movement became a reserve and a fifth column for the Soviet Union.

Initially Lenin and Trotsky liquidated all parties except the Bolshevik Party, then the same principle went along; the left wing members of the same party or those opposing the leadership were physically liquidated, including all the thinkers, leaders and prominent militants of Russian socialism, including Trotsky himself. In the end, the party structure was reformed to match the regime of one-party rule.

Bureaucratic Mode of Production:

The mode of production, in broad terms -according to the Marxian definition- is the social form of the social surplus.

In the Soviet Union, the social surplus was generated under the supervision of the organized state bureaucracy (its core was the party elite), while the workers and peasants were excluded from any political or non-political authority. The party had been integrated into the state apparatus, including the army and security. Thus, a bureaucratic ruling class had been formed. This class established all system policies and supervised their implementation. It set the objectives of the investment process and the mechanisms of their implementation. Ultimately, it determined the mechanisms of distributing the surplus, its destiny and the proportions of distribution among the different groups that constituted the new ruling class. A member of this class was merely a position and nothing more, representing power only in terms of his own professional status, and his entire activity was directed towards the interests of the system as a whole, not his own interest. If that member came out of it for one reason or another, he became nothing, especially during the rise of the system, before the emergence of secret private properties of the bureaucrats. The

surplus was distributed through mechanisms determined by the ruling elite to its members in different forms: “salaries,” bonuses, percentages of “profits,” “state awards,” incentives, special services, excellent special products and other non-codified forms that emerged later. These mechanisms were linked to the nature of the bureaucracy itself, where specific responsibilities were defined for each individual, giving him specific power; a margin of movement that enabled him to practice unregulated forms of theft, as a margin related to any bureaucracy by and large - even in the private sector - for the purpose of making the administration more flexible.

Everyone in the bureaucratic system received a salary or a wage, but there was a qualitative difference between the “wages” of workers and the “salaries” of senior statesmen. The workers received a ration in exchange for their labor power, while the big bureaucrats received a share of the surplus, not corresponding to professional work, but to their socio-political positions. The most important sector of the bureaucracy; its heart, consisted of the highest military ranks, security personnel, the secret service, leading intellectuals of the ruling class, politicians and technocrats in their administrative rather than technical capacity, just like the rest of the upper bureaucracy. That was the ruling class. All this was not deliberately intended or planned; Stalin himself lived an austere life and had few advantages, but running the system required purchasing loyalties.

The bureaucracy formed a social stratum; a position, more than a real class; a legal personality; an institution. It was more important and stronger than its members as long as the system remained coherent. It did not consist of specific individuals; rather, it began its existence as an institution; a social position, an apparatus that included individuals, whom it may get rid of some and recruit others.

The full control of the bureaucratic stratum or class - if it is called so - over society required the prohibition and proscription of individual property of means of production. Individual ownership

means that the bureaucracy is deprived of a part of its power as an owning class and of some amount of the surplus (because it depends on direct robbery). Therefore, it tended to confiscate it to the fullest extent, and became less and less able to do so as its disintegration proceeded as an institution.

In this system, the ruling class or stratum was the state itself. Thanks to this concentration, the surplus was produced and distributed according to administrative plans, by distributing investments, determining wages and gifts and developing the labor power in a way that serves the long-term interests of the system. It was inevitable that the state would provide services such as education, health services, etc., to an appropriate extent for that goal. The system extracted the social surplus through a general plan that involved the distribution of labor, determination of working hours, workers' rights, etc. Thus, the surplus was extracted from the working classes as a single block, being organized by administrative methods in the production process. The state employed the worker in a specific place, specified his rights, and might need to consider his preferences, if the local authorities were reasonable enough to achieve the highest possible performance. As for peasants, the state was “buying” a percentage of their crops and compelling them to purchase certain “public” services, both at compulsory prices. In the early periods, peasants' farms were compelled to provide a certain number of laborers annually to the state to become workers in the cities. In addition, the peasants were being subjugated to generalized servitude, which resembled that of the Asiatic mode of production, in the form of public works. Moreover, the state imposed certain taxes on the products, not related to their cost; with the purpose of guaranteeing a predetermined income. This is not to mention the concentration camps, set up by order of Lenin,⁽³⁶⁴⁾ reached its peak

⁽³⁶⁴⁾ Richard Pipes, *Lenin's Gulag*.

extension during Stalin's rule and incarcerated millions; estimated to be 8-15 million people in 1942.⁽³⁶⁵⁾

This system; therefore, consisted of two main classes: the upper bureaucracy and the forced laborers. All work was carried out under coercion. In addition, the striking laborer became subject to execution in the late 1920s.⁽³⁶⁶⁾ Workers were not distributed among the various production sectors by bureaucratic decisions only, but also by indirect mechanisms, such as the types and quantities of taxes (e.g., during the Khrushchev era, the livestock farmers were obliged to sell their products to the state at the price that it set, which meant their conversion from private producers into laborers for the state).

The bureaucracy, being the only owner of the means of production, compelled the citizens to work for it. Moreover, the worker did not have the right to move from one job to another except after approval of the state because their employment contract was done with the state, not with the workplace. The citizen had no right to work in other countries, except with a mandate from the state that was sharing his salary in this case. In all cases, they were not receiving wages, but rations, which they had no right to bargain about; rather, they had to receive. In fact, the workers had no role in the determination of their income, were not allowed to bargain, as there was no labor market at all, but the state determined everything for them, according to its calculations.

Under this system, the working class cannot be considered proletariat, in the Marxian sense of the word, for many reasons. It did not pay surplus value to the state. The mode of bureaucratic exploitation prompted the state to employ the entire population; otherwise, they would starve to death. Besides, the working class was not separated from the possession of the means of production; it could not choose to work and meanwhile the state used non-

⁽³⁶⁵⁾ Tony Cliff, *State Capitalism in Russia* (1955/1974).

⁽³⁶⁶⁾ *Ibid.*

economic means to enforce it to work; including very dreadful ways. The state also controlled the transfers of the workers, their fields of study and specialization, etc. The worker was just a “subaltern,” working for the bureaucracy as the farmer in ancient Egypt used to work for the king, with some difference, as will be mentioned.

In conclusion, the surplus was extracted from the workers as a whole in favor of the bureaucratic stratum as a legal personality; an institution. This method of robbing was not related to market mechanisms, but there was no market at all. The state determined both wages and prices according to its goals, regardless of the cost. It was not concerned with the profit rate of each enterprise, not even the general profit rate in the first place, but it was concerned mainly with the stability of the system as a whole. The state in such a system was more important than anything else: politics was first. Economic policy was an element in a policy aimed at securing the social system against both internal and external pressures, whatever the economic cost and losses. This was evident in what is called the inefficiency of the Soviet economy; economic projects were created in the service of the state policy, not for profit-making.

Based on this concept, the surplus in the bureaucratic society was the Generalized Labor Rent. The logic of the economic plan determined from the start the division of labor and the distribution of workers over the means of production. It also determined the quantity and quality of workers' consumption, the level of bureaucracy's income and the rate and areas of capital accumulation. The plan determined everything, and the income of the members of the dominant class was determined according to their roles in developing and implementing the policies of the system as a whole. As for the exchange, it did not take place in a free market, but in a central market, which was under the control of the state and subject to the general plan, without regarding the cost, production price, or exchange value.

This surplus was not a surplus value because it was not produced through buying and selling labor power, but was extracted through

uneconomic ways; by coercion. However, it was not purely feudal surplus; rather, it was an intermediate form, having characteristics of both.

This can be called the Modern Bureaucratic Mode of Production, which differs from the old bureaucratic systems - such as ancient Egypt - because the surplus in this case was extracted as a Generalized Labor Rent from the working class as a whole, not from its members as individuals, or from its divisions (e.g., village communities). Here the rate of exploitation of the individual workers varied, and there were even privileged workers who were given high wages and workers who were receiving wages in establishments that were loss-making. But there was a generalized labor rent going to the state.

This system arose as a result of the Russian revolution with its dilemmas as it was dealt with above, and the conditions of Russia and its own social composition. This was not a historical inevitability in any way. The establishment of that system was the result of the balance of political powers in Russia. It would have been certainly that things go differently if the Bolshevik revolution failed for subjective reasons; even that might be better for Russia.

The Soviet power had to extract the surplus from the peasants by coercion because it was the only surplus that was available at the beginning. Meanwhile, the backward industry alongside the foreign blockade pushed the state to prioritize heavy industry at the expense of the consumer goods industry. This option led to achieving high accumulation coincident with a low rate of consumption. Besides; the wages were very low, with brutal suppression of the workers and enforcing them to work and prohibiting working outside the state sector, otherwise labor camps, especially since most of the population were peasants, with a shortage of labor needed for rapid industrialization.

This system is considered a pre-capitalist socio-economic formation, not in the Marxian sense, but in the sense that it was less

technologically advanced, based on backward means of production and its development became almost blocked after a few decades. It was also less modernized than capitalism; the state imposed Marxism on the people as a religion, not allowing it to be criticized or refused, so one is not able to think freely without the guidance of another (this is the definition of Enlightenment presented by Kant). A situation that is undermining secularism.

Despite achieving a great development of productive forces in the beginning, the formation of modern bureaucratic society implied a strong tendency for stagnation. It lacked a strong internal impulse to develop the means of production as quickly as it actually did (note that the high rate of China's growth began actually after starting the transition to capitalism). Western pressures and blockade were the biggest motivations for rapid growth. Moreover, the continuation of the bureaucratic system required its success to maintain its isolation from the influence of the global market. So, the extremely fast industrialization at the beginning, especially for machinery and equipment, arm industry in particular, was very concerning for the bureaucracy.

Disintegration and dissolution of the bureaucratic system:

Notwithstanding the rapid development of means of production in the Soviet Union, the bureaucracy failed to catch up with capitalism. The latter possessed a vast global market, a special internal drive for growth and stimulating development and it was much more advanced than Russia. A costly conflict took place between the two parties. The capitalist countries endeavored vigorously to restore this part of the world that had almost left the global market. This prompted the Soviet bureaucracy to work to strengthen itself, which explains its centering of the entire Soviet economy around the manufacture of weapons (while this did not happen in the socialist countries which the Soviet army was protecting, benefiting from the Cold War). This heavy cost of the army and armament placed enormous pressure on the Soviet resources, accelerating the collapse of the system.

In addition, domination of the bureaucracy always leads immediately to great corruption, despite all laws and instruments of oversight and control. As aforementioned, this bureaucracy gave its members a margin for private movement in their implementation of the system policy, like any bureaucracy in general. With the growth of sources of surplus, the private interests of the members of that class grew over time. Hence, peripheries of the system ultimately achieve triumph over the institution as a whole and this was what actually occurred for the bureaucratic systems. As the external pressures continued, the peripheries of the system; the new rich bureaucrats, met with capitalism abroad; hence, the capitalist transformation started. This process was gradually reinforced by the breakdown of the Iron Curtain, under the effect of the communication revolution and the public awareness of the conditions of the opposite world; the capitalist. Then the bourgeois revolution broke out in Eastern Europe and later in the Soviet Union, while China preceded by a decade or more.

In conclusion, what actually took place in the socialist countries was the consequence of the political situation of those countries at the time of their transformation to socialism. It was neither the result of some errors or problems in practice, nor -certainly- of foreign conspiracies as some Marxists claimed. The fact that the socialist revolution did not take place in the developed countries, as predicted by Marxism, was not a coincidence, but a challenge to the theory about the socialist revolution and all the predictions of Marx and Engels.

The idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat constituted a fatal weakness in the Marxist socialist theory; it led to an ambiguous utterance about the proletarian state; sometimes considered a state, a state-commune and a state that vanishes because it is no longer needed. How can one conceive that *“special bodies of armed men, prisons,*

etc.” -in the words of Lenin- confiscate the means of production and then choose for the vanishing of their volition? How can such a state be meanwhile a non-state, as described also by Lenin, except on paper? Then how can it be conceived, assuming all good intentions, that the state of armed workers will not be an oppressive state, while peasants -in the case of Russia- accounted for 85% of the population?

This theory was adhered to in the socialist revolutions following that of Russia: the party rulership on behalf of the working class, even in countries almost having no workers; so who represented that party?! How can it be conceived that this party state would be dissolved autonomously?

Because of the failure of the socialist state, there was virtually a consensus in the ranks of the socialists on the necessity of finding another socialist alternative in which the state is subjugated to the people. But practically speaking, there is no such “recipe” yet for implementation. Moreover, who can think that there may be a state that is subject to the people?

Actually, the good state is the dead state.

This chapter is ended by referring to what is being pointed out by the Marxists that the aforementioned socialism was not really socialism, but another system, which they called a bureaucratic workers' distorted state, state capitalism, etc. It is necessary to draw attention that it was also considered here a stratified and bureaucratic system; but this is the Socialism as it had been implemented. It does nothing to say that another socialist ideal was not established, which history should achieve, just to deny the charges of socialism. The goal was to analyze the actual reality, not the name; an autopsy.

‘Notwithstanding all the disasters, socialism had achieved great steps in the path of development and welfare for people who were utterly backward and some of them were primitive in the full sense of the word. For instance, it cannot be imagined how the peoples of the Tatars and Central Asia could witness this modernization without socialism, as there were no other promising political currents. However, it is not easy to envision what would happen to Russia and China without the socialist revolution. Would the bourgeoisie have achieved greater freedom, welfare and development for those peoples? Maybe’

13. The Failure of Utopian Socialism

If we choose, we can live in a world of comforting illusion

Noam Chomsky

These are attempts to establish small isolated communities based on socialism. Among the most important of these attempts were the

projects of Charles Fourier, Saint Simon and Robert Owen, in addition to similar attempts have been repeated many times.⁽³⁶⁷⁾ It is still being attempted today by some anarchists.

Some criticisms of these attempts are:

1. These projects require rich people to finance them, such as Tolstoy and Owen who gave up their property as charity without peasant or labor movements.

Is it possible to transform the world into socialist communes based on the generosity of the wealthy as an alternative to class struggle?

2. Some old socialists, such as Robert Owen, did not trust the masses and did not rely on them to build the socialist project. They put their trust in a benevolent ruler who would implement their ideas and espouse successful experiences. These include the cooperative societies suggested by Owen and the Phalanstère, which are socialist cooperative colonies; economic commons whose features were detailed by Charles Fourier, each including two to three thousand persons.

Marx and Engels' rejection of this fantasy was clear: *“the emancipation of the working classes must be done by the workers themselves.”*

3. They rejected political action as if the state and capitalism would not interfere with their projects, which was one of the reasons for their failure. How can it be conceived that the ruling class and the state may allow the whole people to come out from under their authority? Utopian socialists tended to focus on the end goal of a perfect society without considering the practical steps needed to get there. They lack clear plans for achieving their goals.

4. Such projects may only succeed in establishing primitive settlements. In the contemporary world, there are networks of roads, airlines, shipping lines, a global division of labor and now the

⁽³⁶⁷⁾ Many details are available in: Harry W. Laidler, *Social-Economic Movements: An Historical and Comparative Survey of Socialism*

Internet. How can one conceive the establishment of self-sufficient cooperatives not linked to the global economy? If such commons become models for the world, how can it be conceived that the world will turn into small independent entities? Who will then have nuclear reactors (fusion in the foreseeable future) and something such as the Suez Canal, Facebook, etc.? How will the exchange between these gatherings be facilitated? The more practical approach is the transformation of the economy to be based on cooperatives in all projects, without adhering to the concept of independent communes.

5. For the world to shift to a cooperative economy, it must confront the resistance of capitalism and the state, from economic competition, conspiracies, and even police repression if necessary. The cooperatives will also have to engage in fierce battles to dismantle the state and confiscate private capital through political struggle alongside the establishment of these cooperatives. Social struggle is inevitable to achieve a transformation in the existing system.

In conclusion, this socialism is really utopian; its proponents were and are not aware of the nature of the modern world, nor the magnitude of the challenges facing them'

14. Anarchism: The Magic Bullet

Proudhon said about the state:

To be GOVERNED is to be watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued,

censured, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the wisdom nor the virtue to do so. To be GOVERNED is to be at every operation, at every transaction noted, registered, counted, taxed, stamped, measured, numbered, assessed, licensed, authorized, admonished, prevented, forbidden, reformed, corrected, punished. It is, under pretext of public utility and in the name of the general interest, to be place under contribution, drilled, fleeced, exploited, monopolized, extorted from, squeezed, hoaxed, robbed; then at the slightest resistance, the first word of complaint, to be repressed, fined, vilified, harassed, hunted down, abused, clubbed, disarmed, bound, choked, imprisoned, judged, condemned, shot, deported, sacrificed, sold, betrayed; and to crown all, mocked, ridiculed, derided, outraged, dishonored. That is government [he means; the state]; that is its justice; that is its morality

What is anarchism?

The word anarchism in English is derived from the Greek: αναρχία, which means: without a ruler, king or president. It is a political trend whose various currents agree on the need to dissolve the centralized state and abolish any authoritarian relationships that use coercion and oppression, condescending to the will of its members, so that society can organize its affairs through voluntary cooperation among its members. It also emphasizes horizontalism and consensual power among equal members of society, with decision-making handled in an anti-authoritarian way where everyone has an equal say in each decision. Anarchist organization relies on the voluntary participation of free individuals in self-managed cooperative associations.⁽³⁶⁸⁾ It should not be overlooked that anarchism considers individual freedom as the highest good and values individuality in itself, but this freedom can only be achieved in a certain type of society. Its social politics and socialist content should also not be overlooked.⁽³⁶⁹⁾ In the words of Alexander Berkman *"More contemporaneously and accurately, it stands for the absence*

⁽³⁶⁸⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, on the concept of anarchism (Arabic).

⁽³⁶⁹⁾ Walt and Michael Schmidt, *Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics of Anarchism and Syndicalism*, p. 33.

of both domination (mastery or control over another) and hierarchy (ranked power relations of dominance and subordination” and in short “we can live in a society where there is no compulsion of any kind.”⁽³⁷⁰⁾

1. There is a definition that brings anarchism closer to the concept of the permanent revolution: *“It is not a political theory. It is a way of conceiving life and life, young or old as we may be, old people or children, is not something definitive: it is a stake we must play day after day,”* etc. *“Although something that can only be called anarchism is very obviously present in the direct actions, protests, community campaigns and discourses of certain activist groups - the people whom I’d like to call anarchists in this thesis - many of them do not normally call themselves anarchists and some actively shun the label, etc.”* Uri Gordon added that anarchism is a political theory; ideas, not an ideology. One has the ideas but the ideology has him. The ideas of anarchism are flexible and change according to the emergence of new data.⁽³⁷¹⁾ Here he temporarily ignored the constants of anarchism, but soon he re-recognized them: a libertarian, anti-authoritarian and egalitarian tendency. It only negates the most rigid ideology; therefore, it can be considered a utopia, not an ideology. Some anarchists tend to the idea of the permanent revolution, so they do not talk about final salvation and a radical revolution, but about partial constantly increasing gains for the people. Among them, the late thinker Sameh Saeed Abboud in Egypt and Rudolf Rocker, who said: *“I am an anarchist not because I believe anarchism is the ultimate goal, but because there is no such thing as an end goal.”*⁽³⁷²⁾ Its theorists also deny that it is a belief: *“Anarchism is an economic, social and political theory, not a belief... these fixed ideas and rigid beliefs that cannot be criticized and refuted are necessarily the source of tyranny and contradiction.”*⁽³⁷³⁾

Anarchism is then a utopia (in the sense provided by Mannheim) that includes ideological elements such as its anti-capitalist and anti-

⁽³⁷⁰⁾ Alexander Berkman, What Is Communist Anarchism? Chapter 20.

⁽³⁷¹⁾ Uri Gordon, Anarchism and Political Theory: Contemporary Problems, chapter 1.

⁽³⁷²⁾ A quotation from Sameh Saeed Abboud, critical reading in Anarchism.

⁽³⁷³⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, Anarchism is neither a belief nor utopia (Arabic).

state position: “It is a concept of making an ideology fit for the requirements of life instead of trying to make life fit for the requirements of ideology.”⁽³⁷⁴⁾

It is also a moral principle; based on cooperation, exchange of benefits and the principle of “do unto others what you would have them do to yo,” with no exploitation or domination. Some anarchist thinkers derive this principle from human nature in general,⁽³⁷⁵⁾ since solidarity allegedly prevails over the struggle for survival. The prevailing perception is that eliminating exploitation and oppression and achieving equality among people is sufficient to make them act in accordance with the previous principle, and society will be able to punish the violator by simply rejecting and contempt.

In fact, searching for a comprehensive definition of anarchism is futile. However, all its schools share the idea of hostility to condescending authority in general and especially to the state. Some anarchist schools think it should be reduced to minarchism; federal with a decentralized administration, with tasks limited to achieving security, law enforcement, external representation and coordination between various civil society institutions. Other anarchist schools, particularly social ones, seek to immediately abolish the state and replace it with a new form of social organization. The state, in their conception is a source of evil; a destructive organization. Of course, anarchists generally envisage the successful dismantling of the state only on a global scale. Some, such as William Godwin, argued that the widespread use of reason among the masses would eventually prompt the government to wither away as a superfluous entity, thus rejecting the use of revolutionary methods to dissolve the state apparatus. Instead, he called for replacing it with a process of gradual peaceful development until it vanishes on its own. He believed that the state with limited authority, could be accepted at present as a necessary evil, which would become increasingly

⁽³⁷⁴⁾ Lorenzo Kom'boa Ervin, *Anarchist vs. Marxist-Leninist Thought on the Organization of Society*.

⁽³⁷⁵⁾ Naom Chomsky put forward this opinion in his debate with Michel Foucault in 1971.

insignificant and powerless through a gradual diffusion of illumination among citizens.⁽³⁷⁶⁾

Anarchists have multiple motivations for adopting their projects, such as aspirations for freedom, humanity and enlightened self-interest. Therefore, phenomena such as civilization, technology and the democratic process have been severely criticized by some anarchist tendencies and praised by others. There are religious and non-religious, individual, collective and communist anarchist currents.

Some anarchists call for a single human world through global organizations and struggles, while others do so through local groups and struggles on a local scale.

The alternative to the state is institutions to achieve collective goals, self-managed by the masses and having optional membership. It calls for the suppression of all forms of coercive powers that are condescending to the will of the people. This includes the abolition of repressive laws, the mechanisms of their imposition and every hierarchical organization in the structure of all social and economic relations by and large and all priesthood. It also promises free communication among humans as the only way to manage their common affairs. The only exception is anarcho-capitalism (which advocates the abolition of the state in favor of capitalist sovereignty, not only in the free market, but in the whole society) and this is why it is considered by many anarchists as untrue anarchism.

Anarchists fight for free and equal social relations, independent societies and voluntary, self-managing and consensual institutions which comprise all anarchists of various contradictory schools; anti-

⁽³⁷⁶⁾ In his words: “Above all we should not forget, that government is an evil, an usurpation upon the private judgment and individual conscience of mankind; and that, however we may be obliged to admit it as a necessary evil for the present, it behooves us, as the friends of reason and the human species, to admit as little of it as possible and carefully to observe whether, in consequence of the gradual illumination of the human mind, that little may not hereafter be diminished.” *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness*, vol. 2, p. 379.

authoritarian groupings that break hierarchy and authoritarianism, such as cooperatives, unions and other forms. They implant the seeds of this society within the existing system, not waiting for the moment of the revolution to establish their society.

All currents of anarchism have a strong libertarian tendency. Their interest in individual freedom is clear, connecting individual freedom with collective freedom. Moreover, they struggle for a “*free society of free individuals,*” ... where “*no one is free unless everyone is free and everyone can only be free if each person can individuate or actualize themselves in the most expansive of senses.*”⁽³⁷⁷⁾ Their hostility to exploitation is only in the context of hostility to the domination of capitalism over other classes (excluding anarcho-capitalism, which is a marginal current).

Anarchism as a thought and movement is as old as human history. It has appeared in all regions throughout history, including modern times, and still strives to realize the human dream of getting rid of repressive power, especially the state. The first person who explicitly described himself as an anarchist was Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, but he was, contrary to his anarchist ideas, hostile to the feminist movement and women's rights. Anarchism is largely synonymous with libertarianism and anti-authoritarianism, which includes socialist anarchism, individualistic anarchism and other trends, as will be seen. On the other hand, it was remarkable that Joseph de Jacques described his principle as libertarian, but he was a communist, unlike Proudhon.

Modern anarchism emerged mostly as a reaction against some of the worst characteristics of the modern state, namely centralization and increasing intrusiveness in the affairs of individuals and groups, weakening individual freedom and autonomy. It revived since the sixties of the last century, after successive failures, thanks to the failure of state socialism, the expansion of marginalization and the end of the welfare state.

⁽³⁷⁷⁾ Cindy Milstein, *Anarchism and Its Aspirations*, p. 12, p. 14.

Anarchists and their proponents participated in various labor and socialist movements: in the Paris Commune, then the Russian and Spanish revolutions. Besides their acts of individual terrorism in Europe and in many revolutions and protests all over the world, from the May 1st strike in Chicago to their role in the Orabi revolution in Egypt and even the Arab Spring. But they were always defeated, whether by the bourgeois state or the emerging Soviet power in the case of the Russian revolution. They established groups of independent anarchist societies on the fringes of larger societies. Some of them are still ongoing, and some are under formation on the margins of authoritarian societies.

In attempts to get rid of wage labor and capitalism, many people around the world have resorted to establishing various types of cooperatives; experiments that most of which are largely successful. They include: communes, agricultural cooperatives, workers' cooperatives, consumer cooperatives, voluntary cooperatives to provide free services to some groups, such as the elderly, housing cooperatives, service cooperatives, mutual insurance cooperatives, etc. All these forms reduce costs and some of them guarantee jobs for their members.

Sameh Saeed Abboud defined the nature of the cooperative as follows: A voluntary, democratic institution that is open to membership and economic participation, which is a condition of this membership. A more detailed definition presented by the International Cooperative Alliance is: *“an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise.”* Hence, the cooperative is based on the idea of integration and partnership between work, capital and management. This means that it is not based on wage work, unlike capitalist companies. The exchange of goods and services between cooperatives is based on the same principles of cooperation. Rather than the principle of competition between capitalist companies, there is the principle of cooperation between cooperatives and their

union from the bottom up. The local community is served in return for the profits achieved by the cooperative at its expense and in return for tax exemption, training and continuing education offered to the members, which distinguishes the cooperative from the capitalist company. In a cooperative, there is one vote for the member regardless of his financial contribution, the share price is fixed and may be assigned to others without selling it in the market and the interest is distributed according to the share for the service of the capital, not as a means of making a profit.⁽³⁷⁸⁾

Theoretical basis:

Anarchists do not proceed in their project, contrary to Marxism, from the laws of history or historical inevitability. Rather they build their conception on the basis that it is the best option and that capitalist ownership (for the majority of them) and the state (and condescending power in general) are pure evil, without caring about the origin of this evil and the reason for its formation historically as Marxism did.⁽³⁷⁹⁾ There are many anarchists who believe that capitalism is the daughter of the state. Consequently state destruction is the prerequisite for the downfall of capitalism, not the other way around, as focusing on the struggle against capitalism is futile. The majority of anarchists agree with materialism in its Marxian sense, and almost all of their currents agree with the law of value (labor is the source of value; therefore, private property is a result of the work of the toilers) and with Marx's analysis of capitalism. In addition, they repudiate, with a few exceptions, wage labor and the market economy, in the context of rejecting what they prefer to call Domination rather than Exploitation as Marxism does.

⁽³⁷⁸⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, on the cooperatives and their rules.

⁽³⁷⁹⁾ Here an obvious model of this “logic”: Pëtr Kropotkin, *Anarchism: its philosophy and ideal*-Alexander Berkman, *What Is Communist Anarchism?*

⁽³⁸⁰⁾ Because they reject all forms of domination, they consider economic exploitation one of its forms. For the same reason, anarchism generally rejects leadership, but the latter necessarily emerges in practice from the most active and initiative elements without being entrusted, so it becomes a non-democratic leadership. Thus, there is a need to struggle against any tendency to authoritarianism or perpetuity of any authority.

Anarchism did not engage in theoretical ideology; being essentially a political philosophy, having basic principles summarized in self-organization, voluntary association and mutual aid.⁽³⁸¹⁾ It is not even a theory exactly, but an idea and a project; a belief in the possibility of building a better society than the existing one, based on the aforementioned principles. In short, anarchism differs from Marxism in that the former tends to be a moral discourse about revolutionary practice, while Marxism tends to be a theoretical or analytical discourse about revolutionary strategy.⁽³⁸²⁾

The theoretical basis for modern anarchism was laid by William Godwin. He argued, in his most important book,⁽³⁸³⁾ that people are born without certain principles; originally neither good nor vicious. It is not permissible for a person's origin or social status to have anything to do with the way he is treated. Humans are all of the same nature, with the same feelings and the same mental capacities. Furthermore, there are three ways to make the human mind more perfect: through literature (transmitting knowledge through mediums or discussion), education or a scheme for the early impression of right principles and political justice. As regards robbery and fraud, the two great vices in society, they originate because of: extreme poverty, the ostentation of the rich, perpetual

⁽³⁸⁰⁾ Randall Amster - Abraham De Leon - Luis A. Fernandez - Anthony J. Nocella - Anthony Shannon, *Contemporary Anarchist Studies*. pp. 11-12.

⁽³⁸¹⁾ David Graeber, *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology*, p. 3.

⁽³⁸²⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

⁽³⁸³⁾ *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*.

tyranny by legislation and the way of the enforcement of law in the inequality of conditions. If everyone did not demand more than he needs all this evil would not appear. He attributed the root of all evil to the political institutions. Likewise, the government (meaning the state apparatus) reinforces evil, although its existence indicates the existence of previous evil, yet it reinforces that and does not give an opportunity for change to the better. One of his main conclusions is that government counteracts the improvement of the individual mind; it is the curse of mankind; a corrupting force in society, encouraging dependence and ignorance. It will continually become less necessary and less powerful with the gradual spread of illumination and the increase in people's moral and political understanding, until finally it dissolves and the people run their own affairs.

On the other hand, some anarchists tried to establish a philosophical basis (other than the philosophy of William Godwin), including the attempt of the great anarchist thinker, Pëtr Kropotkin, to highlight the supremacy of cooperation in nature. In 1902, he published the book *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, in which he presented this conception, explaining the survival and evolution of living organisms through cooperation rather than competition in the Darwinian sense. This led to the success of species in survival and their evolution, including humans. He applied his theory to both human societies and animals through their stages of evolution, providing many real-world examples to demonstrate that the main factor facilitating evolution is cooperation between individuals in freely associated societies and groups, without central control, authority, or coercion. Some anarchist Buddhist philosophers also believe that there is wisdom, understanding, and love in the universe that people do not see due to their ignorance, and human nature does not inherently include anything that causes hatred or the production of violence and oppression. Anarchists

virtually unanimously agree that anarchism has existed almost since humanity existed, in the “primitive” societies.

Talking about a theory can be found -according to Uri Gordon- in the works of a number of thinkers, but for the average anarchist, what is found is a combination of attitudes, opinions, emotions and outlooks; pieces of eloquent narrative that may cohere in his mind but do not conform to what is expected from a theory.⁽³⁸⁴⁾

Anarchist theories, currents and trends:⁽³⁸⁵⁾

They can be summarized into six lines of difference: The first line: between those who believe that an anarchist communist revolution is necessary to reach the final goal and those who believe that reaching the final goal depends on a long-term process of revolutions, reforms and self-liberation. The second line: between those who are strongly inspired by the legacy of Marx and non-Leninist Marxism, and those who acknowledge some of Marx's contributions, especially in political economy. The third line: between those who advocate for unanimity among all members within an anarchist group to make decisions and those who believe that only the rules of direct democracy are sufficient to make various decisions according to the opinion of the majority. The fourth line: between those who support unity of the group in thought and practice regarding defining the strategy and tactics of the anarchist group, and those who support the multiplicity of directions within the same group. The fifth line: between those who view the class struggle as a primary and essential sphere of revolutionary practice and those who consider that there are other more important spheres, such as the rights of minorities, women,

⁽³⁸⁴⁾ Anarchism and Political Theory: Contemporary Problems, chapter 1.

⁽³⁸⁵⁾ Most of the following part is referred to the book of Sameh Saeed: The origin of anarchism, or critical reading in anarchism (Arabic).

human rights and the environment. The sixth line: between those who limit propaganda and organizational activity within public unions and civil society institutions and those who limit themselves to building anarchist propaganda organizations.

Anarchist schools vary in the diversity of the forms of practice devised by their members through their struggle. There are the council communists, the cooperatives and the syndicalists who think that the trade unions are not only economic organizations but can also be revolutionary organizations to organize the workers for their final emancipation.

Deciding to clarify some details, it will be found that anarchism's tendencies are endless in terms of ideology, values, desired societal system and the mechanisms for reaching it. This includes gradualism and revolution, peaceful action or violence, building anarchism from below or through revolution, etc., but all share the idea of salvation; actualization of the ideal society.⁽³⁸⁶⁾

There are dozens of detailed ideas of the anarchists concerning the method of commodity exchange, calculating the price of commodities, abolishing money, creating alternative currencies, the use of gold and silver or cards with working hours, the creation of cooperative banks, providing gifts (such as offering free computer programs or an information network such as Wikipedia), volunteer work, free markets and cooperatives, etc. All of which are just

⁽³⁸⁶⁾ These tendencies include: Individualism – collectivism – Communism – cooperative – syndicalism - Insurrectionary – platformism - peaceful and anti-military -feminism-environmental and green - primitive – social - anarcho-naturism (advocates vegetarianism, free love, nudism, hiking and an ecological world view, walking and roaming) - free market anarchism (defending private property, free-market economic system, combating hierarchy, supporting labor issues, hostile to capitalism in the economy and hostile to imperialism in foreign policy) - post-left anarchism (seeking freedom from the constraints of ideology in general, criticizing leftist and moral organizations and interested in focusing on social rebellion and the rejection of left-wing social organization) - post-anarchism (rejects the idea of coherent doctrines and beliefs, following the method of postmodernist ideas) - capitalist anarchism - Queer anarchism (a trend that considers anarchism as a solution to the problems faced by multi-sexual, gays, transgender and bisexual people) - Rural Anarchism.

attempts to reduce the domination of capitalism. There are disagreements about the form of the desired society: cooperatives – communes - public ownership - private ownership without waged labor (and some are against public ownership in general) - union control - distributing the output according to work or according to need, whether immediately or gradually, etc.

Dozens of other semi-anarchist trends are added, which differ in many details, but agree on the aforementioned outlines. Most of the disagreements concern the details of the alternative system to capitalism.

Among the interests of anarchism: free love and free thought - free education - resistance to ethnic, national and religious identities.

Regarding globalization, anarchists do not take an opposing position, contrary to common perceptions. Rather, they are against neoliberalism and the globalization of big companies, calling for the elimination of national borders and for the free movement of people, property and ideas. Therefore, they are considered -as David Graeber mentioned⁽³⁸⁷⁾- much more supportive of globalization in general than the International Monetary Fund or the World Trade Organization. They are trying to debunk the nature and goals of neoliberal globalization, which is limited to the freedom of international trade and the movement of global capital, while impeding the freedom of the movement of people and information using the argument of intellectual property rights. Thus, the phrase “genuine globalization” is more appropriate to describe the anarchist stance.⁽³⁸⁸⁾

⁽³⁸⁷⁾ The new anarchism, a part of the book of: anarchism, the revolution and human (Arabic translation).

⁽³⁸⁸⁾ David Graeber, Op. cit.

The majority of anarchists refuse the use of violence, while a minority of them supports it under the slogan of “*armed struggle*” or “*propaganda of the deed.*”⁽³⁸⁹⁾

Despite all this diversity, there are those who believe that all anarchists are very close, contrary to what it seems. Anarchism, as defined by some of its proponents, is “*a synonym for socialism;*” “*one of the streams of socialist thought.*”⁽³⁹⁰⁾

Some specific anarchist branches:

Individualist anarchism: adopted many of the principles of classical liberalism. What sets it apart is the emphasis on the idea of equality in freedom and individual ownership. Individualist anarchists believe that individual consciousness and self-formation should not be limited by anything, be it a collective body or a public authority; traditions, beliefs or others. Its goal is to achieve individual freedom through gradual change, without destroying the state in a revolutionary way, but in the long run. The ideas of this branch are close to the ideas of Proudhon. There is also a trend called egoist anarchism, which is individualistic but more radical (Max Stirner).

Anarcho-syndicalism: Workers' federations, unions and cooperatives are potential revolutionary forces for social change, which will supersede capitalism and the state with a new society democratically governed by workers.

Collective anarchism (for instance: Bakunin): seeks to achieve the revolution and seizure of power and property with violence - the compulsory collection of means of production in the form of cooperatives owned collectively by its members - distribution according to contribution (some say that later it will become according to need). Bakunin and Marx agreed that the industrial proletariat is the main class in the revolution, but for Marx it was

⁽³⁸⁹⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, the origin of anarchism, prelude.

⁽³⁹⁰⁾ Daniel Guerin, Anarchism: From Theory to Practice.

exclusively the industrial proletariat, which was historically tasked with carrying out the revolution, while Bakunin deemed that the peasantry and even the Lumpenproletariat have a role in the revolution. Additionally, he considered the proletariat to include industrial workers and deprived peasants.⁽³⁹¹⁾ Collectivists decided to use representative democracy and the wage system, plus distinguishing (not all of them) in wages between simple and skilled labor, what was criticized by Kropotkin.⁽³⁹²⁾

Anarchist-communism: holds that the most form of social organization that can realize individual freedom is the self-administered communes, which collectively own and use means of production, and are linked to other communes through voluntary union. Anarcho-communists generally support direct democracy. However, some of them believe not to yield to the opinion of the majority, under the pretext that it impedes individual freedom, preferring consensus, while others accept the other way around. They approve the system of distribution as needed along with the abolition of cash. While many anarcho-communists oppose commerce, some do not and support some non-monetary forms of commerce among the commons.

Many individualist anarchists oppose communism in all its forms, on the grounds that the voluntary communism advocated by Kropotkin is impractical. They even deny that communist anarchism is a true form of anarchism.

Anarcho-communists broke away from Proudhon's mutualism and Bakunin's collectivism, asserting that individuals have a right to the product of their individual labor and that wages should be determined according to private contribution to production.

Anarcho-communists argued that there is no valid way to measure the value of any person's or group's economic

⁽³⁹¹⁾ Statism and anarchy, preconditions for a social revolution.

⁽³⁹²⁾ The Conquest of Bread, chapter 13.

contributions. Therefore, a fair wage for each individual cannot be determined. Kropotkin elaborated extensively on his explanation to refute the idea of distribution according to work or working hours approved by the collective anarchists,⁽³⁹³⁾ justifying the communist slogan: from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.

Anarchism without qualities:

As a reaction to the division of anarchists into various doctrines, this trend arose in 1989, calling for the abandonment of multiple labels for anarchism, seeking to emphasize the idea of combating authoritarianism, which is a common characteristic of all schools of anarchist thought. It declared that the first goal is to ensure personal and social freedom for human beings, regardless of the economic basis on which it can be achieved.⁽³⁹⁴⁾

Primitive anarchism: aims to go back to the primitive society.

Sharing economy: One of the anarchist conceptions of the economy. Rather than capitalist ownership, everyone should equally own the means of production and capital is divided among the entire population. So, ownership is equal and makes no differences in income, status or power. People also should develop a scenario or an agenda for what to do and every person is a participant in that process. Besides, humans decide together the scenario of what to do: either individually or with work group - abolition of hierarchy in society in general and in workplaces - equal pay for equal work (no distinction between work skill) - abolition of the market. In addition, there is vague talk about the exchange mechanism, besides a lot of talk about self-sufficiency groups.⁽³⁹⁵⁾

⁽³⁹³⁾ Kropotkin wrote: “No distinction can be drawn between the work of each man. Measuring the work by its results leads us to absurdity; dividing and measuring them by hours spent on the work also leads us to absurdity.” Ibid.

⁽³⁹⁴⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, critical reading in anarchism (Arabic).

⁽³⁹⁵⁾ An interview with the American anti-capitalism economic thinker, Michel Albert (Arabic translation).

Platformism and other currents: The recurrent failure of anarchism before Marxism and the discovery that the weakness of the organization was a crucial factor in this failure motivated the emergence of this trend in 1926 and launched a strong call for anarchist organization. This led to more disagreements between anarchists. Certain trends emerged: 1. Platformism, which decided that *“the only way to solve the problem of public organization is, in our view, to mobilize active anarchist militants to lay the groundwork for specific positions: theoretically, tactically and organizationally, i.e., basis for a coherent program with its perfection or shortcomings, etc.”*⁽³⁹⁶⁾ Hence, the establishment of an anarchist organization and a clear revolutionary program; that is, to take from Leninism what the anarchists had rejected throughout their history. 2. Anarchism as a Way of Life, which is not a clear ideology but an anarchist way of life within the capitalist system. This includes protesting against hierarchy, self-management through the creation of counter-institutions such as communes and non-hierarchical collectives, abandoning paid work, seizing vacant places, working in the shadow economy and practicing certain cultural activities; in short, the establishment of a small and isolated anarchist society. 3. Autonomous Anarchism is also found.

The question of organization:

Anarchism as a whole is against the role of the professional party. Instead, it supports mass spontaneity. Moreover, its proponents criticize the principle of democratic centralism in particular. The alternative to the party is propaganda organizations - the alternative to democratic centralism is direct democracy - the commune as an alternative to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, anarchism superseded the authoritarian side in Marxist-Leninist socialism, starting from a party of professional vanguard,

⁽³⁹⁶⁾ A quotation from John Molyneux, *Anarchism: A Marxist Criticism* (Arabic translation).

to the stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Direct democracy also offered a more democratic alternative to representative democracy and communicative democracy.

Bakunin proposed the idea of creating a “collective power,” which should only exert influence among the masses if it remains invisible and secret. This was proposed more than once.⁽³⁹⁷⁾ Thereafter the idea was reiterated by George Woodcock. It may appear authoritarian as the secret leadership could wield more influence than the declared leadership, similar to the hidden power of modern states being more authoritarian than their predecessors. Considering the natural human inclination towards seeking status and power, a secret society can become a covert authority akin to Colonel Gaddafi's regime in Libya, who paradoxically identified as an anarchist!

Critical reflections on anarchism:

* Anarchism has been able to transcend the deeply rooted Marxist idea claiming that the proletariat cannot establish its economic system within bourgeois society, but it has to seize political power first. The new idea is the opposite; the popular classes can establish cooperatives and institutions independent of the capitalist market within bourgeois society. This is what the anarchists have been trying all the time and have had some success (it is said that

⁽³⁹⁷⁾ For example, his letter to Albert Richard in September 1870: “*I must, more than ever, consider you as a believer in centralization and in the revolutionary State, while I am more than ever opposed to it and have faith only in revolutionary anarchy, which will everywhere be accompanied by an invisible collective power, the only dictatorship I will accept, because it alone is compatible with the aspirations of the people and the full dynamic thrust of the revolutionary movement!*” In his letter to Nechayev on 2 July 1870 he was clearer: “*by what power or rather by what force shall we direct the people's revolution? An invisible force - recognized by no one, imposed by no one - through which the collective dictatorship of our organization will be all the mightier, the more it remains invisible and unacknowledged, the more it remains without any official legality and significance.*”

9% of the world economy is based on cooperation). This idea is fully consistent with the project of the permanent revolution.

*** Anarchism sharply criticized the state apparatus, exposing its parasitic role and the absence of its alleged historical necessity. However, it is unimaginable -and this is what the revolutionary tendencies in anarchism aspire to- that a popular revolution can immediately dissolve the state apparatus and end all forms of domination. What is prospected in this case is a state of general chaos that may end with an authoritarian government. The anarchist perception that the masses will organize themselves and manage their lives once the state apparatus is destroyed is theoretically uncertain, nor is it evidenced by the events of history. When states were suddenly destroyed, either chaos or an iron rule emerged. Two notable examples are the Paris Commune, which ended in failure and the return of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and the Russian Revolution which ended with Stalin's rule. Actually, the abolition of the state at once can only take place in the whole world at a close time, which is just a fictional scenario. States can be disintegrated gradually: suppression of the standing army - gradual disarmament - peace agreements and union of countries with each other - popular police - popular courts - e-government - abolition of state ownership and its interference in the work of the economy, etc. The revolutionary forces can also establish institutions of popular governance from below, gradually, as nuclei of an alternative to the state. In the latter case, it can be imagined that the destruction of the state apparatus in the context of a major uprising is feasible. But anarchism did not specify the mechanism for abolishing the state, with the exception of those who promote a sharp political revolutionary project. The great anarchist philosopher (William Godwin) envisaged that the development of people's knowledge and consciousness would ensure the withering away of the state, which is an idea that is not known how and when it would happen. Can knowledge confront weapons?!**

*** The gradual construction of an anarchist system without taking politics into account is no different from the utopian projects of socialism in the nineteenth century. The state and existing systems will not allow the growth and incursion of a new hostile system except by force. Therefore, there is no alternative for political struggle to supersede capitalism. On the economic level, how is it conceived that cooperatives will be able to set aside capitalist monopolies or compete with them in the first place? How can the poor accumulate enormous wealth to the point of bankrupting capitalist projects? Otherwise, is it envisaged that capitalism will be patient for hundreds of years until this happens without sending the police and the army to confiscate the cooperatives?!**

*** There are anarchist conceptions that are looking unrealistic; such as the principle of distribution according to working hours, which is impossible to apply in practice. The anarcho-communists presented a sufficient refutation of this,⁽³⁹⁸⁾ to which it is added that work is graded in complexity and degrees of skill, so its exchange value can only be determined in the market. Additionally, distribution according to need is also impossible. Indeed it is not possible to determine the needs of the individual unless a central apparatus is established that has authority over society, bearing in mind that the needs of the people are infinite in the first place. This is possible only in heaven or when abundance becomes endless! It is not possible to dispense with the market economy in any way, except in an unforeseeable future and in light of conditions that cannot be envisioned nowadays. In addition, people's altruistic morality cannot be relied upon, since every person looks forward to the best and strives for excellence, so it cannot appeal to them to sell their products according to the working hours they cost. How can it be differentiated between two things of the same type, one produced in ten minutes and the other in four hours, for instance (according to the conditions of their production)? Additionally, it is not possible to**

⁽³⁹⁸⁾ Kropotkin delivered a detailed criticism in: *The Conquest of Bread*, chapter 13.

estimate the value of some products without the owner's point of view; how much do the artist, the skilled player and the talented surgeon sell their work for?! Regarding the idea of abolishing the distinction between simple and skilled work and abolishing the hierarchical division of labor, it is not known how it can be done. How can this division be abolished between the surgeon and the assistant nurse or between the director and the actor, etc.? Moreover, is it possible to abolish the hierarchy between the mother and her infant! How can self-sufficiency be achieved for the different regions? This requires exorbitant expenses and an infinite cost. Furthermore, it is practically impossible in the foreseeable future. How can self-sustaining cooperatives be established in a world where even the major countries are no longer self-sufficient, especially with the ever-expanding specialization? It is clear that the goal is to reduce the volume of exchange, which is an impossible goal in a global society having neither a free nor a centralized market.

*** The idea of abolishing profit equates to eliminating accumulation and development. Is this acceptable? How can the growing needs of people be met without producing new goods and services?**

*** The invisible collective power proposed by Bakunin may be perceived as more authoritarian. Perhaps the idea was not explained well, and the intention was to create a propaganda organization without revealing its members to prevent them from becoming revered leaders.**

*** If anarchism is so diverse and encompasses various concepts, goals, and means, why would someone insist on labeling themselves as an anarchist? There are anarcho-capitalists, individualists, anarcho-primitivists, nihilists, bohemians, etc.⁽³⁹⁹⁾ There is no singular project, and the anarchist idea is not uniform. People's inclination towards classification and stereotyping is a tradition of**

⁽³⁹⁹⁾ These trends are explained in detail by Sameh Abboud in: critical reading in anarchism.

the state they oppose. However, many individuals engage in activities that fall under anarchism but refuse to be labeled as anarchists, and they are justified in doing so.

* Conceptualizing an ideal system is easy, but translating it into reality is a different challenge. Bakunin acknowledged this when criticizing Hegelianism and Marxism. While anarchists often outline blueprints for a desired society, it may be more beneficial to let people determine what works best for them. Anarchists advocate for people's autonomy in decision-making, yet they sometimes contradict themselves.

* Advocating for anarchism in its various approaches is based on the idea of being “better” for human beings than capitalism and other systems. This is itself a choice made for the masses by elitist anarchists. Indeed it is not reasonable to assess a system that was established temporarily and in limited areas.

It is more feasible for the people to decide on the system that suits their aspirations at this time or that.

Is it difficult to draw a system “better” than anarchism? It is essential to involve practical mechanisms for implementing theories in real conditions rather than just on paper. In addition, anarchism is also a system; rather multiple systems, with very specific features, which its proponents consider the end of history, even though they did not declare it. Thus, the mentioned project impedes human innovation and social development; that is any project for a specific system implies an encroachment on people's horizons and aspirations.

All anarchist tendencies define a specific vision of future society, not leaving the horizons open. Additionally, they focus on dissolving the state and ending wage work. Most of them describe details about the future system, to the extent that Kropotkin explained how bread should be distributed, how someone could have a personal piano and even the number of working hours.

There is also the idea of salvation deeply rooted, which envisions a final solution to human suffering and thus an end to history. It is associated with the idea of returning to nature, the primitive anarchist society as portrayed by some anthropologists as an ideal society, which is an unrealistic perception.

In fact, drawing up an ideal system and striving to implement it may waste human efforts and may even help the existing systems. Squandering efforts for illusions certainly solidifies the status quo.

* Anarchism has faced defeats in revolutions, notably in Spain during the 1936-1939 revolution. Factors contributing to these failures include the dominance of global capitalism by multinational corporations, the impossibility of achieving self-sufficiency for individual countries and the challenges posed by heavily armed military and police forces. Attempting to achieve complete victory in one country surrounded by powerful adversaries proved challenging, especially during the rise of fascism in Europe.

* The repeated argument in the anarchist literature that ancient societies were anarchist ignores that they were: first primitive, small and scattered societies, secondly they witnessed brutal conflicts between tribes, and thirdly they ended up forming of class and statist systems. It is not possible to accept the argument that the disintegration of those societies took place from outside them,⁽⁴⁰⁰⁾ since whoever destroyed those societies were groups of human beings as well and not from another world. So from where did those states originate?! States had already set up through the mechanism of tribes fighting each other's tribes, i.e., anarchist tribes fought each other and no larger anarchist societies were created.

* Some anarchists resorted to trying to argue that their imaginary system is in accordance with human nature and even with nature in general.⁽⁴⁰¹⁾ This was also the argument of bourgeois,

⁽⁴⁰⁰⁾ This was the pretext of Bromley in his preface of Kropotkin's book: *The Conquest of Bread*.

⁽⁴⁰¹⁾ For example, Kropotkin, *Anarchist Morality*.

feudal lords, slave-owning thinkers (Aristotle, for example) and even those who justified the cast system found in India. It is an argument similar to that of clerics in explaining the division of human beings into classes, and very close to the idea that relies on “the laws of history” to justify its purposes. The response is very simple: if this or that is the nature of humanity, why does it not last? How did humanity break its nature!?

Kropotkin explicitly declared “*All we can do is to give advice.*” This is the essence of anarchism: moralistic advocacy. It is also asking to eliminate all that impedes the free development of the two feelings of love and hate in the present society; all that perverts man's judgment: the state, the church, exploitation; judges, priests, governments, exploiters, meaning that these factors distort human nature.⁽⁴⁰²⁾ Some argued, for example, that human nature is generally good and does not justify the existence of the state and repression. As it was pointed out somewhere in this book, the aforementioned factors are nothing but a product of human nature itself; otherwise, where did they come from?

* To be more consistent, “post-anarchism” should not be attributed to what supposedly precedes it; anarchism should not be a reference for this conception. It is necessary also for the same purpose to reject any conception of a particular social system as an ultimate goal since the world is not confined either to an intellectual system or to a final goal. Besides, all attempts to do so have failed. Human aspirations are endless, whether they are freedom, welfare or something else. Neither capitalism nor socialism is the end of history; rather, the goals of the struggle must be broader and more spacious. However, it is possible to accept one situation but as temporary, going to transform into another.

* Anarchism is not very concerned with the ideas of welfare and development. Rather, there are those who call for a return to primitiveness to get rid of oppression and exploitation. It focuses on

⁽⁴⁰²⁾ Ibid.

liberation and ending repressive powers. However, is not a comfortable and luxurious life a constant aspiration of mankind? Is it possible for the individual to live without realizing his creative abilities and his desire for a better life and satisfying his increasing needs? Wouldn't welfare and development be among the factors of liberation if they were made available to all?

* Setting a specific goal as establishing an anarchist society may not be achieved because it depends on a moral tendency that cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, the struggles and efforts are squandered in vain. As the state emerged in the past after tribal conflict, is it impossible to envisage the struggle of communes and cooperatives?

* Anarchists envision that the abolition of the state (and classes) must lead to an anarchist society. This vision ignores the fact that the division of society is not only class. There are degrees of intelligence; there are geniuses and different talents, so what guarantees that a dominant class of geniuses, for example, will not appear? The problem lies in relying on the moral commitment of all, without envisioning a mechanism that guarantees this commitment.

* As noted by devoted anarchists, anarchism is suffering from great theoretical poverty and is not interested in studying objective conditions, nor does it have a plan to achieve this impossible task: the establishment of anarchism in one country for economic and military reasons. It also refuses to learn from its historic failures, preferring to rewrite them as successes, as monitored by the anarchist Chris Day.⁽⁴⁰³⁾

'Every claim of the accordance of a project with the laws of history or divine instructions means a desire to be subjected to superhuman power; it's masochism. The assertion that a project is consistent with human nature is a fallacy; everything that human beings have done

⁽⁴⁰³⁾ The Historical Failure of Anarchism, the Anarchist Library.

and are doing is consistent with human nature. The revolutionary project is merely a human ambition: Utopia'

15. Modernism and Postmodernism

Most propositions and questions that have been written about philosophical matters are not false, but nonsensical

Wittgenstien

There is no room here for a presentation of modernism and postmodernism, so it is sufficient to present what is related to the subject matter of the book: the permanent revolution.

Meaning of modernity & modernism

There is no agreed-upon meaning of modernity. Therefore, its origins are also controversial.

A distinction must be made between modernization, modernity and modernism. Modernity is a word applied mostly to a stage in the history of Western Europe that began with the dissolution of the era of feudalism and the emergence and domination of capitalism. Outside Europe, in the countries that were colonized, partial modernization took place by force, through colonialism. In Japan, Russia, China and others, the state espoused the modernization process itself. It capitalized society to some degree or another or set

up a modern bureaucratic system which disintegrated later (this was analyzed in Chapter 12).

Regarding modernism, it usually means the intellectual movement that arose and thrived in the same era mentioned in Europe.

At the infrastructure level (in the Marxian sense), rising capitalism achieved a great development of the means of production. Manufacture was replaced by the factory and mechanized industry. Additionally, commodity production required the liberalization of markets, hence the liberation of labor by abolishing feudalism and subsistence economy, organizing production and the scientific revolution to increase productivity; therefore, the rate of profit. Preferring science over religion was nothing but an expression of capitalism's tendency to develop the means of production through promoting scientific and technological developments. For the same reason, capitalism has been interested in secular education and the separation of the state from religious institutions. This system required attention to the element of time, respect for deadlines, determination of working hours and a bookkeeping system, including systems for accounting at all levels, whether in the work unit or at the community level as a whole, to organize the work process at the lowest costs and the highest returns.

At the level of the superstructure (in the Marxian sense), the concept of modernism was associated with the Renaissance and the philosophy of Enlightenment, which started beside the harbingers of capitalism and the emergence of its sprouts. The changes in the infrastructure necessitated an institutional state based on law and a strict legal system. In such a system, it was necessary to abolish the divine right of kings, religious authority and to espouse secularism in general. Modern government, which replaced the absolute monarchy, has been portrayed as representing the whole society. Since the accumulation of capital has become the ultimate goal of the rising class, it necessitated the removal of all obstacles to this process. Because capitalism arose on a national level, it became

necessary for the modern state to become a national one, adopting citizenship as a bond that supersedes any other bond, issuing identity papers and systems for moving from one country to another, etc.

With these major transformations, shifts took place in various aspects of knowledge in compatibility with the emerging system. Moreover, Modern philosophies were devised, which strived to display the world in a rational intellectual system in confrontation of and at the expense of the old religious one, which relied on judgments based on religion or traditions. These philosophies attributed the ability to reach objective knowledge and the Truth to reason. Besides, it based itself on the human subject, adopted the idea of continuous progress as a historical direction, as well as the slogan and goal of achieving human liberation and equality. Accordingly, Descartes can be considered the father of modern rationalism, which reached its climax through Kant at the hands of Hegel; the creator of the Absolute Idea.

The main subject of the philosophies of modernism was epistemology; that is, the nature of knowledge and the ways of reaching it through reason. Modern science, which relied on experiment, observation and conclusion, emerged also. Various social sciences arose, meaning the development of ways and methods of studying, research and organization that facilitate dealing with the public, controlling it and formulating its mind and conscience. This enabled the rising class to grow, expand and tighten its domination over society and the masses. All this was done with the utmost reverence for reason and rationality.

The concept of reason in modernism: There is no clear and unified definition of reason among philosophers. The broadest definition is that it is human's intellectual and cognitive faculty; which directs the action on the basis of universal general criteria. It is commonly associated with logical or “correct” thinking. This concept was consolidated by Hegel: “*what is rational is real and what is real is rational,*” in the sense that the rational is the categories that are

deduced from each other, such as the category of Quantity. As for the concrete things, such as: the pen; their existence is not logically necessary; so they are not rational. Deduction is, of course, a logical process, so reason is the logic. Hegel considered that logic is pure reason; the human reason which is the same as reason of the world or Nomos according to the old expressions. Obviously, this is a metaphysical concept. The one who criticized this concept most of the modernists was Marx, who considered reason to be that of human only, asserted the primacy of matter over thought, and that it is not the consciousness of people that determines their social existence, but contrariwise, their social existence that determines their consciousness. However, the concept of reason remained the logical thinking of all schools of modernism.

Art also became expressive or associated with the structure of the new class.

All this was done in the name of rationalization. Scientific research, social sciences and new forms of social organization required a new sacred; an alternative to theological religion. The suitable option was reason. Modernism was associated with the Age of Enlightenment and its idea of complete rationality, that is, the search for true knowledge and a means to control nature and society.⁽⁴⁰⁴⁾ The thought of modernity searched for the unity of the world and for the Truth. It also sought the unity of human with nature away from religion, on the basis of the laws of existence. The bourgeoisie (and the bureaucracy) spoke in the name of reason, not in the name of its interests; hiding behind reason and claiming to set up a rational system to achieve its objectives.

In its struggle against feudalism, the new class resorted to putting forward revolutionary ideas and slogans, calling for criticism of all sanctities and temporarily violating all constants. Subsequently, it turned in the opposite position after the matter was established.

⁽⁴⁰⁴⁾ Ian Craib, Op. cit., p. 236.

To provide a clear and simplified determination of modernity, it can be defined as Rationalization, in the sense of relying on reason in all decisions and considering anything and everything subject to research, criticism and rational analysis. This includes secularization, in the sense of making religion a personal matter for the individual. Thus, research is resorted to in all aspects of life based on the scientific method (experimental and mathematical by induction and deduction). This is unlike pre-modernism: acknowledging the inadequacy of the mind, its need for guidance from outside and then submitting to dogmatic beliefs.

Criticism of modernity and modernism:

The slogans of rationalization and Enlightenment were deceptive. Human as a being is using his reason since his evolution, which played an important role in making civilization. The development of productive forces throughout history, starting from control of fire, to the agricultural revolution, building cities, etc., could not be done without the use of reason. But what is new in the era of modernity was the use of reason to justify the capitalization of society and the imposition of this system on the peoples. The primitive accumulation of capital took place with iron and fire in the name of progress and reason. Tens of millions were exterminated in the name of a civilizing mission, and the world was occupied by Europeans under the same slogans. Regarding science, scientific research and modern means of organization, which were not necessary for the preceding society, were developed for the need of the rising class. All that happened was the creation of a new role for reason in favor of capitalism, which needs science and its applications, organization, respect for time, wealth saving, accumulation, protection of private property, etc.

There is no justification for considering modernism rational as opposed to the alleged irrationality in pre-modern times.⁽⁴⁰⁵⁾ All that happened was the advocacy for sanctifying reason to control the other; poor classes and foreign peoples.

Indeed, as aforementioned, the unconscious controls reason, both on an individual and societal level. So rationality should not be perceived as more than the use of the abilities of reason. There is no such thing as the rationalization of society, as there is no rational system. Rather, there is the use of reason in organizing society in a way that achieves the interests of a particular class or group. All systems of society are derived from the conscious and subconscious of the dominant class, expressing its interests and aspirations for domination. Otherwise, haven't people used reason before modernity?! Even the science of logic was devised in the days of Aristotle.

In fact, modernity did not follow reason, as the latter does not lead anything. Rather it is merely an instrument. Actually, modernity celebrated and used it successfully in achieving the goals of capitalism and the modern state. So, modernity does not mean rationalization precisely, but using reason to reorganize society in favor of capitalism.

Additionally, when philosophy, which claims to be the product of rational research, replaced religion, despite its use of logic; the highest product of reason, it was a set of unjustified doctrines and dogmas.

The idea can be summarized in one phrase: putting religious reference aside; SECULARIZATION.

But actually “secular” religions replaced the heavenly religions.

⁽⁴⁰⁵⁾ Claude Lévi-Strauss' studies have done justice to the “primitive” human being from the “charge” of being irrational. He revealed what he considered to be the wisdom beyond the rituals and myths of the Amerindians.

While modernism called for critical thinking in the course of its struggle against the old systems, it began to discard this approach after it had achieved the final victory. It began calling for submission to the system, the state which allegedly represents the whole society, private property and the capitalist market as the end of history. It presented a utopia at the beginning, which was transformed afterward into a justificatory ideology.

The peoples were promised liberty, fraternity, equality, moral progress, welfare and happiness for all human beings. But Modernity brought them a ruthless economic system, political systems the most delicate of which is a representative pseudo-democracy and for most of its history it established ugly dictatorships. It also used reason to wage devastating wars and squander wealth in arming, intimidating and deceiving peoples and for the luxury of the few.

The capitalist system became suffering from a chronic crisis while the socialist systems disintegrated and turned into the same crisis economy and at last dissolved. The phenomenon of marginalization has also been expanding. The marginalized groups that are outside the official system began to rebel and demand their rights, working to grab their status away from state interference or assistance, paving the way for the right of difference, relativism in the spheres of ethics and for different standards. All of this violated the ideas of identity, centrality, reference, right and wrong and the concept of development. Modernism has fulfilled capitalism's goals; afterward it became resistant to the realization of its original slogans.

Therefore, modernism has failed to achieve its slogans. This prompted a lot of thinkers to criticize it, even when it was at the top of its ascent.

Regarding thought, modernism has become incapable of formulating comprehensive theories that present the Truth, especially after the failure of revolutionary socialism and the

unfulfilled predictions of Marxism. The failure of the practical project coincided with the decline in the popularity of theoretical thought, signaling a period of rebellion. Additionally, the emergence of the theory of relativity and quantum theory raised doubts about the accuracy of popular scientific theories. The discovery of psychology, the unconscious mind and the irrational behavior of even educated individuals further challenged traditional beliefs. The persistence of social phenomena, such as wars and power struggles without rational justifications, including the rise of fascism and Stalinism and the devastation of World Wars, highlighted the limitations of rational explanations. The true role of culture, knowledge and thought as tools of power was exposed with the rise of fascism and Stalinism, widespread corruption, world wars, the use of atomic weapons, ongoing alienation and state domination. Critiques of modernity revealed that comprehensive theories, moral arguments, science and technology are merely instruments in the hands of capitalism and the state. Fascism gained power through democratic means, Stalinism emerged from a workers' and peasants' revolution, and the atomic bomb was used to defend democracy against fascism. This barbarism was a direct result of the democratic and revolutionary aspects of modernism.

If modernism transcended religion to philosophy, it actually moved from metaphysics to metaphysics. It shifted from theology to secular religions, from a sacred to another sacred, such as reason, which was treated as an independent and sacred entity; metaphysics, and such as the nation, representative democracy and the savior of the world (the working class). Modernism refuted religious thought, arguing that it cannot be proven true by reason. However, it created many ideas that reason cannot demonstrate its validity. At the top of that is the entire philosophy and on top of that is Hegel's completely rational philosophy –allegedly- which claimed that the world's categories are deducing themselves from each other; which is impossible to validate. The discourse of Truth, which is based on the claim of rationality and scientific neutrality, includes

its opposite of mythoi, occult (the Unseen) and sanctities. Reason has been dealt with as a metaphysical entity in the philosophies of modernism; a supernatural entity worthy of sanctification, which is just a deception. Indeed, it is nothing but an instrument that does not control itself or humans, but is used mainly by the unconscious; the dominant component of the human mind. The unconscious is not an entity either, but instincts, feelings and unrealized thoughts, some of which are repressed.

Postmodernism:

These theories fall within what is known as post-Marxism, but due to their special importance in this era, it is decided to dedicate a separate chapter to them.

- The term does not carry an agreed meaning even among those who devised and are using it and those who are describing themselves as postmodern. There is no consensus among the theorists on the date of its emergence and whether it arose with modernity or after it. Rather, its proponents differed in the fundamentals of their philosophies and even on its denomination, and some of them even denied their belongingness to these currents.⁽⁴⁰⁶⁾ Anyhow, it is neither a theory nor theories with specific features, nor is universal in nature. Each of its thinkers dealt with specific issues of thought, art, literature and other aspects of life, including fashion shows, sports, economics and politics. Its attempt to refute the idea of Truth or objective knowledge led its thinkers to limit their attention to the analysis of text, discourse, phrase, linguistic

⁽⁴⁰⁶⁾ Lyotard used the expression “*the post-modern condition*,” while Jameson viewed it as “*the cultural logic of late capitalism*,” or “*a recent cultural age in the West*.” Umberto Eco rejected the term and proposed instead what is called “*generalized multilingualism of our time*.” Moreover, Foucault and Gilles Deleuze considered their work to be a break and communication with modernism, and both denied belonging to those trends. Ehab Hasan, the question of post modernism, introduction of the translator, pp. 5-6 (Arabic).

systems and cultural representations. Postmodernism views these fields not as products of the material economic structure of society but as the entry point and foundation for understanding the latter. It does not recognize the existence of an economic basis for society upon which the class struggle rests. It also lacks any standard for judging social phenomena but deals with each moment separately.

These fundamentals contradict the claim of knowing the Truth, reason, what is beyond the world and the self. It does not provide an explanation for the world and does not claim to realize the Truth of being or its reason. Moreover because it is not an intellectual system with specific features, its thinkers have been looking at the world as mere moments, situations and separate events; fragments. For this reason, they have not developed a methodology or a cognitive module. This is consistent with their view of the theory as a mere mechanism for exercising authoritarianism, which they have been against. It is merely a critical attitude towards modernism; its concepts and its products in art, literature, philosophy, sociology and politics.⁽⁴⁰⁷⁾ In short, it is against the epistemological foundations of modernism, based on multiculturalism and pluralism of ways of life. It also calls for changing the education system so that students examine knowledge to reveal what it contains in terms of assumptions, ideology and interests, so that they can produce it themselves rather than being content with being mere recipients.

The term Postmodernism implies a problematic and expresses the differing definitions by its upholders, who are originally against definitions because they are against any determination, identity or concept. The definition suggests consistency and presupposes that the reader will understand it as defined by its author and as all readers will understand it. This is what postmodern theorists have rejected, denying the existence of objective truth.⁽⁴⁰⁸⁾ So, what is this

⁽⁴⁰⁷⁾ Esam Hamza. Postmodern philosophers: Jean Francois Lyotard, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, John Leonard (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁰⁸⁾ Ehab Hasan. Op. cit., introduction of the translator, pp. 5-6.

thing? Is it reasonable for theories to be described in this way; in relation to other theories, without specifying their overall orientation!?

In fact, they are multiple trends that are difficult to categorize, but there are indicators of their general tendency, as shall be adressed.

- Criticism of modernity began early, by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, linking the progress of science and the arts to moral decline. He criticized society for its distortions and inequality in the name of Enlightenment, even though he increasingly turned against the philosophers who were once his friends. He resorted to nature, claiming it as the realm of order and harmony and therefore reason. Moreover, he aimed to change humans within that order and allow them to escape the confusion and chaos created by social organization.⁽⁴⁰⁹⁾ Rousseau also argued that the solution is putting the state's sovereignty in the service of reason.

Marx also strongly criticized modernity, calling for what it promised and did not fulfill: freedom and equality. But he spoke in the name of Truth and the laws of history, concluding that the socialist revolution is the only way out of the repercussions of modernity. However, this did not bring Marxism closer to the theories of postmodernism in its usual sense, which criticized Marxism for being linked to the basic ideas in the thought of modernism.

Nietzsche is considered the Godfather of postmodern theorists. He rejected truth in exchange for hermeneutics: "*there are no facts, only interpretations,*" criticized metaphysics, deemed the apparent world as the true existence and advocated for deconstruction.

The Frankfurt School also played a principal role in criticizing modernity and modernism or rather criticizing its failure to achieve freedom and justice. Nonetheless, it cannot be considered a

⁽⁴⁰⁹⁾ Alain Touraine, *Critique of Modernity*, p. 21.

postmodern school. Rather, Habermas; its last theorist, strongly opposed those theories, defending the project of modernism, which he considered not yet completed.

- There is no chronological sequence between modernism and postmodernism. Both Nietzsche and Heidegger's criticism appeared in the era of the rising of modernism.⁽⁴¹⁰⁾ However, the theories called postmodernism actually appeared around the year 1970. They appeared first in the fields of plastic art, drawing, architecture and civil engineering, before extending to all branches of knowledge, such as literature, criticism, philosophy, morality, education, sociology, anthropology, culturology, economy and politics, etc.⁽⁴¹¹⁾ What is meant is intellectual, literary and artistic theories and trends came in opposition to the components of modernism, such as metaphysics, identity, origin, voice, center, reason, truth, epistemic certainty, historical progress, definition and the subject. Instead, it presented difference, multiplicity, dispersion, skepticism, deconstruction, meaninglessness, non-system, perspective, discourse, etc. Unlike the theories of modernism, it does not aim to know the Truth of the world. Among its common terms: infinity of significance - death of the author (= denial that the text is issued by the author or that it is an expression of his experience in life; the author uses previous texts⁽⁴¹²⁾) - death of the reader; since every reading is a misreading - the text dismantles itself by itself (deconstruction is not a dismantling of the structure of a text, but a demonstration that it has already dismantled itself and its aim is to allow the text to show its ideological aspects and contradictions) – decentering (= absence of an external or internal center) –

⁽⁴¹⁰⁾ Lyotard stated: “Neither modernism nor postmodernism can be clearly identified as distinct historical epochs, as postmodernism is often seen as emerging from modernism. It must be acknowledged that postmodernism is inherent to modernism, as modernism itself contains a desire to transcend its own boundaries and evolve into something else.” A quotation from Badr Eddin Moustafa, paths of postmodernism, p. 26 (Arabic).

⁽⁴¹¹⁾ Gameel Hamdawi, entrance to the concept of postmodernism (Arabic).

⁽⁴¹²⁾ Abdel Monem Agab El Fia, the fiction of the death of the author (Arabic).

elusiveness – gap – undecidability - impossibility of the objectivity of knowledge - text death - infinity of significance - meta-textuality - meta-language - meta criticism (criticism of criticism), etc. In the field of philosophy, it does not believe in objective truth; every reality in its perception is merely a construction of man's self-ideas.

It also discussed and paid attention to marginalized issues; from folk art, to homosexuality, to ethnicities, etc., in the course of resisting the Center.

It also repudiates the tendency of philosophy to reject contradiction in favor of unity, so it has been calling for multiplicity and diversity.

Ehab Hasan summarized its general orientations briefly ⁽⁴¹³⁾:

1. Rejecting comprehensive theories such as: Hegel's philosophy, Comte's theory and Marxism, with a focus on dealing with specific partial phenomena.

2. Rejecting absolute knowledge, epistemic certainty and the stability of meaning, along with the rejection of traditional logic based on the coincidence of things and words.

3. Rejecting natural and historical determinism that prevailed during the stage of modernism, especially the concept of linear evolution.

4. Opposing all forms of authority, whether in discourse, politics or art.

- Examining these trends leads to unmasking a central trend, which is the opposition to all forms of authority. The rejection of truth, certainty, the laws of history and the subject, along with its theories of education and the claim of the death of the author, implies this central orientation.

Because of its tendency to reject authority, it rejects the tendency of modernism to present consistent and systemic theories, by

⁽⁴¹³⁾ Badr Eddin Moustafa, Op. cit., p. 36.

denying the necessity of harmony, coherence and interdependence. It contradicts the concept of centralization and monism, adopting the opposite: pluralism, difference, diversity and dismantling of the interdependent, in line with its rejection of every authority. Additionally, it connects knowledge and power; knowledge is not innocent but a product of power. For example, Foucault believed that the will to knowledge is exactly the will to have Truth, making it the key to the link between knowledge and power. Claiming access to the Truth is a quest to exercise power.

Therefore, all theories are ideological, serving specific powers. That is why postmodernism rejects the monist and universal concepts of modernity, such as: morality, truth, human nature, reason, the theory of social progress, historical inevitability and teleology. It even criticizes scientific thinking and its perceptions about the world and society, and science itself, which claims neutrality, objectivity and presenting the Truth. Regarding social sciences, such as clinical psychology, sociology, education and politics, Foucault argued that they have provided a scientific justification for forms of control, taming people and formulating their ideas to enhance power. On the other hand, it embraces cognitive and ethical relativism and cultural pluralism. In short, postmodernism dismantles all centralism without dismantling the idea of decentering or indeterminacy; multiplicity instead of unity. This is the most important factor in the difference of its thinkers in their perceptions of postmodern content (e.g., it is a central theoretical tool in Foucault's analyses of both power and knowledge and their concretization in practices and discourses). However does extending the deconstruction require dismantling the central ideas in postmodernism? This will be addressed later.

With the same impulse, postmodern writings are characterized by difficult language, ambiguity, complexity and deliberate elusiveness, making them very difficult to understand. The aim is to let each individual read however they want since there is no single reading of the text but multiple and unlimited readings, called

floating semantics.⁽⁴¹⁴⁾ This indeterminacy of meaning was created by Roland Barthes, who thought that the text has to generate the largest number of connotations and meanings, which would not be achieved if the text deliberately seeks clarity and transparency. The more difficult the text and its ability to inspire, the more profound its meanings and the greater its significance. According to him: *“Clarity is not an absolute and indispensable quality in writing, but rather an extension of class; any way of writing is a sign that you are a member of a particular class talking to other members of the same class.”*⁽⁴¹⁵⁾ The writer, in Barthes' opinion, should contribute to making the reading process fruitful in two ways. First, not to provide a closed text loaded with decisive judgments and final results, which are usually based on the illusion that the author possesses certainty and knows the absolute Truth. Second, on the contrary, the writer should present an open text in the sense of ambiguity, confusion and suggesting meaning without specifying it. That is why he spoke of non-readability, not in the sense of impossibility of reading, but as a description of texts that do not accept a single reading, i.e., non-closed texts.

- The writings of postmodernists are characterized by their liberation from the constraints of centralization, conceptual unity and tradition, in exchange for glorifying difference, seeking to deconstruct and openness to others through discussion and interaction. Additionally, intertextuality, meaning the interaction of two or more texts benefiting one another, overlapping different types of texts and the abolition of barriers between them: political, literary, philosophical, social and various artistic forms, etc., making the text a mosaic of other texts that were incorporated into it with different techniques and viewing each text as a re-formation of previous texts. It is also characterized by not using the language of structure and closure, with an interest in refuting ideology.

⁽⁴¹⁴⁾ Gameel Hamdawy, Op. cit.

⁽⁴¹⁵⁾ Badr Eddin Moustafa, Op. cit., p. 32.

What also distinguishes postmodernism is its interest in everything that is marginal, such as the profane, the strange, the different and the feminine, in line with its sympathy for marginalized groups.

- Deconstruction means breaking down ideas and intellectual structures into separate units to understand their significance and revealing the elements of falsity and truth by examining their origin, roots and mechanisms of formation or what is called "working through genealogy," literally meaning the tracing of family lineage.⁽⁴¹⁶⁾ In short, revealing and refuting the reference frames, assumptions and ideological foundations of the text. It always assumes a different conception of the origin of phenomena than the customary or prevailing narrative, on the basis that history has more than one narrative and that the narrative of the authority prevails. But it can be viewed on the other side, by questioning and deconstructing concepts that at first glance seem neutral, scientific and objective, to understand them.

For instance, rather than justifying the "war on terrorism," "terrorism" is analyzed first revealing its origin and the justifications of its perpetrators and whether it is actually terrorism or something else.

⁽⁴¹⁶⁾Abdel Aziz Al-Dawy distinguished between three fields in which genealogy is used. The first is the science of history, to trace the chain of ancestors of an individual or a family. The second is the biological use of the theory of evolution. The third is philosophical use, which has two types of genealogy: the first is a historical genealogy of ideas, characterized by the adoption of a temporal perspective with a logical and rational system, with Hegelian philosophy being a prominent example. The second is what Nietzsche used in his famous book "The Genealogy of Morality." This method follows the stages of formation and sequencing of the connotations of an idea (morality in Nietzsche's case) not in terms of its logical and rational sequence, but based on a major axiom that moral values, meanings and ideas do not have fixed, transparent and transcendent origins that exist outside the human environment. What lies beyond its production and development in all ages are objective and existential conditions linked to the interests of life and personal interests.

A quotation from Ahmad Abelhaleem Attia, "Postmodernism and Deconstruction," p. 117 (Arabic).

Deconstruction does not search for the Truth, but presents another perspective. It reveals the contradiction of the discourse of Truth with itself by showing that while it displays itself in a scientific, neutral and objective capacity, it includes what is dogmatic and sacred.

- Postmodernism rejects what Lyotard called metanarratives or grand philosophies. He defined postmodernism as the questioning of those metanarratives.⁽⁴¹⁷⁾ It also refuses to acknowledge any of the concepts, principles and beliefs produced in the age of modernism, which were consolidated most in German idealistic philosophy. It also rejects the objectivity of science as the key to progress, regarding it as a kind of ideology.

Moreover, it does not consider the class struggle as a key to human salvation, as Marxism argued, viewing all this as mythoi and illusions. The alternative is the multiple forms, types and modes of language use. The world is replete with plurality and difference, not consistency and compatibility, and there are no meanings lying beyond the apparent things; real existence is only this apparent. Lyotard, while criticizing Habermas's aspiration for consensus, favored dissidence, saying: *“such consensus inflicts violence with the dissonance of language games. Innovation is always born out of dissent.”*⁽⁴¹⁸⁾

Postmodernism rejects even human history as a general course, dealing with it as separate moments that are not connected by a link, which is what they call fragmentation. This fragmentation strips the self from consciousness and the ability to form meaning; schizophrenic (in a non-medical sense).

Postmodernism also eliminates the historical dimension from social phenomena, analyzing them as separate discourses and representations on a horizontal level, based on the surface of reality. Lyotard also believed that looking at society as a total unit (such as

⁽⁴¹⁷⁾ The post-modern condition, introduction (Arabic translation).

⁽⁴¹⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 23.

a single national identity) has lost its legitimacy. Instead of that view, he called for stimulating difference at the expense of authority and the single opinion.

- Double reading or deconstructive reading (Jacques Derrida): it means reading any text twice when analyzing it. The first reading aims to explain and understand the dominant point of view, confirms it and determines the degree of its coherence. The second reading aims to criticize that point of view and works to strike at its weaknesses that appeared in the first reading, aiming to dismantle it.⁽⁴¹⁹⁾

- Consistently with the idea of rejecting authority, postmodernism generally does not accept any moral standard or general human tendencies (and of course implicitly rejects the humanistic conscience), in favor of absolute relativism in the field of morality. Consequently the idea of “human rights” is rejected on the grounds that it stereotypes the human being and denounces difference. Likewise, Lyotard considered that defining universal human rights presupposes the existence of an inhuman entity that determined them, and because this did not happen, the slogan is not legitimate.

- Postmodernism presents an alternative to reason and rationality, represented in art, feeling, the body and desire. It also offers an alternative to identity and consistency, which is difference and becoming; a language that contradicts the language of reason and logic; feeling language.

- Postmodern thinkers analyzed the state by breaking it down into four basic determinants: violence, borders, identity and statecraft. They criticized the phenomenon of sovereign states as immoral because it encourages existential conflict between peoples, leading to wars and conflicts. The aim of this deconstruction is to search for a new paradigm in which politics is redefined through

⁽⁴¹⁹⁾ Tariq Al-Bitar, the theory of postmodernism, part (1), foundations and methodologies (Arabic).

non-regionalization and a more internationalist approach to accommodate developments in the environment of international relations.⁽⁴²⁰⁾ However, they did not present a clear alternative.

- **The death of man: modernity portrayed man as a conscious, free, active, creative and meaning-making subject, positioning him as the center of the universe instead of God. In contrast, postmodernism views man as not free, but submissive and driven; controlled by the unconscious that forms most of the psyche, including instincts and repressed feelings. He is also subject to the social system, from the production system to the knowledge system (a common example is that if Newton was born in the fourteenth century, he would not have discovered the law of gravity). Thus, postmodernism refutes basic modernist concepts such as objective truth, reason, science and even human will itself. In short, it argues that man is not the free self that discovers Truth and creates their own world. This shift prompted postmodernists to focus on forms or symbols, especially language.**

Critique & deconstruction of postmodernism:

Postmodernism has been a response to the failure of modernity to meet public expectations. These theories effectively refuted modern Western culture, liberating the mind from central categories based on reason that perpetuated exploitation, domination and subjugation of peoples. While postmodernism revealed the relativity of truth, the relationship between knowledge and power and the role of rationality in subjugating others, it overreacted by seeking to eliminate authority altogether instead of advocating for the constructive use of reason.

Ultimately, it failed to provide a practical project for human liberation or answer the question of what is to be done.

⁽⁴²⁰⁾ Tariq Al-Bitar, the theory of postmodernism, part (2), the sovereign state and beyond (Arabic).

- It is clear from all of the above that postmodernism set before itself the task of resisting or dismantling every authority of every kind, which is its central issue, implicit in all its ideas. The authority of Truth, the authority of the text, the authority of the author, the authority of identity, standards, center, ideology, metaphysics, etc. This is an idea similar to the permanent revolution. But it did not realize that the idea of resistance in itself is a counter-power, productive and constructive, at least before it turns into a repressive authority after winning. Utopia is a revolutionary idea; representing the power of resistance before it turns into an ideology that justifies a repressive authority. In addition, the revolution in any form is a counter-power, before it turns into a regime; a counter-revolution. There are also forms of authority that must be followed, such as the authority of the technician in his field, the authority of the commander over the soldier at the time of war in particular, the authority of any individual who uses a technician to carry out a specific work and there is the authority of the majority over the minority, etc. These are authorities that must be respected, not necessarily repressive. Likewise, the endeavor of every individual to deliver his ideas and disseminate his opinions is undoubtedly a pursuit of power, but it is a natural behavior, consistent with the inclinations of ordinary people and practiced by all of them. As for the role of the reader in understanding and reproducing the text, it is a spontaneous act that has been occurring since the evolution of human beings. Every person understands the other within the limits of his own culture and perceptions. It is a matter that does not need special theories about the birth of the reader and portraying this as one of the inventions of postmodernism.

Michel Foucault's concept of power is not linked to the subject and has no source. Power produces itself in all areas of life and exercises itself invisibly, according to his words. Moreover, if the concept of the subject is metaphysical, as Foucault argued, then it is clear that separating power from the subject and looking at it as a transcendent prior which creates and recreates itself and creates the

subject, makes a new metaphysics which is rejected by postmodernism. It is something prior to the world and self-producing. Foucault also rejected reason's authority on the ground that it is the one that has given itself the right to distinguish between rationality and absurdity. But what is the stance of the irrational, the body; doesn't it also have power? If power does not have an origin, then it is itself an origin. Besides, discourse criticism leads to the production of a discourse, i.e., power. According to Jacques Derrida *"The intellectual today must be the mouthpiece of the marginal, women or the peoples of the Third World."*⁽⁴²¹⁾ But using his own logic leads to this query: who gave the intellectual the right to represent those groups? Isn't this a form of authoritarianism? Hence, postmodernism produced what it rejected.

- The world encompasses not only difference, multiplicity and diversity, but also communication between people; therefore, mutual understanding, agreement and unification of some goals from time to time. In addition, the absence of the absolute and final Truth of the world does not negate the existence of facts that cannot be disputed, such as water evaporating at a certain temperature and multinational corporations controlling one third of the world's economy. Furthermore, postmodern philosophies emphasize difference and diversity as opposed to Truth, they inadvertently elevate these concepts to a form of Truth in themselves! The world is full of contradictions: identity and difference, multiplicity and unity, disengagement and connection, power and resistance, truth and falsity, etc. Otherwise, why do all these postmodern philosophies and theories constitute a particular trend? Has it not previously summarized its ideas and their core content (against power)? Isn't this a central idea? The idols of truth, unity and essence have been replaced by other sacred idols, such as difference, diversity and multiplicity.

⁽⁴²¹⁾ Badr Eddin Moustafa, Op. cit., A quotation from Anwar Mogheeth, intellectuals and politics-debate with Jacques Derrida, p. 61.

- Postmodernism is one of the orientations of constant criticism of modernity, but it focuses more on the criticism of metaphysics in all its forms, the criticism of absolute Truth and the criticism of the idea of the neutrality of knowledge. Nietzsche initiated this critique, which was later expanded by others. It is not a revolt against modernity but a continuation of its critique since its inception.

- Postmodernism is an expression of an intellectual current based on criticism of the disintegration prevalent in society, manifested in various ways:

*** Specializations have become more diverse and precise.**

*** Marginalization, especially the emergence of a broad class called the precariat, consisting of temporary workers, which does not constitute a class "for-itself" (to be addressed in detail later).**

*** The emergence of resistance movements by marginalized groups.**

*** A resurgence of historical fascism.**

*** The failure of the socialist project and Marxist predictions.**

*** Multinational corporations producing commodities in multiple regions.**

*** Imperialism evolving into invisible domination mechanisms.**

*** The value of commodities shifting towards software, resulting in a dynamic system that weakens stability of meaning and self.**

*** The role of the universal intellectual becoming obsolete in favor of specialized professionals, technicians who are cogs in the capitalist machine, rebelling against authority.**

*** Expansion of the services sector at the expense of the industrial sector.**

*** Proliferation of applications such as those of banks and companies such as Uber, making applications central to management.**

*** Commodification of art, sports, etc.**

Society no longer presents itself as an integrated unit but as a collection of interconnected, invisible parts. Power is totalitarian yet subtle, with no comprehensive formal ideology. The main communication mechanism in advanced societies is electronic information system symbols. This has led to ideas such as multiplicity over unity, diversity over uniformity, concealed power and the absence of a center. Additionally, there is a decline in the idea of historical progress, denial of identity, collapse of causation principles, absence of the subject and a new view of art and beauty favoring folk and commercial art. Furthermore, the downfall of the authorities of reason, Truth, method, logic, family, society and the concept of universals in general.

The supremacy of information technology has brought back the idea of prioritizing thought over matter, leading to new concepts such as language analysis, discourse, death of the author and absence of the subject.

- The concept of human rights, a product of historical struggles, signifies an agreement among human beings for a minimum level of equality and freedom. While major powers may misuse this concept, it can also serve as a utopia and a tool for oppressed groups to achieve their interests. The content of human rights has evolved under pressure from marginalized groups, emphasizing that human rights are rights, not duties imposed on individuals.

However, Lyotard presented a fallacy to justify his rejection of human rights as they were not posited by an inhuman subject; this is true, but people posited them through communication and thus they gained their legitimacy. It is a human product and they are rights, not duties imposed on individuals, which is a motivation for respecting them not for rejecting them.

- Postmodern theorists criticize reason and rational thinking for perpetuating exploitation and repression. However, reason remains a crucial tool for analysis and innovation, despite its dual role in

postmodern theories. They reject reason while simultaneously utilizing; the complex theories and ideas they present rely on the use of reason. Otherwise, why did philosophers publish all those volumes of books?

- Postmodernism, while not absolute truth, is a part of modernism, reflecting a rebellion against modernism's unfulfilled promises. This observation was made by philosophers belonging to modernism before. It is just an extreme reaction, which quickly almost faded.

- Critics argue that postmodernism lacks practical alternatives to the capitalist system and often falls short in providing concrete solutions. It shares some ideas with the Frankfurt School in terms of envisioning freedom and overcoming alienation, Instead of offering radical solutions to social contradictions; it tends to focus on partial changes that cater to various demands and interests without addressing core issues.

- The introduction of specialized terminology such as deconstruction and genealogical methods may not add value to intellectual discourse, as similar analytical methods have been used historically without such terminology.

- The deliberate ambiguity and complex language in postmodern writings have been criticized for reflecting a decline in intellectual stature. Critics suggest that this may be an attempt by intellectuals to assert their value indirectly by presenting incomprehensible texts, creating a barrier between the writer and the reader

- Postmodernism's emphasis on difference, pluralism and dissent raises questions about the true meaning of accepting differences and the potential conflicts that may arise when different perspectives clash. While advocating for acceptance of diversity, postmodernism may not adequately address conflicts that arise from differing viewpoints.

- Humans rely on communication, mutual understanding and agreements to navigate life. Sanctifying differences to the point of

multiplicity and disunity would isolate individuals, contradicting human social nature. The complexity and ambiguity in postmodern writings may encourage readers to reinterpret texts. While some theorists advocate for the death of the author, authors' interpretations remain significant and communication between individuals relies on shared meanings derived from language.

- The complexity of writings and deliberate ambiguity may seem to motivate the reader to rewrite the text. If one considers that "every reading is a misreading," "the death of the author" and "the death of the reader" as they have said, everything would lose meaning and communication between human beings would be impossible. So, what is the aim?! Barthes discussed literary texts, but ambiguity and complexity are also present in philosophical texts. This observation has sparked anger among readers, and many have commented on it. Those who support the idea of the death of the author are also eager to sign their names on their writings! In reality, the author is not dead, and even if their work is interpreted in different ways, each reading attributes the conclusions to the author.

- Habermas's efforts (see chapter eleven as well): he argued that the project of modernity is far from over as it continues to pursue its objectives, meaning the values of Enlightenment, rationality and social justice. He espoused the defense of universal reason and morality, arguing that the project of modernity has not failed but has not yet consolidated. He insisted on the possibility of establishing a free society in which everyone is happy; a goal which postmodern theories evaded. In his defense of reason and modernity, he argued that the latter also means liberation from the power of the sacred, free and open communication and dialogue in a democratic sphere; the public sphere. This is what can lead to the establishment of a true democratic society, free from repression and domination and based on understanding, exchanging ideas, equal arguments and evidence within the framework of an open public debate. As for the emergence of totalitarian regimes and other

deviations of reason, they are - according to him - a product of irrationality, while reason eliminated slavery and feudalism and is capable of providing more.

Indeed, irrationality or the unconscious participated in the elimination of slavery and feudalism through the capitalists' greed for capital accumulation. In all cases, reason was and has been used as an instrument.

Habermas accused the philosophies of consciousness or the philosophies of the self of being responsible for the deviation of reason towards instrumentalism. He decided that the solution lies in moving from the central categories of consciousness and self in modernist philosophy to the philosophy of communication between subjects. This means going beyond the subject-object relationship, the idea of truth, to the relationship between subjects, communication and free dialogue between the people. Thus, for him, Truth became the subject of agreement between people, not the objective truth. This is called communicative rationality.

This idea misses the fact that this is what actually happens. The alleged truth claims to be a product of the subject's relationship to the object, but it is actually a product of people's belief, a product of social relations. In addition, communication and dialogue take place based on what people consider their opinions derived from their own relationship to issues and phenomena. It was interesting that he sought to achieve consensus in communication, which is virtually impossible.

- Postmodern trends rejecting linear historical progression are critiqued for overlooking general progress in productive forces despite temporary setbacks. History progresses in a zigzag manner, driven by evolving human needs and efforts to meet them.

- Regarding the relativism of values and morals and the death of man that some postmodernists insisted on; it is opposed by the humanistic conscience, which is also a human product and its content is not completely constant, but a general reference for

human beings (refer to chapter nine). People have already produced the so-called human rights as a moral power. Even though it has already become an idol and a tool used by states to blackmail each other, it is also, contrariwise, used by the people and the oppressed to assert their rights.

- Those theorists deal with language as if it is an independent entity; as if it produces itself, just as Foucault dealt with power, as a prior eternal existence independent of space and time.

- There is a serious point of view: criticism of modernism in societies that have not reached its modernity is a matter of concern. As well as criticism of science in societies in which scientific production faces great problems, criticism of nationalism in societies that are still fighting wars over their narrow identities and most of all criticism of representative democracy in societies that have been suffering for decades from tyranny.⁽⁴²²⁾

A permanent revolution in modernity:

The idea that has long promoted the wisdom of reason is very poor. Reason is merely the faculty of conscious thinking of human beings, conservative by nature, as Karl Kautsky argued; just an instrument that does not realize itself and has no goal or aspiration. It addresses objects under the guidance of the mind as a whole. If logic is considered “correct thinking” or that is consistent with facts, then the mind does not always work in a logical, demonstrative and realistic way. It is crowded with illusions and delusions and governed by the unconscious, which includes, among other things, instincts, emotions and repressed tendencies of the human psyche. Reason cannot be considered a measure of truth or a criterion of

⁽⁴²²⁾ Ezz Eddin El tamimy, postmodernism as propaganda for the systems (Arabic).

perfection in any field. But modernism and postmodernism depicted it as an entity, not as a faculty; sacred to the first and profane or impure sacred to the second.

If reason is governed by something else, then it cannot be conceived that it represents anything, such as the state, the nation, the working class, the believing community, goodness, etc. Calling reason to control human lives and resorting to it in everything is nothing but a call for some power to dominate the world in the name of reason. In the era of modernity this power has been capitalism. Its stakeholders promoted the greatness, neutrality and objectivity of reason, and in the name of this mythos modernity announced, in the form of its philosophies and theories, that it represented this fictional being.

But this should not lead to declaring war against reason, as postmodern theories have done, since reason is an effective and useful instrument for human progress. Civilization could not have existed without using this unique faculty of the mind; otherwise it will not be possible to continue and advance. Noting that this is an impossible decision to implement at all in the first place, and it only expresses irritation at the repercussions of modernity. It is possible to use rationality as a slogan in the name of which people have been enslaved and exploited, as well as contrariwise can be used as an instrument of liberation, rebellion and revolution. Reason is -as was repeatedly mentioned - just a faculty and an instrument that is suitable for contradictory uses.

Just as modernity meant using reason to reorder society in favor of capitalism, the permanent revolution needs reason to carry out more progress to achieve welfare and freedom for the populace, and to dismantle the products of capitalism that are hindering the achievement of this purpose, on top of which is the modern state apparatus.

- The final Truth is an illusion and as Nietzsche argued, no philosopher ever stopped to ask about the nature of the Truth, but

all the questions revolved around how to reach it or the conditions for its possibility. All philosophies considered that the issue of Truth does not need to be justified: *“ask the oldest and most recent philosophies on this issue, you will find that there is no single philosophy aware that the Truth itself needs to be justified.”*⁽⁴²³⁾ Human knows the Truth within the limits of the abilities of his mind, his ideology and his aspirations. Furthermore, the continuation of life creates more aspects of the Truth, so its end is never reached. This does not negate but confirms that there are facts until proved otherwise. Such as the law of the relationship between pressure and volume and the fact that the sun is a star whose temperature is such and such. As for the laws governing matter, they are merely induction or deduction that facilitates controlling nature and using it for human benefit.

- The world is actually the apparent, as postmodern philosophers have posited, and there is no inner entity beyond that appearance. However, language can never fully express this phenomenon, as abstraction and coding are inevitable. A word such as "lion" does not represent a tangible entity but rather an abstraction of all lions across time and space. Abstraction is necessary for us to interact with the world. It is important to remember that language consists of abstractions and symbols. Regardless of how language evolves or changes its symbols, coding and abstraction are essential for communication to continue.

- Recognizing that there is no absolute Truth and that different interpretations are possible leads to the understanding that human beings can only navigate and make choices through communication. This communication is not aimed at agreeing on a singular truth or convincing others of a specific interpretation but rather at finding common strategies. While achieving a degree of convergence in hermeneutical viewpoints is possible, it is important to acknowledge that there will always be some differences.

⁽⁴²³⁾ A quotation from Badr Eddin Moustafa, Op. cit., p. 45.

- Continuous criticism in every field is part of the process of permanent revolution, not to create differences or pluralism, nor to establish a final system in any field, but to eliminate barriers to freedom, development and welfare. Criticism aims to uncover contradictions and inconsistencies in thought or social reality while striving for harmony and compatibility, even though these may never be fully achieved. The goal is to attempt the impossible task of reconciliation. Revolutionary criticism does not claim to have a definitive solution but calls for a Re-Enlightenment based on the communication and knowledge revolutions of modern times.

- Modernism marked the transcendence of supernatural religion, and now it is necessary to transcend secular religion, including sanctities such as the state, the nation, the market, commodities, leaders and all earthly deities.

- The project of the public sphere and communicative rationality as envisioned by Habermas:⁽⁴²⁴⁾ He aimed to create a public sphere as mediation between civil society and the state to address human problems. This sphere consists of various arenas for dialogue, newspapers, periodicals and salons, based on freedom and exclusion of ideological and economic pressures, whose voice is heard by the state and achieves consensus of opinions. However, he did not specify how to establish this free sphere, as the public sphere already exists under the influence of the state and the ruling class, as he acknowledged himself. How is stakeholder control excluded? Can people agree on one opinion, such as expropriating the big companies for instance? Can there be consensus on anything in general? It is clear that he intended to stop social conflict, cancel the idea of revolution and resolve social contradictions through communication. He imagined that the public sphere was free in the past, while in reality it was created by the bourgeoisie for itself to put pressure on the feudal state. He also ignored the state's

⁽⁴²⁴⁾ Summarized clearly and published smoothly by Ashraf Hasan Mansour in his article: the theory of Habermas in the public sphere (Arabic).

emphatic rejection of what does not achieve its interests and the interests of the ruling class. In the end, he presented a moralistic advocacy that is inconsistent with the existence of contradictory social powers. Additionally, he envisioned that the development and reform of language are sufficient to achieve free discussion and agreement, as if human contradictions and conflicts result from linguistic difficulties.

The existing antagonistic contradictions cannot be resolved by communication, but by social and political struggle. As for the mutual understanding between hostile powers; between the capitalist and the marginalized, it can only be done temporarily and only when they reach a conclusion that understanding is better for each than continuing the struggle.

Habermas's communication cannot achieve its purpose in the existence of the state apparatus. He himself set a condition for the success of communication; the absence of coercion or pressure: since there is no sound public sphere in which democracy is not prevailed and carrying the ethics of dialogue and enjoying human rights and non-violence.

- In the current era, metaphysical issues have taken a back seat to pressing human concerns such as marginalization, exploitation, environmental degradation, nuclear threats, and incurable diseases. Those seeking to address these challenges must move beyond abstract thought, focus on practical solutions to the world's problems and make efforts to answer and re-answer the perpetual question: What is to be done?

- Modernism and its Eurocentric perspectives are being challenged by globalization and the rise of Asia, leading to a more objective understanding of human reality that transcends traditional boundaries.

'What cannot be translated into a project of action is merely contemplative and a worthless philosophy'

16. Intellectuals, Masses and Power

The intellectual is supposed to be the clear individual figure of a universality of which the proletariat is the obscure, collective form. For some time now, the intellectual has not been called upon to play this role

Michel Foucault

Who is the intellectual? What is the intelligentsia?

The broadest definition of culture, among other definitions, is: all spiritual production of human beings; all human creativity.

All human production necessarily includes creativity of some kind. This is the basis for defining the concept of an intellectual.

Intellectuals disagreed on the definition of the intellectual and the usage of the term “intelligentsia” also varied (a term of Polish origin). Sometimes it denotes highly educated people in general; technocrats or intellectuals who have abstract thought, whether by caring for it, assimilating and understanding it, or by participating in its production to one degree or another.

The terms technocrats and intellectuals will be used here in the aforementioned sense and it will be stopped at the main stations of the subject of the definition of intellectuals.

The first part of the intelligentsia, which constitutes technocrats of every type, serves the existing system and the ruling class, directly or indirectly, unless the individual transcends his technical capacity and gives attention to public affairs. In such a case he may or may not serve the system. The scientist who is concerned with mere research in science does not care who serves this science, even if he participates in the production of destructive weapons. The same scholar may think before undertaking such work and may reject or accept it. Yet the purely instrumental reason is not neutral; the discoveries of scientists and the work of “neutral” technocrats are within the framework of the status quo; the system. Whoever invents a new machine serves those who can buy and use it. Whoever discovered the steam engine served capitalism and enabled it -inadvertently- to destroy craft industries and the industries of entire countries during the first industrial revolution. And whoever discovered healthy food provided a service to those who can buy it, since it is costly.⁽⁴²⁵⁾ Many ideas and hypotheses appeared throughout history, but they were not transformed into practical applications unless being adopted by the dominant class. Examples include the idea of flying; whose attempts to invent began in the ninth century and the Andalusian scientist Abbas Ibn Firnas became famous for it, and the invention of missiles, which were used in China as mere fireworks. Moreover, there are technocrats working in the field of abstract thought, as researchers and employees in social research centers, universities and institutes.

Intellectuals are divided into two parts. The first one cares about culture just for fun or enjoyment; serving the stability of society, i.e., the system. The second uses its knowledge and ideas for the purpose of either changing society or maintaining its situation. The latter may engage in public and political work in particular, either against or with the system, consciously or unconsciously.

⁽⁴²⁵⁾ Sartre provided examples and many explanations for this phenomenon in his book: A plea for Intellectuals, I. what is intellectual? (Arabic translation).

The intelligentsia (technocrats + intellectuals) is not just an appendage to the different classes, but it has its own distinct interests. It is true that most of its members are employees of the ruling class, but they are not part thereof, rather they have a degree of independence and distinction. It is neither a class nor a unified section, but many sections, dissonant and contradictory, standing in different or hostile camps, and thus the interests of its members are incompatible. Hence, its views are multiplied and contradictory and its individuals and groups are struggling against each other all the time. Intellectuals are economically weak groups that derive their strength only from their ideological role and their ability to influence intellectually the various classes. Although they do not possess the economy, they possess knowledge and ideology; this effective weapon in the social and political struggle, i.e., they have cognitive power.

The definition of intellectuals cannot be limited to their involvement in public affairs, as groups that are not specialized in the field of culture may also be involved in public affairs. Mental labor cannot even be clearly distinguished from manual labor. Even a manual laborer does some amount of mental labor and vice versa. As Gramsci stated: “*all men are intellectuals;*” meaning that there is no pure manual labor. Intellectuals are distinguished from the non-intellectuals by the direct social function. Contrary to Sartre's saying: “*the intellectual is someone who meddles in what is not his business;*”⁽⁴²⁶⁾ the intellectual meddles in what is his business, which is the public affairs, as it is the work that he understands and through which achieves his aspirations.

Intellectuals originate from any social class, not just technicians, contrary to what Sartre also claimed.⁽⁴²⁷⁾ The path to the production of pure thought and public action is open to all persons, and it has been witnessed many innovators and thinkers coming from the

⁽⁴²⁶⁾ Op. cit., p. 12.

⁽⁴²⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 15.

ranks of the working classes, knowing little about technology. Shouldn't, e.g., the semi-proletarian; Egyptian poet Ahmad Fouad Negm be considered an intellectual? Can Jean-Jacques Rousseau not be considered a philosopher? The proletarian, Karl Bebel, is he not an intellectual presented published theoretical works? Can the semi-proletarian Maxim Gorky; the founder of the school of socialist realism be forgotten? In addition to Proudhon; the examples are many.

The lumpenintelligentsia: a term that is less than a century old (since the 1930s). It refers to technocrats and intellectuals who are ignorant or justify the state, the shabby bourgeoisie and any human decadence. Among them are the educated illiterate in their specializations, the ignorant researchers and experts and all the educated people who abandon professionalism and act as mere swindlers or servants of the authorities. Some are doctors who behave as mere swindlers; they falsify their specialties, take commissions from laboratories and from each other, violate professionalism in diagnosis and treatment, supervise acts of torture and falsify medical reports for the authorities (some of whom cooperate with the intelligence services in “democratic” countries). Besides, psychologists who justify racism with alleged scientific research and provide fake results. This is along with some media professionals who fabricate news and, information or events that did not happen. There are also educated technocrats who promote pre-modern values and systems, such as inciting the government for the withdrawal of nationality by birth from the militants as if it is a grant from the state, or supporting projects of inheriting authority in supposedly republican regimes.

There are many showy intellectuals whose aim is to gain prestige without presenting intellectual production. They do not read but write and publish on subjects they know nothing about, presenting fables to the readers. What is worse is that some of them know and fabricate facts hoping for the authority's contentment or seeking fame. These categories are found in abundance in the markedly

underdeveloped countries, but no country in the world is devoid of them. There are also technocrats who study well in developed countries and after returning to their backward countries engage in a primitive system without any resistance; a common phenomenon in countries such as Saudi Arabia and others.

This group is not just technocrats, but it rejects professionalism; therefore, takes an ideological position, motivated by crude interest and herein lays its ugliness. It does not use technology for its own interests, but achieves these interests by abandoning professionalism in the service of the authority, placing itself in the position of a shabby servant; scum.

Some determinants regarding the concept of the intellectual:

* **The marginalized intellectual:** This type of intellectual does not belong to the institutions of formal society and is often unrecognized by official academics and intellectuals, whether pro- or anti-government. They may be self-taught intellectuals and are sometimes revolutionary intellectuals who face persecution and marginalization. An example is Karl Marx, who achieved fame and intellectual influence despite persecution and neglect. Other examples include Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau. Radical revolutionary intellectuals are often marginalized and face neglect and persecution. These intellectuals do not necessarily come from lower classes. Some individuals from dominant or middle classes align themselves with the aspirations of the poor and oppressed for personal or psychological reasons. Conversely, intellectuals from lower classes may integrate into the dominant class for personal interests. However, not all intellectuals from lower classes align with the oppressed. Many intellectuals prioritize achieving status and may be willing to abandon the poor classes for personal gain, as knowledge and ideology are commodities in demand in the labor market. The desire to achieve status is a key determinant in their choices, which may lead them to break ties with the class they originally aligned with. An example is the parties of the Second Socialist International, led by intellectuals such as Karl Kautsky,

who supported their governments in the First World War, contradicting their original principles.

The most crucial factor in the persistence of an intellectual sympathetic with the popular classes is to remain marginalized, unable or unwilling for one reason or another to join the ranks of the dominant class.

* **Gramsci and the Organic Intellectual:** Gramsci did not regard the intelligentsia, as a category independent of classes. Instead, he categorized intellectuals into two sections: traditional intellectuals, such as scholars and writers, who appear to be socially neutral while belonging to certain class formations, and organic intellectuals, who are, in short, the thinking and organizing element of a particular fundamental social class.

He said about the second category: *“Every social group, coming into existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself organically, one or more strata of intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields. The capitalist entrepreneur creates alongside himself the industrial technician, the specialist in political economy, the organizers of a new culture, of a new legal system, etc. It can be observed that the 'organic' intellectuals which every new class creates alongside itself and elaborates in the course of its development, are for the most part “specializations” of partial aspects of the primitive activity of the new social type which the new class has brought into prominence.”*⁽⁴²⁸⁾ Thus, the organic intellectual is the intellectual who affiliates with a class and gives it self-consciousness, formulates its theoretical perceptions of the world, performs organizational and instrumental functions to ensure the continuity of the appropriate division of social labor for that class and then justifies and guarantees its interests. It is taken for granted that the organic intellectual chooses the class to which he would like to affiliate.

⁽⁴²⁸⁾ Selections from the Prison notebooks pp. 132-133, Gramsci Internet Archive.

The intellectual -contrary to Gramsci's idea- is not just a member of a class or merely its expression; especially the “organic” intellectual. It must be added here that this intellectual -in the aforementioned sense- does not join a class except to achieve his status. He is either originally belonging to that class or his association with it achieves the desired status he is looking for. So, he is not just a pure expression of a class, i.e., its Reason, but he has his psychological and material motivations and ambitions. In the end, he is a being of flesh and bone and may change his affiliation if circumstances change.

* Foucault distinguished between the universal intellectual and the specific intellectual and discussed the end of the era of the intellectual who claims to possess the Truth and represents the conscience of society and justice: *“that major era of contemporary philosophy has passed; the era of Sartre and Merleau Ponty, when a philosophical or theoretical text had to give you the meaning of life and death, the meaning of sexual life and to tell you whether God exists or not? What is freedom and what should be done in political life and how to behave with others, etc.”*⁽⁴²⁹⁾ He argued that the universal intellectual represented by Marxism and existentialism has faded, giving way to the specific intellectual who is educated within certain limits and specialized in a particular field. Foucault emphasized that the specific intellectual is engaged in political struggles and uses their knowledge and experiences for political purposes. This can be explained in the following features:

1. They do not give lessons or provide general guidance, but offer tools for action and methods for analysis.
2. They focus on specific issues, reveal new situations.
3. They renounce the claims of totalitarianism, universality and totality, and exercises political, theoretical and moral vigilance in their field of work or social environment.

⁽⁴²⁹⁾ Ahmad Ramadan, the intellectual between Gramsci and Foucault (Arabic).

4. The specific intellectual is the analyzer and critic of the systems of thought, which have become axioms, and which are organically linked with human concepts, attitudes and behavior.

5. His mission is not to enact laws, propose solutions and provide advice, but the transformation or change through his field, by diagnosing the present.⁽⁴³⁰⁾

Foucault observed the decline of the universal intellectual, who was once seen as the ultimate authority on all matters. Modern intellectuals are now more specialized in specific areas of knowledge, reflecting the increasing complexity of society. Technocrats, doctors, lawyers and journalists have all become highly specialized in their respective fields. Comprehensive philosophies have also become less prevalent in contemporary intellectual discourse.

* Sartre and the committed intellectual: He dealt with this issue in detail in his book: *A Plea for Intellectuals* and discussed the concept of the committed intellectual who dedicates themselves to a public cause with the goal of transforming society. He argued that commitment is not a choice but an obligation for the intellectual, who must choose to engage with social issues. The committed intellectual is free in the sense that their freedom compels them to make choices, and even not choosing is considered a choice that carries responsibility.

Sartre defined the role of the committed intellectual as: struggling against the resurgence of ideology (meaning false consciousness) among the popular classes, using the knowledge capital provided by the ruling class to construct a popular culture, rehabilitating technicians of practical knowledge from disadvantaged classes and turning them into organic intellectuals, and rooting the current activity to stand against every authority.⁽⁴³¹⁾

⁽⁴³⁰⁾ Ibid., a quotation from Zawawy Bagora.

⁽⁴³¹⁾ Op. cit., pp. 58-59.

Regarding the intellectual committed to the issues of the ruling class, Sartre did not consider him committed but a pseudo-intellectual, although he also chooses. He prescribed this category of intellectuals as the “unhappy conscious” people who know the truth but, under the influence of life's circumstances, behave hypocritically with authority at the expense of moral principles. This expression was used by Hegel to describe believers in an authoritarian God; they can neither unite with nor be independent from this God, so they suffer misery. The Jews were singled out.

This definition of the committed intellectual brings one back to the principle of universal Truth and makes the intellectual its bearer. It seems that Sartre described himself in particular. This is a stage that has already passed; the era of that universal intellectual who knows all the crafts has already ended. Moreover, limiting the concept of the intellectual to those who take the part of the popular classes includes a degree of arbitrariness. Is it not possible to consider the thinkers of the bourgeoisie as sociological “scientists” and intellectual philosophers?! What does it mean to describe an intellectual as a pseudo-intellectual? It is a call to claim holding the ultimate Truth; an idea that also involves dividing thought into true and false, in the sense of true consciousness versus false consciousness; a way of thinking embraced by leftists in general.

Sartre's ideas on the intellectual bear what might be called the “default intellectual.” He is the one who defines his characteristics, role and goals, and whoever deviates from that is considered pseudo, not genuine. He thus made his view the criterion of Truth

* Muhammad Abed Al-Jabri shared with Sartre the restriction of the intellectual to someone who *“is essentially a social critic, analyzing and contributing to overcome the obstacles to a better social system.”*⁽⁴³²⁾ Both embrace the concept of a critical thinker.

⁽⁴³²⁾ Intellectual's legacy in the Arabic world, p. 25 (Arabic translation).

* As well, Julian Banda referred to what he called the “real intellectuals”: *“They are closest to being honest with themselves when overwhelming metaphysical feelings and lofty principles, that is, the principles of justice and truth, push them to expose corruption, defend the suffering and challenge the ugly and brutal authority.”*⁽⁴³³⁾

* Edward Said adopted Gramsci's concept of the organic intellectual. He argued that *“the intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying and articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public. And this role has an edge to it and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than to produce them), to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations and whose raison d'etre is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug.”*⁽⁴³⁴⁾

The definitions and types of intellectuals are endless: the avant-garde thinker of Edward Said, the quarrelsome intellectual, the courageous intellectual of Julien Benda, the project intellectual of Muhammad Abed Al-Jabri, the leftist intellectual of Bourdieu, the power or traditional intellectual, the critical intellectual, the justificatory intellectual, the preaching intellectual, the representative intellectual who claims to represent a group or class through a party or a union and the unbelonging (or outsider) intellectual, among others. The majority of theorists have explored the concept of the intellectual in a way that ranges between Gramsci and Sartre's thesis, presenting themselves to the world as bearers of the Truth and promising a future society free of suffering, as leaders and guides of the public.

⁽⁴³³⁾ A quotation from Ali Asaad Watfa, the critical intellectual as a concept and significance (Arabic).

⁽⁴³⁴⁾ Representations of the intellectual, p. 11.

In essence, an intellectual, in the broadest sense, is a person who is interested in abstract thought, whether by assimilating it only or participating in its production. Moreover, they may use their knowledge and ideas to change society or maintain it in the same situation. They may also engage in public activity, particularly political, either against or with the system, consciously or unconsciously.

The era of the universal intellectual as the vanguard and leader has come to an end, replaced by the specific intellectual, who is an individual within the crowd, more knowledgeable about one aspect of life.

Why does the intellectual care about the field of public affairs?

To understand why intellectuals, even revolutionaries, are interested in public affairs, it is important to remember that every human seeks to achieve a certain status, whether material (economic or physical), moral, or both. This innate inclination in humans serves as a mechanism to overcome feelings of vulnerability and insecurity. When working in the field of culture, this pursuit of status has psychological motives, as discussed in the analysis of human nature. Additionally, working in this field can also be a profitable profession. Ultimately, humans work for themselves, albeit indirectly.

The psychology of a professional militant is not fundamentally different from that of a professional criminal from a certain perspective.⁽⁴³⁵⁾ Both are willing to work hard and take risks, including the possibility of being killed, to achieve status, whether material or moral. A militant, whether revolutionary or counterrevolutionary, is considered an adventurer. The aspirations of the professional fighter may coincide with the interests of a social group for a period of time, but egoism and personal ambitions may

⁽⁴³⁵⁾ This idea is taken verbally from the late friend Sameh Saeed Abboud.

separate them at one moment or another. However, this militant is very different from the revolutionary delegated by the self-conscious masses merely to carry out a certain task for a period (this will be discussed in detail in the last chapter). It is often observed that professional intellectuals talk about their thoughts as if they are of theological secrets that the masses cannot understand. This is merely an effort to confer importance and power over the self that is seeking status.⁽⁴³⁶⁾ In reality, it is not necessary for a worker to have a deep understanding of abstract philosophical and social science concepts to grasp socialism. Ideas that cannot be easily explained to an ordinary person are likely to be confusing. This notion is reminiscent of Sartre's belief that proletarians are incapable of speaking for themselves and require intellectuals to articulate their cause and reveal the true nature of their situation. (Reference: Hall: 1996)⁽⁴³⁷⁾

The intellectual groups, being economically weak and lacking material influence in society's economic structure, are too weak to assert themselves as a social power with their own interests. Therefore, they often align themselves with a stronger power such as God, the people, the nation, or the working class to gain

⁽⁴³⁶⁾ Ernest Mandel (as an example) said: *“the category of the revolutionary party stems from the fact that Marxian socialism is a science which, in the final analysis, can be completely assimilated only in an individual and not in a collective manner. Marxism constitutes the culmination (and in part also the dissolution) of at least three classical social sciences: classical German philosophy, classical political economy and classical French political science (French socialism and historiography). Its assimilation presupposes at least an understanding of the materialist dialectics, historical materialism, Marxian economic theory and the critical history of modern revolutions and of the modern labor movement... The notion that this colossal sum of knowledge and information could somehow spontaneously flow from working at a lathe or a calculating machine is absurd. The fact that as a science Marxism is an expression of the highest degree in the development of proletarian class consciousness means simply that it is only through an individual process of selection that the best, most experienced, the most intelligent and the most combative members of the proletariat are able to directly and independently acquire this class consciousness in its most potent form,”* The Leninist Theory of Organization, II. Bourgeois ideology and proletarian class consciousness

⁽⁴³⁷⁾ A quotation from Hall, 1996, the intellectual according to Sartre.

empowerment. They believe that their knowledge grants them the authority to represent the Truth and create an ideal system on behalf of a social power. However, these groups are often devious, deceptive, self-serving and do not truly represent the interests of the masses. There is nobody who burns himself up to give others light, as intellectuals allege. They are not mere bearers of thought, but groups having interests, representing themselves and using the spontaneous and unorganized movement of the masses for their advantage under demagogic slogans. The difference between the "elites" or the "vanguard" and the masses lies not in the level of consciousness or perception of reality but primarily in their aspirations and interests.

Any class or group can advocate for its viewpoint and criticize others, but claiming to be an ideal to follow is a baseless assertion.

When intellectuals claim to represent the masses, they assume a form of authority without realizing it, positioning themselves as leaders and guiding lights for the public. This representation is often based on illusions, lies, or deception, as they do not truly represent anyone but themselves. Actually, when they present themselves as a representative of the people, they implicitly declare their inability to represent themselves and position themselves as bearers of their consciousness and thinkers on their behalf, when in reality they represent only themselves. In short, representation is one of the manifestations of power.

Gilles Deleuze was expressive when he described it as *"the indignity of speaking for others."*⁽⁴³⁸⁾

Over the course of a century and a half, we have witnessed an iterative trajectory of leaders and activists in popular movements. It typically begins with a radical discourse and strong stances, but as the leader gains prominence in formal society, they often transition to a more "realistic" discourse. Eventually, they may become a

⁽⁴³⁸⁾ Intellectuals and power: A conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze.

friendly opponent or even a friend of the regime they once opposed. This pattern was evident in the leaders of socialism in the Second International, as well as after the Russian Revolution when the Bolshevik party demanded blind obedience from workers. This trend continued through the 1968 uprisings and into the Arab Spring. Undoubtedly, there are very few who have not followed this path.⁽⁴³⁹⁾

Intellectuals are generally ambitious individuals who seek to continuously elevate their status. They derive their strength and fame from their knowledge, ideas and ability to justify and disseminate their beliefs. This can lead them to cling to outdated ideas to maintain their status, even if those ideas no longer hold relevance. The fear of losing stature and demand in the cultural market may drive intellectuals to persist in upholding obsolete ideas, creating a disconnect from reality.

On the other hand, the opposite also happens. An intellectual - sometimes leading- changes his position from a “militant” or “neutral” to an advocate of repressive power without any pressure. When he feels the imminent demise, he tries to regain his moral influence at any cost, by betting on the winning horse or what he imagines as such, or when he imagines that the continued rise of his star requires siding with and serving the authorities.

Finally, there are some intellectuals who have the courage to announce their abandonment of all the ideas they built after they become unsatisfactory for them. So, they achieve a new position with this bold announcement and change their compass.

⁽⁴³⁹⁾ John Molyneux and Conor Kostick wrote: *“Throughout the twentieth century, the status of 'socialist' or socialist-democratic leader was synonymous with moderation and social advancement. The classic path of a militant was this: gaining support from the base using seemingly radical rhetoric and politics, then gaining gradual prominence in the movement by stripping of the principles one by one, until becoming a full member of the political elite, with a uniform and tie, a driver's car, a high salary and multiple relationships with the business community and employees. In other words, falling into the captivity of the elite, that he claimed intends to change.”* Anarchism: A Marxist Criticism.

Among intellectuals' attempts to distinguish themselves, raise their value and deprive the public of culture is presenting their writings in an incomprehensible, complex, "deep" language that gives a deceptive impression of excellence and genuineness, in an attempt to maintain the separation between the so-called elite and the masses, by depriving the latter of culture. This observation was recorded by many theorists and based on this phenomenon, John Carey, for example, the author of the book titled *Intellectuals and the Masses*, considered modernism fundamentally "antidemocratic."⁽⁴⁴⁰⁾ The majority of intellectuals also promote the role of the individual in history, highlight leaders and masters, especially thinkers and philosophers and deliberately make stars, in general. This is because the consolidation of the image of the star or the heroic leader in the eyes of the people maintains the continuation of the gap between the elite and the masses and the continuation of the division of people in the field of thought into producers and consumers. Even the great leaders of Marxism resorted to this game, exalting the role of the intellectual and the vanguard, which they portrayed as the maker of both the working class's consciousness and the way it realizes itself. Unlike them, the anarchists argued theoretically; so they underestimated leadership in general. But they always had leaders and thinkers, did not refrain from writing their history, with reverence, proudly and highlighting their sacrifices.

Is there a role for the intellectual?

History has not assigned anyone a role, whether it be a class, a person or a group of people. Therefore, the metaphysical idea of the intellectual's role, what is "expected" of them, or what their "message" should be, should be discarded. There is no specific task for the intellectual, as they are not prophets or assigned a specific task by history. They do not have a "natural" or "historical" role.

⁽⁴⁴⁰⁾ Roger Kimball, *Intellectuals and the Masses*.

Instead, they are the ones who choose and define their path, just like any other individual; everyone determines their position. The insistence of intellectuals on developing conceptions about their special and distinctive role is aimed at seeking a prominent position in society and gaining influence over the public. This approach includes the belief that a revolution is impossible without the involvement of intellectual elites with an alleged historical role. Furthermore, the horizontal division of people into vanguard and base or elite and masses reflects the view of intellectuals and implies accusing the masses of ignorance and backwardness, justifying the demand for their obedience and discipline under the banner of the leading party and its elite.

There is a prevalent idea among intellectuals, especially from the socialist left, that revolutionary intellectuals have a role in conveying class consciousness to the public. Therefore, the intellectual who carries the revolutionary theory is seen as guiding the masses and shaping their consciousness. This idea implies a fundamental division of forces in the revolution into those who carry the theory and those who implement it, or in simpler terms: brain + muscles; a conscious leadership and a public following. Intellectuals often caution the masses against acting without revolutionary leadership and theory, warning them of failure if they do not obey or wait for intellectuals to form a coherent organization. In reality, there is no need to convey consciousness to the masses, as they do not require complex theories or philosophy, since the reality is clear and understandable. With the spread of communication tools, increased education and people's interest in understanding their social problems, the desire for freedom, welfare and development is evident. The strategies of permanent revolution are already striving to achieve these goals, but obstacles remain significant, and the journey is long. What is needed is more cooperation, creativity and bold decisions.

The notion that the public is unaware or that their consciousness is distorted, and that intellectuals bring consciousness from outside,

implies several things: first, portraying the masses as mere recipients; second, promoting a dependency relationship between the people and the elite; and third, suggesting an illusion that there is a right and wrong ideology.

Incorrect information or facts can be published for deception and vice versa, while spreading a “wrong” or “correct” ideology is an ideological thinking that is not innocent. It is important to understand that people are not passive recipients but actively engage with ideas based on their experiences. Elites do not represent anyone but themselves, and while they may align with popular groups or lead them, they do not speak for them, as every group, including intellectuals, expresses itself. Elites do not know the interests of the masses better than the masses themselves, as interests are subjective. Each individual determines their interests based on their desires and aspirations. In fact, intellectuals, who are considered capable of rejecting and exposing delusions, are also prone to believing and creating them, and are more susceptible to doctrinal dogmatism and ideological illusions.⁽⁴⁴¹⁾ Pretending their inclination to elevate themselves, claim the ability to change the world and assert a historical mission stems from a sense of material weakness in society and a lack of influence without real social power to support them.

Death of the universal intellectual:

A British critic wrote: “This time has become a period of darkness for intellectuals. One decade ago, thinkers like Jean-Paul Sartre and Bertrand Russell were able to attract many in the West. Bertolt Brecht also wielded significant influence in Eastern Europe. But now it is difficult to think of any person of this caliber whose ideas could capture even a modicum of attention. Intellectuals are despised, university professors are not trusted and universities are overcrowded with students due to reasons related to the cycle of global economic stagnation.”⁽⁴⁴²⁾

⁽⁴⁴¹⁾ Althusser, a quotation from Mohammad Sabila, *orbits of modernism*, p. 87 (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁴²⁾ A quotation from Khaldoun Al-Shamaa, *marginalization of intellectuals* (Arabic).

In our time there is little influence of intellectuals in the field of politics in “democratic” countries, especially in the United States.
(443)

With the expansion of specializations in the political and social “sciences”, as well as the advancement of knowledge and technical sciences, the general or universal intellectual no longer holds the same stature as in the past. This is especially true since they have been unable to fulfill their promises of establishing an ideal society. The situation has been exacerbated by the proliferation of social networking sites and the easy access to information. As a result, the authority of the intellectual has been diminished, and their monopoly over knowledge has ended. Intellectuals no longer provide the essential meaning that people once sought, akin to water and air. The need for abstract thought, metaphysics and exploration of the infinite has waned. Consequently, the public no longer admires intellectuals as they once did; instead, they view them as stakeholders who use discourse to advance their own status. This loss of credibility applies to both the developed and underdeveloped world. Despite promises of creating a society of freedom and justice, ideologies such as Stalinism and fascism emerged and collapsed, while wars, exploitation and racism persisted. The majority of the world's population became marginalized, and conditions in post-colonial Third World countries deteriorated. The public witnessed the intellectual elite aligning with capitalism and totalitarian states, justifying repression. In summary, people are no longer swayed by idealistic rhetoric and Absolute Idea.

Many theorists have observed the phenomenon of the intellectual's death, such as Régis Debray, who announced his own death as an intellectual “*By declaring his abandonment of his liberation struggle role to settle for his role as a writer with a style or as a specialist scientist in a field, expressing his sense of the futility of the presence of*

⁽⁴⁴³⁾ F.A. Hayek, *Intellectuals and Socialism*.

intellectuals as magicians who make meanings and sell illusions.”⁽⁴⁴⁴⁾ The 1968 uprising in France also raised questions and doubts about the intellectual’s stature and legitimacy as a guardian of values or as a representative of people’s conscience.⁽⁴⁴⁵⁾ The events aroused Sartre, who previously defended intellectuals as carriers of the Truth and prompted him to question their value. Michel Foucault observed that what intellectuals discovered since the uprising is that the masses no longer need them to know their reality, which they know completely, clearly and better than them:⁽⁴⁴⁶⁾ *“The intellectual discovered that the masses no longer needed him to gain knowledge: they know perfectly well without illusion; they know far better than he and they are certainly capable of expressing themselves.”*⁽⁴⁴⁷⁾

After the great uprising in Egypt in January 1977, the Egyptian poet Ahmed Fouad Negm bitterly criticized intellectuals for not anticipating or envisioning the possibilities of the outbreak of the tremendous upheaval.⁽⁴⁴⁸⁾ It is useful here to point out that Lenin – as an intellectual- showed clear revolutionary pessimism when he announced, two months before the outbreak of the February 1917 revolution, that his generation might not witness the next Russian revolution.⁽⁴⁴⁹⁾ This expectation shows to what extent the role of the leading intellectual was marginal in the events of Russia at a time when the great uprising was brewing. In response, intellectuals

⁽⁴⁴⁴⁾ Ali Harb, *Elite illusions or intellectual criticism*, p. 41 (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁴⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

⁽⁴⁴⁶⁾ Quoted Badr Eddin Moustafa, *postmodernism routes*, p. 56 (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁴⁷⁾ The intellectual according to Sartre.

⁽⁴⁴⁸⁾ The poet said:

“Did one of them see a sign of the apocalypse?
Before the gospels come on the day eighteen of January
When Egypt rose up after what they thought was asleep
To curse hunger, humiliation, grievances and the government”

Fouad Najem's satire of intellectuals was repeated (such as in the poem: *My People Live*).

⁽⁴⁴⁹⁾ Ernest Mandel, *Trotskyism of the moment* (Arabic translation).

began trying to open new fields and invent a new language to present the old theories, in an attempt to re-market themselves, to no avail.

The universal intellectual is already dead; since the stage of searching for the Truth ended, the Absolute Idea died and the era of comprehensive philosophies faded and became a part of the past.

What can the specific intellectual do?

Like any human being, this intellectual has his ambitions and aspirations. If he entirely optionally wants to play a role in the permanent revolution, he is capable of disseminating propaganda and practicing incitement among the masses that are eligible for revolution. In addition to scandalizing the regime, publishing real information about the state of society and providing logistical support for the revolution. He is also able to participate in various protest movements. In historical experience it was witnessed that propaganda and incitement; organized and non-organized, played a great role in the preparation for the spontaneous great popular uprisings everywhere. Here, the anarchists' idea of propaganda organizations jumps, which do not guide the mass movement, but propagandize the ideas of the revolution and provide logistical contribution to the masses.

If the specific intellectual likes to have a role in the revolution, he has to work to scandalize the authority and the regime; its exploitative nature. He can also criticize the foundations of the existing society and ideology, expose the false pretenses of the state and the ruling class, help the masses to learn, smash the sanctities and set an example in breaking the bases of the system, presenting new art, spreading education, fighting for a better treatment regimen, developing and adapting scientific research to the interests of the public. He has before everything to determine his status in the social system; does he serve the dominant power or the counter-power; the permanent revolution?

Actually, no one will respond to the intellectual presenting himself as a prophet; the messenger of the absolute Truth. So, if he wants to influence, he must fight against the forms of repressive authority wherever he is, whether political or epistemological, against all forms of falsity, deception and deceit and against the apparatuses of repression, on top of which is the state.

This is not a task or a mission, but the possibility to contribute to the revolutionary movement like any other individual. Let him participate -if he likes- in the masses activity as an individual, so he presents his experiences, suggestions and knowledge without being a leader or boss, but an ideal and an initiator. He can also provide support from afar, meaning suggestions and insights.

A role for the intellectual by and large cannot be defined, and it is not possible to create an image of a “default” intellectual as needed. What can be done is only analyzing and understanding what intellectuals actually do and what can they do. Urging the intellectual to be an organic one in the expression and in the sense intended by Gramsci, committed as Sartre termed or to be merely a catalyst for the movement of the masses; these are mere appeals similar to the urging to virtue. The reality has been showing that the intellectual defends his own view and interests from his position. The fact that some sympathize with certain social groups does not denote a historical mission, but just a non-binding voluntary action.

What can be presented regarding the role of intellectuals is nothing more than analysis and criticism. Gramsci's advice to the vanguard or to the revolutionary party yielded nothing.

What can only be done is imploring specific intellectuals to descend from their heights and not to deal with the people as a group of ignorants who are unaware of their interests. It is also possible to talk about dialogue with the public or to establish a relationship with them, not aiming for “educating” or “directing” others. A contribution to provide information and convey people's experiences to each other from the position of specialization is also

legitimate, but without getting involved in expressing the “historical” interests of the masses, nor playing the role of the bearer of the revolutionary theory or the embodiment of the struggling class “for itself.”

They are also implored to abandon the device of vague theses, showy writing, complex language and deliberate ambiguity to confer grandiosity upon their writings.

When the masses become the vanguard: the literate public:

The oppressed class, especially the new proletariat, does not need an ideology but a Utopia. This class is not integrated into the existing systems and does not benefit from its continued status. It is not reconciled with its conditions. Therefore, it does not fit any justificatory but promising ideas. Hence, it does not need the general & universal intellectual who formulates its consciousness of herself and of the world. Rather its position in the world is clear enough, needing no justification and its aspirations are clear enough, needing no philosophical formulations or tons of complex books.

As people's knowledge progresses, the less they need the intellectual by and large, while, this need will disappear at the end. Even it will be possible for all people to be technocrats and intellectuals. With the dissemination of knowledge and social communication skills, the division of labor between intellectuals and the public will disappear; the producer and consumer or the recipient of culture. This superseding is a condition for achieving constantly revolutionary successes, where there is no one who invests his mind to move the crowds as he likes and stops them at the moment his dreams are actualized.

With the transformation of the public or many thereof into technocrats and intellectuals, the specific intellectual will dissolve in the crowd and lose his feeling of grandiosity; what is going on gradually now.

The sanctification of persons, theories and even slogans will eventually cease. Terms such as: the Icon of the revolution, the

Orator of the revolution, the Youth of the revolution, the Leaders of the revolution, etc. will disappear.

'Without the masses becoming self-conscious, aware of their potentials and those of their adversaries, oriented with the suitable path to victory and leading themselves, they will not be able to realize achievements on the path to revolution'

17. The Contemporary World

*It was narrowing until its rings tightened,
then it was released,
while I thought it would not be*

Muhammad ibn Idris Al-Shafii

First: Scientific Revolutions:

Humans are now in the era of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, ⁽⁴⁵⁰⁾ which includes artificial intelligence, robotics, the Internet of Things (connecting and exchanging data between devices and systems with sensors, processing ability, software and other technologies over the Internet), autonomous vehicles, 3D printing, nanotechnology, biotechnology, materials science, energy storage and quantum computing. The Fifth Industrial Revolution, focusing on human-machine collaborations is on the horizon.⁽⁴⁵¹⁾

The world is undergoing scientific revolutions in various fields that have the potential to transform life on earth within decades following the information and computer revolutions. These revolutions include:

1. Information revolution: This revolution began 500 years ago with the invention of printing, progressed through a pre-digital stage involving organized production of information and transitioned to the digital stage after World War II.⁽⁴⁵²⁾ Software production has become a crucial branch of production, with information and programs comprising a significant portion of the value of goods and services. Nanotechnology has played a key role in saving raw materials, reducing weight and advancing industries such as electronics, medical technologies and synthetic materials production. Scientific research and information production have become dominant fields of work, with computer-assisted artistic production becoming prevalent. The transmission of information has become faster, cheaper and more accessible, leading to increased

⁽⁴⁵⁰⁾ The previous three revolutions were: the replacement of manual labor with machines in the 19th century, the technological revolution represented in mass production at the end of the 19th century and the computer revolution after the Second World War.

⁽⁴⁵¹⁾ Stephanie M. Noble a, Martin Mende b, Dhruv Grewal c, A. Parasuraman, The Fifth Industrial Revolution: How Harmonious Human–Machine Collaboration is Triggering a Retail and Service evolution.

⁽⁴⁵²⁾ Boyd Rayward, Information Revolutions, the Information Society and the Future of the History of Information Science.

labor and capital productivity but also contributing to higher unemployment rates. Technocrats now make up a larger percentage of the workforce, while manual labor has diminished in importance in developed countries. The United States has seen manual labor shift to the back of the economy, with innovation-driven sectors taking the lead.⁽⁴⁵³⁾

This revolution has enabled greater participation of women and people with disabilities in the workforce and has advanced military capabilities while also making wars more destructive. Citizens now have easier access to information, facilitating the exposure of corruption and government deception. The information revolution and globalization are mutually reinforcing. Capitalist globalization and anarchist globalization (e.g., Wikipedia, Firefox and Linus) promote global information exchange among individuals. Social networking sites, electronic publishing and hacking of restricted sites have played significant roles in shaping global events, such as the Arab Spring and subsequent uprisings in countries such as Turkey, Brazil, India, Ukraine and Hong Kong.⁽⁴⁵⁴⁾

Information conflicts between countries and institutions have intensified, influencing their decisions and future trajectories, including those of companies. E-commerce has expanded significantly and is projected to continue growing (reaching \$25.3 trillion in 2018, with \$22.4. trillion in business-to-business transactions). Stock exchanges may eventually transition to purely electronic platforms.⁽⁴⁵⁵⁾ Even stock exchanges can turn into just an electronic application.

This revolution has led to a sharp rise in productivity. For instance, productivity increased annually by an average of 1.4% in the United States between 1973-1995, but since 1995 it is increasing at a rate of 2.9% annually, which is a very high rate, by virtue of

⁽⁴⁵³⁾ Brink Lindsey, *the end of the Working Class*.

⁽⁴⁵⁴⁾ Paul Mason, *post-capitalism, A Guide to Our Future*, p. 13.

⁽⁴⁵⁵⁾ Kuwait News Agency, Monday 2018/4/16, al-ain.com.

information, communication technology and electronic commerce.
(456)

The production of software and databases is costly, but it is possible to copy them endlessly at no cost, which brings their value down to nearly zero.

It is now possible to have one global electronic currency independent from the states (millions today are using bitcoin), with banks reduced to an electronic application and close their premises.

The end of the paper era is imminent in all fields, from education, to government transactions, to libraries, etc.

A large part of money has become just numbers on the computer. In 2006, the sum total of money in the world was about \$60 trillion, yet the sum total of coins and banknotes was less than \$6 trillion. More than 90 per cent of all money; more than \$50 trillion appearing in people's accounts, existed only on computer servers.⁽⁴⁵⁷⁾

The relationships between people have weakened by virtue of electronic connections, and families are disintegrating.

Education has become possible to be done on-line, and every individual has become able to develop his information, which heralds the dissolution of the gap between people and the end of the monopoly of cognitive power.

It has also become probable to achieve cultural convergence or acquaintance in the world, which enhances the exchange and interaction of cultures.

Nonetheless, the information revolution is a double-edged weapon; a weapon of the state and the ruling classes, and a weapon of the people and the weaker social powers. The first party is still

⁽⁴⁵⁶⁾ Bin Dawoodia Wahiba, E-Commerce as a tool for competition in global markets - Case Study of Arab Countries (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁵⁷⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, Sapiens, A Brief History of Humankind, pp. 165-166.

having the upper hand and the war is going on between the big corporations and the state, between each of them and with the peoples & lower classes.

2. The robot:⁽⁴⁵⁸⁾ It is used in any repetitive or dangerous work or in a difficult climate. It can deal with particles that the worker cannot see clearly and does not require lighting or climate adjustment and is fast and accurate. This technology saves labor, opens up areas for more skilled work, such as programming, and lowers production costs. Additionally, the robot does not make mistakes and can put aside manual work completely, allowing humans to devote themselves to mental work.

It can do a lot of industrial work, agricultural work, war work, guard work and various service activities. The robot has become involved in delicate surgeries of the nervous system, heart and bones under the supervision of doctors, in addition to manual work in hospitals, such as sterilizing rooms and transporting equipment. The sales of robots in the field of medicine in 2015 amounted to 7.24 billion dollars.⁽⁴⁵⁹⁾ Gradually, both the nurse and the doctor will turn into highly qualified programmers and mentors.

Actually, there is a human-like robot; that can walk and talk,⁽⁴⁶⁰⁾ be a friend and helper for the elderly and isolated people, for the disabled and people with special needs in general, a domestic worker and even play games with humans. There is even a sex robot,⁽⁴⁶¹⁾ which threatens the disappearance of the prostitution profession!

⁽⁴⁵⁸⁾ The previous three revolutions were: the replacement of manual labor with machines in the 19th century, the technological revolution represented in mass production at the end of the 19th century and the computer revolution after the Second World War.

⁽⁴⁵⁹⁾ Top 6 Robotic Applications in Medicine.

⁽⁴⁶⁰⁾ Here's What Sophia, the First Robot citizen, Thinks About Gender and Consciousness.

⁽⁴⁶¹⁾ Nael Shokry and others, Our Sexual Future with Robots.

Robot sales in 2017 amounted to 381,335 units, while it was 115,000 units annually between 2005 -2008. This trade is more spread in Asian countries.⁽⁴⁶²⁾

Thus, the traditional proletariat is threatened with disappearance.

It is certain that the generalization of using robots will lead to the gradual disappearance of manual labor and the chances of survival will remain for highly skilled labor. Therefore, entire peoples may become outside modern civilization. The labor required for projects will also decrease, which threatens an increasing explosion of unemployment and the growth of parasitic occupations as an alternative, to absorb social conflicts. According to The Economist, a recent study found that 50% of jobs are at risk of automation in 32 countries.⁽⁴⁶³⁾

3. 3D Printer: This is a machine that produces a complete product based on electronic programming. It is a technology that provides the ability to print complex overlapping parts, which can be made from multiple materials, with different mechanical and physical specifications and installed together. It produces prototypes that closely resemble the look, texture and function of a product prototype. Among its advantages is being more accurate, faster, less expensive, consuming less raw material, less energy consuming and easier to use than other production methods. It can be used in the production of any form whatever the material intended for manufacturing.

This technology is being used in various industries such as jewelry, engineering, construction, cars, shoes, aircraft and the medical field. It can also be utilized to manufacture foods such as cheese, pastries and artificial meat.

⁽⁴⁶²⁾ Executive Summary World Robotics 2018 Industrial Robots.

⁽⁴⁶³⁾ The Economist, Daily chart, Apr 24th 2018, by The Data team, a study finds nearly half of jobs are vulnerable to automation.

In recent years implementing 3D printing in small and medium enterprises has become financially feasible, allowing for personal use at home. While currently mainly used for producing plastic products, it is expected to evolve to create a wider range of items⁽⁴⁶⁴⁾

Furthermore, 3D printing is now employed in training for anatomy and surgery, including creating models for student practice⁽⁴⁶⁵⁾ and manufacturing organs and devices for transplantation.⁽⁴⁶⁶⁾

Certainly, as a result of this technology, there will be radical social changes. Among the expected changes are production on-demand, which leads to a reduction in the volume of commodity inventory, thus affecting the storage and transportation sectors, as well as a reduction in intermediate operations between the direct producer and the consumer, which will reduce the number of intermediaries.⁽⁴⁶⁷⁾ It will also come at the expense of unskilled labor. Moreover, it has become possible to manufacture complex equipment in one process rather than manufacturing a number of parts and then assembling them,⁽⁴⁶⁸⁾ which is a blow to the assembly industry and manual labor.

Manufacturing will be more flexible, as the same equipment can be used for multiple processes, thus reducing the ratio of constant capital (means of production) in the industry. This has been only partially achieved without 3D printer.

Because it is highly developed and depends on computers and programming, there will be more room for highly qualified technocrats. In addition, companies will not need to move their capital to countries with cheaper labor power.

⁽⁴⁶⁴⁾ Rose Eveleth, *Our three-dimensional future: how 3D printing will shape the global economy*.

⁽⁴⁶⁵⁾ *Three-dimensional printing: review of application in medicine and hepatic surgery*.

⁽⁴⁶⁶⁾ Guk Bae Kim and others, *Three-Dimensional Printing: Basic Principles and Applications in Medicine and Radiology*.

⁽⁴⁶⁷⁾ Rose Eveleth, *Op. cit.*

⁽⁴⁶⁸⁾ *Ibid.*

In conclusion, the composition of the classes will change radically. There will be more business for small enterprises, for personal home production, for highly-skilled labor and for the producer at the expense of the merchant. This approach gives individuals more freedom, self-sufficiency and a partial detachment from the market economy.

4. **Microbiology:** This is another area of the current scientific revolution. Its most important content deals with genes. Scientists have already succeeded in cloning very important substances, such as human insulin, thrombolytics and dozens of other medications, all of which are widely used in medicine today. Cloning of beings is already in progress, and there are many clones. In addition, gene cloning is now a regular practice, along with organ cloning, which is still under research. The cloning of stem cells has been successful, which can be used to treat many serious diseases. Moreover, genetic engineering is widely used to produce agricultural crops with desirable traits (12% of agricultural land used this technology in 2015),⁽⁴⁶⁹⁾ to modify the genetic characteristics of some animals, and to clone others, including pigs, salmon and mosquitoes.⁽⁴⁷⁰⁾ It is not unlikely that it will be used to modify human genes, which is currently being researched for disease treatment but may later be used in the creation of a superhuman. There is also a concern that tyrants may use genetic engineering to create fearless soldiers and obedient workers,⁽⁴⁷¹⁾ and even to reproduce Neanderthals for menial labor.⁽⁴⁷²⁾ Some claim that a person's happiness has nothing to do with their social status, but only with the hormone serotonin,

⁽⁴⁶⁹⁾ Genetically Engineered Crops: Experiences and Prospects, p. 73.

⁽⁴⁷⁰⁾ COGEM TOPIC REPORT-CGM/120111 -01, genetically modified animals: a wanted and unwanted reality, Summary.

⁽⁴⁷¹⁾ Yuval Noah Harari, Sapiens, A Brief History of Humankind, p. 356.

⁽⁴⁷²⁾ Ibid., p. 358.

⁽⁴⁷³⁾ which may lead scholars of the system to chemically manage tendencies of rebellion and revolution.

In conclusion, the biological revolution that has been ongoing since ancient times, when humans used to castrate bulls to reduce their aggressiveness, promises to increase the productivity of plants and animals, improve their breed, extend human life, improve health and change genetic traits. In the field of economics, it has already achieved and will continue to achieve a lot by improving animal and plant breeds and increasing productivity. In the future, the modification of human memory can be envisioned through the manufacturing of information injections or transferring it via computer to the human brain. Moreover, it is possible to make humans immortal, sexually neutral, disease-resistant, while eliminating genetic diseases and treating the remaining ones radically and easily. However, the fear of authoritarians, tyrants, greed, avarice and superhumans using humans as slaves or experimental animals will persist. This necessitates efforts to control scientific research and resist attempts to use it in the service of the state and ruling classes.

5. Renewable energy sources (including hydropower, biomass, solar power, wind energy and hydrogen energy), nuclear fission energy, and nuclear fusion are key areas of focus. Some governments are driving the use of these energy sources and financing their investments. The European Union aims to increase the percentage of renewable energy to total energy to 15-20% by the middle of this century, and Japan plans to invest \$700 billion by 2030. It is projected that the total annual investments in the world in 2030 will reach \$460 billion.⁽⁴⁷⁴⁾ Oil and gas companies are resisting this trend, claiming that the expected increase in energy consumption will be met by oil and gas. These companies benefit

⁽⁴⁷³⁾ Ibid., p. 346.

⁽⁴⁷⁴⁾ György Csomós, Relationship between Large Oil Companies and the Renewable Energy Sector.

more from fossil energy, as renewable energy projects are still costly and have incurred losses in the West, unlike in China where costs are lower.⁽⁴⁷⁵⁾ Governments are concerned about the rise in energy needs with the depletion of oil and gas reserve. Thus, a conflict persists between fossil energy companies and governments, which fear the depletion of fossil energy sources alongside thermionic emission.

At the end, the use of fossil energy will vanish and the use of renewable energy, including solar energy, will prevail. Fusion energy, once it begins to be produced commercially, will provide endless amounts of cheap energy. This energy will be generated from hydrogen fusion nuclear reactors, in very small quantities, while the resulting energy will be enormous. Work is currently underway to establish a large experimental reactor of this type in France in preparation for commercial production later, with 35 countries participating in its establishment,⁽⁴⁷⁶⁾ while there are dozens of other small and experimental reactors. In addition, electric or hydrogen-powered cars are already in use.

The social consequences of the generalization of renewable energy can be summed up in reducing environmental pollution, desalinating sea water in huge quantities to solve the expected water shortage problem in the world and allow the cultivation of vast areas of land. In addition to weakening the economics of oil and gas, creating sections of researchers and technocrats in the field of renewable energy and creating a class of investors in this field, especially solar energy.

⁽⁴⁷⁵⁾ Mariel Rosriguez, the Social and Economic Impacts of Clean Energy.

⁽⁴⁷⁶⁾ WHAT IS ITER?

The development of means of production, including the generalization of using information technology, robots and 3D printers, has resulted in a decrease in working hours on average in most countries. In 1910 the annual working hours of workers in developed countries were 3000 hours and now they have decreased to 2000 in Japan, 1850 in the United States and 1600 in Germany.⁽⁴⁷⁷⁾ In Britain, it decreased from 2200 hours in 1950 to 1700 at the present time, including personal activities such as using the telephone and making personal purchase deals.⁽⁴⁷⁸⁾ It will also lead to the gradual disappearance of manual labor and the chances of survival will remain for highly skilled labor. Thus, some entire peoples may become outside modern civilization. The labor required for projects will also decrease, which threatens an increasing explosion of unemployment and the growth of parasitic occupations as an alternative to absorb social conflict.

With the proliferation of robots, digital technology and 3D printers, all factories and even service sectors can easily become unmanned. They will only require software, programmers and remote human supervisors. Business owners can handle all this work themselves; otherwise, they become unnecessary parasites. This development leads to a continuous increase in labor productivity. Advanced technology allows us to overcome market anarchy by following the principle of demand production. 3D printer, robots, feasibility studies and the Internet network drive this mechanism, reducing anarchy, minimizing surplus waste and keeping commodity inventory as low as possible. The world has already entered the stage of what is known as Post-Fordism, shifting from strictly organized modular mass production in fixed production lines to producing several models of the same commodity based on changing market demands, thanks to advancements in computer knowledge and usage in the industry. This eliminates the

⁽⁴⁷⁷⁾ Carl Davidson, post-capitalist society By Peter Drucker (Reviewed).

⁽⁴⁷⁸⁾ Paul Mason, Time for post-capitalism, 1st July 2019.

need for huge inventories of raw materials and products, aligning commodity production with consumer needs and eliminating the separation between administrative, research and productive work.⁽⁴⁷⁹⁾ This heralds the advent of the production-on-demand system.

One consequence of all this is the displacement of manual labor, leading to entire populations being marginalized from the civilized world, resulting in a widespread marginalization rate and human surplus, which is already occurring. There are significant marginalized populations worldwide, economically or socially, including informal economy workers, "illegal" immigrants and even scientists and researchers working outside the traditional company, institution or state framework. As a result, organized sections of society tremble in fear of the marginalized revolution. It is possible that capitalism may seek to eliminate this human surplus through wars, epidemics and reduced fertility. Past atrocities, such as the Rwandan genocide, the civil war in Congo resulting in six million deaths and the Sudanese regime's killing of 300,000 people in Darfur, highlight the lack of intervention to stop such massacres. Additionally, millions have died in Gulf wars, Syria and Yemen, with developed nations often fueling these conflicts by providing financial support and weapons.

Second: Dominant powers in today's world:

1. Global capitalism: It is the most important component of the dominant powers in the world. It is mainly composed of multinational corporations, which manage more than a third of the global production of goods and services and acquire more than

⁽⁴⁷⁹⁾ Jeremy Rifkin, *the Impasse of Capitalism*, Chapter VII: Post-Fordism, pp. 263-293 (Arabic).

three-quarters of technology and foreign investment flowing globally.⁽⁴⁸⁰⁾

In addition, their international organizations, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization and various international blocs and their extensions in ideological and state apparatuses, including the armies. The most important characteristics of this capitalism are the growth and spread of the domination of multinational corporations, dominance of financial capital, the immensity of fictitious capital, the tendency of major capitalist countries towards a rentier economy, concentration of wealth and globalization. Capitalism is also becoming more parasitic with the production of successive generations of products according to "fashion" without any real addition, deprivation of old products of software, monopolistic prices, short-lived commodities, production and sale of narcotics, transformation of sport from games into industry, money laundering, organ trafficking, arms brokering, investing in cash-purchasing debts, stock market speculation, etc.

Other powers allied with this capitalism include ruling families in Arab countries, major international gangs that practice all kinds of crime and compradors in the underdeveloped world.

Multinational corporations have achieved some autonomy from the state, enabling them to go beyond the state in terms of tax evasion, capital transfer and corrupting government officials to facilitate their manipulations, especially in underdeveloped countries. They negotiate with different countries outside the supervision of the mother country and work for the benefit of their administrators and shareholders before any other party. In the mother country, they deal with the bureaucracy and the authorities through lobbyists.⁽⁴⁸¹⁾ Meanwhile, the two parties cooperate for a common interest. These multinational corporations play a role in

⁽⁴⁸⁰⁾ Ahmad Essayed El-Kordi, multinational corporations, 2011 (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁸¹⁾ Steve Kapfer, Multinational Corporations and the Erosion of State Sovereignty p. 9.

strengthening their countries by penetrating other countries, especially the underdeveloped ones. They expand the influence of the mother country in the world, just as the mother country endeavors to enable these companies to spread and make profitable deals for them, often unfair to other countries. Nevertheless, the state is still of great importance to capitalism. Not profitable projects or those that benefit the system in the long term, such as compulsory education and healthcare, are undertaken virtually by the state. In addition to achieving security and preventing crime, the state also supports other institutions that are subject to it or its capital, such as religious, educational, cultural and media institutions.

There is now what is called surveillance capitalism, which distributes programs through social networking sites and mobile devices, sells them to governments, monitors people's behavior, and determines their tendencies. This enables them to identify the ideal way to guide and control their minds. For example, one BBC reporter attended an experiment to monitor the population of a Chinese city of 4.7 million people, in which devices were managed to record and classify the activities of the population within only 7 minutes.

However, this does not prevent disputes between the MNC and the state of the mother country side by side with a struggle over interests and influence. Recently President Trump's administration imposed restrictions, hindered globalization, discouraged capital export to China and fought against informal labor. His aim was to weaken China and strengthen the United States. Politics in this case ruled the economy. Thus, there is a conflict between companies and the state of the mother country over interests and influence.

2. Bureaucracy: The state bureaucracy became stronger in the West after the introduction of Keynesian theory, which prompted state intervention in the economy on a large scale and the emergence of the welfare state after World War II. It is evident that the bureaucracy as a whole -including the private sector bureaucracy-

in most countries of the world has become one of the dominant powers. It is not just a servant of capitalism, but has major and distinct interests, even in the most powerful capitalist countries. ⁽⁴⁸²⁾During the period from 1970 to the present, according to the Institute for Economic Studies, the salaries and bonuses of executives in the USA increased at least nine times, while the wages of workers decreased to a third, taking into account the level of inflation or simply the cost of living and the purchasing power of the dollar. The managers of some companies were also able, based on the fabricated information they provide about their companies, to receive very high ratings. For example, the International Insurance Company, AIG, enjoyed an AA rating even two days before its collapse!⁽⁴⁸³⁾ Indeed, the final word in guiding American policy today belongs to the administration and the major shareholders of the giant multinational companies, among whom are a number of army generals (militarization of the administration).⁽⁴⁸⁴⁾

There are several factors behind the rise of bureaucratic power: growth of the power of senior administrators in numbers, importance and role in the economy, as well as the growth of a sector of the intelligentsia linked to the state and large corporations. In addition to exacerbation of capitalist crises, resulting in an increasing need for state intervention, which led to the growth of the latter's role in absorbing class struggle, by providing social aid and saving major capitalist projects from ruin, adjusting market movement and opening foreign markets. The modern state has become a huge octopus, not only achieving security and defense as the great liberals called for in the past, but also sticking its nose into the whole of society, from the habilitation of individuals to accept obedience and commitment, to participating in the ruling class in

⁽⁴⁸²⁾ This is a very interesting study on the American beaurocracy: The American Bureaucracy: It is what you know not who you know.

⁽⁴⁸³⁾ Qusayy Al-Safi, Marx spectrum that doesn't disappear (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁸⁴⁾ Mohammad Mourad, Capitalism from evolution to crisis, Reading in the backgrounds of the current financial crisis (Arabic).

robbing. In the underdeveloped world, where there is amore repressive state, the situation is uglier.

3. The Deep State: This term has become widespread. It refers to the influence of the executing powers of the state apparatus, including the military bureaucracy and its auxiliary organizations, even in the United States, where President Trump was complaining of this phenomenon.⁽⁴⁸⁵⁾ It is a term coined in Turkey, meaning a group of influential elements in the intelligence, army, security, judiciary and groups of organized crime.⁽⁴⁸⁶⁾ In underdeveloped countries, the weight of the bureaucracy (besides the deep state) is greater than its weight in the West, and in some countries it actually controls the whole economy. There are armies that are acting as economic companies, such as the Egyptian army,⁽⁴⁸⁷⁾ partly the US army as a partner in the military-industrial complex,⁽⁴⁸⁸⁾ or rather: the scientific-military-industrial complex, the Myanmar army⁽⁴⁸⁹⁾ as well as the Chinese army before.⁽⁴⁹⁰⁾ This fact indicates to the revolutionary forces the importance of considering that the deep state is an enemy in itself, and due to its "deep" nature, it is dangerous. Even the bureaucracy as a whole is parasitic and hostile to the revolution and to development in general. It is a source of corruption, squander and sabotaging the work of the system. Moreover, the state is a gateway for its men to the business class; therefore, as an apparatus, it maintains with all its might the class division in society.

⁽⁴⁸⁵⁾ Jon D. Michaels, the American Deep State. The writer denies this status to the US bureaucracy, accusing the Trump administration of corruption and failure.

⁽⁴⁸⁶⁾ Mike Lofgren, Anatomy of the Deep State.

⁽⁴⁸⁷⁾ Mohammad Hosney, Generals of gold and analysis (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁸⁸⁾ JAMES Q. WILSON, the Rise of the Bureaucratic State.

⁽⁴⁸⁹⁾ The big companies govern the world (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁹⁰⁾ Marie Horrigan, The Red Army's role in China's economy.

Third: Neoliberalism and Globalization:

After World War II, the socialist camp emerged as a strong threat to the capitalist West, and the labor movements in the West relied on this threat. In addition, there was a wave of rapid growth after the end of the war. This prompted capitalism to provide few gains to the lower classes in the West. Likewise, the poor were able to obtain some gains in the Third World, based on the international balance and the spread of communism. A welfare state appeared there, such as Nasserite in Egypt.

But after the end of the Cold War and the failure of statist systems, capitalism returned to tighten its grip on society, hence the emergence of neoliberalism. This can be summed up in the state's abandonment of its protective role for the poor, its interference in market mechanisms, relinquishment of its ownership through privatization and the transformation of the world into a single market.

Within the policies of neoliberalism is the policy of globalization. This is being carried out under the leadership of a close alliance among multinational corporations, state apparatuses of the major capitalist countries and international economic institutions. It includes the free movement of capital and goods across borders without barriers, the interdependence and interrelations of financial institutions, production, distribution and exchange processes, globalization of communications, free circulation of information and cultures and political globalization. This policy encourages the liberalization of closed societies, such as freedom of expression, political freedoms, women's rights, human rights by and large and transcending national ideas and the idea of national independence in favor of considering the world as one unit.⁽⁴⁹¹⁾ Neoliberalism has been linked to the policy of globalization. In fact, what has been done is enabling multinational companies to evade some of their financial obligations towards the state and to extend their influence

⁽⁴⁹¹⁾ 8 types of Globalization.

to many countries. But the free movement of people is not allowed except between specific countries, such as the countries of the European Union. Conversely, there have been more restrictions on the movement of people from poor countries to rich ones.

That policy resulted in: First: migration of capital from the West to countries with cheap labor, China in particular after it took the path of a market economy, thus putting pressures on the workers in the West (between 1991 and 2007 America lost nearly a quarter of manufacturing jobs due to low wages in China⁽⁴⁹²⁾) and on local industries in poor countries. This led to the expansion of poverty. However, it contributed to the development of skills of the workers and increased productivity. Second: parts of products became manufactured in several countries and assembled in other countries, to take advantage of various factors of production whose cost varies from one country to another. Third: bankruptcy of many “national” companies in the underdeveloped countries or transferring their ownership to multinational corporations. Fourth: a massive increase in the number of marginalized and even the marginalization of entire peoples. This included the growth of the shadow economy everywhere (its proportion in some Western European countries reached 20-26 %⁽⁴⁹³⁾). Poverty pushed people to illegal immigration from poor countries, putting more pressure on employment in the West and being an important factor in the spread of racist tendencies among them. Fifth: increasing concentration of wealth in a few hands and the massive growth of credit; therefore of fictitious capital. Sixth, one of its consequences is the spread of conflicts and wars in various regions of the world. Seventh: the spread of

⁽⁴⁹²⁾ Arig hammad, a very short introduction on the contemporary global economy, what capitalism needs to survive (Arabic).

⁽⁴⁹³⁾ The shadow economy in African and sub-Saharan countries constitutes more than 60% of the macroeconomic volume, in Asia it is 40%-60% of the number of workers in the formal economy, in Mexico it is 50% and in European countries it varies from country to country. In Italy it is 26-20%, in Spain it is 23-10% and Finland is the lowest country; between 4-2%. In Syria, between 35 and 40%. Hayyan Salman, Shadow economy or the underground economy (Arabic).

financial, administrative, moral, industrial and commercial corruption everywhere, especially in the underdeveloped world, being practiced more skillfully in the developed world. Fraud, scam, tax evasion, giving and taking bribes are all widespread phenomena. All this results in squandering parts of human resources and capacities, exploiting the weak by the domineering powers, increasing social inequality and driving out good currency by the bad currency; e.g., larger companies backed by the state can displace more efficient companies from the market. Eighth: aggravation of robbing the Third World. This is done indirectly: conditional loans, unfair deals, circumventing money transfers in the form of profits or for imports at unreal prices, etc. Multinational corporations and their mother countries do not hesitate to cooperate closely in bribing and deceiving officials in the Third World, even by using prostitutes and sometimes even killing them, invading their countries militarily or organizing military coups.⁽⁴⁹⁴⁾ Ninth: There are other effects, especially in the Third World, including the spread of drug abuse, the prevalence of serious diseases, changes in language structure and changes in customs and traditions.⁽⁴⁹⁵⁾ Hence: preserving forms of aggravated exploitation. Among these forms: trafficking in human beings: prostitution - organ trade - trafficking in children - the kafala (sponsorship) system in Arab countries and even forms of slavery and serfdom literally are still existing in the West and East.⁽⁴⁹⁶⁾

⁽⁴⁹⁴⁾ John Perkins' confessions provide countless examples of these dirty operations in which corporate organs align with imperialist state organs. Confessions of an Economic Hit Man (Arabic translation).

⁽⁴⁹⁵⁾ Fairouz Mustafa Hamdi, the Impact of Globalization in the Developing Countries.

⁽⁴⁹⁶⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, serfdom in today's world. The researcher demonstrated many forms of serfdom and mentioned alarming figures: the number of women and children who are trafficked annually exceeds 700,000, 50,000 of whom go to the United States of America alone - human trafficking has become an industry that brings in seven billion dollars annually - the estimates mentioned in the annual survey conducted by the US State Department estimate that between 800,000 and 900,000 men, women and children are trafficked as slaves across international borders each year - 30 million people are held in slavery around the world, in countries including Sudan, Mauritania and Niger (Arabic).

Fourth: Waste of Wealth:

The policies of states and large companies in this era are causing significant losses to humanity. Among the mechanisms contributing to these losses are regional wars and ongoing proxy conflicts. The human toll from these conflicts includes the expenses of armaments, which may exceed the profits gained by any party, amounting to 1822 billion dollars in 2018. These losses are substantial enough to lead to significant shifts in living standards. Other losses stem from corporate competition and the concealment of high technology. Additionally, environmental destruction, such as global warming resulting from the use of coal and oil as cheap energy sources, persists since clean energy remains expensive. The production of perishable goods, investment of vast sums of money to produce multiple brands of the same commodity and the substantial investment in the manufacture, storage, transportation and maintenance of weapons also contribute to these losses. International corporations seek to incite wars and promote destruction to re-arm and rebuild countries.

Furthermore, wealth is squandered in various parasitic activities, including exaggerated media, idle capacity in industry and agriculture due to marketing difficulties or price maintenance planning. Additionally, the extravagant spending of many wealthy and corrupt rulers is wasteful. For instance, what purpose does it serve for one individual to own 50 palaces or villas, or for a poor government to possess a fleet of luxurious presidential planes? Why build thousands of opulent places of worship everywhere? Stockpiling ancient weapons that are unusable and hoarding gold and jewelry are also examples of wasteful practices. What value does a ruler derive from clinging to power at the cost of slaughtering thousands of their people and destroying infrastructure? Why perpetuate hostility between human groups based on religion or

nationalism when communication and understanding could benefit everyone?

Among the crimes of capitalism is the pattern of consumption that is harmful to health, the environment and wealth. Many of the products offered in the markets, especially in underdeveloped countries, are adulterated, short-lived, poor and often dangerous to the health or life of the users. The promotion of diets is carried out by major networks consisting of monopolies of food production and distribution, experts, doctors, nutritionists, media, publishing industry and experts in advertising and public relations. Neither these parties nor governments take into account people's health except under pressure from public opinion (mainly in Europe). Thus, foods that are closer to toxins are produced and distributed, including: hydrogenated and semi-hydrogenated oils, fructose sugar- processed meats, preserved and canned foods, dairy products adulterated with hydrogenated oils (and the Chinese some day adulterated them with melamine), fast food full of starches and poor types of meat, sweets and chocolate mixed with hydrogenated oils, meat full of hormones, animals (including fowl and fish) are fed fodder, which produces poor quality meat, other than cigarettes, drugs and alcohol. Likewise, unnecessary medicines must not be forgotten, which often harm people's physical and mental health, including, for example, most obesity treatment drugs. All of these products are vigorously promoted to make profits. In addition to clothes that are harmful to the skin and general health, including some types of cheap tissues, shoes made of poor quality leather, high-heeled shoes for women, etc.

Humans have been squandering their efforts throughout history in numerous trivial or harmful activities. The efforts of Muslims and Christians in the “sciences” of religion, for example, cannot be imagined, which could have been used to develop life conditions. Since its emergence, the state apparatus is squandering countless wealth on surveillance, control, oppression, combating “crime” (instead of addressing its causes), showing prestige and

manifestations of grandiosity, plus the luxury of rulers, armies and their priests.

The pursuit of prestige and power to the utmost extent, whether by states, rulers, wealthy individuals or ideological groups, along with greed and avarice, explain this foolishness. Even achieving the highest rate of profit or material benefit in general does not justify this squandering. Furthermore, it is possible, with some wisdom, to achieve more profits while preserving human resources and stability. Although there are forms of cooperation between individuals, classes and states, such as cooperation to reduce global warming, selfishness prevails more than preserving the common good of humanity.

Fifth: Alienation or Estrangement:

The individual in the world today is alienated from himself and his humanity in various aspects, including:

- Economic alienation occurs when an individual feels like a stranger in front of their own products, as the fruits of their labor are transformed into something else before their eyes. The individual may see their work being used against them in the form of capital and weapons, leading to a sense of alienation. The exploiter, driven by a desire for wealth and success in the market, may feel compelled to accumulate more capital, even if they do not necessarily need it for financial reasons. This drive is often fueled by competition and greed, as individuals seek to outperform their rivals. People may view the market as a powerful force that they must submit to, even though they are the ones who created it. They may see money as having inherent power, even though it is simply a medium of exchange. In reality, money is just paper or numbers on a computer screen, but it has taken on a symbolic significance that leads people to treat it as a sacred entity.

- **Social alienation:** In this case social relations and traditions are viewed as superhuman powers, even though they are of human creation. As Marx argued: *“Hitherto men have constantly made up for themselves false conceptions about themselves, about what they are and what they ought to be. They have arranged their relationships according to their ideas of God, of normal man, etc. The phantoms of their brains have got out of their hands. They, the creators, have bowed down before their creations.”*⁽⁴⁹⁷⁾ This is alienation in thought: the idea is created by man and thereafter he submits himself to it. Sometimes one may adopt ideas that are hostile to him and his original ideas, or belittle him. Examples are the woman's adoption of ideas that underestimate her, so she resists her own liberation and the oppressed who is enthusiastic for his oppressors and fights for their sake vigorously. The alienated person in this case is hostile to whoever opposes his “idea,” because he reminds him of his alienation and impotence.

- Hypnosis revealed that the individual can receive thoughts and feelings that are strange and incompatible with his reality, such as the feeling that he is eating apples while he is eating potatoes. At the level of societies a similar thing happens, so misleading memes are implanted; making one feel content and pleasure while he is being oppressed for the benefit of his exploiters. Some people may be convinced that they are speaking their own opinion while it is a meme that has been skillfully implanted in their minds. This is another type of intellectual alienation, which is quite similar to religious alienation.

- **Political alienation:** most people have left politics to the “politicians,” so that it became a profession. Even “struggle” also became a profession in many cases. It looks as if individuals have assigned certain persons and groups to do work that originally belongs to them all, so the individual gave up his power or his participation in political power to who is guiding him on his behalf. In representation, political alienation is seen with the naked eye:

⁽⁴⁹⁷⁾ The German Ideology, preface.

people choose who speaks and acts in their behalf, although -by virtue of human nature- he works for-himself before anything else. In democratic countries, political alienation is fulfilled: “public” rights are embodied in that case in the law and constitution, establishments to defend the “homeland” and institutions that provide public services. The state apparatus seems to be an impartial power to achieve the common good and its existence looks destined and an inescapable necessity. Everyone in society has to show submission to this instrument, imagining that it embodies the spirit of the nation and the public conscience. The matter seems like what happened with the creation of God; in the state, people put their perceptions of the concepts of right, justice and protective power. Rather, the alienation in the state is more profound. It consolidates the actual repression of society in the lived reality, in addition to being not created by people by and large, but created forcibly by a certain group of them.

- There are many other forms of self-alienation of the individual, such as: the media professional sells his smile to the public and his conscience to the capitalist or the state - the ruler shows not his actual feelings and concerns, but something else - the priest also says: these are not my words, but God's orders - the worker and the scholar each sell his skill while keeping his thoughts and convictions to himself - the employee says: it is not mine but the computer's decision - even in art and sports; the general public has come to practice all this through specialized elites.

- Additionally, there is a unique form of alienation prevalent in the world today: the intellectual or politician who is no longer convinced of certain ideas but clings to them because they preserve his social status, otherwise he will turn into an ordinary person. His thoughts have turned into an idol that he worships and feels inability to create alternative ideas.

- Also, the scientist depends on funding to demonstrate the validity of a hypothesis. So, the field of research is determined according to the desire of the funder, who may request even certain

results; therefore, pushing the researcher to work in the most marketable field.

- In contemporary society, the individual is taught to show love to people, to smile at customers and to compliment them, so his feelings are not his “own.”⁽⁴⁹⁸⁾ A person may do something because it is a “duty,” not because he likes it, as submission to a belief or tradition or to the conditions of work in the market. Thus, the smile becomes fake and an automatic duty. The individual is also stereotyped according to standards set by the system. He is taught a certain way of addressing others, sitting and walking, wearing certain costumes on various occasions and celebrating or even expressing grief in predetermined ways. He has also to eat his food in public places according to the “etiquette.” Many people are also prohibited from expressing their opinions because they are committed to expressing the opinion of the institutions to which they belong, such as teachers in their schools, judges in their courts and even with public opinion, party cadres, clerics, etc.

- There are many false feelings of happiness; false because not everything that brings happiness frees man from alienation. Narcotics do this, and there is even a disease called “manic depression. However, true happiness is what an individual achieves when they are free, self-conscious and fulfilled. It is manifested in their physical and psychological health and in the realization of their abilities. According to Fromm, *“The subjective feeling of being happy, when it is not a quality of the state of well-being of the whole person, is nothing more than an illusory thought about a feeling and is completely unrelated to genuine happiness.”*⁽⁴⁹⁹⁾ Evidence of the spread of false happiness includes the prevalence of mental illnesses, psychopathic and sadomasochistic tendencies, narcissistic personalities, broken and defeated personalities, chronic fatigue, etc. In 2017, the number

⁽⁴⁹⁸⁾ Erich Fromm, *The Fear of Freedom*, p. 195 (Arabic translation).

⁽⁴⁹⁹⁾ Erich Fromm, *Man for Himself*, p. 181 (English translation).

of people suffering from depression reached 300 million.⁽⁵⁰⁰⁾ Additionally, the number of cases of personality disorders due to substance abuse reached 168 million in 2016, and the proportion of drug users was 0.9% of the world's population in 2017.⁽⁵⁰¹⁾ The tendency towards superficial religiosity has also increased globally in recent decades as a mechanism to acquire inner security.

- Technological alienation, as Erich Fromm named it:⁽⁵⁰²⁾ The modern man is very social but also very lonely. He has become more isolated, as he is afraid of getting close to others while also fearing loneliness. “Social communication” plays the role of breaking loneliness without achieving closeness, so the social tendency of the individual is fulfilled without direct interaction with their “friends,” who have become virtual. This social communication occurs through the Internet and mobile phones. The individual, as Herbert Marcuse noted, now sees themselves in their products: cars, Hi-Fi devices, kitchen equipment, etc. Heidegger considered technology as metaphysics because it controls man.⁽⁵⁰³⁾ The problem lies in consciousness rather than in things. Of course, things can be used for the benefit and comfort of people, but when humans become devoted to things, they become alienated. Man has possessed technology throughout history, but it only became “metaphysics” in the capitalist era.

- Religious alienation will be addressed later

Alienation in all its forms can be explained by man's feeling of weakness in the face of nature and society to which he is obliged to integrate and submit. Many people work in fields other than their

⁽⁵⁰⁰⁾ World Health Organization, Depression.

⁽⁵⁰¹⁾ Hannah Ritchie and Max Roser, Substance Use.

⁽⁵⁰²⁾ The revolution of hope, towards a humanized technology.

⁽⁵⁰³⁾ Khalid El Qaseemy, Heidegger and metaphysics (Arabic translation).

specialization or in areas they do not enjoy due to market conditions, and they are subject to ethical systems that do not align with humanistic values. Furthermore, most people do not achieve their ambitions because they do not find enough opportunities for action.

The contemporary individual is nothing but a “subaltern,” not a real person, not truly themselves.

Sixth: A System in Crisis:

The capitalist system is accustomed to periodic crises resulting from the disparity between production and consumption capacities, stemming from market anarchy. Previous crises were followed by economic recovery, but since the 2008 crisis, this recovery has not occurred. Wages are declining, unemployment and stagnation are increasing, and class differences are widening. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), it is expected that growth rates will remain low in developed countries for the next fifty years.⁽⁵⁰⁴⁾ According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), it is expected that growth rate will remain low in developed countries for the next fifty years.⁽⁵⁰⁵⁾

The capitalist crisis is characterized by stagnation, recession, inflation, deflation, unemployment, austerity policies, debt crises, impoverishment, famines, slow growth rates, financial company bankruptcies, capital turnover slowdowns, industrial capital transformation into financial and service capital due to low profit rates, accumulation of surplus capital, globalization of financial

⁽⁵⁰⁴⁾ Nigel Warren 04 April 2014, why does capitalism go into crisis.

⁽⁵⁰⁵⁾ Paul Mason, Post-capitalism, A Guide to Our Future, p. 5.

capital, increase in the shadow economy and an increase in the private sector's share of GDP without a corresponding rise in taxes and fees.⁽⁵⁰⁶⁾ In addition to the continuous expansion of the phenomenon of marginalization of the population. While capitalism in its infancy was fighting marginalization, even by force (one day it reached the point of executing homeless people in England, in addition to burning, flogging and enslaving them),⁽⁵⁰⁷⁾ it has now become a producer of marginalization.

Before this crisis, bouts of a new type of crisis emerged: stagflation; that is stagnation in markets with rising prices, due to the high costs of production and the inability of the market to absorb the products. What is new in the recent crisis since 2008 is: firstly, it is chronic and not transient like its predecessors; secondly, it is not only the surplus of mass production, but also the surplus of capital, which led to a decline in the rate of profit. Meanwhile, private capital has become unable to find sufficient markets for investment, the debt values of countries have risen and they are suffering from a lack of liquidity which renders them incapable of effective intervention to stimulate the market. The injection of huge amounts of money during the 2008 crisis at the expense of the working classes led only to a limited revival of the markets, but it did not prevent the bankruptcy of many major banks and companies.

The factors contributing to the continuation of the crisis can be summarized as follows:

Accumulation of fictitious capital and fictitious wealth:

Fictitious capital is, by definition, capital that circulates through exchanges with other units of capital, but cannot be exchanged for commodities and services. If everything in the market is bought with

⁽⁵⁰⁶⁾ Moataz Hasiso, the reality of the working class in the context of the development of the capitalist system (Arabic).

⁽⁵⁰⁷⁾ Maurice Dobb, studies in the development of capitalism, p. 177, p. 179, pp. 185-186 (Arabic translation).

money, a large amount of surplus money will remain and people will not find anything to buy. This surplus money is what is referred to as fictitious capital. The term was coined by Karl Marx to refer to funds available from all forms of credit.⁽⁵⁰⁸⁾ It accumulates as a result of the expansion of credit, financing through installment sales, mortgages and financial speculation if it exceeds the amount that can be absorbed. The widespread use of credit cards leads to more financial growth, which is not offset by equivalent growth in production. There are also fictitious profits, which give a false impression of the formation of more wealth. Stock market profits, for example, and their losses are not real because they represent only the transfer of money from one capitalist to another. The debt of most countries is greater than the sum of their national production. Historically, the United States has had a total debt value (governmental and private) of 100-180% of GDP. However, in the late eighties, the total debt reached 200% and continued to grow until 2009 when it reached about 300%. Japan, Britain, Spain, France, Italy and South Korea also have debt levels in excess of 300% of GDP. Even China's debt relative to GDP increased since 2008 to 46.2%, while the total debt (that of the state, banks, business and families) doubled dramatically from 6 trillion dollars at the start of the financial crisis in 2008 to about 28 trillion dollars at the end of 2016. The debt value, in relation to GDP, increased from 140% to nearly 260% in the same period, and it may have reached 300%. The world debt in 2018 stood at US \$217 trillion or 327% of gross world product, the highest in history.⁽⁵⁰⁹⁾ So, what does that mean? The amount of dollars in circulation far exceeds the American GNP; the United States can issue dollars and use them since the Bretton Woods System was brought to an end in 1971.⁽⁵¹⁰⁾

⁽⁵⁰⁸⁾ Capital, Vol. III, Chapters 25 & 32.

⁽⁵⁰⁹⁾ International Marxist tendency, world perspective: 2018 a year of the capitalist crisis.

⁽⁵¹⁰⁾ An agreement between 44 countries, concluded in the United States in 1944, to establish the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD). It was also decided to stabilize the dollar's rate against the major currencies, setting \$35 against an ounce of gold.

This explains what is called the massive debts of the American government, without any commitment to convert dollars into gold. This has already been done after the 2008 crisis; however, it is taking place within certain limits to avoid a dramatic collapse of the dollar value. Financial markets have witnessed tremendous growth in the last decades, which means an unprecedented growth of fictitious capital. In 1995, the average daily volume of speculation in the stock exchange reached more than one trillion dollars, while the volume of international trade (exports & imports) did not exceed much more than 4 trillion dollars per year.⁽⁵¹¹⁾ This means that the amount of speculation in money was more than 91 times the volume of trade volume per year on that date. The speculation reached 98% of the value of cash transactions in the world, and only 2% involve the values of actual use.⁽⁵¹²⁾ Moreover, the international trade in real products does not exceed 1% of the volume of trading securities.⁽⁵¹³⁾ The financial assets of the world as a whole increased in the form of debts and credits several times in one decade, including a large part called Toxic Assets,⁽⁵¹⁴⁾ because they are fictitious capital; financial derivatives supported by other assets, such as mortgage bonds, not real assets. The value of those assets reached \$167 trillion in 2019.⁽⁵¹⁵⁾

The first problem here lies in the fact that financial capital grows at the expense of productive capital and its owners get part of the profits of industrial capitalism and the efforts of workers. It also creates parasitic activities, such as the advertising industry and wars.⁽⁵¹⁶⁾ This is in addition to paper “stars,” such as athletes, senior

⁽⁵¹¹⁾ Mohammad Murad, capitalism from evolution to crisis - reading in the backgrounds of the current financial crisis. (Arabic).

⁽⁵¹²⁾ Encyclopedia of Marxism, Fictitious Capital

⁽⁵¹³⁾ Andy Blunden, Op. cit.

⁽⁵¹⁴⁾ What Are Toxic Assets? Definition And Meaning

⁽⁵¹⁵⁾ 167 trillion dollars, Global financial asset volume (Arabic).

⁽⁵¹⁶⁾ Ibid.

artists, top fashion models, media figures, clerics, politicians, etc. These stars are manufactured by deliberate planning and used for several purposes: increasing ticket sales, promoting certain products, presenting ideals to young people that unload their energies and offer them hope for having wealth.

The second problem: while fictitious capital creates increased economic activity, at some point, an explosion occurs, and markets collapse; not only parasite markets but all markets, as they do not distinguish between fictitious and productive capital. Examples of these crises include the 2008 disaster; the real estate bubble burst. This capitalist parasitism not only steals from workers but also impedes the growth of production, technical development and the standard of living of the general population.

Fictitious capital (and the productive) is not just wealth but a social relationship between capitalists and workers. Acquiring and accumulating this money transfer the efforts of workers to parasitic groups, including speculators, bankers, stars of art, sporting and media figures, swindlers, cheaters, authoritarian rulers, arms brokers, drug dealers, professional army, security men, etc. These are the majority of the world's wealthy today. Data are available on the degree of concentration of wealth in the hands of the few oligarchs worldwide, and the figures are increasing.

As the strength of parasitic capitalism is growing, marginalization on the other side is also growing.

However, fictitious capital is necessary for the functioning of the market economy. Without banks, the credit system and the stock exchange, investment opportunities are reduced. But when its size reaches what was mentioned above, its role turns into its opposite; endless crisis, leading to a disaster.

Idle capital or surplus capital: Gross capital formation in the European Union and the United States fell below 20% of GDP for the first time since the 1960s. US corporations in 2018 held \$1.9 trillion in idle money. The liquid assets of non-financial

corporations, which include hard currency, foreign deposits, money-market and mutual-fund shared at a record \$2.4 trillion in the third quarter of 2017.⁽⁵¹⁷⁾

- In view of the achievement of a huge production surplus after the major breakthroughs in technology, companies expanded in selling by installments and banks expanded in granting loans, which increased the volume of fictitious capital and exacerbated the surplus capital crisis.

The reaction of capitalism to its crisis was summed up in:

- When the huge cumulative production of the big companies far exceeded the levels of absorption in the traditional markets, these companies rushed to work to create a single global market in which the national markets would be integrated in the direction in which international trade would escape from all restrictions and obstacles.⁽⁵¹⁸⁾ This achieved some temporary relief of the crisis.

- Chinese markets absorbed huge amounts of excess capital, which partially curbed the crisis. But that was only temporary, as the Chinese economy also began to slowdown in growth rates.

- When globalization became a threat to the deteriorating American economy, the American president announced his policy of “America First,” which was an expression of his country's economic crisis. While America previously led the slogan of globalization, it started to impose customs duties to protect its industry, and instead of globalizing labor, it decided to build a wall separating it from Mexico. The Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) and the Atlantic Partnership Agreement on Trade and Investment (TTIP)⁽⁵¹⁹⁾ were canceled. Thus, globalization was a temporary solution to

⁽⁵¹⁷⁾ International Marxist tendency, world perspective: 2018 a year of the capitalist crisis.

⁽⁵¹⁸⁾ Mohammad Mourad, capitalism from evolution to crisis, readinh in the backgrounds of the current financial crisis.

⁽⁵¹⁹⁾ Ibid.

the problem of the American overproduction and capital surplus, then turned into its opposite.

- Expansion of luxury and frivolous consumption, along with parasitic activities, serve as mechanisms to increase the consumption of the wealthy and provide employment for some of the unemployed.

- Further expansion in lending and selling by installments exacerbates and fuels the crisis at the same time.

- Encouraging wars to boost arms sales, revitalize production, impose purchases on dependent countries (such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt) and destroy and rebuild infrastructure, as seen in Yugoslavia after its breakup and in Iraq.

- There was an attempt to implement the New Middle East project to open the region as a major market for goods and surplus capital, but the project has so far failed. Despite these measures, the crisis continues to worsen. It is evident that significant intervention is now necessary to overcome it, which is certainly possible.

Seventh: Marginalization or social exclusion and the New Proletariat:

What is marginalization?

Defining the concept of marginalization is not easy, as it encompasses various categories and dimensions. It exists in different forms and degrees, with meanings varying from one country to another. Anglo-Americans often focus on poverty as a cause of material suffering and individual problems, defining it based on a specific income level. In Europe, there is a focus on non-financial poverty and social exclusion.⁽⁵²⁰⁾ In Ethiopia, poverty is considered

⁽⁵²⁰⁾ Silver H, Miller SM (2003), A Social Exclusion: The European Approach to Social Disadvantage.

synonymous with social exclusion.⁽⁵²¹⁾ Extreme poverty ultimately leads to some degree of exclusion; the impoverished are unable to access certain goods and services, visit expensive places, or engage in various fields. The more severe the poverty, the greater the difficulty in integrating into society. At the extreme end of poverty, individuals struggle to interact with the mainstream of society; the middle class, and lack the essentials for life. The term marginalization encompasses complex and overlapping conditions. It is not as straightforward as concepts such as "alienation" or the relationship between "We" and "The Other," nor does it depict a homogeneous group of people versus a unified, authoritarian and fortunate center. Marginalization extends beyond poverty and may be a cause or have no direct relationship with poverty in some cases. It can involve conflicting social classes. In the informal economy, both workers and employers may be marginalized. In certain instances, there may be a connection between a profession and a specific ethnic group, leading to discrimination, as seen historically with Jews in Eastern Europe. Presently, this phenomenon exists in Ethiopia among pottery makers,⁽⁵²²⁾ similar to how Bengalis are often relegated to cleaning roles in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries, a well-known occurrence.

There are other determinants that add to the concept of marginalization:

1. The groups at risk, such as the disabled, the elderly and those with suicidal tendencies.
2. Exclusion can be from certain fields, such as housing, permanent work, education and credit.
3. The basis of problems associated with the process of exclusion, such as unemployment, lack of skills, poverty, high crime rate, family breakdown and poor health.
- 4 - The processes driving exclusion and

⁽⁵²¹⁾ Tamiru Berafe, *Assessing the causes and effects of social exclusion: The case of 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda in Sothern Nation, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State in Ethiopia.*

⁽⁵²²⁾ Tamiru Berafe, *Op. cit.*

the levels at which they operate, such as economic, political and social factors. 5. Mechanisms of marginalization, such as government policies. ⁽⁵²³⁾

Marginalization is merely a social position, and the same person may be marginalized in one aspect, such as religious rights, and integrated in another, such as holding a high rank in the army or being extremely wealthy. There is also permanent and temporary turnover marginalization, ⁽⁵²⁴⁾ as some are becoming integrated while others are becoming marginalized all the time. A group of people may be marginalized in one country while not in another (e.g., the situation of the Palestinians in Israel and the West Bank versus their situation in Latin America). Moreover, the type and degree of marginalization for the same group varies from one country to another. The marginalization of women, e.g., in one country differs from that in another.

Marginalization involves the denial of rights, opportunities, or resources enjoyed by the members of society that are essential to social cohesion. Therefore, a marginalized individual is considered a semi-citizen, half or a quarter of a citizen, or a person who lacks citizenship by and large; *Denizen*. This term means exactly “resident” and was used in ancient Rome to describe foreigners residing in the Roman Empire. ⁽⁵²⁵⁾

The early definition of social exclusion or marginalization is breaking the social bond, and then it evolved into a broader definition, which is depriving individuals or groups from participating in society in which they live or depriving some based on their ethnic, racial, religious affiliation, etc. ⁽⁵²⁶⁾ The marginalized can simply be considered those who are not integrated into the

⁽⁵²³⁾ Jelena Helemäe, *Notion of Social Exclusion and its application to studies of Youth*, pp. 7-8.

⁽⁵²⁴⁾ Tamiru Berafe, *Op. cit.*

⁽⁵²⁵⁾ Guy Standing, *The Precariat*, p. 14.

⁽⁵²⁶⁾ Richie Howitt, *Op. cit.*

mainstream of society; the “recognized” section, or not subject to the system in this or that field. This includes deliberate marginalization, by discriminating against certain groups of society. It is commonly thought that the marginalized are confined to a trivial, weak, or inferior status. However, this concept does not agree with the fact that the marginalized contribute to high percentages of the national product of many countries and that some of their groups have become a time bomb capable of launching revolutions. Marginalization implies inequality between people, but rather creates a social hierarchy on disparate grounds; economic, social, cultural, religious, etc.

Marginalization includes a specific field or more; accordingly, there are degrees and forms of exclusion. Therefore, there are marginalized elements in varying degrees and in different forms. There are, of course, those who are completely marginalized, such as most street children without any official identity. Indeed, the majority of the marginalized are in fact semi-marginalized, outside the mainstream to one degree or another and in one field or another; economic, social, political and cultural marginalization.

There is no absolute link between marginalization and poverty. Few of the marginalized are not poor, as some earn well from their work, whether it is legally or illegally permissible or criminal. Many of the marginalized are educated and using the Internet, but not organized in specific, regular, or officially registered work. There are also intellectuals - in the narrow sense of the word - standing outside any official or unofficial cultural institutions and producing randomly and for nothing: cultural marginalization. Moreover, racial discrimination or discrimination against the sick and deformed, etc., does not differentiate between the poor and the rich, except rarely.

Among the sectors of the marginalized and semi-marginalized are the following: illegal immigrants, street children, women, the unemployed, workers in the shadow economy, entire peoples (the Fourth World), the elderly, ethnic and cultural minorities such as

blacks in some countries, people with below-average intelligence, the disabled, people with mental illnesses, the mentally handicapped, addicts, people with autism, some people with talents and geniuses, the deformed, the destitute, the homeless, the families of prisoners or those released from prison, those who hold political ideas that are against the prevailing, such as the exclusion of liberals, communists, or political Islam groups.

The largest categories and fields of the marginalized to some degree include:

*** Women: discriminated against in most countries of the world, especially with regard to work and the conditions of marriage, in addition to the harassment that forces them to withdraw and isolate to some extent. Women receive lower wages than men in most countries, even in Japan, which has the highest wage gap between men and women (in 2010, 44% of women were paid less than the minimum wage ⁽⁵²⁷⁾). With the spread of industry in the third world, women became more attractive to this field thanks to the possibility of accepting lower wages and temporary job. ⁽⁵²⁸⁾**

*** Street children: especially in poor countries. Many of them are of unknown parentage, lost their families, or were pushed to the streets due to extreme poverty or family disintegration. Some of them engage in work, whether in factories, shops, or temporary service work, in addition to engaging in the world of crime.**

*** Homeless groups: These are very large groups, spreading all over the world, including the richest countries.**

*** Workers in the shadow economy, or the hidden or black economy practiced by individuals or institutions. They work outside state control, are not subject to official statistics and monitoring, governments do not know their added value, they are not included in the calculations of the national product, do not pay taxes or fees,**

⁽⁵²⁷⁾ Guy Standing, Op. cit., p. 61.

⁽⁵²⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 60.

and are not subject to the legal wage system or various insurance systems. The shadow economy includes all forms of economic operations such as trade, credit, cash and barter transactions, credit and immediate sales, all kinds of corruption and crime. In addition, it includes the most ancient forms of exchange (barter) along with the most modern (electronic commerce) and from the simplest commodities (labor power) to the most complex of them (drugs,⁽⁵²⁹⁾ and weapons). Besides domestic service, unlicensed workshops and factories, street vending, sidewalk vending and seasonal employment. The majority of these groups are workers producing the usual goods and services but are not integrated into formal society, and some of them are members of the community, immigrants, or refugees.

* **Part-time working from home:** Nurses, teachers, editors and graphic designers are doing it the most. This is getting more and more widespread, so it is enough to know that until 2017, 43% of American workers were working from home part-time to improve their income,⁽⁵³⁰⁾ 70% of technicians in the world work from home at least once a week and 53% work half a week until 2018.⁽⁵³¹⁾

* **Ethnic and religious minorities:** such as the Roma in various countries, especially in Europe, the Bidoon (without nationality) in Kuwait, the Dalit in India, the Christians in Egypt, the atheists in Islamic countries in particular, the Jews of Ethiopian origin and the

⁽⁵²⁹⁾ The World Bank estimated the volume of the drug trade at 2-5% of the world's output. The spread of this work has been assisted by the presence of specialized banks or offshore, i.e. tax haven, where more than 1,500 banks are specialized in the world. Hayyan Salman, shadow economy or hidden economy.

Note: Offshore banks are independent banks located outside the depositor's country of residence. They are often situated in low-tax jurisdictions or operate beyond international oversight. These institutions are frequently associated with illicit activities such as black market transactions, organized crime, tax evasion and money laundering.

⁽⁵³⁰⁾ Taysha Murtaugh, 18 Works From Home Jobs That Bring in Cash.

⁽⁵³¹⁾ Ryan Browne, 70% of people globally work remotely at least once a week, study says.

Palestinians in Israel, the Shiites in Saudi Arabia, the Sunnis in Iran, etc.

*** Refugees and illegal immigrants: they are a huge group spreading across the world. Among them are war refugees, those exposed to political persecution and those fleeing poverty and unemployment.**

*** Indigenous people: especially in America and Australia.**

*** Deep web or dark web: ⁽⁵³²⁾**

These are websites on the Internet that cannot be accessed through the known search engines but special ones that do not show the caller ID. They do not use well-known protocols, which make it difficult to access, or the usual domain extensions such as “com” or “net,” but other domains such as “onion” and “bit,” which are closed domain extensions. ⁽⁵³³⁾

The deep Internet controls the largest part of the Internet, with an estimated size of 400-500 times the size of the surface (or exposed) part. ⁽⁵³⁴⁾ While the dark Internet makes up more than 80% of the World Wide Web. ⁽⁵³⁵⁾

Not all the content of these sites is illegal, but 57% and the other part is legitimate.

They engage in e-commerce using cryptocurrency, specifically Bitcoin, and sell a variety of items including credit card numbers, weapons, drugs, counterfeit money, diplomatic credentials, stolen Netflix accounts, and software that enables hacking into other people's accounts. Each category has its own price. Of course, these

⁽⁵³²⁾ Deep web is any part of the Net that is not indexed by search engines. This includes websites that gate their content behind pay walls, password-protected websites. The dark web, on the other hand, uses encryption software to provide greater security.

⁽⁵³³⁾ Deep network: 80% of the Internet content is blocked for you (Arabic).

⁽⁵³⁴⁾ Gabriel Weimann, *Going Darker? The Challenge of Dark Net Terrorism*.

⁽⁵³⁵⁾ Deep network: 80% of the Internet content is blocked for you.

sites pose a threat to the interests of the companies and the economy as a whole.⁽⁵³⁶⁾

Hackers resort to marketing their products through these sites.

Likewise, terrorists are using it to recruit members and receive volunteer requests,⁽⁵³⁷⁾ to spread their propaganda, to communicate with each other and to plan their operations.⁽⁵³⁸⁾

The dark web is also used in illegal activities, such as illegal trade, forums and communication among sexual adolescents. There are also sites for teaching the manufacture of weapons and explosives and sites specialized in organ trade.⁽⁵³⁹⁾

These sites are not easily surveilled by governments and they hide the identity of their participants.

In conclusion, the stereotype of the marginalized as people who are wearing worn-out clothes, living in the streets, cannot find their daily bread and who are being used by the authorities against revolutions is no longer valid. Rather, the marginalized now form numerous and varied sectors, many of which are active in contemporary society.

Marginalization rate in the contemporary world:

* The population of shanty towns in 2006-2007 was one billion and estimated to reach 1.4 billion in 2020, according to the United Nations.⁽⁵⁴⁰⁾

⁽⁵³⁶⁾ Darren Guccione, What is the dark web? How to access it and what you'll find.

⁽⁵³⁷⁾ You can find details here: Sam Edwards, Terrorism recruitment on the dark web, 19 March 2019.

⁽⁵³⁸⁾ Gabriel Weimann, Going Darker? The Challenge of Dark Net Terrorism.

⁽⁵³⁹⁾ From Wikipedia.

⁽⁵⁴⁰⁾ Annabaa Network, the population of the world's shantytowns will be 1.4 billion in 2020 (Arabic).

*** The number of homeless people around the world was estimated at about 100 million in 2005. Males constitute 75-80% of homeless people in the West.⁽⁵⁴¹⁾**

*** In 1990, 35 percent (1.8 billion) of the world's population were living in extreme poverty, which decreased to 10.7% in 2013.⁽⁵⁴²⁾**

*** According to the United Nations, one -third of the world's population was living at a low level of human development in 2017).⁽⁵⁴³⁾**

*** The International Labor Organization reported that the world's unemployment rate reached five percent in 2018, with 61% of employment (2 billion) in informal work.⁽⁵⁴⁴⁾**

*** In 2017, 821 million people were suffering from hunger, and over 150 million children were suffering from stunting.⁽⁵⁴⁵⁾**

*** The International Monetary Fund's statistical survey from 1988 to 2000 revealed that the hidden economy as a percentage of the gross domestic product ranged from 35 to 44% in underdeveloped countries, 21 to 30% in eastern countries and 14 to 16% in "Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development" countries.⁽⁵⁴⁶⁾ In China, the size of the shadow banking sector was estimated at 30% to 80% of the GDP in 2017.⁽⁵⁴⁷⁾**

*** In 2011, the number of marginalized individuals in Egypt was estimated at 32 million,⁽⁵⁴⁸⁾ while India had 83.4 million outcasts**

⁽⁵⁴¹⁾ Wikipedia, Homelessness.

⁽⁵⁴²⁾ The World Bank, End poverty in all its forms everywhere.

⁽⁵⁴³⁾ United Nations Development Programme, World's most marginalized still left behind by global development priorities: UNDP report, Mar 21, 2017.

⁽⁵⁴⁴⁾ Lisa Schlein, Global Unemployment Has Reached Lowest Level in a Decade.

⁽⁵⁴⁵⁾ WHO, Number of Hungry in the World Continues to Rise, New UN Report says.

⁽⁵⁴⁶⁾ Magda Tamer, The shadow economy is a phenomenon of underdevelopment in developing countries.

⁽⁵⁴⁷⁾ World perspectives: 2018 - a year of capitalist crisis.

⁽⁵⁴⁸⁾ Nabil Al-Qett, a leader in social democratic Egyptian party.

(untouchables) classified as marginalized, with 91.9% of Indian workers in informal employment,⁽⁵⁴⁹⁾ Additionally, refugees from Syria, Iraq and other areas face marginalization, as well as the majority of Yemen's population due to war and poverty.

* In 2008, the percentage of women in temporary work in Japan was around 50%, compared to less than 20% for men. In South Korea, 57% of women and 35% of men were in temporary work, while in Britain, 40% of women were in part-time jobs with lower hourly wages than full-time work. In France and Germany, women accounted for 80% of part-time jobs.⁽⁵⁵⁰⁾

* The Roma population in Europe is estimated to be 12-15 million, facing challenges in integrating into mainstream society. They experience poverty, unemployment, malnutrition, low life expectancy and lack access to public services such as water and electricity despite governmental efforts to reduce discrimination. They still face racial discrimination⁽⁵⁵¹⁾ A 2011 study found a 74% unemployment rate among Roma in Europe,⁽⁵⁵²⁾ while a Serbian study from 2007 reported that only 3% of working-age men and 1.5% of women were employed.⁽⁵⁵³⁾ The President of Czechoslovakia stated that the unemployment rate among Roma in his country was 90% and he refused to back down from that.⁽⁵⁵⁴⁾

According to the United Nations Development Program on March 21, 2017, among the most vulnerable to systemic segregation, not only economically but also socially and culturally, women, rural people, indigenous people (5% of the world's population and 15% of its poor), ethnic minorities, the disabled, immigrants, refugees and

⁽⁵⁴⁹⁾ Srija & Shrinivas V. Shirke, *An Analysis of the Informal Labor*, p. 41.

⁽⁵⁵⁸⁾ Guy Standing, *Op. cit.*, pp. 61 -62.

⁽⁵⁵¹⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-21.

⁽⁵⁵²⁾ Roma survey - Data in focus - Poverty and employment: the situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States, p. 23.

⁽⁵⁵³⁾ Cedomir Sagric and others, *Social Marginalization and Health*.

⁽⁵⁵⁴⁾ Almadaen.com.sa, 8 October 2018 (Arabic).

persons with special sexual orientation (LGBT) in almost every country in the world. The largest group is women (forced marriage, mutilation, exclusion from certain jobs, the need for the husband's consent before joining work in 18 countries and in 100 countries they are excluded from work because of their gender).⁽⁵⁵⁵⁾ There are also 250 million individuals who are subjected to racial discrimination.⁽⁵⁵⁶⁾

It is very important to know that tens of millions of industrial workers in China and the rest of the third world countries that attract foreign investments are deprived of any insurance cover or legal protection. They also work up to 14 hours a day, without vacations, sometimes they spend the night sleeping in the factories and wages are very minimal. Women do not enjoy maternity leave, sometimes they do not have the right to become pregnant nor have children at all. In addition, there are many cases of suicide recorded in those areas.⁽⁵⁵⁷⁾

Factors of marginalization by and large:

The phenomenon is as old as human kind: expulsion or flight from the tribe. In modern times, expulsion or withdrawal from a specific social activity or from a number of activities and social fields may occur. This may be done systematically or as a result of the mechanisms of action of the social system itself. Among the factors is extreme destitution which leads people to be unable to participate in the use of society's capabilities.

The rate of demolition of the old (pre-capitalist) society was higher than the rate of construction of the new society. In Europe, this problem was solved by immigration to the Americas, Australia

⁽⁵⁵⁵⁾ United Nations Development Program, Mars 21, 2017.

⁽⁵⁵⁶⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁵⁵⁷⁾ The global proletariat is the only class capable of ending capitalism and exploitation! - 2011.

and other regions. As for the countries that were colonized and followed the path of growth of underdevelopment, the problem has become exacerbated and still is.

Combined development also played a role: infant mortality decreased without the assimilation of modern culture, leading to a population explosion. The progress of the productive forces also led to the creation of a surplus population that is swelling in the world, overcome in the West by the decline in the birth rate and thus equilibrium was achieved. However, the progress of the productive forces led to a decline in the proportion of industrial workers, in favor of service labor, including some temporary and even parasitic activities. This exacerbates the phenomenon of marginalization. In the underdeveloped world, the birth rate is still not balanced with the job creation rate. This is among the most important factors of illegal immigration and the consequent phenomenon of the marginalized in the West. In addition, the pattern of development in the Third World or what is called bad growth exacerbates the poor distribution of wealth in favor of the few, thus increasing the severity and extent of poverty.

There is also governmental corruption and backwardness of local capitalism in Third World countries.

Marginalization has also been exacerbated by the policy of neoliberalism, which expelled large segments of the population from work and from the umbrella of social guarantees. So, the era of the welfare state ended in the Third World; the golden age of the poor.

In the West, the system failed to assimilate new generations of old immigrants, mainly for cultural reasons, which created enclaves and marginalized areas that are expanding with time.

In most cases, marginalization is obligatory and accompanied by one form or another of discrimination and oppression, but sometimes it is optional. There are those who themselves choose marginalization within the context of rejecting the societal

framework,⁽⁵⁵⁸⁾ and for various motivations, including the desire to simply achieve an increase in the original income, to gain a certain experience, to compensate for failure, etc.⁽⁵⁵⁹⁾

Moreover, there are some investors who choose to work in the shadow economy to maximize their profits. Some women marginalize themselves in some countries and some circles under religious or other arguments. There are also those who choose the nomadic life and move from one country to another. This is of course besides the world of organized crime in general.

There is the example of Egypt as a model for a systematic and widespread process of marginalization, where a new Egypt is being built separate from the rest of the country. A new capital and a summer and a winter resort connected to it by highways, with advanced services, at prices so high that can only attract the wealthy classes, while in old Egypt projects are being created that serve the rich by grinding the poor and middle class. Additionally, continuing to provide grants to the military and patronage while leaving the rest of the country in ruins. Large segments of the people are also deprived of even the enjoyment of the river and sea beaches, with their use limited to certain categories of the rich or “sovereigns.” Certain groups, entire classes and social strata are also deprived of certain jobs, such as those of judges, officers and diplomats.

Factors behind the spread of the shadow economy:

In underdeveloped countries:

- * Lack of fairness and transparency in the tax system.
- * Government corruption.
- * High licensing costs and complex procedures with accompanying royalties.

⁽⁵⁵⁸⁾ Saif Eddin Ali, *The Marginalized Youth* (Arabic).

⁽⁵⁵⁹⁾ Guy Standing, *The Precariat*, p. 59.

*** Increase in individuals' contributions to social security and retirement pensions.**

*** Sometimes relatively low wages in the formal sector.**

*** High unemployment rates.**

*** Disguised unemployment, especially in state-run economies.**

*** Worker productivity in the shadow economy may be higher than in the formal economy due to incentives and worker satisfaction with conditions.⁽⁵⁶⁰⁾**

*** Informal investors making significant profits without establishing companies or paying fees and taxes, especially in the real estate sector.**

There is a dark side to the shadow economy phenomenon. Apart from worker exploitation and lack of insurance and union representation, unlicensed factories engage in commercial fraud, producing goods that may be substandard and pose health and environmental risks. Illegal advertising for medicines and magic remedies also contributes to the negative impact. Criminal activities such as drug trafficking and human trafficking divert resources and effort away from productive activities, hindering economic growth and tax collection.

In developed countries:

In addition to criminal activities, illegal immigration and marginalized groups with low wages contribute to the growth of the shadow economy. Globalization has increased labor market flexibility, leading to the expansion of informal work.

Repercussions of marginalization:

*** Completely marginalized groups, such as street children, face abuse and exploitation.**

⁽⁵⁶⁰⁾ Magda Tamer, Op. cit.

*** Poverty, crime and family issues are common outcomes of marginalization.**

*** Religious minorities may face restrictions and persecution in some countries. Non-religious people in some countries are also subject to persecution, whether by society or the state, and sometimes they are imprisoned or executed on charges such as blasphemy or contempt of religions.**

*** Shadow workers lack insurance coverage.**

*** Refugees and immigrants experience discrimination and violence in some countries. These factors contribute to the perpetuation of the shadow economy and its negative impact on society and the economy.**

*** Women in many countries are suffering from difficulty in finding a job, discriminatory laws regarding marriage and divorce, as well as domestic violence and sexual harassment in all its forms.**

*** Street and seasonal vendors are persecuted by the police. The Bouazizi incident in Tunisia (he set himself on fire in protest against police persecution) and Mohsen Fikri in Morocco (the police crushed him inside a rubbish truck) are just two examples.**

*** Persons of specific sexual orientations are suffering discrimination, assaults and even imprisonment in a number of countries.**

*** The shadow economy does not contribute to the proceeds of taxes, fees and insurance for workers, thus depriving society of large sums of money.**

*** The shadow economy often produces inferior products that are harmful to health or safety as mentioned above.**

*** The absence of adequate housing, potable water, sanitation and electricity leads to the underperformance of hundreds of millions of people around the world, resulting in poor outcomes in knowledge, skills and health levels.**

*** The hazards of narcotic trafficking.**

*** There are also serious psychological repercussions as a result of marginalization of all kinds, including the spread of psychopathic, aggressive and depressive personalities.**

Decline of the role of the working class:

The working class in Europe achieved a great rise in both its economic and political struggles in the period following the Paris Commune in 1871 until the First World War. During that period, there was a noticeable growth of the socialist movement in various directions, alongside the formation of the Second International. ⁽⁵⁶¹⁾

Since that war, with the transformation of the socialist parties of the Second International towards reformism, the workers' movement began to decline. Its class consciousness did not strengthen but profoundly regressed, as observed by Marxist theoreticians. ⁽⁵⁶²⁾ This was consolidated by the fact that the workers' parties in Europe supported the governments in the First World War, under the pretext of "defending the fatherland," without tangible objection from the workers themselves. The same researcher believes that since the 1920s and after the rise of social democracy and the emergence of Stalinism, things had been reversed. Today, there are no political parties representing the interests of the working class, and it can be stated that the working class, for decades, did not appear as a party or as a class on the political scene (a class for-itself). Additionally, it had no effect on events. It is well known that the European working class did not fight against Nazism and fascism.

Moreover, it is clearly noticeable that the working class as such was politically absent from the Arab Spring. However, it is true that there was some participation in the protests by workers as

⁽⁵⁶¹⁾ William A. Pelz, A People's History of Modern Europe, pp. 83-102.

⁽⁵⁶²⁾ The world proletariat is the only class capable of ending capitalism and exploitation!- Detailed text-2011, Internationalist communist union.

individuals, but the workers did not engage in political efforts in the form of organized or collective work.

The working class is also virtually politically absent around the world today.

The most important factors in the decline of the labor movement in the West and in the world can be identified by and large as:

*** The working class achieved great successes in terms of working conditions from 1871 (especially from 1880) until before the First World War, which prompted it to reject the idea of revolution, preferring reformism and even an alliance with capitalism. Since reformism yielded actual gains while revolutionary efforts failed, the colonial movement contributed to the high rate of capital profit, enabling the bourgeoisie to raise workers' wages and provide them with some advantages. After the Second World War, the welfare state emerged under pressure from the expansion of socialist systems. All of this pushed the working class not only to subside but also to integrate into the system, even throughout the Third World; a phenomenon that drew the attention of many socialist leaders and frustrated many thinkers (such as those of the Frankfurt School).**

*** After the rise of Stalinism with all its atrocities, not only the workers but many Marxist intellectuals were frustrated. If this is the destiny of the workers' revolution and the result of reform work, what can succeed?!**

*** The number of industrial workers has declined in favor of service workers in nearly all countries. Many of the latter provide intermittent services, hourly or day labor, i.e., temporary workers or semi-proletariat. Advanced industry has also reduced manual labor in developed countries, becoming more important in the economy as a whole, thus diminishing the large workers' gatherings in old factories. Parasitic jobs have also proliferated due to increased unemployment resulting from automation.**

*** Fear of transitioning from workers into marginalized individuals has arisen with the emergence of competition from**

immigrants and refugees in the West and the spread of marginalization, especially in the third world. Workers in the formal sector (non-marginalized) now have something they can lose: their jobs, health and social insurance and unemployment benefits in many countries. Despite the decline of welfare in the era of neoliberalism, there remains a significant disparity in income and benefits between workers and the marginalized.

* The workers' movement declined in all Western countries after the failure of the socialist revolutions following the end of the First World War.

* Leadership of the workers fell into the hands of opportunistic elements allied with business interests. Their parties and the "political class" in general lost their luster and legitimacy due to failure, opportunism and alignment with the state in recent decades. The workers' movement has been bureaucratized, with the so-called socialists or workers' left warning authorities worldwide about the potential for chaos from what they perceive as the revolution of the hungry and "illegal" immigration. It is worth recalling the stance of the Egyptian "National Progressive Unionist Party" and its president ⁽⁵⁶³⁾ during the 1977 uprising of the hungry. The party condemned riots and vandalism, stating that sabotage is a decadent and uncivilized means of expression. It declared: *"The party condemns riots and vandalism; sabotage is nothing but a decadent and uncivilized means of expression. Acts of sabotage were carried out by various elements, including CIA agents and parasitic capitalism, according to a scheme aimed at attaching this process to national, democratic and progressive forces. We call on all political forces in Egypt and all parties to uphold legitimacy and respect the law. Party members in some governorates contributed to maintaining the peacefulness of the demonstrations, in coordination with the responsible agencies that welcomed this."* (our emphasis).

⁽⁵⁶³⁾ Quoted Ahmad Sadeq Saad, our need for a new socialist strategy (Arabic).

Marginalized Components:

The lumpen or the shabby proletariat:

It is a term coined by Marx, describing a mass of people in Paris completely different from the industrial proletariat, living on the margins of society and practicing parasitic professions characterized by criminality, and in turn, against revolutionary movements. He did not include expelled workers, those with disabilities preventing them from working, or disabled elderly people in this category. Instead, he confined his term to: adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, pimps, brothel keepers, porters, literati, organ grinders, ragpickers, knife grinders, tinkers and beggars.⁽⁵⁶⁴⁾ It is not understood why he considered porters, knife sharpeners and metal welders among the lumpen proletariat, except perhaps because of their anti-revolutionary positions in his time.

The lumpen proletariat can be identified as sections that are predominantly parasitic, criminal, or both, such as thieves, swindlers, drug dealers, mercenary soldiers, professional beggars, pimps and gamblers.

Those who are working in the crime economy (money laundering), practicing a formal economic activity even at a loss to cover up unregulated sources of funds, trading in stolen or smuggled goods, human trafficking, smuggling and illicit gain, etc., can be considered among the lumpen bourgeoisie.

The lumpen proletariat can be used by authorities to suppress revolutions: the shabbiha in Syria, the thugs in Egypt, the thugs in Yemen and the Rabatah in Sudan.

The new proletariat:

⁽⁵⁶⁴⁾ The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, 1852, V.

The marginalized include different sections in addition to the lumpen proletariat. They include a significant percentage of workers, such as day laborers, shadow and seasonal workers. There are also millions of educated people, who are economically and politically marginalized, as well as workers not included in trade unions and temporary workers in the private and state sectors. Alongside marginalized intellectuals who are not recognized by "official" society and state institutions. Just as there is official media, there is unofficial media, mainly on websites, and just as there are parties and organizations, there are random gatherings of politicized and non-politicized youth. You may even find scientists and researchers isolated from the scientific research community or unemployed and highly educated, named by Umm Al-Zein Ben Sheikha as "*knowledge labor power*."⁽⁵⁶⁵⁾ who are present in huge numbers in the third world. In addition to other categories as shall be pointed out. Scientific and research institutions prefer people who follow their policies.

It is not possible to collect all marginalized and semi-marginalized individuals in one basket, especially since some of them choose to be marginalized, as indicated. However, a certain section of them can be identified, which can be called the new proletariat. This group includes those who work in the shadow economy as wage workers or in their own projects, seasonal employment, street-side vendors, transit services, temporary employment in capitalist or governmental projects (such as fast-food restaurants, coffee chains, customer service centers, delivery services and part-time work, which is very attractive for women). There is a type of work called "work on-demand," where the worker waits for the employer's request and gets paid for actual working hours or the service provided (e.g., Uber drivers.⁽⁵⁶⁶⁾ This section of

⁽⁵⁶⁵⁾ Philosophical readings in the Tunisian revolution (Arabic).

⁽⁵⁶⁶⁾ Ricardo Antunes, The New Service Proletariat.

people mostly suffer from poverty, lack of insurance and state oppression.

The new proletariat includes a large section known as the Precariat, a term introduced into the English language in 2004, combining the words proletariat and precarious. It refers to workers employed in temporary, part-time, or on-demand work who lack sufficient income for life, job stability, promotion opportunities and safety. They may work in hazardous or long-term jobs without compensation for work-related injuries and lack the opportunity to acquire new skills or engage in collective action such as the right to strike. This category encompasses hundreds of millions of workers in various countries, particularly in the Third World. The Germans add to this definition the completely jobless.⁽⁵⁶⁷⁾ The phenomenon of the precariat has spread with globalization and the industrialization of the Third World, leading to rapid migration from rural areas to cities and the movement of workers between countries in the West, creating intense competition in the labor market. One unique feature of the precariat is the sense of belonging to a multinational company rather than a specific country, making it a truly global "class" in the process of formation.

This form of transient work challenges the traditional concept of exploitation faced by the precarious. They do not sell all their labor power to one party but only a portion, which may be minimal, making it difficult to consider their wage as the value of their labor power. Therefore, it is worth reconsidering the nature of the surplus that the capitalist collects, known as "surplus value" in Marx's terms. For example, in the case of a delivery worker or an Uber driver, does the business owner profit from the precarious worker or from the customer who pays for the service? Is it considered surplus value in either scenario?

⁽⁵⁶⁷⁾ Guy Standing, Defining the precariat.

It does not look plausible to consider the precariat a part of the working class,⁽⁵⁶⁸⁾ but a part of the new proletariat. If workers by and large are exposed to unemployment and obligated to accept temporary work in certain periods, this is a chronic, not an accidental marginalization; situation that pertains to the precariat. They are living in a state of permanent or long-term insecurity, especially since many of their members choose this type of work by their will and not striving to change it. In this aspect they are similar to the rest of the new proletariat, such as street vendors and workers who work for customers by piecemeal, daily or contracting. This chronic situation of insecurity and the inability to plan private life affairs and draw plans for the future has strong repercussions on one's psyche. Millions of them around the world leave their homes without breakfast and without money, waiting for a paid operation. Those people usually hate their life and would do anything to overcome their ordeal.

The new proletariat constitutes a class in a non-Marxian sense. Some of its members are workers, some are private employers and some work from home, such as some computer programmers, Internet merchants and many others.⁽⁵⁶⁹⁾ But it is classified as a class based on its precarious status, its weak connection with formal society and its revolutionary capacity. It includes -in addition to paid workers- tens of millions of sidewalk vendors, owners of small workshops and technicians who are involved in piece-work for clients, such as maintenance workers of various specializations. It also includes domestic servants, building guards, street children and millions of homeless people. All these sections cannot be considered parts of the proletariat. What is the surplus value paid by street vendors, for example? How does capitalism exploit the street children and the homeless who live on occasional work?

⁽⁵⁶⁸⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁵⁶⁹⁾ Best 40 International Work from Home Jobs (Work from Anywhere in the World Online).

This “class” is growing rapidly, at the very expense of industrial workers, posing a significant threat to the existing systems. It is characterized by:

- * Open-minded, as it is very dynamic economically and socially.**
- * Tendency to be liberated from the constants of society, especially that it is already relatively free from law and customary.**
- * Tendency to liberate from ideology in favor of utopia (in the sense that dealt with in chapter seven).**
- * Hatred of the state.**
- * Tendency to violence, as the majority of its members have nothing to lose but their suffering.**
- * It has an impressive percentage of educated people who are good users of computers and the Internet.**
- * Tendency to non-authoritarian thought, pluralism, temporary leadership and democratic mandate. This is thanks to the varieties of activities, areas and levels of work. This was witnessed in the movements of the anarchists based on this class and in the uprisings of the new proletariat all over the world.**

The revolutionary capacity of the new proletariat:

The proletariat described by Marx and Engels was in a state close to that of the new proletariat: extreme poverty - lack of insurance - lack of medical care - very long working hours - many of them suffered work injuries without compensation - women's wages were much lower - child labor - inhumane housing, etc. In the beginning of its formation, it used to smash machines and destroy factories, but capitalism was able to absorb and domesticate that proletariat. However, contemporary capitalism has reproduced a new proletariat that is more powerful, inclined to revolution and bears a high destructive tendency. After domestication of the proletariat and emergence of the new proletariat, a new reality has

emerged. The new proletariat is an ever-increasing power. Today, there are billions of people belonging to this “class,” constituting the majority in many societies and running a huge sector of the economy, especially in the underdeveloped world. This proletariat has proven to be the first and strongest challenge to the system in all countries, having strong tendencies for change. However, its destructive tendency does not mean a mere tendency to sabotage, but just a tendency to overturn the system and destroy any template. As much as these powers can form pressure groups and achieve a degree of domination over civil society, other powers join their movements, such as workers, students, elements of the middle class and poor peasants.

The new proletariat is also outside the game of representative democracy; many of its members do not even have the right or the ability to vote, and others have no one who can represent them from within the official system, as their interests are too great for the dominant classes to tolerate. So, who do they elect?

This class is suffering from a deep feeling of frustration and alienation; since its daily life is just suffering; “an un-lived” life in the words of Erich Fromm. This nightmare generates a tremendous destructive tendency; its children feel the absence of any kind of security, as they have been left to their fate without support, the enemy behind and before them: poverty, disease, state oppression and the exploitation of official society. It is a class that is bleeding all the time and does not find a way to stop this bleeding. This great destructive energy made it a source of terror for the official society in all its classes, just as it made it a weapon of deterrence in the hands of some governments against the West, by threatening to open the door to illegal immigration.

However, on the other hand, they have a great revolutionary capacity, as they are capable of sparking revolutions, confronting the state and mobilizing the workers and the rest of the masses. They participated in many revolutions such as the Chinese and Algerian revolutions. There is the example of the Algerian “La

Pointe”: illiterate, manual laborer, manual farmer and boxer. He was imprisoned in the reformatory for vandalism, two years for theft and eight months for practicing prostitution and resisting arrest. Besides constantly abusing others and adoring money (perhaps he was a psychopathic personality), etc. Nonetheless, he later became a heroic fighter and among the leaders of the revolution.

The role of the new proletariat in the uprisings of the Arab Spring cannot be overlooked, starting from the uprisings of the educated, precarious youth in Tunisia, Egypt and later in Algeria. In addition to the violence of the hungry, including the Anger Friday in Egypt on January 28, 2011, when the security apparatus was destroyed. More recently, they were the main body of the yellow vest protests in France and the Wall Street sit-in of September 2001, followed by demonstrations in more than 1,500 cities in the world, including 100 in the United States. Moreover, the role of marginalized groups is not forgotten in igniting, leading and forming the main body in previous uprisings; in the United States in April 1968, when African Americans, many of whom were marginalized, rose up to protest the assassination of Martin Luther King; who was an advocate of civil disobedience. The uprising was violent and involved more than 200 American cities. Also in Egypt; January 1977, the Central Security Forces (semi-marginalized solidiers) armed insurgency in 1986, the Mahalla uprising in April 2008. Add the marginalized uprising in London in August 2011 and in France in October 2005, which was violent and limited to some suburbs inhabited by groups of diverse origins and cultures. The largest part of these groups was of Arab and African origins, along with people of many other nationalities and there also were many French. It expressed a real social phenomenon; the phenomenon of the deprived who have been left behind economic and social progress.⁽⁵⁷⁰⁾

⁽⁵⁷⁰⁾ Borhan Ghalion, the revolution of the marginalized.

The new proletariat in the events of 2011 and after it Arab countries dragged other classes behind it, such as industrial workers and peasants. Burning of Bouazizi himself (marginalized) was the spark that ignited the Arab Spring, and killing the fishmonger Mohsen Fikri in Morocco was the spark that ignited a massive uprising in 2017. The two events provided a symbol for the role of the new proletariat in mobilizing the rest of the oppressed powers (noting that both were educated; secondary education for the first and a diploma in marine science for the second).

The uprisings of the Arab Spring, with educated youth in the center, many of whom were semi-marginalized, were managed by the Internet; the highest technology so far, which indicates the ability of the new proletariat to deal with and use modern technology. Not all marginalized people are weak or poor, nor are they all helpless or vulnerable. Indeed, some marginalized groups are economically powerful and even rival with the power of formal society.

Despite all its revolutionary capacity, the new proletariat needs to drag in the rest of the marginalized and semi-marginalized groups: religious minorities, women, etc., in addition to the proletariat and the technocrats (the intellectual proletariat) behind it. The latter can exert harsh pressure on the regime by virtue of its control so far over the backbone of the economy despite the continuous spreading of the precariat in various economic activities.

By virtue of its mosaic formation and the divergence of its activities and levels, the new proletariat does not prospect a specific system, but - objectively- inclines to achieve what its members consider their right in freedom and welfare; strategies of the permanent revolution. This was evident in the uprisings of the Arab Spring, when the idea of seizing the state was not proposed, but rather the ideas of dismantling the security state, redistributing wealth and abolishing corruption were strongly proposed. The slogans of the Egyptian revolution were: Bread – Freedom - Social Justice - Human Dignity, and choosing the day of the National

Police Day to start the movement was significant: against the security apparatus.

All formal social powers, including the bourgeoisie, workers, peasants, bureaucracy, etc., have ceilings and limits. They prospect a system in the end, and the proletariat has not be seen aspiring -in practice- to more than state socialism on the Soviet or Nasserite model, and then social democracy thereafter in the West. Hence it aspires to nothing more than some social reforms in favor of the workers within the framework of the capitalist system. All formal social powers have become conservative, including capitalism, the proletariat, peasants and employees. However, the marginalized are already outside the system, having no ceiling for their aspirations. And the expansion of marginalization at the global level, involving the educated, scholars, researchers, the illiterate, the destitute, etc., is the material basis for the permanent revolution. Therefore, the new proletariat is the most revolutionary class. This is what the world is already witnessing.

This is not the first time that the revolutionary role of the marginalized is raised. Wilhelm Weitling adopted violence as the appropriate means to change society to socialism. The best way to do so is to push the chaos and social imbalance to the maximum extent possible, as the worse the conditions the greater are the hopes. The most revolutionary elements capable of overthrowing that society were, in his view, the homeless proletariat or the “thieves’ and bandits’ proletariat.”⁽⁵⁷¹⁾ Herbert Marcuse pointed to the revolutionary capacity of the oppressed minorities and students as a threat to the system, but without negating what he called the historical role of the proletariat. Focuses of resistance according to Foucault and Deleuze are represented in marginalized groups, ethnic groups, the colored and even homosexuals. These groups break the order and the rules because they are not always taken into

⁽⁵⁷¹⁾ David Riazanov lectures in the history of Marxism (Arabic translation).

consideration by the dominant powers.⁽⁵⁷²⁾ But this reason is not sufficient; the dominant powers may pay attention and take them into account. Bakunin's opinion was already mentioned on the role of the Lumpenproletariat in the socialist revolution.

It is possible for this “class” to either try or struggle to integrate into formal society, e.g., by legalizing its activities and obtaining official recognition. However, this is becoming increasingly difficult due to the inability of capitalism to absorb the new proletariat. Alternatively, they can continue to strengthen themselves and besiege official society to push it to disintegrate, thus increasing their allies.

The second way is most likely the truly revolutionary way. It is possible for marginalized groups to establish their own institutions (and this is already happening), including popular defense committees, customary justice, economic and social cooperative associations, relief committees, social assistance funds, banks for the poor, non-profit projects, charities and health insurance institutions, etc. Ultimately, they can organize themselves into a parallel society away from that parasitic and hideous power called the state. It is even possible to create global links between the organized groups of the marginalized and even to form groups calling for peace and brotherhood among peoples and renunciation of war and violence. In fact, all this is already happening on a small scale, but if the scope of cooperation organization and self-management expands among the population of this kind, it becomes very possible to create a solid foundation for overcoming the existing authoritarian regimes and forming a society based on self-management without authoritarian tools of repression.

Organization of the New Proletariat:

There is a common idea that the marginalized are elements that lack organization and even the ability to organize; therefore, their

⁽⁵⁷²⁾ Badr Eddin Moustafa, Op. cit., p. 42.

activities are characterized by randomness and lack of insight. In fact this is far from true. The different groups of these sections communicate with each other through informal and non-traditional means, such as some members of the ultras in sports clubs who are politically and culturally marginalized, groups of itinerant workers in different regions and Internet media activists. However, because the marginalized do not constitute a socially consolidated class and do not stand at the same distance from the system (marginalized disparately and by degrees) and because they belong to multiple sections, they cannot coalesce within the framework of an organization with defined features. But of course they can organize in an open front comprising different groups. Obviously this front is led by groups that are more able to organize or more identified. It is a political organization that includes marginalized individuals who are able to communicate with various social strata and different slums, working in these areas in formations that can gather the population around practical and specific goals. The organization has various bases, including regional bases in neighborhoods, towns and slums, as well as vocational or categorical bases for those with specific professions, such as unions for facility guards, street vendors, the unemployed and home workers. Additionally, on a workplace basis if there is a permanent place of business, such as shadow factories. This class is suitable for electronic means of communication more than any other means, which proved effective in organizing major protests in various regions of the world.

In the present time, electronic organization plays an enormous role in the protests of the new proletariat. This has been evident recently in the yellow vest movement. It is through dialogue, asking questions and proposing programs of action and joint plans that groups of the new proletariat can be formed. The Internet is already being used to create temporary electronic organizations that aim to achieve one or more goals and then dissolve automatically, following the same way as the work of the precariat. This organization can be called the on-demand organization, which is formed as needed.

Eighth: Cooperative Economy:

This economy is characterized by reliance on cooperation among the participants, as it does not use paid labor, and the establishments are managed in a democratic manner: one vote for the member, regardless of their financial contribution.

There are many types and forms of cooperation in virtually all fields, including banks, factories, shops, farms, insurance, healthcare and education, etc.⁽⁵⁷³⁾

This sector has been growing steadily for decades, and now it occupies an influential position in the economy all over the world. During the 2008 recession, cooperatives achieved a higher rate of growth in employment in countries of Western Europe, Canada and Latin America compared to the general rate of the economy, and the same in the rate of capital formation. Coordination between cooperatives also contributes to the development of work and the promotion of innovation. Technology is also being developed in larger cooperatives. The role of women in leadership positions in cooperatives is highlighted in a number of Western countries.⁽⁵⁷⁴⁾ In particular, the “Mondragon” region in Spain is singled out, where there exist 102 cooperative institutes, employing 73,000 people.⁽⁵⁷⁵⁾

Members of cooperatives around the world are estimated at one billion, and cooperatives generate more than 100 million jobs worldwide, surpassing multinational companies by 20%. Members of agricultural, fishing, forestry and livestock cooperatives participate in production, profit-sharing, cost-saving, risk-sharing

⁽⁵⁷³⁾ Many details are available in: Bruno Roelants-Gianluca Salvatori, the 2018 World Cooperative Monitor, Exploring The Cooperative Economy.

⁽⁵⁷⁴⁾ Stephen C. Smith -Jonathan Rothbaum, Cooperatives in a Global Economy: Key Economic Issues, Recent Trends and Potential for Development.

⁽⁵⁷⁵⁾ Jill Bamburg, Mondragon through a Critical Lens.

and income-generating activities, which improve members' bargaining power as buyers and sellers in the market.

In 2008, the top 300 cooperatives were responsible for total sales of US\$1.1 trillion, equivalent to the size of the tenth largest economy in the world; Canada and roughly equal to the size of Spain's economy. In Brazil, cooperatives are responsible for 40% of agricultural GDP and 6% of total agricultural exports.

Here are figures related to the resources and production of cooperatives and the proportions or numbers of their employees in a number of countries:⁽⁵⁷⁶⁾

In Quebec, Canada, 70% of the population are members of cooperatives.

In Finland 62% of the population are members of cooperatives.

In France, 35% of the population are members of cooperatives, and 75% of agricultural producers are members of cooperative enterprises.

In Norway, 58% of the population are members of cooperatives.

In the USA, there are 35 million members of cooperatives; every 4 out of 10 individuals are members of cooperative societies.

In Argentina, there are more than 17,941 cooperative societies with a membership of 9.1 million members.

In Canada, every 1 in 3 people is a member of a cooperative (33%) and the number of members in the province of Quebec has exceeded more than 5 million members (nearly half of the population).

In Colombia, more than 3.3 million people are members of cooperatives, 8.01% of the population.

In Costa Rica, more than 10% of the population are members of cooperatives.

⁽⁵⁷⁶⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, cooperative economy and development (Arabic).

In Finland, the Finland S-Group has a membership of 1,468,572 households, which represents 62% of Finnish households.

In Germany, 20 million people are members of cooperative organizations and societies or 25% of the population.

In Japan, 1 in every 3 families is a member of a cooperative.

In Kenya, 1 in 5 people is a member of a cooperative (5.9 million Kenyans are direct beneficiaries and 20 million are indirect beneficiaries by earning their livelihood through cooperatives).

In India, more than 239 million people are members of cooperative societies and organizations.

In Malaysia, 5.5 million people or 20% of the total population are members of cooperative societies and organizations.

In Singapore, 50% of the population (1.6 million people) is members of cooperative societies and organizations.

Moreover, cooperatives participate in significant proportions in national economies:

In Belgium, 19.5% of pharmaceutical products are produced through cooperative enterprises and there are more than 30,000 cooperative organizations.

In Brazil, 37.4% of the GDP is produced by cooperative enterprises.

In Finland, cooperative institutions are responsible for 74% of the production of meat and meat products, the production of 96% of daily food products, the production of 50% of eggs and 34.2% of banking transactions.

In France, the cooperative sector deals with 181 billion euros, as it deals in 60% of banking business, 40% of agricultural and food production and 25% of retail trade.

In Kuwait, the cooperative sector deals in 70% of the retail trade.

In New Zealand, the cooperative sector participated in 22% of the GDP growth rate, as it controls 95% of the daily produce market, 95% of daily product exports, 70% of the meat market, 70% of the fertilizer market, 75% of the product trade market, wholesale pharmaceutical and 62% of the grocery market.

In Norway, the cooperative sector deals in 96% of the dairy market, 55% of the cheese market, more than 70% of the egg market, 52% of the grain market and 15% of the construction market. It reaches 40% in cities such as Oslo, 30% of the non-life insurance market.

Moreover, in the largest capitalist country, the United States, there is a large cooperative sector; the resources of cooperatives in 2017 were \$500 billion and they employ 2 million people.⁽⁵⁷⁷⁾ Dairy cooperatives control about 80 percent of dairy production, while in California most producers of specialty crops⁽⁵⁷⁸⁾ are organized into cooperatives.⁽⁵⁷⁹⁾

'The active development of the cooperative economy constitutes an attempt to escape from capitalism. It is not just a marginal presence in the system, but an economic bloc able to penetrate and sovereign one day'

⁽⁵⁷⁷⁾ Jill Bamburg, Op. cit.

⁽⁵⁷⁸⁾ specialty crops are fruits and vegetables, tree nuts, dried fruits, horticulture and nursery crops (including floriculture).

⁽⁵⁷⁹⁾ World Food Day, FAO, 16 October 2012.

18. Post-capitalism

Every point in history is a crossroads. A single travelled road leads from the past to the present, but myriad paths fork off into the future

Yuval Noah Harari

Undoubtedly, capitalism is just a passing historical stage that will be followed by another stage. According to the simple principle that the results are implied in the introductions, and based on the idea that history is cumulative, it is possible to draw, within certain limits, possible scenarios for the transition from capitalism to another system, considering the current situation and its movement. Taking into consideration that humans are a decisive factor in historical transformations, one should support a particular scenario rather than just analyze and monitor it. It is also important to consider human inclinations, potentials, the objective capabilities of the existing system and the direction of its movement. This way, one can avoid getting involved in drawing a specific system on paper only to be surprised by its opposite as it unfolds before their eyes, making practical stances and struggles more feasible. If the goal is to propose an ideal system, it should be drawn up and implemented by the people, or they will face the consequences of their inaction. For example, some argue for socialism versus barbarism, urging people to choose the ideal project to avoid a fate of barbarism (though one may question if there is anything more barbaric than what humans have experienced throughout history). Others

advocate for a communal cooperative system as the only way out of crises, warning that suffering will persist otherwise.

In the context of the permanent revolution project, people are not urged to choose a specific and final system because there is never a final system; history is endless. Instead, they can adopt strategies that advance their endless aspirations. The call is to resist any system, including the one that succeeds capitalism, as no system can cater to all freedoms, welfare and development. Changes in people's needs, capabilities and means of production lead to shifts in their relationships and conflicting interests. Let the next system emerge from current and future social struggles, guided by the oppressed classes' compass of freedom, welfare and development. However, pre-planning the social system is unrealistic, as is aiming to solve all of humanity's problems and achieve eternal victory of virtue over vice. These are illusions that only materialize in daydreams and works of imagination.

Furthermore, viewing a specific social or political system as a goal reflects authoritarianism and arbitrariness, carrying seeds of reaction. Any system will be in favor of a certain group, as it is not possible to create an ideal system that fulfills all freedom, welfare and development.

The Marxist conclusion that workers' struggle inevitably leads to socialism is no longer reliable, as it has been shown to fail in previous instances.

Finally, a paragraph by Tariq Shamekh (a Tunisian anarchist militant) is added: *“The repeated rhetoric about an alternative to the system and who can offer it, unless what is meant is an alternative within the framework of the existing system or by riding on a revolutionary movement to save the system, then this is what the opposition has achieved and is actually achieving. But if what is meant is to consolidate an alternative now, to transcend the current system, based on a revolutionary movement, then this is considered a fall into sorcery and idealism. Is it possible to consolidate an alternative before the emergence of new conditions? How can a pedantic group replace the revolting masses if they are not domineering? Can the demolition process be separated from the construction process? How will the building forces get ready and how*

will the path of building without demolishing be shown to them? Construction and demolition are the two sides of the revolutionary process. The search for an alternative in all its conditions is a frantic pursuit by intellectuals to dominate the masses with their sorcery. We know the ready charge and the claim that I am 'an anarchist who glorifies the spontaneity of the masses and thus serves the enemies'. But the masses liberate themselves by themselves and for themselves without a mediator, neither a state nor a party nor individuals. And if you see in yourself the actual revolutionary eligibility, join the destitute in the popular neighborhoods and the inner regions and contribute without your arrogance. Contribute to consolidate criticism of the existing system. Consolidate the lessons of the revolutionary movement. Organize with them autonomously and coordinate with the rest of the organizations and initiatives in a horizontal, cooperative manner and contribute to the liberation of their practical and organizational initiative as one of them and for them.”

Before defining the possible post-capitalist scenarios, the basic content of this transmutation must be defined first. There is no clearer and more accurate definition than Marx’s definition of the capitalist mode of production, which is the capitalists' expropriation of the surplus through buying workers' labor power. In conclusion, it depends on wage labor: *“Whatever the social form of production, laborers and means of production always remain factors of it. But in a state of separation from each other either of these factors can be such only potentially. For production to go on at all they must unite. The specific manner in which this union is accomplished distinguishes the different economic epochs of the structure of society from one another.”*⁽⁵⁸⁰⁾ The method of union in capitalism is the union of wage labor and capital. Accordingly, the system that can be described as post capitalist is void of wage labor before anything else.

Much has been written about post-capitalism and the disappearance of the working class without any accuracy in defining the concepts. There are those who consider that capitalism has

⁽⁵⁸⁰⁾ Capital, Vol. II, Chapter 1: The Circuit of Money Capital, II. Second Stage, Function of Productive Capital.

already disappeared and been replaced by “business,” providing examples of projects in which knowledge and networks are an essential part of their capital, such as Apple, Uber, Alphabet, Facebook, Amazon and Microsoft,⁽⁵⁸¹⁾ and projects that their “capital” depends on public money. Examples include investments of pension funds (their assets amounted to \$27.6 trillion in 2018 in “the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)” alone) and investments of insurance companies.

Most discussions on this topic focus on the development of productive forces, the emergence of cooperative projects within the system, and the transformation of value into knowledge that capital owners cannot control. However, this overlooks a crucial aspect of the post-capitalist transition process: capitalist ownership and wage labor. There are numerous wage workers and stockholders, and capitalism will not willingly relinquish its wealth. Additionally, heavily armed forces will not switch their allegiance to become popular armies. This process of social transformation must involve political struggles and violent confrontations between the masses (potentially in alliance with the new “business” class) and capitalism and the state. It is a battle over immense interests.

Monitoring the changes within the current system is also essential to identify the expected scenarios for its transformation

These are the fundamental transformations occurring in the capitalist system, based on the review in the previous chapter.

These are the basic transformations taking place in the capitalist system, based on what was reviewed in the preceding chapter:

* Growth of the possibility of spreading individual and cooperative projects thanks to technological development.

⁽⁵⁸¹⁾ John Kay, *Moving Beyond Capitalism*.

*** Growth and merging of the power and influence of technocrats and bureaucrats, where management and modern informatics become linked. This new social section can be called Techno-bureaucrats.**

*** Increasing growth of marginalized people, especially the precariat, which is insecure and unconnected to formal society. Consequently, there is no way for this “class” to liberate itself except through individual and cooperative work, unless radical changes occur in the system leading to its integration into formal society. The widespread marginalization on this scale is a sign of the decomposition of the capitalist system and an indication of prospective profound social transformations. Bourgeois modernity, with its stereotyping of individuals and the coordination of society, has reached its climax and can no longer continue in the same way. Accordingly, capitalism with its current composition (not as a system) is no longer capable of providing more freedom and welfare for the general public, not even to maintain the strict social system it created. It now has to either change itself or face the increasing protests of the marginalized and even the workers.**

*** Multinational companies have practically gained control of the world's economy and have begun to act with a degree of autonomy from states, including that of the mother country, and they negotiate directly with governments. Thus, the nation-state has lost part of its control over the country it is ruling.**

*** The communication revolution and the ease of access to information have led to an increasing degree of globalization of culture, the exchange of experiences, and broadmindedness of humans in general. It is more illumination, based on an abundance of knowledge and continuous dialogue on social networking sites. Everything has already come under scrutiny, and the number of those involved in the general human dialogue about all issues and phenomena is increasing. Free information sites and volunteering for mutual and free services are also spreading through the Internet.**

*** One of the most prominent changes taking place in the world is the transformation of the stock of value and wealth into knowledge. The increasing fading of manual labor, the ongoing automation of mental work (artificial intelligence), transformation of the components of goods and services as material values in favor of what they contain of know-how and technical experience at the expense of the material parts are leading to:**

- 1. Change in the methods of capital-account. Knowledge is more and more becoming capital, and countries and big corporations are trying to monopolize it.**
- 2. Disruption in the way wages are determined.**
- 3. Difficulty of separating work from leisure time.**
- 4. Ordinary employment is moving to transit service work and to parasitic work.**
- 5. Rise of technocrats, as mentioned above.**

Marx referred to this phenomenon as a genius expectation; the phenomenon of capital's increasing disposal of direct human labor, thus leading to the dissolution of itself as capital .⁽⁵⁸²⁾

*** Spread of the Internet and the development of the production of electronic programs made electronic administration and government two projects that are already being realized in developed countries and being achieved slowly in other countries. It has become possible in the near future to get rid of most office functions and turn financial institutions into mere applications on the computer. It also became possible soon to dispose of millions of service jobs. Transit work, according to the on-demand system, has also become generalizable in all services, thus transforming hundreds of thousands of companies into just electronic applications. The world has become marginalizing management and the owners of capital in favor of the techno-bureaucrats.**

⁽⁵⁸²⁾ The Fragment on Machines. The idea of Marx was aforementioned before.

*** The higher public and private bureaucracies have achieved a great deal of independence from the ruling class, including the military bureaucracy. Although senior administrators are considered among the members of capitalism by virtue of the job they perform; managing the capitalist system and maximizing its profits, the recent decades have witnessed a growth in their role and a high degree of independence from businessmen. With the expansion of crisis in the current system and the inability of governments to provide funds for investment that is now hindered, they have no choice but to seize the money of the capitalists or the public. The first action may push the capital to flee or stop, and the second may drive the masses to barricades. For fear of this and that, governments, including European and American, resort to deficit financing⁽⁵⁸³⁾ (the government spends more money than it receives as revenue, the difference being made up by borrowing or minting new funds), which is a policy that has its limitations and repercussions and does not solve the problem.**

*** The cooperative sector in the economy has achieved great growth.**

*** The market in developed countries is witnessing a decline in the rate of profit and the rate of interest, by virtue of the abundance of capital in the private sector and the stagnation resulting from the difference between the ability of the system to produce without its ability to market and consume what is produced. It is the so-called contradiction between the forces and relations of production analyzed by Marx. This has led to an intensification of class antagonisms and exacerbation of the difference in the distribution of wealth and income. In underdeveloped countries, capitalist globalization and following neo-liberal politics have exacerbated the social contradictions, which find no hope to resolve apart from the rest of the world after the strong intertwining that occurred between economies, governments, and even among peoples worldwide.**

⁽⁵⁸³⁾ Nigel Warren, Why does Capitalism go into crisis?

*** As a result of the economic changes that the world has witnessed in the last decades, there has been a clear rise of the Right of every kind: fundamentalism and fascism, whether in the Third World or the developed West.**

*** Regional and civil wars are spreading, and the slogan of the war on terror has been used by the Americans as an excuse to wage wars and expand or consolidate American influence in the world to compensate for the deteriorating economic power. On the other hand, the Chinese-Russian challenge emerged and the globe became an arena for unresolved conflicts between the superpowers.**

*** Humans have been able to change their culture over time. It is clear that the rate of violence has declined, and the time of wars has decreased, despite the development of destructive capacity. Invasions similar to the Mongolian invasions are no longer witnessed except rarely and on a small scale. Weapons of mass destruction have become internationally prohibited, and treatment of war prisoners has been improved. There are some moral values, a balance of power, international pressures to reduce the rate of wars and devastation. The horrible means of execution, such as impalement, have also disappeared. In addition, many countries have abolished the death penalty. There is also a growing trend towards achieving equality between women and men and guaranteeing the rights of children and people with special needs. Moreover, there are indications that the role of the state will end in the long term.**

Not everything is black, but there is some light.

Anticipated scenarios for superseding capitalism:

1. Technocratic Revolution:

The first to call for technocratic rule was Saint Simon. Afterward this advocacy was revived in the United States in 1919, calling it “Technocracy,” on the grounds that modern economies are so complex that they cannot be understood and controlled by politicians, so their management must be subject to scientists, technocrats and engineers. The founder of the idea believed in the possibility of a technology policy. This trend had become a significant movement in the thirties of the last century⁽⁵⁸⁴⁾ but faded later. The idea was supported by the sociologist Karl Mannheim, based on the possibility of managing society on a purely scientific basis, calling for the end of ideology.

Technological development tends to make politics confined to elites and to give professional advisors a greater role in community management. This has already created a new situation: the technobureaucratic elite has become a relatively independent power. The most distinctive example in this regard is the important role being played by the American Military-Industrial-Scientific-Complex. The technological revolution also transformed the content or components of capital. The value of capital is no longer concentrated in material means of production or natural resources but mainly in knowledge. The value is now mainly produced by scientific research, innovation and software; that is knowledge and its applications in the working process, giving the workers in the field of scientific research and innovation an increasing power. Now the one who possesses knowledge is the owner of real capital, and these people can carry their capital with them anywhere. This situation frees them from subordination to the capitalist owners of machines, but will themselves be the most important capitalists.

This is the greatest challenge to today's capitalist system.⁽⁵⁸⁵⁾

This change in the structure of the economy prompted the American economic writer Peter Drucker to expect the next ruling

⁽⁵⁸⁴⁾ John G. Gunnell, *the Technocratic Image and Theory of Technocracy*.

⁽⁵⁸⁵⁾ Carl Davidson, *Post Capitalist Society*, by Peter F. Drucker.

class to be composed of what he called the Universal Educated Person,⁽⁵⁸⁶⁾ who is technical and administrative. This person is able to research in specialized areas and apply the results in general. Hence applies the chaos theory to economics, genetics to archaeology and data-mining to social history;⁽⁵⁸⁷⁾ a perception that seems perfectly possible. Indeed, after the tremendous development in science and technology and capital partly shifting to software, it became possible for the new techno-bureaucrats to have the upper hand in society. Along with mutual exploitation, transfer of value and wealth from hand to hand and the accumulation of wealth through the market without wage work. The rest of the population will have no choice but to either become techno-bureaucrats or work in fields such as education, health care and the practice of law, until these jobs are also automated, along with the parasitic activities. Actually, scientists and researchers are irritated with their subordination to capital objectives, which raises the question of the relationship between knowledge and power.

2. Disappearance of wage work in exchange for the proliferation of individual and cooperative capital, time banks, the sharing economy and voluntary work, such as Wikipedia, where 27 thousand volunteers are working.⁽⁵⁸⁸⁾ Along with projects such as investing pension funds and investment funds, funds deposited in cooperative insurance companies, which obtain a surplus that is redistributed to the owners of these funds. Actually, the supervisors of these activities cannot be described as capitalists.

3. State socialism under the rule of techno-bureaucrats: either the state intervenes in the Keynesian way but on a comprehensive scale or through direct intervention to redistribute the output, provide jobs to the unemployed, confiscate capitalist properties and liquidate fictitious capital and parasitic activities. This is likely to be

⁽⁵⁸⁶⁾ Paul Mason, post-capitalism, A Guide to Our Future, p. 114.

⁽⁵⁸⁷⁾ Ibid., p 114.

⁽⁵⁸⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 11.

achieved through either direct intervention of the existing states and imposition of their policies or by popular revolutions that overthrow capitalism in favor of techno-bureaucrat seizing the state apparatus. One of the sure results of the development of productive forces is the growth of the size and power of technocrats and with the transformation of capital owners increasingly into parasitic beings, it becomes possible for technocrats to take over the rule of society and confiscate capital for a state they control. When the marginalized lose any place and any opportunities for advancement, the social conflict will become more and more confined between them and the new ruling class.

4. The different anarchist systems: popular revolutions followed by the dissolution of the state.

5. Libertarian scenario: shrinking state functions, dismantling most of its components, on top of which is the professional army and the possibility of direct democracy.⁽⁵⁸⁹⁾

6. Nuclear war and possibly the end of the world.

7. There is a very plausible scenario for the success of capitalism in overcoming its crisis in the long term. This would require bold decisions such as imposing high progressive taxes, freezing speculation and reducing the volume of fictitious capital. To restore and ensure long-term recovery, several steps need to be taken. Firstly, implementing the new Middle East project by force, transforming the region into an open market for trade and investment. This would involve satisfying the Russians, replacing the ruling classes in the Middle East with secular and pragmatic elites, resolving the Palestinian question and eliminating Zionist ideology. Secondly, modernizing Africa and making it a region conducive to investment and trade, as well as doing the same for Latin America. Thirdly, relaunching the globalization project without restrictions or conditions. Mega states or post-nation states may be formed

⁽⁵⁸⁹⁾ Ekaterina Schulmann, The future of the state and the state of the future.

under the dominance of major unions of multinational corporations and several capitalist states. There is a possibility that global capitalism will decide to get rid of the human surplus, one way or another, in conjunction with the modernization of the Middle East and Africa.

After capitalism, the disappearance of the market with its traditional mechanisms is not prospected. As for the alternative, central planning, it must fail, especially if it is implemented in a large country. The competition between the various political, security and even economic institutions of the state through political means creates a kind of anarchy in investment and production, which was evident in the socialist countries. Of course, there can be no transparency in a country governed by a central authority. In addition, the market cannot be abolished in case of the unity of the world. It is inconceivable that central planning takes place at the level of the globe and therefore determining the demand on the part of all sectors on the level of the world as a whole. All of this was evident in the inefficiency of socialist economies and their collapse at the end. The only alternative to the anarchy of production (whether in the free market or central planning) is the pattern of on-demand production. The latter requires a very high level of development of the productive forces while achieving a high degree of flexibility in the use of equipment and information technology, in the sense of achieving the possibility of multiple uses of both, so that no big waste occurs in the invested money. This is already being achieved gradually. Therefore, the next system is anticipated to be based on a rationalized market economy in one way or another.

'In all scenarios of the transmutation of capitalism into a new system, class struggle is necessary; a clash between the public and the state apparatus along with a series of civil and regional wars'

19. Mechanisms of the Permanent Revolution

- What is to Be Done?

Life is worth nothing unless we find something to struggle for

Micheline Sauvage

If one cannot answer the question: What is to be done by any ordinary person concerning here and now, he would have given no answer.

By the permanent revolution, it is not meant a popular uprising all the time or a perpetual civil war. Rather, it is intended to continue working for more freedom, welfare and development. Furthermore, the permanent revolution does not aim to establish a new system; any social or political system has frontiers that it does not try to cross; therefore, the revolution goes on against the system by and large; against stability in the literal sense of the word.

This does not preclude changing the most repressive and backward systems, in favor of a new system that is more capable of achieving any revolutionary shifts. But for the revolution to continue, revolutionaries should not set this goal as their ultimate aspiration. They must start immediately to resist the next system; the counter-revolution.

The idea of continuing the revolution includes “here” and “now,” as well as long-term goals. The removal of a system in favor of a more advanced one, if possible, is not the end, but the continuation of the revolution requires continuing actions from below; within civil society, to keep the pressure on the political system going.

The revolution is a symphony including all levels: political, economic, social, cultural, cognitive and scientific.

The advocacy of the permanent revolution connects the endless aspirations of humans for freedom, welfare and development with realpolitik. Working for these aspirations begins with adopting realistic goals; achievable at this moment or that, with more comprehensive goals in the foreseeable future, but it is an endless process.

Social Nature of the Permanent Revolution:

History is not teleological; it has no determinism or predetermined course, nor is there a class that has a historical role or is entrusted with a historical mission. The pretenses of some groups that they are working for higher principles are not indicated by the facts of history at all. The revolution is an action to achieve the aspirations of certain social powers, nothing more, nothing less. It is not a sacred action and does not carry sacred principles. The strategies identified here can be increased, decreased, or exchanged. By and large, it achieves the aspirations of the most deprived social powers, but it can be partially achieved at the hands of the powers most capable of rebellion and revolt, which is mostly the new proletariat, as discussed before. It is likely that this proletariat will drag many other social powers, such as women, poor peasants, industrial workers, groups and segments of the middle class and even bourgeois elements in certain circumstances and periods.

It is neither necessary nor possible to define the nature of the revolution. What is usually meant by this is: democratic, bourgeois, or socialist revolution, while some add: Islamic. The permanent revolution is not a project to build a new system, but rather it is a

continuous process to increase freedom, development and welfare in the context of dismantling the existing systems, not within their framework. The revolution is against the status quo in favor of these aspirations that may increase with time and their horizons are determined according to the capabilities of the conflicting powers and the course of the political struggle. As Kautsky pointed out; the bourgeoisie did not carry out any revolution, but rather “its” revolutions were staged by the workshop laborers and small merchants, while it reaped the results. Rather, it froze the revolution at a certain point. In France, the goal of the masses was: freedom, equality and fraternity, but the bourgeoisie stopped the revolution without achieving except only small steps on the path of these hopes. This is just an example.

It is not necessary to adopt a specific model of regime change for the permanent revolution. Rather, it is possible to make: revolutions from below, political revolutions, uprisings without seizing power, etc. Even the “bourgeois” revolution can be advocated in some countries. The goal is development, freedom and welfare, not a specific system. In addition, resisting any obstacle to these strategies, whether the state, the dominant class of any kind and political or non-political forces of any current.

It is also possible that the project of embourgeoisement of a backward society is a progressive action; a moment in the permanent revolution. The establishment of cooperatives, forms of direct democracy and acting to overcome capitalism may be appropriate in another society. Revolution from below or from above or both together and in different forms, according to the circumstances of each society, are all mechanisms of the permanent revolution. In tandem with peaceful work, parliamentary struggle, mass violence, general disobedience, even mere propaganda for revolutionary ideas and any other struggles. The tactic is open to everything that can lead to the mentioned strategies. It is possible for a revolution to overthrow the most parasitic sections of capitalism; fictitious capital and capitalism based on the armed

forces (e.g., the United States). It is also possible that capitalism will be overthrown in favor of technocrats. More important is the continuous process of building popular institutions in civil society: civil associations, trade unions, environmental service associations, etc. So what can be the nature of these revolutionary processes?!

It is also reasonable for the permanent revolution to confront the reactionary masses themselves, by refuting their reactionary demands or aspirations, criticizing them, in addition to diligent propaganda and explanation. Not everything that the masses demand serves the revolutionary process. Calls such as halting the development of machinery so that workers do not lose their jobs, supporting racist slogans to prevent alien migration or empathizing with oppressive regimes deserve no sympathy. This applies to any populist slogans.

Revolutionary theory - Utopia of the permanent revolution:

What is meant is Utopia in the sense intended by Mannheim; a "potential" ideology that changes reality and then turns into an actual ideology, hindering further change. The advocacy for the permanent revolution includes the continuation of the revolution in the field of ideology as well, by creating an ideology that criticizes itself; a Permanent Utopia; its proponents and receivers realize that it is nothing more than a perspective. To achieve this, theory and praxis must not be separated; rather, the theory is its praxis. The theory that is not applicable in practice is a utopia in the old traditional sense of the word; useless. However, the theory of the permanent revolution is not a real theory in any way, but mere strategies that are realized and not realized. It does not include metaphysics or any kind of philosophy, nor does it adopt any particular method, but uses all the products of thought that serve its strategies.

In this book, there are many ideas consistent with the ideas of postmodernism, Marxism, anarchism, structuralism, liberalism,

libertarianism, existentialism, some trends in psychology and others. All of which serve in a consistent way the strategies of the permanent revolution and the mechanisms for its achievement. It is just a call to action; freedom, development and welfare are nothing but choices not based on any science, nor are they deterministic, nor are they the “right” path, nor are they the result of a comprehensive theory. This is just a utopia. However, there is nothing to prevent using the various ideas produced by humanity and using any method or borrowing judgments and any ideas, without molding them into a systemic formulation as if they are the truth of existence, and without sanctifying or even clinging to them. Rather, as temporary tools for understanding and diagnosing reality, consumables, without sanctity or normative value, nor as slogans that must be adhered to or correct categories that were developed to apply them. There is no one “right” way to the revolution, but there are many ways and methods according to each society and its circumstances.

Because every theory necessarily contains a conservative seed as it -at least- rejects other theories and works to freeze the activity of the mind, this book neither presents a new ideology nor calls for the adoption of concrete goals with specific features. On the contrary, it calls for overcoming and re-overcoming every theory and every ideology in favor of Utopia, and abandoning any conception of a new social order; it calls for the perpetual negation of every principle, any stability, and every perception, including what is presented herein. This is an advocacy for free thinking, having no obstacles, axioms, beliefs, or doctrines, for the sake of revolutionary thinking.

No theory has succeeded in providing a definitive truth regarding the explanation of the world. That is because there is no ultimate truth; but, as Sartre pointed out, something that is on its way to exist, and it can be added that it will never exist. Frequent attempts were made by philosophers and sociologists to transform ideology into a science, but to no avail. Philosophers have failed to interpret

the world in a way generally accepted by human beings, including Marxism. Metaphysics reached its climax and its death at the hands of Hegel. It is no longer necessary now to search for the Absolute after that process failed completely with the failure of speculative philosophy. There is no evidence of an absolute beyond nature, including the so-called “laws” of dialectics, or any other laws prior to nature or society. Humans are the ones who formulate what is perceived through experience, observation, practice, abstraction and analysis. Even the concept of matter, e.g., is merely an abstraction of concrete things, created by human reason.

What is watched of the endless multiplicity of theories and their change as the fashion of clothes or hairstyle changes, the resort to ambiguity (deliberate in many cases) and to the complex and 'deep' language to explain simple and old ideas and the mysterious speech closer to the language of Sufism and the delirium of the insane? It is nothing but attempts by intellectuals to highlight their presence or to serve the dominant political and social powers and impose their cognitive authority. Everything possible in sociology and philosophy was proposed, in vain. There is no escape from ideology, and there is no way to interpret the world except in a relative way; perspectival.

In accord with Abd Al-Rahman Badawi, the philosophers have added more delusions to the human mind and overloaded the mind with a mixture of vague or inapplicable teachings and rules .⁽⁵⁹⁰⁾This ambiguity and that linguistic complex express -according to the writer’s estimation- a feeling of inability to produce clear and meaningful ideas; a compensatory defensive mechanism.

The world cannot be summarized in a closed and final intellectual system as the ultimate truth. Even strategies such as freedom, development and welfare and even love, have no absolute meanings, no final limit and with fighting for them they will be only on their way to exist and will never be fulfilled. Actually, the pursuit of Truth is similar to searching for a mirage. Human knowledge of

⁽⁵⁹⁰⁾ Methods of Scientific Research, pp. 8-9.

anything increases with the continuation of handling it. The thing is always known from certain aspects that increase with more research and even human knowledge sometimes turns into its opposite. There are no doubts that people know the things, but they know them more deeply and more comprehensively with more dealing, and they always see them from a changing angle or angles. This is the meaning to say that Truth is something that is on its way to exist. This also justifies the stoppage of trying to have the ultimate and absolute Truth. All what can be known is one side or another, one degree or another, but it is not possible to reach the absolute and final Truth. If one knows something called the absolute Truth, the history of the world, as Engels pointed out, would have ended and all contradictions would be overcome.⁽⁵⁹¹⁾ Yet the subject-object relationship is indispensable. Even communication (Habermas' alternative theory of the subject-object relationship) is built on the basis of people's representations of their relationship to the object. The relationship of the subject to the object is the source of knowledge, but truths are always partial, relative, variable and dependent on the position of the subject in relation to the object.

Adhering to a specific theory is like sitting in prison, especially if it is systemic, whatever it is; philosophy, religion or science, while claiming the existence of a “correct” theory is just a tool for hegemony. Society institutions and professionals in theoretical work and politics used to pretend their control over the correct science, even Marxism and anarchism did the same. This is tantamount to the religious view of the world and linked to the emergence of a priesthood of thinkers and leaders with moral authoritarian influence.

Any one has the right to present a project to society and to suggest a criterion for the different choices. But to consider his project as the “right” one is deceiving oneself and others. It is just a perspective. Being away from the absolute value judgments and

⁽⁵⁹¹⁾ Ludwig Feuerbach And the End of Classical German Philosophy, Part I.

setting “correct” standards avoids one falling into the captivity of the ideology of Truth-seeking.

The advocacy for the permanent revolution is a call to criticism and negation. There is no need to develop a systemic theory for the revolution, simply because it would mean defining the revolution in a final horizon. The first pillar of the “theory” of the permanent revolution is making it subject to negation; negating itself beforehand, which requires its presentation as a Utopia (necessarily containing ideological elements), not as a scientific theory or absolute Truth.

It goes without saying that believing in something is essential to its success. It is called herein for believing in the goals of freedom, welfare and development with the flexible meanings already presented.

Therefore, this book did not follow a specific method or a specific ideology like the well-known theories, but what is presented is merely specific objectives having flexible concepts and the way to achieve them. It is a book in the Utopia of the permanent revolution.

All theories tried to derive support from nature or from the “laws” of history. Nevertheless, the slogan of the permanent revolution relies on the aspirations of the people, not on the “Truth.” Human is not destined or obliged to harmonize with the universe or to its alleged laws. Moreover, the permanent revolution is a rebellion against any system, does not subject to nothing but human aspirations and prospects to re-create the essence of man. The attempt of breaking necessity and creating a Utopia, like in science fiction, is a motivation for development.

This pragmatism reduces the scope of ideology in favor of Utopia for the interests of mankind which is the aim. It is impossible to develop a constant and objective theory of a changing reality. On the other hand, developing a theory that changes with the change of reality negates it as a theory from the beginning; a “theory” that continually negates itself; a set of possibilities that are not

necessarily systemic or logically connected. More important is the pursuit of actualization of people's aspirations, then the theory should be adapted to these aspirations. With this approach one can get rid of reification of thought: there is no idea that means the Truth, there is no reverence of science and there is no submission to the authority of thought in general. Let there be a permanent revolution in the world of thought as well, and let ideology expose its nature, which strips it of holiness. This does not negate the facts presented by various sciences and researches, but not as the final Truth, as evidenced by the everlasting development of science. It is in a permanent revolution.

The bourgeoisie espoused what it called “rationalism” to use it to control society, not to know the truth. Man -by and large- tends to achieve power and status, not to find the Truth. Reason will not be able to rule the world, but the world is being ruled by humans using their unconscious besides their conscious all the time. Let reason be controlled and subjected to the aspirations of freedom, welfare and development rather than using it now by the powers of oppression and repression. Let reason be at the service of self-organization, self-governance, thinking apart from the institutions and revolting against the state and the dominant classes over the head of humanity. Let humanity return to Enlightenment in its original form, which was violated, as defined by Kant: *“Enlightenment is man's emergence from his self-incurred immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another. This immaturity is self-incurred if its cause is not lack of understanding, but lack of resolution and courage to use it without the guidance of another. The motto of Enlightenment is therefore: Sapere aude! Have courage to use your own understanding!”* ⁽⁵⁹²⁾ This Enlightenment must be a permanent process; a struggle between Utopia and ideology, which will continue to be produced and reproduced.

⁽⁵⁹²⁾ An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?

(Sapere aude in English=Dare to know).

So, the only beginning of Enlightenment and illumination is the acceptance of subjecting constants to criticism. Especially the sacred constants, whether this sanctity is in the form of a religious text, secular ideology or historical personages; therefore, desanctification of every sanctity becomes acceptable. The next step is necessarily transforming the claim of reaching the absolute Truth into a mere point of view that is in turn subject to criticism and modification. The next step follows from the preceded: the refutation of ideology (inherently justificatory) in favor of Utopia, which means a project to change the world. Thus, Enlightenment is a continuous process; a struggle between Utopia and ideology, which will continue to be produced and reproduced. Rather, pretending to use reason and resorting to fictitious logic to prove illogically the validity of inherited constants, sanctities and the superiority of certain persons or beings is just a pretense of Enlightenment and rationality.

It is not possible to put in place an imaginary system and prospect the possibility of adopting it by the general population. But people choose the system that best suits their level of development, consciousness, culture, balance of social powers and the interaction of disparate interest groups in a largely spontaneous manner. Usually people think about things, but what is realized is something else; it is what Hegel called: cunning of reason in history. Additionally, any system is necessarily conservative, resists change per se, by virtue of the interests of its stakeholders. Moreover, working towards strategies that cannot be fulfilled paves the way for the continuation of the revolution against every system and every conservative power.

By and large, the important thing is to change the world and not to interpret it, as Marx righteously pointed out. Therefore, the search for a “correct” and definite approach with specific features is useless. If certain strategies, such as freedom, are put before one’s eyes it will not be difficult to discover the obstacles and forces standing against it and decide the struggle against them.

This is not a call to abandon theoretical thought, but rather a call to deal with it with flexibility, away from the idea of a comprehensive and complete “revolutionary theory.” It is enough to draw broad and flexible lines that are always subject to modification, addition and deletion. In addition to rejecting every closed intellectual system or that is presented as the correct and final theory or Truth of the world, and ending the era of sanctifying people and making gods. The devise of a specific method that is valid for every time and place is in itself an assault on the freedom of the human mind and a restraint on its potential for innovation and creativity.

Criticizing ideology in favor of Utopia is one of the axes of the permanent revolution, by implanting and consolidating the idea that everything is subject to analysis and that one has the right to question and doubt every idea. This means supporting, motivating and endorsing all forms of rebellion against the prevailing culture and directing radical criticism of the “constant principles of the nation” and religion in particular, including secular religion, i.e., ideas that have become constants and sanctities that their criticism is a cause of accusing others of being infidels whose heads are wanted. It is necessary for those who want to break this stagnation to break taboos and prohibitions in the present culture; even at the daily behavioral level, on top of which are the taboos of sex, religion, politics, laws and various interventions of the state and society in the individual’s freedom. Along with the deconstruction of identity discourse: nationalism, class, religion and ethnicity.

Revolutions can break out without a well-defined theory. It is enough to have revolutionary tendencies in society, writers calling for overcoming the status quo, progressive intellectual and political calls and above all practical initiatives, albeit small ones. Self-conscious masses, having goals that they do not give up can change reality and even force theorists to adopt their goals and change their ideas. People's aspirations are the decisive element in the

revolution's Utopia. Hence, an organic link between theory and praxis becomes actual.

This Utopia because it calls for dismantling the systems and powers of oppression, must be critical, so its advocates must confront ideology, including the sanctities of the ruling classes and the state:

- Trotsky made a wonderful remark which is quite realistic: *“Social reaction in all forms is constrained to mask its real aims. The sharper the transition from revolution to reaction; the more the reaction is dependent upon the traditions of revolution, that is, the greater its fear of the masses - the more is it forced to resort to mendacity and frame-up in the struggle against the representatives of the revolution.”*⁽⁵⁹³⁾ This requires the necessary effort to deconstruct slogans and concepts that give contrary impressions to their purposes. These include using the governments of human rights slogans for the purpose of dominating other countries, using democratic slogans by repressive regimes and the use of patriotic and nationalist slogans to justify the privileges of statesmen and the privileged class.

- Criticizing the sanctities, theological and secular, and resisting the phenomenon of the cult of personality in political, sports and intellectual realms. This involves exposing the social and utilitarian basis of these phenomena that favor forces of oppression and exploitation.

- Criticism of ideas that portray history as the creation of an individual or call for the sanctification of a leader, depicting them as heroes who shape events, plays a dangerous role in numbing the minds of the masses. These ideas are anti-revolutionary as they may lead the public to passively wait for a strong hero to bring about desired change. Waiting for a savior hero such as the Mahdi can breed complacency, leading to the belief that history will only change when such a figure emerges.

⁽⁵⁹³⁾ Leon Trotsky, *Their Morals and Ours*.

- Criticism of comprehensive theories, reformist calls and utopias (in the ordinary sense) that claim to present the ultimate Truth while encouraging critical thinking and setting an example in that direction.

- Developing and controlling the use of language is crucial. Inaccurate use of words and grammatical structures can lead to misunderstandings, difficulties in dialogue and incorrect judgments. Discrepancies between spoken and written language can hinder language learning and should be carefully considered. Additionally, the multiplicity of meanings for the same word and the variety of words indicating the same meaning can create confusion.

In many languages, there are complex grammatical rules with numerous exceptions, similar pronunciations for different words with distinct meanings and letters that are pronounced differently in various contexts.⁽⁵⁹⁴⁾ One notable example of language imprecision is found in medical terminology. Terms such as "arrhythmia" and "myocardial infarction" are often used inaccurately, leading to misunderstandings in medical communication.

In public discourse, societal relationships are sometimes described as independent entities, such as "national ties" being referred to as "the nation." This can create misconceptions about the nature of these relationships. Similar issues can be found in various fields of knowledge, including philosophy. Using words with multiple meanings, expressing personal ideas without clarification, excessive abstraction, lengthy explanations, digressions and ambiguous styles can all contribute to misunderstandings and hinder effective communication. This can deepen divisions between different groups of people and create barriers between the public and fields such as science, thought and culture.

In conclusion, language that is not conducive to effective communication can be detrimental and unnecessary.

⁽⁵⁹⁴⁾ De Saussure mentioned many of these problems in some detail in his book: *cours de linguistique generale* (Arabic translation).

- Resisting taboos and prohibitions in scientific research, particularly in genetic engineering and gene therapy, is important. Pressure should be exerted to ensure that research in these areas serves humanitarian goals and is not monopolized by capitalist institutions or the state.

- Criticism of the so-called social sciences and their role in misleading people and subjecting them to repressive authorities.

- Developing social studies that critique existing realities rather than merely studying them.

- Eradicating illiteracy, promoting non-governmental education, resisting reactionary educational curricula and giving parents control over school curricula.

- Breaking the monopoly of knowledge by promoting various sciences and encouraging independent scientific research.

- Artistic and literary criticism is crucial to encourage free self-expression and expose attempts to manipulate art for propaganda purposes.

- Promoting independent and professional scientific research while discouraging the development of weapons.

- Exposing and scandalizing the parasitic role of the state; its origin and its dark history, and transforming its image from the sacred to the anti-sacred (the impure sacred), which is its actual nature.

- Criticism and rebellion against traditions and customs that are not necessary for people's lives, such as religious ceremonies, female mutilation, etc., plus traditions that have lost their relevance due to changing circumstances, such as the custom of paying a dowry for marriage.

- Exposing and criticizing the ideological role of civil society institutions that appear neutral, and revealing the state's methods of controlling people's consciousness. This includes hierarchical systems, stereotyping and subjecting individuals to authoritarian

societal standards. It is possible to create alternatives to civil society institutions, such as education and health institutions not based on hierarchy.

- Social networking sites and Internet platforms provide a non-authoritarian alternative to official media. This means has proven successful in coordinating revolutionary forces and mutual service groups, disseminating accurate information, exchanging ideas and opinions and practicing direct democracy.

The general goals of the revolution: dismantling the system and its apparatuses everywhere worldwide:

- The tools used by the dominant classes in class struggle are the state, ideological institutions and private property. The state plays a crucial role in capital accumulation and private wealth, supporting monopolies, opening foreign markets, fostering corruption and collaborating with crime and ideological apparatuses. Resistance is necessary to dismantle these structures, starting with the state as the primary evil. This resistance requires counter-institutions established through popular initiatives.

- It is important to recognize that the state has become the vanguard of the dominant class in multiple ways. Firstly, the bureaucracy and deep state have their own economic and political interests. Secondly, the modern state fulfills the roles mentioned above. Thirdly, the state plays a significant role in shaping and promoting prevailing ideologies. Fourthly, the socio-political struggle primarily involves workers, the marginalized, and the poor against the state. The state is not just a tool of repression for the dominant class but also the planner and enforcer of the social system. The capitalist class in even the largest capitalist countries cannot sustain the class struggle for long without state support. In the most underdeveloped countries, the state's role has always been prominent.

- The participating forces in the revolutions have disparate goals and their strategies may be contradictory. More important, their traditional goal is to seize state power. Hence they aspire to begin

building a political system, including new ruling institutions, under the control of an elite group of professionals in governance and control.

This marks the beginning of the counter-revolution within the revolution itself. Each revolutionary party tends to halt the process of change within the limits that align with its aspirations. Consequently, they try to exclude, suppress, or eliminate other forces, leading them to restrict the aspirations of the masses within their own boundaries. In contrast, the concept of permanent revolution does not aim to seize state power but rather seeks freedom, welfare and endless development. To achieve these goals, it is essential to prevent the establishment of any stable system, dismantle existing systems and create a state of social-political fluidity that allows for the free development of society.

The permanent revolution focuses on dismantling repressive powers rather than seizing them for its own benefit. This involves weakening the state, dismantling its institutions, depriving it of authority over society and various social powers, and ultimately abolishing it entirely. Additionally, it works to eliminate class and sectarian domination, bringing down revered figures such as leaders, thinkers, scholars, artists and athletes, and removing barriers that hinder creativity, excellence and talent display. This approach ensures that the revolution remains ongoing and transformative. The concept of permanent revolution encompasses all revolutionary actions against existing conditions based on the specific circumstances of each social reality. Working against statist systems, even in collaboration with the bourgeoisie, is seen as a step towards development and liberation. Similarly, opposing financial and monopolistic capitalism is crucial. Embracing bourgeois revolutions in regions such as the Persian-Arab Gulf is considered progress, and representative democracy, despite its formalities, is preferable to military regimes. Direct democracy is a positive step when the masses are more advanced. Dismantling statist structures in most countries can lead to freedom if replaced by popular

initiatives. Supporting the establishment of state regimes in underdeveloped societies may also aid in their progress. There is no one-size-fits-all solution for global liberation; instead, it requires a multifaceted struggle.

These diverse approaches, though seemingly contradictory, stem from the varying conditions in different regions worldwide. As a result, the paths of the revolutionary process differ despite sharing common overarching strategies.

- By and large, these obstacles should be confronted:

1. The state apparatus - a government without a state: The goal of seizing or destroying the state ended in history -if achieved- with the restoration and development of the state or with the re-establishment of another state. It has also become very difficult for a revolutionary movement to seize the state apparatus, which has become heavily armed and has weapons of mass destruction, along with hidden control institutions that are ramified everywhere. The easier action and the most practical and most realistic of public freedoms is the struggle to dismantle this apparatus, at least gradually. It goes without saying that dismantling the state apparatus or every repressive power cannot be completed at a local level except in highly developed countries, where it is possible to form institutions of security, justice and popular armies not condescended over society, since other countries will not stand by and watch the “experiment,” but will initiate the attack. This requires, firstly: the efforts of the revolutionary forces to work on a global level. Secondly: limiting the slogans of dismantling the state and the rest of the repressive institutions to what is possible in this or that country at this or that moment. Thirdly: gradually forming popular apparatuses from below, step by step, taking over the functions of the state (this is not a unique thing; Islamic groups achieved this successfully in Egypt for a long time).

So that the revolution is not just demagogic slogans and an unattainable dream, the following objectives can be placed:

*** Struggling to achieve democratic reforms and imposing council (soviet), direct and delegate model of democracy, as the highest form of democracy known so far, in contrast to the illusory representative democracy.**

*** Working to overthrow tyrannical regimes and monarchies and establish delegated parliamentary governments.**

*** Pressing to reduce military expenditures and disarmament of weapons of mass destruction on a global scale.**

*** Pressing to replace the professional army with a system of temporary conscription in both the army and the security services at all levels, with the exception of using professional personnel as trainers only. This may be astonishing, but with the development of technology and modern weapons, military training has become easier and requires a shorter time; therefore, highly educated recruits can easily be trained at a high level, making the standing army dispensable.**

*** Struggle to abolish the professional judiciary and replace it with a popular judiciary (such as the jury system), while preserving professional judges in an advisory position, who can be dispensed with in the future.**

*** Resisting state interference in the economy, especially the right to own property and the practice of investment and trade. This includes pressing for the privatization of all state property either by sale or by handing over to the workers.**

*** Dismantling the “deep state” elements, which are pervasive in the administrative and technical bodies of the state, by generalizing the e-government system and making senior officials mere delegates from municipalities or local councils. Moreover, dismantling organized gangs and liquidating professional criminals who are among the components of the deep state.**

*** Finally, dissolving the state completely, as an essential step on the road to freedom. Of course, there will still be an army and**

security of conscripts and a popular judiciary. In the end the administrative apparatus will be subjugated to the people's councils and with complete globalization it will be possible for the state to disappear completely. Hence, the state as an apparatus superimposed upon society will end and the delegated parliamentary government becomes the general coordinator of the community. Therefore, there will be a government without a state.

* Transforming education into community supervision; by making schools and universities non-profit, under the supervision of students, parents or their delegates.

All these goals certainly encounter rejection and resistance of the state and the ruling class. Even repression will be practiced against those who call for or strive to achieve them. This requires open and decisive confrontations, major uprisings and clashes, ousting of the existing governments, imposition of the authority of the people's councils and the rest of the aforementioned goals.

In this plan, there is no party that strives to seize power, but rather a broad popular movement that establishes a delegated government formed from the bottom up; exactly opposite to the Marxist plan.

2. Sanctities and their institutions, whether theological or secular: their confrontation requires an ideological struggle against theology and racist and national theories, along with a political struggle to force the state to discard support for religious institutions and to impose complete secularization, while working to dismantle the state apparatus itself.

3. Capitalist monopolies must be liquidated, on top of which is the state's economic sector, plus abolishing regulations that hinder individual and cooperative investment, as well as dissolving international cartels, trusts, and capitalist economic organizations. This becomes easier after dismantling the state. The alternative economy is clearly a free-market economy. It is not possible in practice to implement another system except by force, that is, by a

repressive power, so the world's tragedy is repeated as it has been witnessed.

The era of state socialism is over, just as capitalism in its current composition and structure (not as a system) has rotted. Let individual cooperative and capitalist projects be formed, and let whoever wants to work for himself or for others, according to his will. When the capitalist system disappears and with the liberation of people from the state and all apparatuses of repression, there will be another system created by the people autonomously; consistent with their cultures and with the level of the available productive forces.

4. Parasitic activities and institutions in general, such as religious institutions, parasitic economy, fictitious capital, and most trading, are to be abolished. Besides taxing the profits of the stock exchange and regulating its trading, limiting advertising, liquidating the narcotic drug sector, and abolishing inheritance.

5. Ideology (see chapter 7).

6. Official marriage implies restraints on individual freedom. The official family creates jealousy and greed, inheriting the children high or poor status and position. So, the resulting social differences are destructive to the psyche of the young. Therefore, relations between women and men should become open and free, with formal marriage abolished. Children must also become under the responsibility of society, especially their material needs, so they are brought up within a free family (without official marriage), but under the guidance of education specialists.

The question of revolutionary organization:

- There is no precedent for an organization adopting the permanent revolution.

- The organization is a model of the next system, as it establishes a system like itself. Historical events repeatedly demonstrated the

validity of this statement. The party based on repression of its members and domination of its leadership becomes an arrogant authority after it seizes power. These parties often played a counter-revolutionary role when the masses exceeded their ambitions. One of the clearest examples is the position of the Bolshevik Party in Russia after the October Revolution of 1917 and the positions of left-wing organizations on the famous 1968 uprising in France. There was also a lesson in the Iranian revolution that ended with the rule of the mullahs. In fact, professional organizations and trade unions tend in the end to side with the counter-revolution, and all the events of the world over the past century indicated this. There are hundreds of examples of trade unions and workers' parties betraying the people. Therefore, there is a wisdom that the revolution devours its own children. Usually and in virtually all cases, the most revolutionary elements and the most faithful to the declared principles disappear from the scene during great transformations in history.

An authoritarian and hierarchical organization that relies on professionals and the representative democracy or the dictatorship of its leaders tends to control its members and kill their spirit of rebellion. Since special interests of the organization as an institution are formed with time, in addition to the interests of the leaders and chiefs in preserving their domination over the members and directing the organization in favor of continuing their authority. No one gives up his status unless obligated (an important example is the refusal of the cadres of the Russian Bolshevik Party, who were all intellectuals, until 1905, for workers to join the party committees despite the pressure of Lenin, who failed to pass his opinion⁽⁵⁹⁵⁾). The party that forms and distinguishes itself from its masses represents only itself and its active force. Therefore, it would be normal for such an organization to use compromises and alignment and resort to negotiations with various political forces to protect its

⁽⁵⁹⁵⁾ John Molyneux, *Marxism and the Party*, p. 45 (Arabic translation).

continuity and cohesion. This is a seed of a counter revolution from the beginning. The only guarantee that any organization will not become bureaucratic or calcified is that the leadership should be formed by mere delegated model of representation; a system in which the delegated can be withdrawn at any time by the ranks. In addition; to be always temporary, devoid of power and its decisions are what assigned by the members. These conditions prevent the emergence of charismatic leaders and sacred personalities. In the current era, it has become easy to achieve this democracy thanks to the ease of means of communication, especially the Internet. The January 2011 uprising in Egypt provided a model for how the Internet can be used for discussion, agreement and planning.

The issue of organization has been raised in labor movements throughout its history. Moreover, it has been a subject of sharp conflict between Marxism and anarchism and even within each of them, as well, since their beginnings.

- The Communist Party, according to all Marxist currents, is distinguished from the working class in that it carries the revolutionary theory; the political consciousness of the working class. The communists *“have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.”* The founders of this idea are Marx and Engels, as mentioned before. In the Communist Manifesto the relationship of the Communist Party to the proletariat was summed up. *“In the first place, absolutely ruled out is the conspiratorial view of the role of the party as a small band of adventurers acting on behalf of, but apart from, the class. Also ruled out is the authoritarian view of the party handing down orders from above to be obeyed by the essentially passive masses and the purely propagandistic view of the sect merely preaching its doctrines until the rest of the world is won over, etc.”*⁽⁵⁹⁶⁾ The manifesto emphasized that communists defend the overall interests of the working class, both locally and globally. Contrariwise there are later references by Marx indicating his exaltation of the masses at the

⁽⁵⁹⁶⁾ John Molyneux, Op. cit., p. 13.

expense of the party: *“the function of a party was to lead and serve the proletariat in its battles and not to ‘set up any sectarian principles of their own by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement,’ ‘the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves,’ ‘Trade unions are the schools of socialism. It is in trade unions that workers educate themselves and become socialists because under their very eyes and every day the struggle with capital is taking place.’ ‘The political movement of the working class has as its ultimate object, of course, the conquest of political power for this class and this naturally requires a previous organization of the working class developed up to a certain point and arising from its economic struggles.’*⁽⁵⁹⁷⁾ But this is –unfortunately– what Engels criticized later (1890).⁽⁵⁹⁸⁾ Besides the spontaneous formation of the party, Marx did not object to the concept of a broad party which is steadily and smoothly expanding and organizing within ever wider sections of the proletariat, until at last it includes the overwhelming majority.⁽⁵⁹⁹⁾ However, in the end, it can be concluded that Marx did not clearly define the difference between the party and the class, which Lenin did later.

After Marx and Engels, new additions were made by Lenin. The most important of them will be mentioned.

Lenin rejected the idea of an expanded party in favor of a party based on a cadre of professional revolutionaries, claiming that the revolutionary theory can only be assimilated by highly educated elements; on whom the party should mainly rely. Since the workers’ conditions do not allow them to grasp the Marxian thought, the party relies on intellectuals of bourgeois origin, besides a workers’ vanguard that is more capable than the rest of the workers of understanding the scientific socialism. Thus, one encounters a class and a conscious party; the vanguard of this class leads the workers and conveying consciousness to them, while also learning from their

⁽⁵⁹⁷⁾ Ibid., pp. 18, 19, 21, 22.

⁽⁵⁹⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 22.

⁽⁵⁹⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 25.

spontaneity and initiatives.^{(600),(601)} This spontaneity was described by Lenin as “*consciousness in an embryonic form.*”

There is a postulate taken for granted in the Leninist theory: the masses are not politically conscious, unlike intellectuals and “conscious” leaders. Thus, mass spontaneity, despite its importance, needs the guidance of intellectual leaders, and class political consciousness can only be conveyed to workers from without. That is, from outside the economic struggle; from outside the sphere of relations between workers and employers; from outside the working class, particularly from bourgeois intellectuals. This eternal judgment assumes that the masses are always less conscious than the party members and less capable of understanding (they do not understand dialectics and historical materialism, as pointed out by Ernest Mandel!). Thus, Marx’s principle “*the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves*” has turned into its opposite. The most important role now belongs to the bourgeois intellectuals who carry the revolutionary anti-bourgeois theory. Therefore, manual work and mental work are separated, hierarchical formation is preserved within the revolutionary camp (class and party) and determining the interests and destiny of the working class also became the task of intellectuals. Finally, thought became independent of reality and not its product; the party “represents” the class without its will. It has the task of infiltrating its ranks and convincing them of its ideas and charting its “own” path.

Now the Party is the carrier of proletarian political consciousness, especially its solid core, and one becomes more revolutionary and more socialist as they approach that core. Based on this logic, the number of Marxist organizations that pretend to represent the workers multiplied; no matter how small their size

⁽⁶⁰⁰⁾ What is to be done? pp. 18-20.

⁽⁶⁰¹⁾ Ernest Mandel, *The Leninist Theory of Organization, Proletarian class struggle and proletarian class consciousness.*

and no matter how low their potential and political value because they all have the “correct” theory that should be conveyed to the proletariat from without. A crude example is that the Trotskyist Fourth International was formed from a very small number of meager organizations that had little connection with the workers, although they were supposed to represent the international working class.⁽⁶⁰²⁾

The non-Marxist parties, which consider themselves revolutionary, leftist and secularist, have also followed this path, leading to the phenomenon of their cleavage, weakness, dispersion and isolation from the masses. The majority of them are involved in supporting the existing reactionary regimes just to maintain their existence. This explains the power of spontaneous movements in relation to the elite organizations that exist in all countries. This was a clear phenomenon in the recent Arab uprisings, which were not subject to any “revolutionary” organization.

Later, Lenin changed his stance on spontaneity after the 1905 revolution in Russia: *“There is not the slightest doubt that the revolution will teach social-democratism to the masses of the workers in Russia,”*⁽⁶⁰³⁾ However, the composition of his party did not change much accordingly.

- The ultimate goal of revolutionary Marxist parties (other than the reformists) is to seize the state apparatus and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat (or of “its” party; no difference). It is imagined that once this goal is achieved, all human problems would end. To achieve this goal everything is sacrificed except the party; the torchbearer of the Truth.

⁽⁶⁰²⁾ Ernest Mandel described the situation quoting from Trotsky himself: described by Ernest Mandel, quoting Trotsky himself: *“His followers were few and the organizations they created with diligence were terribly lacking in material means and were shattered by divisions and defections that were due to their particular vulnerability and isolation from the working-class masses.”*Trotsky: A Study in the Dynamic of His Thought.

⁽⁶⁰³⁾ A quotation from John Molyneux, *Marxism and the party*, p. 44.

- The intellectual conflicts between various revolutionary socialists in relation to the party centered on the possibility of ensuring that there would be no deviation into the dictatorship of the party and the leader, which is exactly what happened. After socialist revolutions, the dictatorship of the proletariat was embodied in the dictatorship of the party; the bearer of consciousness, then the boss's dictatorship.

The discussions in the Marxist camp revolved around the role of workers' spontaneity, its reliability, leadership's role in the revolution, horizontal (anarchist) organization of the party versus the hierarchical organization and about democratic centralism; all of which cannot be covered in this book. The main debate about the revolutionary socialist party has revolved around the nature of the relationship between the elite and the masses; the production of revolutionary theory is the prerogative of intellectuals and there are few vanguard workers who are able to assimilate proletarian consciousness and thus the leadership.

One of the biggest opponents of Lenin's theory of organization was Rosa Luxemburg, who envisaged the revolution as a spontaneous, unplanned mass path, in which the intellectual accompanies the movement of the masses without being its guardian. She thought and observed that the spontaneous movement increases the need for organization.⁽⁶⁰⁴⁾ However, she did not deny the role of the party, calling it to play an important role without being the guardian of the working class, and to influence it primarily through ideas and slogans, not through organizational authority or practical initiatives. She also supported the Mensheviks' opinion on party membership, but believed that the main task of the party is political leadership, not issuing calls for action and the actual organization of this struggle. Meanwhile she criticized the centralism of the Bolshevik Party.

⁽⁶⁰⁴⁾ The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions, p. 26.

Gramsci also disagreed with Lenin's theory of the party as presented in his book: What Is to Be Done. He valued workers' spontaneity much more than Lenin and was more flexible regarding party membership, giving essential importance to popular elements and considering leadership the most important element.

-The Leninist theory of the revolutionary party is consistent with the interests of intellectuals, leaders and bosses. The goal is a revolution that completely eliminates class division, begins with the seizure of political power, then builds socialism. State socialism is led, of course, by the socialists, who know dialectics, materialism and economics; a day of resurrection that will fulfill the dreams of the oppressed.

The moderate and reformist Marxist currents took a different approach to the issue of organization, but what is being dealt with here is what concerns the revolution: the revolutionary organization.

- The problem of organization for anarchists: They are sensitive to the authority of leadership, hierarchical organization, and they have a feud against condescending authority in general. Therefore, anarchism in general rejects the theory of the Leninist party; the vanguard; contrariwise, they are calling for reliance on mass spontaneity. Its alternative to the vanguard party is the propaganda organization, which is completely rejected by Lenin's project and by all Marxists. Anarchism also rejects the principle of democratic centralism in particular, in favor of the principle of direct democracy. Finally, it rejects the project of the dictatorship of the proletariat in favor of "minarchism;" federal without administrative centralization, whose tasks are limited to achieving security, law enforcement, external representation and coordination between the various civil society institutions. Some anarchist schools seek to immediately abolish the state and replace it with a new form of social organization, such as communes.

Their point of view on this matter is summed up in the idea that the organization is a model of the future society, and that an authoritarian organization will establish a repressive power after the revolution.

Decisions are brought about in anarchist groups by all members, and each individual's contribution is voluntary; each member has the right to agree or disagree with any policy or action. Moreover, the ideas of each member are given the same weight and consideration. And no decision can be taken until each member, an individual or a group that may be affected by this decision has the opportunity to express their opinion on the subject matter of the decision.⁽⁶⁰⁵⁾

To carry out propaganda by revolutionary intellectuals without the emergence of authoritarian leaders, Bakunin put forward the idea of creating a “collective power,” which should exercise its influence among the masses, provided that it is invisible; secret (his thesis was referred to before).

This proposal would require highly altruistic intellectuals, which would hardly be found on a large scale. Even those who present themselves as a candle to light the way for others would expect, most of the time, that the people appreciate this.

It is a fearful thing if that secret elite becomes a conspiratorial association that runs the world.

The Revolutionary United Front:

Revolutions do not need a coherent revolutionary organization or revolutionary theory, but revolutionary masses before anything else. This revolutionism includes the desire of those masses to bring about a radical change in their conditions. So, they have to be ready -for instance- to trample on what is called the constants of the nation, national identity and fundamentals of religion, and be open to discussing anything and everything, including religion, deeply

⁽⁶⁰⁵⁾ Sameh Saeed Abboud, the Anarchist organization, why and how (Arabic).

rooted traditions and established customs, and ready to crush any person, any group, any social institution and any well-established laws. Revolutionism also includes the desire to gain freedom of every kind and to eliminate the current political authority.

In great revolutions, such as the Russian and the French, the actual leader was the revolutionary masses. In Russia, there were many parties, including the Bolshevik Party; Lenin's organization, which was incoherent, small and present in major cities but not throughout vast Russia (29 thousand members in February 1917). Additionally, it did not lead the great revolution that broke out in February 1917, but achieved its growth and cohesion after the uprising, the assumption of the Kerensky government and the formation of soviets by mass spontaneity. The masses were marching to the left of the party all the time. It is not an exaggeration to say that after the party seized power it played a role in curbing the Russian revolution. For instance, it dissolved the elected Constituent Assembly because it only got 24% of its membership, suppressed the revolutionary insurrection of the Kronstadt sailors, repressed the trade unions and Lenin accused the Left-Wing Communism of being an infantile disorder. In the end it launched a comprehensive and sharp counter-revolution led by Stalin, closing the public sphere and establishing a totalitarian system in favor of the new bureaucratic mafia.

The role of spontaneity: The masses can move on their initiative, forming their institutions and organizations and even motivating those who call themselves the revolutionary vanguard to grow and spread. It is enough to have propaganda and cultural groups, temporary labor fronts, scattered political organizations, etc. General strikes and massive popular uprisings have taken place in history without planning and without a direct role of a leading organization. Instead the organizations used to spread and have a real existence after the outbreak of the revolution or in its path. Famous examples are the French Revolution, the revolutions of 1905, February 1917 in Russia, the uprisings of 1919, 2011 in Egypt

and many others. However, those major uprisings broke out after certain accumulations, mutual propaganda and incitement among the masses, with a special role for the more cultured and revolutionary elements in propaganda and incitement. The Great French Revolution was preceded by a long struggle of philosophers and thinkers against the old thought. Political clubs spread, intellectuals practiced propaganda and incitement to the public, due to the severe economic crisis, the movement of the nobles against the king took place, then the rebellion of the third estate members of The Estates-General and thereafter the explosion occurred. Likewise, the February 1905 uprising took place in Russia after propaganda and incitement by socialists, populists and others, preceded by many small struggles, the production of literature and the dissemination of modern philosophies. Then there was planning for a demonstration before the Winter Palace. The Russians were puzzled about defining the motivator of the 1905 uprising. Trotsky, for example, went on to describe the matter by saying that *“to the question, who led the February revolution? We can then answer definitely enough: conscious and tempered workers educated for the most part by the party of Lenin.”*⁽⁶⁰⁶⁾ The 2011 uprising took place in Egypt after many years of struggles of the middle class, the marginalized and the workers. With a decision by some activists of demonstrating on National Police Day, the uprising exploded. It is meant here that mass spontaneity is not purely spontaneous, but involves some arrangement and many preparations that formulate the collective unconscious and make the masses ready to respond to a spark, which may be extremely small. In the spontaneous uprising, the collective unconscious turns into action, opening up horizons that were not there before and people release energies, creativity and hidden talents that could not be imagined. After the big explosion, revolutionary changes occur in people's consciousness, resulting from the transformation of the unconscious into the conscious (an Arabic wisdom says: the drunkenness went away and the idea

⁽⁶⁰⁶⁾ The History of the Russian Revolution, p. 110.

came), as the masses participating in the revolution become self-conscious to one extent or another. In fact the spontaneous uprising is a state of acute neurosis, followed by conscious operations to achieve gains, and its prospects are determined according to the quality and quantity of the preceding propaganda. Therefore, mass spontaneity is a product of the collective unconscious, not arising from a vacuum.

The cases of spontaneous uprisings that are not armed with revolutionary goals and ideas may succeed in reproducing a system almost similar to the one against which they revolted and perhaps worse. Hence, the composition and structure of the collective unconscious play a decisive role in the course of spontaneity. The public must know and understand reality and realize what it wants in order for the results to be in its favor. Therefore, revolutionary propaganda is an indispensable necessity for a revolutionary collective unconscious. Inciting and anger are never enough. In the contemporary world, social networking sites can provide mutual propaganda among millions of people.

Spontaneous uprisings have often failed, but this is only the visible and superficial side, as they leave indelible effects, paving the way for subsequent changes in social and economic systems and conditions. The slave rebellion in the Roman Empire, despite its defeat, contributed to undermining the Empire later, and the 1905 revolution in Russia failed, but it created the idea of the Soviets and served as a rehearsal for the 1917 revolution.

In conclusion, spontaneous uprisings stem from the collective unconscious, which accumulates the effects of propaganda from multiple sides. They also push for organizing due to the increasing need for it. Whether they succeed or fail, they leave indelible imprints on society as a whole. Spontaneous uprisings are primarily political actions, even if their slogans are limited to economic goals. In most cases, they put forward political slogans related to state power. Even limited spontaneous movements often have political motivations and goals, as seen in the two 1968 uprisings in Egypt.

The presence of a form of organization enhances the strength of mass movements, enabling them to achieve greater goals and reduce losses in socio-political struggles. It also provides an opportunity to exchange experiences and knowledge. Leaders of protest movements, strikes and various forms of struggle are necessary to define and standardize goals and methods of action. These leaders should emerge from the masses themselves, arising in the course of the struggle without becoming icons or forming bureaucratic apparatuses, constantly changing with the continuation of the struggle process and appointed only by the spontaneity of the masses.

The appropriate organization for the permanent revolution is a multi-level and multi-functional organization with delegated leadership from conscious masses aware of their goals. This organization should emerge from civil society, including delegates from various popular organizations such as parties, political clubs, trade unions, student unions and civil associations. It should be flexible, accepting and disposing of members, including temporary delegates, selecting delegated leadership and allowing any delegate to be withdrawn at any time. The organization should have a general program outlining the approaches of the permanent revolution in the foreseeable future, as well as a tactical program based on the circumstances of the place and time in which it operates, whether internationally or regionally. It should also set conditions for the regulations and rules of participating organizations, rejecting hierarchical structures. To ensure the revolutionary orientation of popular organizations, leaderships must be delegated, voluntary, changeable and disposable at any moment. The administrative apparatus should consist of volunteers, promoting non-authoritarian associations. This type of organization accommodates the diversity of revolutionary social forces, their fragmentation and socio-economic disparities. Any participating organization should have the right to withdraw at any time. The organization interacts with the groups it involves impacts, develops,

provides aid to some, coordinates between them and creates more, infiltrating fields where revolutionary foci are not formed spontaneously.

This organization represents a parallel society or a nucleus of a new society, free from authoritarianism, sacredness, or fictitious strategies. It is a broad, multi-level, open and interwoven organization, serving as a focus of resistance that is interconnected and expanding.

This front implies a flexible societal order; liquid democracy, equality among members and freedom of the individuals; a democracy that guarantees members' commitment to the decisions of the front because they are not orders, but decisions issued by commissioners.

It is not possible for the Revolutionary Front to form special interests or to bureaucratize and calcify, thanks to the flexibility of formation and affiliation, and thanks to its formation from the bottom up; from grassroots organizations that already exist.

The united front can also form temporary alliances with other political or social forces, to achieve specific common goals.

Therefore, this organization and leadership can direct the spontaneity of the masses with the participation of the same masses, so that spontaneity interacts with the organization.

This type of organization cannot succeed unless the masses become advanced in terms of culture, conscious of their reality and aspiring for a truly revolutionary change. Undoubtedly, there are individuals among the masses who are more capable of initiative and leadership and who are more knowledgeable about the social and political reality. The system of delegation -including the right of the masses to withdraw confidence from the delegate- guarantees that these people will not turn into a new repressive power, especially since the seizure of state apparatus is not within the project of the permanent revolution, but on the contrary, the goal is to dismantle it.

It is clear from the context of this approach that the revolutionary front is a product of the consciousness of the revolutionary classes and meanwhile a source of their consciousness. It does not convey consciousness to the masses, but the conscious masses create their revolutionary organization, then interact and exchange ideas with it. The class (in a non-Marxian sense) transforms from a class “in-itself” to a class “for-itself” in the collective unconscious and then in its members consciousness of being belonging to it and of their interests as a class. The revolutionary class delegating some of its members on a regular basis to formulate and coordinate its positions is nothing but an expression of its reaching a state of self-consciousness. Rather, the formation of a party by a few revolutionary intellectuals and appointing themselves leaders of the masses, whether the old or the new proletariat, is the seed of failure of the revolutionary process and its end at the limits of these leaders’ own aspirations. This proposition is not prohibitive but sets an essential condition for the success and continuity of the revolution; self-consciousness of the masses, even in their spontaneous movement. The purpose is to put points on the board, so that the vicious circle from revolution to failure ends.

This seemingly strange talk becomes realistic when it is recalled that the masses have repeatedly stood to the left of the revolutionary parties, as happened in the two largest revolutions; French and Russian.

Tactics of the permanent revolution:

Every path that achieves a step of the aspirations of the revolution is a justified path and there are no sanctities in this field. Starting from literacy of one person until participating in general disobedience or a stormy revolutionary uprising, through participation in the government or parliament, trade union work, human rights work, even cutting off roads, establishing a work front

that includes different groups or individual practice. In addition to engaging in a legitimate party, secret activity, infiltration of hostile organizations, infiltration of state apparatus, organized activity or random activity. In tandem with all forms of action without exception that can lead to achieving a step on the way of the permanent revolution: street activity, writing, working in institutions and artistic work, etc. Every site and every moment has its calculations. What is important is that the revolutionary forces avoid falling into the captivity of a professional organization or an inspiring heroic leader.

There is no justification for wasting effort in disagreeing over the details of the details, nor over fundamental “principles” other than the strategies of Freedom – Welfare - Development. It is necessary to work on dismantling the system's ideology, implanting revolutionary cultural memes that carry the spirit of rebellion and working to break the system in all its locations. Sharp and comprehensive revolutions take place suddenly, by chance and never fully achieve their goals. What is important is dismantling the system on all material and cultural levels, by implanting revolutionary foci in all of these levels, not as a prelude to a general explosion in the first place, although this is useful of course, but - more importantly- a change in depth.

This can be called Revolutionary Pragmatism.

Although major uprisings mostly occur spontaneously, they, as have already indicated, take place under the influence of previous work of propaganda and incitement. What is added now is that the type of propaganda and incitement; the memes that infiltrate the collective unconscious of the people determine the orientation of the slogans of the uprising. Therefore, propaganda organizations have to identify these memes so that they are in the direction of achieving the previously analyzed strategies of the permanent revolution.

Because people tend to imitate, setting examples of individual or group work can be a powerful motivator. This includes initiatives to establish cooperatives or civil associations independent of the state.

The general plan of the revolution can be summed up in dismantling the system, in favor of an alternative; that is: an everlasting operation of liberalizing society as a whole - removal of all obstacles to development - achievement of the welfare of the masses. The aim is not to establish a new system, but to resist any tendency towards establishing such thing, bearing in mind that the removal of the system will inevitably bring a new system. This requires working in both the substructure and the superstructure in a single symphony. This is completely different from the “revolutionary” parties’ tradition of setting a minimum program and a maximum program. That is because: firstly, the permanent revolution does not have an upper limit, and secondly, it is not consistent with the strategies of the revolution to work within the framework of the system, but against it all the time and everywhere. It is one plan, proceeding in the two social structures simultaneously.

1. Working from below to establish a popular authority and a popular economy: War of Positions:

The concept of the war of positions was discussed by Gramsci ⁽⁶⁰⁷⁾ (with references also found in Kautsky's writings). It involves the forces of the revolution infiltrating key sites in the state, civil society, civil administrations and other institutions that govern society, on which the government relies. They establish strongholds and centers under their control, shifting the balance of power in their favor, leading to the weakening and disintegration of the system.

This approach is an effective strategy to challenge the modern state, which has extended its influence into every aspect of society.

⁽⁶⁰⁷⁾ Prison notebooks, pp. 245-252 (Arabic translation).

In Egypt, a prominent example of activity in civil society was the Muslim Brotherhood. While they utilized this method to advance their own group's interests as a parallel sectarian society (such as collecting donations and using only a portion for the people while diverting the rest for their group's benefit, similar to the state's practices), they excelled in infiltrating various civil society institutions. The reference here pertains to the strategy of engagement, not necessarily endorsing its sectarian or reactionary nature.

In the case of the Revolutionary Front, the starting point is not the revolutionary organization infiltrating civil society. Instead, it stems from the spontaneity of the civil society movement and its resistance against the system. As the revolutionary forces grow and require coordination, they establish the Revolutionary Front to organize the revolutionary process. Therefore, the initiation of the war of positions is rooted in the spontaneous actions of civil society, followed by the organization and expansion of this struggle.

The following forms of working from below are a result of spontaneity (small groups and individuals) in conjunction with organization:

*** Establishing cooperatives and individual projects within capitalist society serves as one of the most effective mechanisms for breaking free from wage labor and capital, provided that popular pressure is exerted on the government to enact legislation that promotes cooperatives. Otherwise, operating in the informal economy is an alternative. There are numerous successful models worldwide.**

*** Formation of various economic and social forms beyond the influence of the state: banks for the poor - temporary or permanent consumer associations - interest-free banks (such as monthly financial associations; well known in Arabic societies) - cottage industries - private education in subjects such as languages or specific courses that are useful for work - independent vocational**

training centers - local newspapers - bulletins - clubs - organizing trips with cultural programs - popular sports teams - popular local theater teams - charities - charitable or cooperative medical services - banquet halls - teams of volunteers for cleaning - volunteer groups for repairing internal roads - civil rights struggle - struggle for the abolition of the death penalty and against torture - fighting to cancel poor people's debt to the government - mutual aid groups - groups to provide voluntary services, such as free care for the elderly and the disabled.

*** Women's liberation movements.**

*** Student movements for the development of education, as well as professionals.**

*** Trade union activity: independent unions albeit small or even secret ones, at the level of profession and neighborhoods, with withdrawal from unions that are subject to the government - improving working conditions - maintaining professionalism - resisting polluting activities or those that produce unhealthy or adulterated goods - resisting corruption - resisting monopolistic medicines and food companies - calling for a healthy diet.**

*** Working to expand cheap and free services, in the form of cooperative or voluntary activities.**

*** Struggling to reduce working hours to address unemployment at the expense of the rate of profit.**

*** Anti-monopoly action: by pressing governments to dismantle monopolies such as multinational corporations, cartels and trusts, and even boycotting companies that exploit consumers and workers the most. Cooperatives can offer cheaper and better alternatives with some effort.**

2. Working from above: against the political component of the system:

It is not possible to carry out a radical transmutation in society by working from below alone because a clash is inevitable with the

state, as it will not accept loosing its authority over society unless forced. So, action from above is unavoidable, or what Gramsci called the War of Maneuver. What is meant is attacking the state directly for the purpose of its dismantling. There are several possible forms of this type of struggle:

* **Expulsion of the state as much as possible from the institutions of civil society and boycotting authoritarian institutions as much as possible. This includes liberating civil associations from state domination, as well as cultural, political and educational organizations.**

* **Nonviolent resistance: known as passive resistance; resisting authorities without using violence, which is a problematic expression since resistance itself is a potential form of violence. It starts with the simplest forms of protest, such as a single individual's hunger strike, and builds up to comprehensive civil disobedience. Among its forms are campaigns to boycott specific institutions, companies, goods and services, strikes, boycotting recruitment when possible, refusal to pay taxes, sit-ins in squares and streets - peaceful demonstrations, etc.**

* **Partial revolutions; merely political: uprisings, rebellions, extracting the rights of the masses and partially destroying or weakening the state apparatus, leading to a greater role for the organized populace in running the country, at least liberating their organizations and associations from state control, forcing the regime to legislate cooperatives and reducing the size and role of repressive apparatuses, including the army.**

* **General strike (adopted by the anarchist plan of the revolution): it means abstaining from work. In most cases it is a spontaneous and unpredictable action preceded by propaganda and incitement. However, in some cases it was possible to organize a general strike; the latest example is the strike of the Sudanese in**

July 2019 at the invitation of popular organizations.⁽⁶⁰⁸⁾ The mass strike may be economically oriented (although it is a political action in itself), but it can also be political in terms of slogans and demands, such as the strike of the aforementioned Sudanese and the strike of the Russians in February 1905 and February 1917. It also contributed to the revolutions of Eastern Europe against socialist regimes.

* **Civil disobedience:** This means breaking the law in a planned way, peacefully or violently and non-cooperation with the state. Examples of breaking the law include refusal to pay taxes or fees, refraining from conscription, occupying facilities, cutting off roads, etc. It may be partial, regional, objecting to a specific incident or general at the country level and in various forms. In many cases it is associated with a strike.

* **Not resorting to armed struggle:** all socialist transformations - except for the Russian revolution- took place in this way (or through the Soviet army in Eastern Europe). The result was that society became a form of armed organization itself: an iron rule, a system based on class division and dominated by bureaucracy. This option can bring down the system, but it can only establish another system that does not achieve the people's aspirations for freedom and welfare. There is the Chinese example, which did not turn into a more or less developed country until after the liberalization of the economy and opening the market to Western capital.

* **Uprising:** including violent uprisings. One example is the French Revolution, which pushed the whole world forward even though it was set back by a counter-revolution, and the 1919 revolution in Egypt. Popular violence can be used to achieve popular goals, such as the seizure of vacant housing, for example.

⁽⁶⁰⁸⁾ Rosa Luxemburg was limiting the motive of civil disobedience to spontaneity :“*If; therefore, the Russian Revolution teaches us anything, it teaches above all that the mass strike is not artificially 'made,' not 'decided' at random, not 'propagated,' but that it is a historical phenomenon which, at a given moment, results from social conditions with historical inevitability.*” Op. cit., p. 10.

The same applies to the imposition of the authority of popular committees or councils as a substitute for the state's authority, in neighborhoods, factories, universities and schools. Additionally, the establishment of self-defense committees against security forces and their allies of professional criminals. Furthermore, attacking detention centers and prisons to free revolutionary detainees, and seizing security headquarters and state institutions if the balance of power is suitable.

The revolution is not a peaceful process in all circumstances. It may require the use of violence in moments of sharp or radical transformations. Besides, the counter-revolution almost always resorts to violence; therefore, the forces of the revolution have to respond in the same way.

No doubt that a comprehensive uprising in this way has become much more difficult than in the past, but still possible in small countries and in the Third World.

*** Terrorism as a means of revolution: it is doomed to fail before it begins. The state is militarily stronger than any armed organization, and it is inconceivable that an action done "on behalf of the people" can enable the people to rule. Even though, it may sometimes assist the main revolutionary activity.**

*** Legitimate political action in the parliament: Left-wing organizations have always disagreed on this matter. Accordingly, there are many revolutionary trends believing that access to power through elections is possible; therefore, they will change the system. Salvador Allende and his party took this course in Chile in 1970, and the result was a massive genocide of the communists. Indeed, the aim to transform society revolutionarily is an illegal action from the regime's point of view. Legitimate work cannot benefit the revolutionary movement unless employed in the framework and service of public revolutionary activity. This matter depends on the circumstances of each country. Legal action may merely provide legitimacy to the government and confer a democratic character on**

the regime, contributing to supporting the prevailing ideology. But when the revolutionary forces are able to employ this work in the service of their original plans, it can be useful. It is a clear fact that elections take place within the framework of a deceptive representative democracy. If the revolutionary forces are not able to explain this to the masses and convey a message that they only want to achieve certain gains from the elections, they will not benefit anything from them but will help the regime.

* Establishing customary justice as an alternative to judicial authority is entirely possible if the revolutionary forces can spread ideas and advocates effectively so that people agree to resort to customary justice. This judiciary should be chosen from the public, not assigned from above. The Egyptian state often resorts to this judiciary to resolve sectarian disputes. The customary justice of the revolution should first be formed as a popular court; secondly, it should not be affiliated with the state or any institution linked to the regime; thirdly, it should have the necessary power to enforce sentences, and finally, it should not pass judgments that it cannot implement.

3. Working at the global level - human globalization:

The permanent revolution on the distant horizon is international. Goals such as the dissolution of the state apparatus and disposal of racism and nationalism require action at the global level. Racial and religious conflicts cannot be bypassed as long as their basis remains in reality. Let the solution be in the global citizen, the right of general human belonging and the abolition of borders in the long run.

Capitalist globalization is being achieved (and faltered) in the form of free movement of goods and capital, without the free movement of people except within limits. In order for it to become comprehensive globalization, it must include the imposition of:

- Free movement of individuals, without visas, bans or prohibitions, similar to moving within the European Union.

- Freedom to work and reside in any country.
- Freedom of individuals to engage in love relationships, regardless of nationality, ethnicity, religion, etc.
- Freedom to form popular international organizations, similar to “Doctors Without Borders” organization, “Greenpeace,” etc., that already exist, in all possible fields, such as relief committees, strike support committees, human rights aid for detainees, media institutions, international unions and multinational parties, etc.
- Freedom of mutual exchange of experiences, information and technologies between individual and cooperative projects and even the establishment of trans-national cooperatives, if possible.
- International banks for the poor.
- An international revolutionary front, when the revolutionary movements mature and their coordination requires this front.

International alliances and the proliferation of transnational corporations make it necessary for people to establish counter-alliances. Moreover, if globalization continues to progress, working towards a return to the gold standard or the creation of a global currency becomes a plausible goal, rather than the American-led globalization currently underway (and facing obstacles). In the long run, the establishment of a global federation will be the ultimate outcome of this project, which is not impossible following the success of creating the European Union and unifying currency among its member countries. The United Nations already exists and could potentially evolve to replace existing nation-states as a delegated world government.

However, if necessary, national movements or sectarian rights (such as freedom of worship for persecuted sects) can be supported as long as it is in accordance with the strategies of the revolution.

To propel globalization, the peaceful settlement of disputes between states can be done, even by making “painful” concessions,

thus reducing armaments expenditures and replacing conflict with cooperation.

‘The permanent revolution is a choice, as it is not compatible with historical teleology or human natural inclinations, and the victory of its path is not a historical inevitability, nor certain. This is an advocacy for rebellion, freedom and self-realization. It is certain that the revolutionary forces in the beginning will be a minority, but they can grow over time and bring about continuous changes in their favor, influencing the collective unconscious and the attitudes of people in major moments of rebellion ‘

Sources and References:

English:

A. H. Maslow (1943), A Theory Of Human Motivation,

<https://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm>

Alain Touraine, Critique Of Modernity, translated by David Macey, Blackwell, Oxford UK&Cambridge, USA,

file:///C:/Users/adile/Downloads/pdfcoffee.com_alain-touraine-critique-of-modernity-pdf-free.pdf

Aleks Krotoski, Robin Dunbar: We Can Only Ever Have 150 Friends At Most,

https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2010/mar/14/my_bright_idea_robin_dunbar

Alexander Berkman, What Is Communist Anarchism?

https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/alexander_berkman_what_is_communist_anarchism

Antonio Gramsci, Selections From The Prison Notebooks, Gramsci Internet Archive,

<https://abahlali.org/files/gramsci.pdf>

Auguste Comte, The Positive Philosophy Of Auguste Comte, translated and condensed by: Harriet Martineau, Batoche Books, Kitchener, 2000,

<https://www.4shared.com/zip/YMe -QPgm/THE POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY.html>

Benedict De Spinoza, The Ethics,

<https://www.globalgrevebooks.com/ethics-spinoza-ebook.html>

Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics Of Anarchism And Syndicalism,
<https://www.4shared.com/office/PoFwNAAbda/Black FlameThe Revolutionary.html>

Brink Lindsey, The End Of The Working Class,

<https://www.the-american-interest.com/2017/08/30/end-working-class/>

Bruno Roelants-Gianluca Salvatori, The 2018 World Cooperative Monitor, Exploring The Cooperative Economy,

<https://svenskkooperation.se/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/wcm-2018.pdf>

Carl Davidson, Post-capitalist Society by Peter Drucker (Reviewed),

<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:8zW74TEmg7EJ:www.net4dem.org/cyrev/archive/issue2/articles/PostCapitalist/PostCapitalist.pdf+&cd=8&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=eg>

Carl Gustaf young, The Collected Works of C.G. JUNG, volume 9, part I, The Archetypes And The Collective Unconscious, Translated by R. F. C. Hull,

<https://ia800606.us.archive.org/11/items/collectedworksof92cgju/collectedworksof92cgju.pdf>

Cedomir Sagric and others, Social Marginalization And Health,

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/93e4/40a50742c7b9b0cb885ae62bb13ee85b1b5a.pdf>

Chelsea Gohd, July 11, 2018, Here's What Sophia, The First Robot Citizen, Thinks About Gender And Consciousness,

<https://www.livescience.com/63023-sophia-robot-citizen-talks-gender.html>

Chris Day, The Historical Failure Of Anarchism, Submitted by Juan Conatz on Dec, 29, 2010

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/chris-day-the-historical-failure-of-anarchism>

Cindy Milstein, Anarchism And Its Aspirations, The Institute For Anarchist Studies, Canada, 2010,

http://rebels-library.org/files/anarchism_and_its_aspirations_first_two_essays.pdf

Cogem Topic Report-CGM/120111 -01, Genetically Modified Animals: A Wanted And Unwanted Reality, Summary,

https://www.4shared.com/office/z5gr4Reiq/COGEM_topic_report_GM_animals.html

!

Committee On Genetically Engineered Crops, Past Experience And Future Prospects, Genetically Engineered Crops: Experiences And Prospects,

[https://www.4shared.com/office/VvsIbHLDee/Genetically Engineered Crops E.html](https://www.4shared.com/office/VvsIbHLDee/Genetically+Engineered+Crops+E.html)

Daniel Fleming, Guy Standing (2009), Work after Globalization. Building Occupational Citizenship (review),

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286637872_Guy_Standing_2009_Work_after_Globalization_Building_Occupational_Citizenship_Cheltenham_UK_and_Northampton_MA_USA_Edgar_Elgar_366_pp_Guy_Standing_2011_The_Precariat_The_New_Dangerous_Class_New_York_an/link/5694660e08ae425c6896411f/download

Daniel Guerin, Anarchism: From Theory To Practice, Retrieved On October 26, 2009 from www.geocities.com.,

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/daniel-guerin-anarchism-from-theory-to-practice>

Daniel Guérin, Libertarian Marxism?

<http://libcom.org/library/libertarian-marxism>

Daniel Guérin, Three Problems Of The Revolution, 1958,

<https://robertgraham.wordpress.com/2011/01/11/daniel-guerin-three-problems-of-the-revolution-1958/>

Darren Guccione, What Is The Dark Web? How To Access It And What You'll Find,

http://my.americanheart.org/professional/StatementsGuidelines/ByTopic/TopicsA-C/ACCAHA-Joint-Guidelines_UCM_321694_Article.jsp#.VI8lM3YrIyU

David Graeber, Fragments Of An Anarchist Anthropology,

<http://abahlali.org/files/Graeber.pdf>

Edward Said, Representations Of The Intellectual,

<https://www.kotobati.com/download/representations-of-the-intellectual-pdf>

Ekaterina Schulmann, The Future Of The State And The State Of The Future,

<https://www.eurozine.com/the-future-of-the-state-and-the-state-of-the-future/>

Emile Durkheim, Moral Education,

<https://archive.org/details/dli.ernet.234325>

Emile Durkheim, Suicide,

<https://ia804701.us.archive.org/26/items/DurkheimEmileSuicideAStudyInSociology2005/Durkheim%2C%20Emile%20-%20Suicide%20A%20Study%20in%20Sociology%202005.pdf>

Emile Durkheim, The Division Of Labor In Society, Translated by George Simpson, The Macmillan Company, Fourth Printing, September, 1960, Printed In The United States Of America,

<http://fs2.american.edu/dfagel/www/Class%20Readings/Durkheim/Division%20Of%20Labor%20Final%20Version.pdf>

Emile Durkheim, The Elementary Forms Of Religious Life, Translated and with introduction by: Faren Kields,

<http://home.ku.edu.tr/~mbaker/cshs503/durkheimreligiouslife.pdf>

Eric C. Martin, Science And Ideology,

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/sci-ideo/#H6>

Erich Fromm, Man For Himself,

https://archive.org/stream/in.ernet.dli.2015.28965/2015.28965.Man-For-Himself_djvu.txt

Erich Fromm, The Revolution Of Hope, Toward A Humanized Technology,

<https://www.scribd.com/document/369506840/Erich-Fromm-The-Revolution-of-Hope-Toward-a-Humanized-Technology-Harper-Row-1968>

Erich Fromm, The Sane Society.

Erich Fromm, To Have Or To Be,

<https://giuseppicapograssi.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/erich-fromm-to-have-or-to-be-1976.pdf>

Ernest Mandel, The Leninist Theory Of Organization,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/mandel/196x/leninism/index.htm>

Errico Malatesta, A Project Of Anarchist Organization,

http://www.nestormakhno.info/english/mal_rep1.htm

Executive Summary World Robotics 2018 Industrial Robots,

https://ifr.org/downloads/press2018/Executive_Summary_WR_2018_Industrial_Robots.pdf

F.A. Hayek, Intellectuals And Socialism,

https://mises.org/sites/default/files/Intellectuals%20and%20Socialism_4.pdf

Fair Labor association, Use Of Job Vouchers As Payment In Italy,

<https://www.fairlabor.org/report/use-job-vouchers-payment-italy>

Fairooz Mustafa Hamdi, The Impact Of Globalization In The Developing Countries,

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/97c3/996f95af3b6a0537b8048ccdd5c24bd224df.pdf>

Franz Oppenheimer, The State, Its History And Development Viewed Sociologically, Authorized Translation By John M. Gitterman,

https://mises-media.s3.amazonaws.com/The%20State%20Its%20History%20and%20Development%20Viewed%20Sociologically_2.pdf

Frederick Engels, Anti-Dühring,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1877/anti-duhring/>

Frederick Engels, Dialectics Of Nature,

[https://ia904704.us.archive.org/27/items/B-001-002-422/EngelsDialectics of Nature part.pdf](https://ia904704.us.archive.org/27/items/B-001-002-422/EngelsDialectics%20of%20Nature%20part.pdf)

Frederick Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach And The End Of Classical German Philosophy,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1886/ludwig-feuerbach/index.htm>

Frederick Engels, Socialism: Utopian And Scientific, Historical Materialism,

[https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Engels Socialism Utopian and Scientific.pdf](https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Engels%20Socialism%20Utopian%20and%20Scientific.pdf)

Frederick Engels, The Origin Of The Family, Private Property And The State,

https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/origin_family.pdf

Frederick Engels, The Principles Of Communism,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/11/guide.htm>

Frederick Engels, To Franz Mehring, London, July 14, 1893 (Abstract),

[http://www.markfoster.net/struc/engels to franz mehring.pdf](http://www.markfoster.net/struc/engels%20to%20franz%20mehring.pdf)

Gabriel Weimann, Going Darker? The Challenge Of Dark Net Terrorism,

<https://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/going-darker-the-challenge-dark-net-terrorism>

Genetically Engineered Animals - From Lab To Factory Farm,

<https://foe.org/resources/genetically-engineered-animals-lab-factory-farm/#:~:text=Genetically%20Engineered%20Animals%3A%20From%20Lab%20to%20Factory%20Farm,-Download&text=This%20report%2C%20provides%20a%20scientific,the%20environment%20and%20animal%20welfare.>

Georg Lukács, History & Class Consciousness, Translator: Rodney Livingstone, Merlin Press, 1967,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/>

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Encyclopaedia Of The Philosophical Sciences In Outline, translated by William Wallace, Oxford Univ Press ISBN 824512 2,

<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/sl/introduction.pdf>

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, The Phenomenology Of Mind, Translated by J. B. Baillie,

[http://www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Hegel%2CG.W.F/Hegel%2C G.W.F. - The Phenomenology Of Mind.pdf](http://www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Hegel%2CG.W.F/Hegel%2C%20G.W.F.-The%20Phenomenology%20Of%20Mind.pdf)

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, The Philosophy Of History, with prefaces by Charles Hegel and the translator, J. Sibree, M.A,

<https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/hegel/history.pdf>

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Lectures On The Philosophy Of Religion, translated from the second German edition, by the REV. E. B. Speirs, B.D. And J. Burdon Sanderson,

<https://ia800709.us.archive.org/2/items/lecturesonphilo03hegegoog/lecturesonphilo03hegegoog.pdf>

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Philosophy Of Right, translated by T. M. Knox, Oxford Univ Press, ISBN 0195002768,

https://www.4shared.com/office/x9B4ojfwgm/PHYLOSOPHY_OF_RIGHT.html

Gustave Le Bon, The Crowd: A Study Of The Popular Mind,

https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/125518/1414_LeBon.pdf

Guk Bae Kim And others, Three-Dimensional Printing: Basic Principles And Applications In Medicine And Radiology,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297605485_Three-Dimensional_Printing_Basic_Principles_and_Applications_in_Medicine_and_Radiology/download

Guy Standing, Defining The Precariat, A Class In The Making,

<https://www.eurozine.com/defining-the-precariat/>

Guy Standing, The Precariat, The New Dangerous Class,

[https://www.hse.ru/data/2013/01/28/1304836059/Standing.%20The_PrecariatThe_New_Dangerous_Class-Bloomsbury_USA\(2011\).pdf](https://www.hse.ru/data/2013/01/28/1304836059/Standing.%20The_PrecariatThe_New_Dangerous_Class-Bloomsbury_USA(2011).pdf)

G. V. Plekhanov, The Materialist Conception Of History,

http://www.newyouth.com/archives/classics/plekhanov/materialist_conception_of_history.html

György Csomós, Relationship Between Large Oil Companies And The Renewable Energy Sector,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270888316_Relationship_between_Large_Oil_Companies_and_the_Renewable_Energy_Sector

Hannah Ritchie And Max Roser, Substance Use. (web page is no longer available).

Harry W. Laidler Social -Economic Movements: An Historical And Comparative Survey Of Socialism,

https://www.4shared.com/office/x3fhMFHeee/Social-Economic_Movements.html

Herbert Marcuse, An Essay On Liberation,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/works/1969/essay-liberation.htm>

Herbert Marcuse, Reason & Revolution-Hegel And The Rise Of Social Theory, second edition, London-Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD -Broadway House: te-74 Crterr Lane, E.C.4,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/works/reason/reason-and-revolution.pdf>

Herbert Marcuse, The Foundation Of Historical Materialism, transcribed by Brian Reid, proofed and corrected by: Chris Clayton,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/works/historical-materialism/index.htm>

Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man: Studies In The Ideology Of Advanced Industrial Society, edition Of January 2013,

[https://files.libcom.org/files/Marcuse,%20H%20-%20One-Dimensional%20Man,%202nd%20edn.%20\(Routledge,%202002\).pdf](https://files.libcom.org/files/Marcuse,%20H%20-%20One-Dimensional%20Man,%202nd%20edn.%20(Routledge,%202002).pdf)

Ibrāhīm ibn Mūsā Abū Isḥāq Al-Shāuibī, The Reconciliation Of The Fundamentals Of Islamic Law,

<https://ia801204.us.archive.org/19/items/ReconciliationOfTheFundamentalsOfIslamicLawAlMuwafaqatFiUsulAlShariahVolume2/Reconciliation%20of%20the%20Fundamentals%20of%20Islamic%20Law%20-%20Al-%20Muwafaqat%20fi%20Usul%20al-Shariah%20-%20Volume%202.pdf>

Immanuel Kant, An Answer To The Question: What Is Enlightenment?

http://cnweb.cn.edu/kwheeler/documents/What_is_Enlightenment.pdf

Ingo Elbe, Habermas's Critique Of The Production Paradigm,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323950756_Habermas's_Critique_of_the_Production_Paradigm

Integrating Dark And Light, Big Pharma Is Making Us Sick,

<http://integratingdarkandlight.com/big-pharma-is-making-us-sick/>

Intellectuals And power: A Conversation Between Michel Foucault And Gilles Deleuze,

<https://libcom.org/article/intellectuals-and-power-conversation-between-michel-foucault-and-gilles-deleuze>

International Marxist Tendency, World Perspectives: 2018 - A year Of capitalist crisis,

<https://www.marxist.com/world-perspectives-2018-a-year-of-capitalist-crisis.htm>

J. V. Stalin, Dialectical And Historical Materialism,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1938/09.htm>

JAMES Q. WILSON, The Rise Of The Bureaucratic State,

<http://www.siu.edu/~dhostet/classes/501/assign/wilson.htm>

Jared Diamond, Why Is Sex Fun,

https://www.4shared.com/office/aEfsElzjgm/Why_is_Sex_Fun.html

Jean Jacques Rousseau, The Social Contract,

<https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/rousseau1762.pdf>

Jelena Helemäe, Notion Of Social Exclusion And its application To Studies Of Youth,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318685455_Notion_of_Social_Exclusion_and_its_application_to_studies_of_Youth

Jill Bamburg, Mondragon Through A Critical Lens, Ten Lessons From A Visit To The Basque Cooperative Confederation,

<https://medium.com/fifty-by-fifty/mondragon-through-a-critical-lens-b29de8c6049>

Jon D. Michaels, The American Deep State,

<http://ndlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/10-Michaels.pdf>

John Kay, Moving Beyond “Capitalism,”

<https://www.johnkay.com/2018/03/13/moving-beyond-capitalism/>

John T Jost, The End Of The End Of Ideology, Article In American Psychologist, November 2006,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6763300_The_End_of_the_End_of_Ideology

Jordan Inafuku, Katie Lampert, Brad Lawson, Shaun Stehly, Alex Vaccaro, Downloading Consciousness,

<https://cs.stanford.edu/people/eroberts/cs201/projects/2010-11/DownloadingConsciousness/tandr.html>

Jurgen Habermas, The Future Of Human Nature,

https://monoskop.org/images/3/36/Habermas_J%C3%BCrgen_The_Future_of_Human_Nature_2003.pdf

Jurgen Habermas, Three Normative Models Of Democracy,

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ec92/504aac4db909079a9038e2f0f4501d668393.pdf>

Karl Kautsky, Epitaph Of Lenin,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1924/01/lenin.htm>

Karl Kautsky, Exchange On Historical Materialism,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1896/histmat/index.htm>

Karl Kautsky, The Class Struggle,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1892/erfurt/>

Karl Kautsky, The Materialist Conception Of History, Abridged, Annotated. And introduced by John H. Kautsky, translated by Raymond Meyer with John H. Kautsky,

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zzWQwxcOvoXw4O0vfCWbPAmLka3zsiQx/view>

Karl Kautsky, The Struggle Of The Masses,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1912/02/struggle.htm>

Karl Korsch, Marxism And Philosophy,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/korsch/1923/marxism-philosophy.htm>

Karl Mannheim, Ideology And Utopia: An Introduction To The Sociology Of knowledge, translated from the German By Louis Wirth and Edward Shils,

https://www.academia.edu/31930284/Ideology_and_utopia_an_introduction_to_the_sociology_of_knowledge_by_Mannheim_Karl_1893_1947

Karl Marx, A Contribution To The Critique Of Political Economy,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/index.htm>

Karl Marx, Capital,

<https://www.4shared.com/zip/GYPgTkPUfi/CAPITAL.html>

Karl Marx, The Civil War In France,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1871/civil-war-france/index.htm>

Karl Marx, Class Struggle In France,

https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Class_Struggles_in_France.pdf

Karl Marx, Critique Of The Gotha Programme,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1875/gotha/>

Karl Marx, Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy Of Right,

https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Critique_of_Hegels_Philosophy_of_Right.pdf

Karl Marx, Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts Of 1844,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Economic-Philosophic-Manuscripts-1844.pdf>

Karl Marx, Marx-Zasulich Correspondence February/March 1881, Karl Marx: The Reply To Zasulich

<file:///D:/LIBRARY%20IV/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8%D8%A7%D8%AA%20%D8%A7%D8%B4%D8%AA%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%83%D9%8A%D8%A9%20%D9%88%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9/%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83%D8%B3%20%D9%88%D8%A3%D9%86%D8%AC%D9%84%D8%B2/Marx-Zasulich%20Correspondence%20February%20March%201881.html>

Karl Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire Of Louis Bonaparte,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/18th-Brumaire.pdf>

Karl Marx, The Fragment On Machines,

<http://thenewobjectivity.com/pdf/marx.pdf>

Karl Marx, The Poverty Of Philosophy,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/poverty-philosophy/index.htm>

Karl Marx, Theses On Feuerbach,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm>

Karl Marx & Frederick Engels, Letters Of Marx And Engels,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/index.htm>

Karl Marx & Frederick Engels, Manifesto Of The Communist Party,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>

Karl Marx & Frederick Engels, The German Ideology,

https://www.Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_The_German_Ideology.pdf

Kemal Ataman, Religion Of Humanity Revisited,

<https://dergipark.org.tr/download/article-file/143961>

Lisa Schlein, Global Unemployment Has Reached Lowest Level In A Decade,

<https://www.voanews.com/archive/global-unemployment-has-reached-lowest-level-decade>

Leon Trotsky, Results And Prospects,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1931/tpr/rp-index.htm>

Leon Trotsky, The History Of The Russian Revolution, Part I,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/trotsky/works/download/hrr-voll.pdf>

Leon Trotsky, Their Morals And Ours,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1938/morals/morals.htm>

Leonardo Abramovich, Hegel And Professor Krug's Pen: The Erfahrung as Principle Of The Logical Movement,

https://www.academia.edu/10397728/Hegel_and_Professor_Krug_s_Pen_2014_Draft

Lorenzo Kom'boa Ervin, Anarchist vs. Marxist-Leninist Thought On The Organization Of Society,

<https://libcom.org/article/anarchist-vs-marxist-leninist-thought-organization-society>

Louis Althusser, Ideology And Ideological State Apparatuses,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>

Louis Althusser, For Marx, translated by Ben Brewster, transcribed by Andy Blunden, First published In 1965 as Pour Marx by François Maspero, S.A., Paris. In English In 1969 by Allen Lane, The Penguin Press,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1965/index.htm>

Louis Althusser, Marxism as A Finite Theory, An Interview With Rossana Rossanda (1978),

<https://viewpointmag.com/2017/12/14/marxism-finite-theory-1978/>

Lucien van der Walt And Michael Schmidt, Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics Of Anarchism And Syndicalism,

<https://libcom.org/files/Lucien%20Van%20Der%20Walt%20and%20Michael%20Schmidt%20Black%20Flame%20vol%201.pdf>

Ludwig Feuerbach, The Essence Of Christianity, translated & Introduction By Zawar Hanfi, 1972, remainder translated by George Eliot, 1854, Transcribed: Andy Blunden,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/feuerbach/works/essence/>

Mao Tse -Tung, On New Democracy,

https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_26.htm

Marie Horrigan, The Red Army's Role In China's Economy,

https://www.upi.com/Business_News/2001/12/10/The-Red-Armys-role-in-Chinas-economy/94711008001473/

Mariel Rosriguez, The Social And Economic Impacts Of Clean Energy,

<https://www.bakerinstitute.org/media/files/files/a66d9950/IFRI-RodriguezCleanEnergyTech-2012-2-.pdf>

Mark Rowlands, Can Animals Be Moral?

<https://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199842001.001.0001/acprof-9780199842001>

Maureen Lyons, Kantianism And Emile Durkheim's Ethical Theory,

https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1018&context=socanth_honproj

Maurice Godelier, Infrastructures, Societies And History,

<https://www.scribd.com/document/285900782/Godelier-Infrastructures-Societies-and-History#>

Max Horkheimer, Critical Theory, selected essays,

<https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/critique1313/files/2019/09/Horkheimer-Traditional-and-Critical-Theory-2.pdf>

Max Horkheimer-Theodor W. Adorno, Dialectics Of Enlightenment - Philosophical Fragments, Edited by Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, translated by Edmund Jephcott, Stanford University Press, 2002,

https://monoskop.org/images/2/27/Horkheimer_Max_Adorno_Theodor_W_Dialectics_of_Enlightenment_Philosophical_Fragments.pdf

Max Weber, Politics As A Vocation,

<https://study.com/academy/lesson/max-webers-theory-of-the-modern-state-origin-analysis.html>

Michael W Whitehouse - Desley E Butters, Lest We Forget: The Darker Side Of The Hypocholesterolemic Statin Drugs,

http://www.phcogcommn.org/sites/default/files/PharmaComm_8_1_2.pdf

Mikhail Bakunin, Statism And Anarchy, Written: translated and edited by Sam Dolgoff In 1971,

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/michail-bakunin-statism-and-anarchy>

Mikhail Bakunin, Critique Of The Marxist Theory Of The State,

<https://www.Marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/1873/statism-anarchy.htm>

Mikhail Bakunin, Letter To Albert Richard,

<http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/michail-bakunin-letter-to-albert-richard>

Mikhail Bakunin, Letter To Sergey Nechayev,

<https://soversiva.wordpress.com/2011/12/30/bakunin-letter-to-sergey-nechayev/>

Michel Husson, The Debate On The Rate Of Profit,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/mc5aAnRWda/michel-husson-on-the-rate-of-p.html>

Mike Lofgren, Anatomy Of The Deep State,

<https://billmovers.com/2014/02/21/anatomy-of-the-deep-state/>

Mike Reid, The Myth Of Primitive Communism,

<https://fee.org/articles/the-myth-of-primitive-communism/>

Nael Shokry and others, Our Sexual Future With Robots,

<https://responsible-robotics-myxf6pn3xr.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/FRR-Consultation-Report-Our-Sexual-Future-with-robots-.pdf>

Nigel Warren 04 April 2014, Why Does Capitalism Go Into Crisis?

<https://www.marxist.com/why-does-capitalism-go-into-crisis.htm>

Oliver P. John-Richard W. Robins-Lawrence A. Pervin (Editors), Handbook Of Personality, Third Edition, The Guilford Press, new york, London, 2008,

<http://www.umpalangkaraya.ac.id/perpustakaan/digilib/files/disk1/10/123-oliverpjohn-464-1-handbook-h.pdf>

Online Trade Magazine-Industry 4.0,

<https://www.manufacturingtomorrow.com/article/2016/07/robots-in-manufacturing-applications/8333>

Parliamentary Assembly, Discrimination Against Women In The Workforce And The Workplace,

<http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/X2H-Xref-ViewHTML.asp?FileID=10877>

Paul Mason, Time For Post-capitalism, 1st July, 2019,

<https://www.socialeurope.eu/time-for-postcapitalism>

Paul Mason Postcapitalism, A Guide To Our Future,

<https://ia902804.us.archive.org/1/items/PostCapitalismAGuideToOurFuturePaulMason/PostCapitalism%20A%20Guide%20to%20Our%20Future%20-%20Paul%20Mason.pdf>

Paul Mattick, Council Communism,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/mattick-paul/1939/council-communism.htm>

Pavel Ciaian And other, Causes Of Social Marginalisation: The Role Of Social Mobility Barriers For Roma,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313038680_Causes_of_Social_Marginalisation_The_Role_of_Social_Mobility_Barriers_for_Roma

Pension Fund Assets In The OECD Area Decline In 2018, May, 2019,

<http://www.oecd.org/daf/fin/private-pensions/Pension-Funds-in-Figures-2019.pdf>

Peter Georgescu, Is Capitalism Still Relevant?

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/petergeorgescu/2018/05/02/is-capitalism-still-relevant/#687559bf699c>

Pëtr Kropotkin, Anarchism: Its Philosophy And Ideal, translated from the German by Harry Lyman Koopman. First published in San Francisco by Free Society, 1898,

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-anarchism-its-philosophy-and-ideal>

Pëtr Kropotkin, Anarchist Morality,

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-anarchist-morality>

Pëtr Kropotkin, Mutual Aid: A Factor Of Evolution,

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-mutual-aid-a-factor-of-evolution>

Pëtr Kropotkin, The Conquest Of Bread, edition of 1906,

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-the-conquest-of-bread>

Plato, The Republic,

<http://www.idph.net/conteudos/ebooks/republic.pdf>

Post Capitalist Society, By Peter F Drucker (review),

http://vedpuriswar.org/Book_Review/General/Post%20Capitalist%20Society.pdf

Post -Fordism, What is Post -Fordism?

http://www.yorku.ca/anderson/Intro%20Urban%20Studies/Unit2/post_fordism.htm

Randall Amster - Abraham DeLeon - Luis A. Fernandez - Anthony J. Nocella - Anthony Shannon, Contemporary Anarchist Studies,

https://libcom.org/files/Contemporary_Anarchist_Studies.pdf

Ricardo Antunes, The New Service Proletariat,

<https://monthlyreview.org/2018/04/01/the-new-service-proletariat/>

Richard Brodie, Virus Of The Mind, Hay House, 2009,

<https://media.evolveconsciousness.org/books/consciousness/Virus-of-the-Mind-The-New-Science-of-the-Meme-Richard-Brodie.pdf>

Richard Dawkins, The Selfish Gene, published In the United States by Oxford University Press Inc., New York second edition 1989,

https://www.4shared.com/office/gDMZ2P9Sda/the_selfish_gene.html

Richie Howitt, Marginalisation In Theory And Practice, edited by Richard Howitt

School Of Earth Sciences Macquarie University NSW 2109,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235222045_Marginalisation_in_Theory_and_Practice_a_brief_conceptual_introduction

Richard Pipes, Lenin's Gulag, Academic Research Journal, Vol. 2(6), pp. 140-146, June 2014,

https://www.4shared.com/office/ONFZKDIhea/Lenins_Gulag.html

R. I. M. Dunbar, The Origin Of Religion As A Small -Scale Phenomenon,

https://is.muni.cz/el/1421/jaro2017/RLA67/um/Dunbar_2013.pdf

Robert Plomin, Is Intelligence Hereditary?

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/is-intelligence-hereditary/>

Roger Kimball, Intellectuals And The Masses,

<https://www.firstthings.com/article/1994/06/the-intellectuals-and-the-masses>

Roma survey - Data In Focus - Poverty And Employment: The Situation Of Roma In 11 EU Member States,

https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-roma-survey-employment_en.pdf

Rosa Luxemburg, The Mass Strike, The Political Party And The Trade Unions,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/download/mass-str.pdf>

Rosa Luxemburg, Stagnation And Progress Of Marxism, Transcription/Markup: Dario Romeo And Brian Baggins,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1903/misc/stagnation.htm>

Rose Eveleth, Our Three-Dimensional Future: How 3D Printing Will Shape The Global Economy,

<https://www.zdnet.com/article/our-three-dimensional-future-how-3d-printing-will-shape-the-global-economy/>

Ross Speer, The Queen's College,

<https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:633500b3-0830-4ce5-8471-e68b87fd7d86/files/md1fc95e2e7e6a308c42e8863600010fa>

Ruy Braga, On Standing's A Precariat Charter: Confronting The Precarisation Of Labour In Brazil And Portugal,

<https://mulpress.mcmaster.ca/globallabour/article/view/2501/2597>

Ryan Browne, 70% Of People Globally Work Remotely At Least Once A Week, Study Says,

<https://www.cnbc.com/2018/05/30/70-percent-of-people-globally-work-remotely-at-least-once-a-week-iwg-study.html>

Sam Edwards, Terrorism Recruitment On The Dark web, 19 March 2019,

<http://www.youris.com/society/safety-and-security/terrorism-recruitment-on-the-dark-web.kl>

Sayyid Qutb, Milestone,

<https://ia902803.us.archive.org/3/items/milestones-syedqutb/milestones-fl.pdf>

Science And Ideology, Internet Encyclopedia Of Philosophy,

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/sci-ideo/>

Sigmund Freud, an Outline Of Psycho -Analysis,

<https://ia802907.us.archive.org/17/items/SigmundFreud/Sigmund%20Freud%20%5B1940%5D%20An%20Outline%20Of%20Psychoanalysis%20%28James%20Strachey%20Tranlation%201961%29.pdf>

Sigmund Freud, Group Psychology And The Analysis Of The Ego,

<https://www.amazon.com/Group-Psychology-Analysis-Norton-Library/dp/0393007707>

Sigmund Freud, On Narcissism, An Introduction,

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4573/39422536b54a4262a2e26bf0ca6fc4c3b7a9.pdf>

Sigmund Freud, The Ego And The ID., Chapter 1,

<https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~cavitch/pdf-library/Freud SE Ego Id complete.pdf>

Sigmund Freud, Thoughts For The Times On War And Death,

<https://www.panarchy.org/freud/war.1915.html>

Seymour Martin Lipset, Political Man: The Social Bases Of Politics,

https://archive.org/stream/politicalmansoci00inlips/politicalmansoci00inlips_djvu.txt

Silver H, Miller SM (2003). A Social Exclusion: The European Approach To Social Disadvantage,

<https://www.prrac.org/newsletters/sepoct2002.pdf>

Srija & Shrinivas V. Shirke, An Analysis Of The Informal Labour,

<http://www.ies.gov.in/pdfs/CII%20EM -october -2014.pdf>

Marshall Soules, Jürgen Habermas And The Public Sphere,

<https://www.media-studies.ca/articles/habermas.htm>

Stephen C. Smith-Jonathan Rothbaum, Cooperatives In A Global Economy: Key Economic Issues, Recent Trends And Potential For Development,

<http://ftp.iza.org/pp68.pdf>

Stephanie M. Noble, Martin Mende, Dhruv Grewal, A. Parasuraman, The Fifth Industrial Revolution: How Harmonious Human–Machine Collaboration is Triggering a Retail and Service [R]evolution,

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022435922000288>

Steve Kapfer, Multinational Corporations And The Erosion Of State Sovereignty,

<https://pol.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/conferences/2006/Kapfer2006.pdf>

Tamiru Berafe, Assessing The Causes And Effects Of Social Exclusion: The Case Of ‘Pot makers’ In Yem Special Woreda In Sothern Nation, Nationalities And Peoples Regional State In Ethiopia,

<https://academicjournals.org/journal/AJPSIR/article -full -text -pdf/9587EC463318>

Tanya Lewis, The Singularity Is Near: Mind Uploading By 2045,

<https://www.livescience.com/37499 -immortality -by -2045 -conference.html>

Taysha Murtaugh, 18 Works From Home Jobs That Bring In Cash, Jun 13, 2019,

<https://www.womansday.com/life/work -money/g934/best -work -at -home -jobs/>

The Economist, Daily chart, Apr 24th 2018, by The Data Team, A study Finds Nearly Half Of Jobs Are Vulnerable To Automation,

<https://www.economist.com/graphic -detail/2018/04/24/a -study -finds -nearly -half -of -jobs -are -vulnerable -to -automation>

The Intellectual According To Sartre,

<https://intellectualsandthedia.org/2018/12/05/the-intellectual-according-to-sartre/>

The Rise Of Robotics In Manufacturing,

<https://www.manufacturingglobal.com/technology/rise-robotics-manufacturing>

The Bureacracy: It is What You Know Not Who You Know,

http://www.scasd.org/cms/lib5/PA01000006/Centricity/Domain/1198/THE_BUREAUCRACY.doc

The Code Of Hammurabi,

<https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/hammurabi-the-code-of-hammurabi>

Theodor Adorno, Negative Dialectics, translated by E.B.Ashton, Taylor & Francis e - Library, 2004,

<https://rosswolfe.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/theodor-adorno-negative-dialectics.pdf>

The World Bank, End Poverty In All its Forms Everywhere,

<http://datatopics.worldbank.org/sdgatlas/archive/2017/SDG-01-no-poverty.html>

Three-Dimensional Printing: Basic Principles And Applications In Medicine And Radiology, Korean Journal Of Radiology 17(2):182, March 2016 with 3,708 Reads, DOI: 10.3348/kjr.2016.17.2.182,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297605485_Three-Dimensional_Printing_Basic_Principles_and_Applications_in_Medicine_and_Radiology

Tony Cliff, State Capitalism In Russia (1955/1974),

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/cliff/works/1955/statecap/index.htm>

Top 6 Robotic Applications In Medicine,

<https://www.asme.org/engineering-topics/articles/bioengineering/top-6-robotic-applications-in-medicine>

United Nations Development Programme, Mar 21, 2017, World's Most Marginalized Still Left Behind by Global Development Priorities: UNDP report,

<https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2017/03/21/world-s-most-marginalized-still-left-behind.html>

Uri Gordon, Anarchism And Political Theory: Contemporary Problems, University of Oxford. Submitted to the Department of Politics & International Relations, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2007,

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/uri-gordon-anarchism-and-political-theory-contemporary-problems>

Vladimir Lenin, The State And Revolution,

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/staterev/>

Vladimir Lenin, What is To Be Done?

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/download/what -itd.pdf>

Vladimir Lenin, Collected Works, Volume 38.

Vladimir Lenin, Materialism And Empirio-criticism - Critical Comments On A Reactionary Philosophy, translated by: Abraham Fineberg,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/mec/>

Vladimir Lenin, The Revolutionary Democratic Dictatorship Of The Proletariat And The Peasantry, April, 1905,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/apr/12b.htm>

Vladimir Lenin, Two Tactics Of Social Democracy In The Democratic Revolution,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/tactics/index.htm>

Vladimir Lenin, Better Fewer, But Better,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1923/mar/02.htm>

Vladimir Lenin, On The Significance Of Militant Materialism,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1922/mar/12.htm>

Vladimir Lenin, Six Theses On The Immediate Tasks Of The Soviet Government,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1918/apr/30.htm>

Vladimir Lenin, The Three Sources And Three Component Parts Of Marxism,

<https://www.Marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/mar/x01.htm>

W. Boyd Rayward, Information Revolutions, The Information Society And The Future Of The History Of Information Science,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265927855_Information_Revolutions_the_Information_Society_and_the_Future_of_the_History_of_Information_Science/download

What Are Toxic Assets? Definition And Meaning,

<https://marketbusinessnews.com/financial -glossary/toxic -assets/>

WHAT IS ITER?

<https://www.iter.org/proj/inafewlines>

William A. Pelz, A People's History Of Modern Europe, Published By Pluto Press. 2016,

https://web2.mlp.cz/koweb/00/04/37/95/78/a_peoples_history_of_modern_europe.pdf

William Godwin, An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice,

<https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/godwin -an -enquiry -concerning -political -justice -in -2 -vols>

World Health Organization, Depression,

<https://www.who.int/news -room/fact -sheets/detail/depression>

Yuval Noah Harari, Sapiens, A Brief History Of Humankind, English translation copyright © 2014 by Yuval Noah Harari,

https://archive.org/stream/HarariSapiensABriefHistoryOfHumankindRuLitMe456424/Harari_Sapiens-A-Brief-History-of-Humankind_RuLit_Me_456424_djvu.txt

8 types Of Globalization,

http://sugarloaf.nbed.nb.ca/sites/sugarloaf.nbed.nb.ca/files/doc//y2016/Feb/8_types_of_globalization.ppt

40 Best International Work From Home Jobs (Work from Anywhere In The World Online),

<https://moneypantry.com/international-work-from-home-jobs/>

Arabic references and the translated into Arabic:

A Debate Between Noam Chomsky And Michel Foucault About Human Nature, 1971,

<https://www.kutub-pdf.net/downloading/zg4dWH.html>

Abdallah Al-Arawi, The Concept Of Ideology,

<https://qira2at.com/2018/11/19/althusser-isa-2/>

Abdel Monem Agab El Fia, The Fiction Of The Death Of The Author,

<https://www.sudaress.com/sudanile/98383>

Abdel Monem Shiha, Reading In Nietzsche Genealogy Of Morality,

<https://www.mominoun.com/pdf1/2015-12/56604afe02d37566318343.pdf>

Abo El-Nour Hamdy Abo El-Nour Hassan, Jürgen Habermas - morality And communication,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AE%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%82-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D9%88%D8%A7%D8%B5%D9%84-%D9%84%D9%80-%D9%8A%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%AC%D9%8A%D9%86-%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%A8%D8%B1%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B3-pdf>

Abdurrahman Badawi, Methods Of Scientific Research,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D9%85%D9%86%D8%A7%D9%87%D8%AC-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A8%D8%AD%D8%AB-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%85%D9%8A-pdf>

Abdurrahman Badawi, Nietzsche,

https://www.4shared.com/office/x_vOaeLgda/.html

Abraham Leon, The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation,

<https://revsoc.me/our-marxisms/30674/>

Adel El-Emary, Nasserism In The Counter-Revolution,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/files/3925.pdf>

Adel El-Emary – Sherif younis, Beyond Soviet Bureaucracy,

https://modernization-adil.blogspot.com/2010/11/blog-post_6161.html

Adel El-Emary – Sherif Younis, Lenin’s Approach To Imperialism – A Critical Analysis,

<http://www.ssrcaw.org/ar/print.art.asp?aid=321&ac=2>

Adel El-Emary – Sherif younis, Logical Formation Of The Notion Of Mode Of Production,

<https://modernization-adil.blogspot.com/2009/04/blog-post.html>

A group of anarchist writers, Anarchism, The Revolution And Human,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D9%86%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AB%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D9%86%D8%B3%D8%A7%D9%86-%D9%84%D9%80-%D8%B3%D9%8A%D9%86%D8%AF%D9%8A-%D9%85%D9%8A%D9%84%D8%B3%D8%AA%D9%8A%D9%86-%D9%88%D8%AF%D9%8A%D9%81%D9%8A%D8%AF-%D8%AC%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%A8%D8%B1-pdf>

Ahmad Abdel Haleem Attia, Introduction To his translation Of: Feurcach, Origin Of Religion,

<https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D9%85%D8%A7-%D8%A8%D8%B9%D8%AF-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AB%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D9%81%D9%83%D9%8A%D9%83-pdf>

Ahmad Anwar, Social Theory And Ideology, first edition, Cairo, 2006.

Ahmad El Saady, Morals In Humans,

<http://reAl-ciencias.com/%D9%82%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A1%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A8-%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%A9%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AE%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%82-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%B9%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D9%8A%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%86/>

Ahmad Essayed El-Kordi, Multinational Corporations, 2011,

<http://ayadina.kenanaonline.com/files/0032/32860/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D8%AD%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%AA%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D9%86%D8%A7%D9%81%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9%20%D9%84%D9%84%D8%B4%D8%B1%D9%83%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D9%86%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%A9%D8%B1%D8%A9%D8%A8%D8%B1-pdf>

[8%AA%20%D9%85%D8%AA%D8%B9%D8%AF%D8%AF%D8%A9%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D9%86%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%AA.doc](#)

Ahmad Ramadan, The intellectual Between Gramsci And Foucault,

[https://elmahatta.com/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AB%D9%82%D9%81-%D8%A8%D9%8A%D9%86-%D8%BA%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%85%D8%B4%D9%8A%D9%81%D9%88%D9%83%D9%88/](#)

Ahmad Sadeq Saad, Our Need For A New Socialist Strategy,

[https://modernization-adil.blogspot.com/2008/12/blog-post_9762.html](#)

Ahmad Shalaby. The Great Indian Religions,

[https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%A3%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%86-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%87%D9%86%D8%AF-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%83%D8%A8%D8%B1%D9%89-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%87%D9%86%D8%AF%D9%88%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D9%8A%D9%86%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A8%D9%88%D8%B0%D9%8A%D8%A9-pdf](#)

Alan Turing, Critique De La Modernité,

[https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D9%86%D9%82%D8%AF-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AB%D8%A9-pdf](#)

Almadaen.com.sa, 8 October 2018,

Amer Hasan And Emad Ahmad, The Future Of Ideology And Utopia In The Modern Western Social Thought,

[https://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=25565](#)

Annabaa Network, The Population Of The World's Shantytowns Will Be 1.4 Billion In 2020,

[https://mail.annabaa.org/nbanews/57/359.htm](#)

Ali Asaad Watfa, The Critical Intellectual As A Concept And Significance,

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349102935_almthqf_alngdy_mfhwma_wdlalt/link/601ff47d92851c4ed55776b2/download?tp=evJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIn19](#)

Ali Harb, Elite Illusions Or Intellectual Criticism,

[https://www.tahmil-kutubpdf.net/download/MD98VJ.html](#)

Ali Mahmoud Al-Mouhammadawi (editor), Western Marxism And Beyond,

[https://ia800606.us.archive.org/12/items/67597/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%BA%D8%B1%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%A9%20%D9%88%D9%85%D8%A7%20%D8%A8](#)

[%D8%B9%D8%AF%D9%87%D8%A7%20%D9%85%D8%AC%D9%85%D9%88%D8%B9%D8%A9%20%D9%85%D8%A4%D9%84%D9%81%D9%8A%D9%86.pdf](#)

Almamnews, \$167 Trillion Global Financial Asset Volume

[https://almalnews.com/167%E2%80%AE](#) -
[%E2%80%AC%D8%AA%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%84%D9%8A%D9%88%D9%86](#)
[6](#) -
[-%D8%AF%D9%88%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%B1%E2%80%AE](#) -
[%E2%80%AC%D8%AD%D8%AC%D9%85](#) -
[%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B5%D9%88%D9%84](#) -
[%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7/](#)

Al-Ra'i (Egyptian writer and academic), Transformations Of A Secularist Philosopher - An Interview With The Pope,

[https://www.4shared.com/office/vueKxLXiq/_____ .html](#)

Antonio Gramsci, Prison Notebooks,

[https://www.4shared.com/office/13bDFp12iq/_____ online.html](#)

Antonio Gramsci, The Revolution Against "Capital,"

[https://www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/1917/12/revolution-against-capital.htm#:~:text=The%20Bolshevik%20revolution%20is%20based,more%20than%20of%20the%20proletariat.](#)

Arig Hammad, A Very Short Introduction On The Contemporary Global Economy, What Capitalism Needs To Survive,

[https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:loqKxyuI8qUJ:https://www.sasapost.com/capitalism -need -survive/+&cd=5&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=eg](#)

Alfred Adler, Human Nature, first edition, Cairo, 2005

[https://www.tahmil -kutubpdf.net/download/L8DC35.html](#)

Ashraf Hassan Mansour, The Theory Of Habermas In The Public Sphere,

[https://www.academia.edu/35833455/%D9%86%D8%B8%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%A9 %D9%87%D8%A7%D8%A8%D8%B1%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B3 %D9%81%D9%8A %D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AC%D8%A7%D9%84 %D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%A7%D9%85.pdf](#)

Badr Eddin Moustafa, Paths Of Postmodernism,

[https://www.hindawi.org/books/24142969/](#)

Bin Dawoodia Wahiba, E-Commerce As A Tool For Competition In Global Markets- Case Study Of Arab Countries,

[http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=647216](#)

Borhan Ghalion, The Revolution Of The Marginalized,

[https://www.aljazeera.net/knowledgegate/opinions/2005/11/27/%D8%AB%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A9](#) -
[%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D9%87%D9%85%D8%B4%D9%8A%D9%86](#)

Brief history Of Psychology, unknown writer,

https://www.4shared.com/office/dK8hXeR-ig/_.html

Carl Jung, Relations Between The Ego And The Unconscious,

https://www.4shared.com/office/xe1bEd66fi/_online.html

Carl Jung, The Meaning Of Psychology For Modern Man.

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%AF%D9%88%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%B4%D8%B9%D9%88%D8%B1-%D9%88%D9%85%D8%B9%D9%86%D9%89-%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%85-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D9%81%D8%B3-%D9%84%D9%84%D8%A5%D9%86%D8%B3%D8%A7%D9%86-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%AB-pdf>

Carl Jung, The Structure And Dynamics Of The Psyche,

<https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A8%D9%86%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D9%81%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%B9%D9%86%D8%AF-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D9%86%D8%B3%D8%A7%D9%86-pdf>

Damien Keown, Buddhism,

<https://www.hindawi.org/books/61924240/>

David Buss, Evolutionary Psychology,

<https://delopen.com/afu.php?zoneid=1407888&var=2905590>

David Riazanov, Lectures In The History Of Marxism,

<https://revsoc.me/marxism/30640/32650/>

Deep network: 80% Of The Internet Content is Blocked For You,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/Vkpr z1gm/80.html>

Egyptian Anarchism, An Interview With Michel Albert (Posted on the NET then the page disappeared).

Edward Said, Representations Of The Intellectual,

<https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D8%B5%D9%88%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AB%D9%82%D9%81-pdf>

Ehab Hasan, The Question Of Post Modernism,

<https://www.mominoun.com/pdf/2016-02/hadatta.pdf>

Emanuel kant, Groundwork Of The Metaphysics Of Morals,

<https://www.dar4arab.com/pdf-download-book-%D8%AA%D8%A3%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%B3-%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%AA%D8%A7%D9%81%D9%8A%D8%B2%D9%82%D8%A7-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AE%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%82>

[%D8%A5%D9%8A%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%88%D9%8A%D9%84
%D9%83%D8%A7%D9%86%D8%B7](#) -

Esam Hamza, Postmodern Philosophers: Jean Francois Lyotard, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, John Leonard,

[https://modernitysite.wordpress.com/2018/03/04/%D9%81%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%
B3%D9%81%D8%A9 -%D9%85%D8%A7 -%D8%A8%D8%B9%D8%AF -
%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AB%D8%A9-
%D8%AC%D8%A7%D9%86-
%D9%81%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%86%D8%B3%D9%88-
%D9%84%D9%8A%D9%88%D8%AA%D8%A7/](#)

Etienne de la Boétie, The Discourse Of Voluntary Servitude,

[https://www.noor -book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8
%D9%85%D9%82%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A9
%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%A8%D9%88%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%A9
%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B7%D9%88%D8%B9%D9%8A%D8%A9 -pdf](#) -

Erich Fromm, The Heart Of Man, Its Genius For Good And Evil,

[https://archive.org/details/heartofmanitsge000from/page/n7/mode/1up](#)

Erich Fromm, The Anatomy Of Human Destructiveness,

[https://www.dopdfwn.com/cacnoscana/scanoanya/kutubpdfcafe -vdGWy.pdf](#)

Erich Fromm, The Fear Of Freedom,

[https://www.noor
book.com/book/internal_download/55ef1a2e8c9a4850c0711009cfa247a5/1](#) -

Erich Fromm, Man For Himself,

[https://www.dopdfwn.com/cacnoscana/scanoanya/Booksstream k33 Book1871.pdf](#)

Erich Fromm, Psychoanalysis And Religion,

[https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%8A%D9%86-
%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D8%AD%D9%84%D9%8A%D9%84-
%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D9%81%D8%B3%D9%8A-pdf](#)

Erich Fromm, Principals Of Zen Buddhism,

[http://drive.ksaab.com/72015/1/%D8%A8%D9%88%D8%B0%D9%8A%D8%A9%2
0%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B2%D9%86%20%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%
D8%AD%D9%84%D9%8A%D9%84%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D9%81%D8%
B3%D9%8A%20
%20%D8%A5%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%83%20%D9%81%D8%B1%D9%88%D9%85
%20Ksaab.com.pdf](#) -

Ernest Mandel, Leon Trotsky, A Study In The Dynamic Of His Thought,

[http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=652213](#)

Ernest Mandel, Trotskyism Of The Moment,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=43277>

Ezz Eddin El- Tamimy, Postmodernism As Propaganda For The Systems,

https://www.4shared.com/office/Ti7JT2Bljq/_.html

Faleh Abd El-Gabbar (editor), Symposium Of Post Marxism,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/MX-BHYi4ce/online.html>

Ferdinand De Saussure, Cours de Linguistique Generale,

<http://mohamedrabeea.net/libravy/pdf/19c1c680-bd27-4b16-8a36-37615a3a8e6d.pdf>

Feurcach, Origin Of Religion,

https://www.4shared.com/office/Oc0XuNJ9da/-_.html

Faysal Al-Samer, The Zinj Revolution,

<https://www.kutub-pdf.net/book/6990-%D8%AB%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B2%D9%86%D8%AC.html>

Faysal Daraj, Marxism And Religion,

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bx3SOp3nsvDVYjNfeGlzRjgzWDQ/view>

Friedrich Nietzsche, The Genealogy Of Morality,

<https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D9%81%D9%89-%D8%AC%D9%86%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%88%D8%AC%D9%8A%D8%A7-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AE%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%82-pdf>

Friedrich Nietzsche, Twilight Of The Idols,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%A3%D9%81%D9%88%D9%84-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B5%D9%86%D8%A7%D9%85-pdf>

Gameel Hamdawi, Entrance To The Concept Of Postmodernism,

https://www.alukah.net/publications_competitions/0/38509/

Gehad Omar Al-Khateeb, Psychology Of The Masses—A Study In Theories Of Crowd Control,

<https://elbadil-pss.org/2017/10/30/%D8%B3%D9%8A%D9%83%D9%88%D9%84%D9%88%D8%AC%D9%8A%D8%A7-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%87%D9%8A%D8%B1-%D8%AF%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%B3%D8%A9-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D9%86%D8%B8%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D8%A7%D9%84/>

Georges Politzer, Guy Besse et Maurice Caveing, Principes Fondamentaux de Philosophie,

<https://www.4shared.com/zip/wrO8E9EHda/online.html>

Gustave Le Bon, The Crowd - A Study Of The Popular Mind, Dover Publications, INC. Mineola, New York

<https://ia802300.us.archive.org/9/items/the-crowd-a-study-of-the-popular-mind-by-gustave-le-bon/The%20Crowd%20A%20Study%20of%20the%20Popular%20Mind%20by%20Gustave%20Le%20Bon.pdf>

Haidar Ali Mohammad, Gramsci And The Intellectual's Problematic,

<https://www.academia.edu/43661607/%D8%A5%D8%B4%D9%83%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A9%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AB%D9%82%D9%81%D8%B9%D9%86%D8%AF%D8%BA%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%85%D8%B4%D9%8A>

Hasan Musaddaq, The Communicative Critical Theory,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/6uswJCZhiq/online.html>

Hasan Soleiman, Religion And Ideology,

<https://www.diwanalarab.com/spip.php?article2607>

Hayyan Salman, Shadow Economy Or The Underground Economy,

http://www.mafhoum.com/syr/articles_07/suleiman.pdf

Herbert Marcuse, Towards A New Revolution,

<https://www.kutubpdfbook.com/download/AH5C2.html>

Henri Lefebvre, Marxism,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/5hTnJsXNig/online.html>

Hesham Omar Al-Noor, Marxism's Superseding To Critical Theory,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327155143_tjawz_almarksyt_aly_alnzryt_aln_qdvt

Hesham Sharabi, Cultural Criticism Of Arab Society at The End Of The Twentieth Century,

<http://info.wafa.ps/userfiles/server/pdf/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D9%82%D8%AF%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%B6%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%84%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AC%D8%AA%D9%85%D8%B9%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B1%D8%A8%D9%8A%D9%87%D8%B4%D8%A7%D9%85%D8%B4%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A8%D9%8A.pdf>

Ian Craib, Modern Social Theory From Parsons To Habermas, Series Of Knowledge World Books, 244.

Ibrahim Bin Musa Ah Lakhmi Al-Shatbi, Mohammad Al-Shatebi, Al-Muwafaqat Fi Usool Al-Sharia (Approvals For Sharia Principles),

<https://ia804508.us.archive.org/17/items/fiqh11001/fiqh11295.pdf>

Ibrahim Nizar, Potential And Limits Of Societal Criticism, The Model Of Max Horkheimer,

<https://www.mominoun.com/articles/%D8%A5%D9%85%D9%83%D8%A7%D9%86%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D9%88%D8%AD%D8%AF%D9%88%D8%AF%D9%86%D9%82%D8%AF%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AC%D8%AA%D9%85%D8%B9%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%83%D8%B3%D9%87%D9%88%D8%B1%D9%83%D9%87%D8%A7%D9%8A%D9%85%D8%B1-1895-1973%D9%85%D8%A3%D9%86%D9%85%D9%88%D8%B0%D8%AC%D8%A7-573>

Jean Francois Lyotard, The Most-modern Condition,

[https://ia800609.us.archive.org/35/items/ameadi_20170709_1957/%D8%AC%D8%A7%D9%86%20%D9%81%D8%B1%D9%86%D8%B3%D9%88%D8%A7%20%D9%84%D9%88%D8%B6%D8%B9%20%D9%85%D8%A7%20%D8%A8%D8%B9%D8%AF%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AB%D9%8A%20%D8%AA%D9%82%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%B1%20%D8%B9%D9%86%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B9%D8%B1%D9%81%D8%A9.pdf](https://ia800609.us.archive.org/35/items/ameadi_20170709_1957/%D8%AC%D8%A7%D9%86%20%D9%81%D8%B1%D9%86%D8%B3%D9%88%D8%A7%20%D9%84%D9%8A%D9%88%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%B1%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%88%D8%B6%D8%B9%20%D9%85%D8%A7%20%D8%A8%D8%B9%D8%AF%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AB%D9%8A%20%D8%AA%D9%82%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%B1%20%D8%B9%D9%86%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B9%D8%B1%D9%81%D8%A9.pdf)

Jean-Paul Sartre, A plea For Intellectuals,

<https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D8%AF%D9%81%D8%A7%D8%B9%D8%B9%D9%86%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AB%D9%82%D9%81%D9%8A%D9%86-pdf>

Jean-Paul Sartre, Existentialism Is Humanism,

<https://www.kutubpdfbook.com/download/Z7LJWT.html>

Jeremy Rifkin, The Impasse Of Capitalism,

https://ia801208.us.archive.org/7/items/lamushe_gmail_20161009_2216/%D9%86%D9%87%D8%A7%D9%8A%D8%A9%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%85%D9%84%20%D8%AC%D9%8A%D8%B1%D9%85%D9%8A%20%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%81%D9%83%D9%8A%D9%86.pdf

John Molyneux, Anarchism: A Marxist Criticism,

<https://bookmarksbookshop.co.uk/view/2989/Anarchism+A+Marxist+Criticism>

John Molyneux, Is Marxism Deterministic,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=231667&r=0>

John Molyneux, Marxixm And The part,

<https://revsoc.me/wp-content/uploads/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%B2%D8%A8.pdf>

John Molyneux, What is True Marxist Heritage?

<https://www.4shared.com/office/GrfYnFRqgm/.html>

John Perkins, Confessions Of An Economic Hit Man,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/Svc18uesgm/.html>

Jolande Jacobi, The Psychology Of C. G. Jung,

<http://books.ibtesama.com/dldvll18302.pdf.html>

Jorge Larrain, A Reconstruction Of Historical Materialism,

<http://www.m.ahewar.org/s.asp?aid=333234&r=0>

Jürgen Habermas, After Marx,

<https://www.kutub-pdf.net/downloading/uieY87.html>

Jürgen Habermas, Knowledge And Human Interests

<https://www.tahmil-kutubpdf.net/download/DZMGTD.html>

Khaldoun Al-Shamaa, Marginalization Of Intellectuals,

<https://alarab.co.uk/%D8%AA%D9%87%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%B4%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AB%D9%82%D9%81%D9%8A%D9%86%D9%86%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%A8%D9%88%D9%86-%D9%81%D9%8A%D8%AC%D9%88%D9%82%D8%A9%D8%A5%D8%BA%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%82%D9%8A%D8%A9> -

Khalid El Qaseemy, Heidegger And Metaphysics,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=318515&r=0>

Khazaal Al-Majdy, Prehistorical Religions And Beliefs,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8%D8%A3%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%88%D9%85%D8%B9%D8%AA%D9%82%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AA%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%82%D8%A8%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%AE%D9%84%D9%80-%D8%AE%D8%B2%D8%B9%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%AC%D8%AF%D9%8A-pdf> -

Khazaal Al-Majdy, Science Of Religions,

<https://ia601600.us.archive.org/18/items/elmeladyan/%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%85%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%86%20%D8%AE%D8%B2%D8%B9%D9%84%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%AC%D8%AF%D9%8A.pdf>

Karim Mahmoud, Death Of The Universal Intellectual: Does The Intellectual Truly Represent People?

<https://www.hafryat.com/ar/blog/%D9%85%D8%A8%D8%A7%D8%AF%D8%B1%D8%A9-%D9%85%D8%B3%D8%AC%D9%88%D9%86%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D8%AE%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%85%D8%A7-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B0%D9%8A%D9%8A%D9%83%D8%B4%D9%81%D9%87%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D8%AF%D9%84%D8%AD%D9%88%D9%84%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%9F> -

Karl Kautsky, The Road To Power,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/ZoqSijLxgm/-html>

Lambert-Wallace - Lambert William, Social Psychology,

https://www.noor-book.com/book/internal_download/3fcc20613cb3a5bed53fe93ccc86f920/2

Leon Trotsky, The Death Agony Of Capitalism And The Tasks Of The Fourth Internationa,

<https://revsoc.me/wp-content/uploads/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A8%D8%B1%D9%86%D8%A7%D9%85%D8%AC-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%86%D8%AA%D9%82%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%8A.pdf>

Leon Trotsky, The Permanent Revolution.

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=37206&r=0>

Lona Al-Husseiny, The Sacred And The Profane,

<https://mindstory.org/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D9%82%D8%AF%D8%B3-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AF%D9%86%D8%B3>

Lorenzo Colombo, Anarchism Is Opposite To Marxist-Leninist Thought In Organizing Society,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=4751&r=0>

Louis Althusser, Marxism And Philosophy, An Interview With Louis Althusser,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=535033>

Luc Ferry-Alan Renault, Max Horkheimer And The Critical Theory,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=345251>

Magda Tamer, The Shadow Economy Is A Phenomenon Of Underdevelopment In Developing Countries,

Malek Abo Alia, Ideology And Delusion,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=493023>

Maraquis de Condorcet, Sketch For A Historical Picture Of The Progress Of The Human Mind, revision by Alsaied Mohammad Badawi,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D9%85%D8%AE%D8%B7%D8%B7-%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%AE%D9%8A-%D9%84%D8%AA%D9%82%D8%AF%D9%85-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%82%D9%84-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A8%D8%B4%D8%B1%D9%8A-pdf>

Maurice Dobb, Studies In The Development Of Capitalism,

<http://www.raoufabbas.org/Download/Capitalism.pdf>

Michel Fadé, Ideology, Documents From Philosophical Origins,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/d1pDpaVogm/- .html>

Michel Foucault, Philosophy Of Power,

[http://hekmah.org/%D9%81%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%81%D8%A9%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%84%D8%B7%D8%A9%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%B4%D9%8A%D9%84%D9%81%D9%88%D9%83%D9%88/Michel Foucault, The Will to Knowledge, -2](http://hekmah.org/%D9%81%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%81%D8%A9%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%84%D8%B7%D8%A9%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%B4%D9%8A%D9%84%D9%81%D9%88%D9%83%D9%88/Michel%20Foucault,%20The%20Will%20to%20Knowledge,-2)

Max Weber, Basic Concepts In Sociology,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8%D9%85%D9%81%D8%A7%D9%87%D9%8A%D9%85%D8%A3%D8%B3%D8%A7%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D9%81%D9%8A%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%AC%D8%AA%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B9-pdf>

Moataz Hasiso, The Reality Of The Working Class In The Context Of The Development Of The Capitalist System,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=306245&r=0>

Muhammad Abed Al-Jabri, Intellectual's Legacy In The Arabic world,

https://ia800401.us.archive.org/32/items/mobarakibi_gmail_20160515_1338/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AB%D9%82%D9%81%D9%88%D9%86%20%D9%81%D9%8A%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%B6%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%A9%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B1%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%A9.pdf

Mohammad Baquh, The question In The Perception Of Pierre Bourdieu's intellectual,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=560296&r=0>

Mohammad Hosney, Generals Of Gold And Analysis,

<https://modernization-adil.blogspot.com/2017/02/blog-post.html>

Mohammad Mourad, Capitalism From Evolution To Crisis, Reading In The Backgrounds Of The Current Financial Crisis,

<HTTPS://WWW.LEBARMY.GOV.LB/AR/CONTENT/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B1%D8%A3%D8%B3%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A9%D9%85%D9%86-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D8%B7%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A5%D9%84%D9%89%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B2%D9%85%D8%A9%D9%82%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A1%D8%A9-%D9%81%D9%8A%D8%AE%D9%84%D9%81%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%AA%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B2%D9%85%D8%A9%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A9%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%87%D9%86%D8%A9>

Mohammad Sabeelah, Orbits Of Modernity,

<https://www.tahmil-kutubpdf.net/download/J6NLYM.html>

Mohammad Sabeelah and Abdel Salam Ben Abdel Alaaly, Ideology - Philosophical Notes,

<https://www.kutub-pdf.net/downloading/UZ98ow.html>

Mustafa Abdu, The Moral Philosophy,

<https://www.dopdfwn.com/cacnoscana/scanoanya/kutubpdfcafe-flsfa-yf636.pdf>

Muhannad Mustafa, The Concept And limits Of public sphere,

<https://mada-research.org/storage/uploads/2016/12/mohanad.pdf>

Nabil Al-Qett, 32 Egyptian Are Suffering From Being Marginalized By Poverty,

<https://elbashayer.com/259653/2011/06/22/143280/>

Nicos Poulantzas, State, Power, Socialism,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D9%86%D8%B8%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%87-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%88%D9%84%D9%87-%D9%86%D9%8A%D9%83%D9%88%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%B3-%D8%A8%D9%88%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%86%D8%AA%D8%B2%D8%A7%D8%B3-pdf>

Nour El-Din Alloush, Public Sphere Transformations In Political Philosophy,

<https://platform.almanhal.com/Files/2/78806>

Penelope Murray (editor), a group of scholars, Genius, Series of Knowledge World Books, 208.

Pierre Clastres& Marcel Gauchet, Archeology Of Violence,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/O1Jm5HtIfi/.html>

Pierre Clastres, Society Against The State,

<http://www.kutubpdfcafee.com/kutucafe1/kttub1/kutubpdfcafe-SjaZp.pdf>

Phil Slater, Origin And Significance Of The Frankfurt School: A Marxist Perspective,

<https://www.4shared.com/office/0sOmEd0vgm/online.html>

Qalamin Sabbah, Lectures In The Moral Philosophy,

<http://jilrc.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/%D8%B3%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%84%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%AD%D8%A7%D8%B6%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D9%85%D8%AD%D8%A7%D8%B6%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D9%81%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%81%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AE%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%82-%D9%84%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%83%D8%AA%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A9-%D9%82%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85%D9%8A%D9%86-%D8%B5%D8%A8%D8%A7%D8%AD.pdf>

Qasayy Al-Safi, Marx Spectrum That Doesn't Disappear,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=546416&r=0>

Qusayy Al-Safi, Reading In A Book: Surveillance Capitalism, part 1,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=645648> -

Qusayy Al-Safi, Reading In A book: Age Of Surveillance Capitalism, part 2,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=644941>

Ragheb Al-Sergani, The Kharijites, Their Origin, Beliefs And History,
<https://alabasirah.com/node/535>

Rosa Luxemburg, The Russian Revolution 1917,
<https://www.4shared.com/office/ZnKLzXWvfi/online.html>

Saad Muhammad Rahim, After Marx
<http://www.m.ahewar.org/s.asp?aid=245941&r=0>

Saif Eddin Ali, The Marginalized Youth,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=391274&r=0>

Salem Yafout, Habermas's Philosophy Of Communication,
https://www.philadelphia.edu.jo/arts/14th/papers/day_1/session_2/salem_yafot.doc

Sameh Saeed Abboud, A Critical Reading In Anarchism. Cairo, 2017.

Sameh Saeed Abbou, Anarchism Is Neither A Belief Nor Utopia,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=130009&r=0>

Sameh Saeed Abboud, Contemporary Anarchistic Currents,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=570257&r=0>

Sameh Saeed Abboud, Cooperative Economics And Development,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=471709&r=0>

Sameh Saeed Abboud, Libertarian Marxist Currents,
<http://www.ssraw.org/ar/print.art.asp?aid=570499&ac=1>

Sameh Saeed Abboud, On The Concept Of Anarchism,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=568483&r=0>

Sameh Saeed Abboud, On The Cooperatives And Their Rules,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=389336&r=0>

Sameh Saeed Abboud, Serfdom In Today's World,
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=232146&nm=1>

Sameh Saeed Abboud, The Anarchist Organization; How And Why?
<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=279013&r=0>

Samir Amin - Burhan Ghalioun, A Debate About Religion And The State,

<https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D8%AD%D9%88%D8%A7%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%88%D9%84%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%8A%D9%86-pdf>

Scott Lillenfield And Others In The Book "50 Great Myths Of Popular Psychology,

<https://www.hindawi.org/books/51846050/>

Sigmund Freud, An Outline Of Psycho–Analysis,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D9%88%D8%AC%D8%B2-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D8%AD%D9%84%D9%8A%D9%84-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D9%81%D8%B3%D9%8A-%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%AC%D9%85%D9%88%D9%86%D8%AF-%D9%81%D8%B1%D9%88%D9%8A%D8%AF-pdf>

Sigmund Freud, The Future Of An Illusion,

<https://www.kutub-pdf.net/downloading/eynH0c.html>

Sigmund Freud, Thoughts For The Times On War And Death,

<https://www.alarabimag.com/books/20145-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%A8-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%B1%D8%A8-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%B6%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D9%88%D8%AA.html>

Sigmund Freud, Totem And Taboo,

https://www.noor-book.com/book/internal_download/d77861e901c0f5d8ba4b01c185258e63/1

Taha Al-Hashimy, History And Philosophy Of Religions,

<https://www.noor-book.com/%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%AE-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%86-%D9%88%D9%81%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%81%D8%AA%D9%87%D8%A7-pdf>

Tariq Al-Bitar, The Theory Of Postmodernism, part (1), Foundations And Methodologies,

<https://sasapost.co/opinion/postmodernism-theory-1/>

Tariq Al-Bitar, The Theory Of Postmodernism, part (2), The Sovereign State And Beyond,

<https://sasapost.co/opinion/postmodernism-theory-2/>

The Big Companies Govern The World,

<https://arabicpost.net/%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%8A%D9%81-%D8%B3%D8%AA%D8%A7%D9%8A%D9%84/2018/09/26/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B4%D8%B1%D9%83%D8%A7%D8%AA>

[%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%83%D8%A8%D8%B1%D9%89](#) -
[%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D9%8A -%D8%BA%D9%8A%D8%B1%D8%AA](#) -
[%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85](#) -
[%D8%A7%D8%AD%D8%AA%D9%84%D8%AA/](#)

The Global Proletariat Is The Only Class Capable Of Ending Capitalism And Exploitation! – 2011,

<https://www.union-communiste.org/ar/2018-05/lbrwlytry-llmy-ltbq-lwhyd-lgdr-l-nh-lrsmly-wlstgll-ns-mfsl-2011-3524>

Theories Of Social Change, without the author's name,

<https://www.marefa.org/%D9%86%D8%B8%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%AA%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D8%BA%D9%8A%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%AC%D8%AA%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B9%D9%8A>

Umm Al-Zein Ben Sheikha, Philosophical Readings In The Tunisian Revolution,

<http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=257639&r=0>

Vladimir Lenin, Imperialism Is The Highest Stage Of Capitalism,

<https://revsoc.me/wp-content/uploads/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D9%85%D8%A8%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%A3%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%89-%D9%85%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%AD%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B1%D8%A3%D8%B3%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A9.pdf>

World Food Day, FAO, 16 October 2012,

<http://www.fao.org/3/a-az877a.pdf>

World Health Organization, Depression,

<https://www.who.int/ar/news-room/detail/11-09-2018-global-hunger-continues-to-rise--new-un-report-says>

Zaki Alayyu, Definition Of Intellectual, Entries And Problematic,

<https://www.iicss.iq/?id=25&sid=223>

The Author:



- * **Egyptian nationality**
- * **DOB: October 10, 1955**
- * **Original profession: Physician - Cardiologist**
- * **Independent non-specialist researcher**
- * **Presented numerous works in various fields: Social, Socio-economic, Historical, Political, Islamic, Arabic Linguistic, Ideological and Medical studies**
- * **General Orientation: Libertarian**
- * **adilemary@gmail.com**

The author's most important books and research:

(Some are printed and all available online – in Arabic unless otherwise specified)

- * **On Bonapartism (1986)**
- * **On the Phenomenon of Dependency (1986)**
- * **A General Analysis of the Egyptian Communist Movement (1994)**

- * The Situation of the Intelligentsia in the Modern Egyptian Social Structure (1996)**
- * Nasserism in the Counter-revolution (or “The Left, Nasserism and the Counter-revolution” in the printed version) (2002)**
- * Islamic Centralism - Islam’s View of the Other (2006)**
- * What do the Qur’anists Say? (2008)**
- * Beyond the Tragedy of Kamelia Shehata (2010)**
- * A Different Reading of the Uprising of January 18 and 19, 1977 (2011)**
- * Critique of the Egyptian Revolution (1) (2011)**
- * The Path and Prospects of the Egyptian Revolution (2011)**
- * The Roots of Arab Racism (2012)**
- * Critique of the Egyptian Revolution (2-The Revolution of the State) (2014)**
- * Why Do We Hate Political Islam? (2014)**
- * Critique of the Egyptian Revolution (3- Al-Sisi and His Men) (2016)**
- * Research on Linguistic Issues in the Qur’an (2017)**
- * Marxism is the Philosophy of the State, Not the Proletariat (2020) (Arabic and English)**
- * The Failure of State Socialism to Achieve the Goals of the Revolution (English)**
- * Marxists and Nasserists - an Example of the Confusion in the Marxist Mindset**
- * The Phenomenon of Religious Mania in Egypt (2023) [Arabic and English]**
- * The Zionist Massacres Against the Palestinians (2024) [Arabic and English]**

Co-written works:

* **The Dilemma of the “New Arab Thought” – Reply to Adel Hussein (1986)**

* **Lenin’s Approach to Imperialism (1988)**

* **Parasitic Capitalism - a Third Perspective (1988)**

* **The Structure of Underdevelopment (1988)**

* **Logical Formation of the Notion of the Mode of Production (1991)**

* **Beyond the Soviet Bureaucracy (1991)**