

THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

VOL. XLVI, NO. 1-2

APRIL-OCTOBER 1976

Whole No. 100-101

CONTENTS

Modern Revolution and Ideology

Yoshiharu OZAKI 1

**Competition for Survival among Inhabitants
and Fully Developed Human Beings**

Jun IKEGAMI 19

Economic Analysis of Business Organizations

Banri ASANUMA 35

PUBLISHED BY

THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY

SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

THE
KYOTO UNIVERSITY
ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN
THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XLVI NUMBER 1-2 (APRIL-OCTOBER 1976) WHOLE NUMBER 100-101

MODERN REVOLUTION AND IDEOLOGY

By Yoshiharu OZAKI*

I Revolution and Democracy in Advanced Capitalist Countries

1. Lenin's Thesis

It was in March, 1918, when revolutions in the European states, expected to occur soon following the Russian revolution, yet remained to be seen, and the Russian Revolution itself was barely out of confusion and out of the old yoke of Tsarism and subsequent domination of bourgeoisie. Lenin, urging the need to take into consideration the dismal reality, spoke to revolutionary people of Russia as follows:

We must be able to.....reckon with the fact that the world socialist revolution cannot begin so easily in the advanced countries as the revolution began in Russia—in the land of Nicholas and Rasputin.....But to start without preparation a revolution in a country in which capitalism is developed and has given democratic culture and organization to everybody, down to last man—to do so would be wrong absurd¹⁾.

We see that it is immeasurably more difficult to make the first breach in the system that is holding back the revolution. It will be much easier for the European revolution to advance to the second and third stages.²⁾

* Associate Professor.

1) V. I. Lenin, Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 98-99.

2) *Da.*, Extraordinary Fourth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, *ibid.*, pp. 176-177.

Lenin repeated the similar statements frequently, and it is possible to read an important thesis concerning revolution in advanced capitalist states. Combination of well-developed capitalism and bourgeois democratic institutions makes the start of socialist revolution a very difficult one. However, at the same time, once the difficulty has been overcome, the very difficulty paves the way for smooth continuation and accomplishment of the revolution. It was Lenin's appreciation of the difficult task for the proletariat of advanced countries which comes between those two theses. The difficulty arises because of the need to disclose the fraudulent act of bourgeois democracy as a tool of domination, and to overcome the persistent prejudices of bourgeois democracy among "the backward masses" of workers and peasantry, which is a struggle possible only within the structure of bourgeois democracy, and to give democratic organization and training to the maximum extent to workers and people at large through utilization of struggle for democracy and the democracy itself as a means of class struggle, and by doing so, to prepare the revolution persistently for a very long time³). The task was not merely that of breaking through into the domination of bourgeois democratic system and to prepare for the start of revolution. Achieving the task in itself would be a process of establishing subjective conditions to facilitate continuation of the revolution further to its second and third stages. In this sense, the task would be a practical intermediary between the two theses.

Why the conditions, or the highest idea of (bourgeois) culture, democratic culture and systems, free society of united bourgeoisie are acting as the force to keep the workers in a state of "cultural slavery⁴)"? Where are to be found the subjective and objective conditions which could overcome those difficulties and become a factor to facilitate future revolution?

The following discussion aims to provide a croquis of an approach to this multi-dimensional problem. The approach consists of looking into the reason why the bourgeois ideology—particularly the bourgeois concept of democracy—has such a strong power to take hold of people, and finding out the way to destroy its domination. What is needed to complete the task is not to be misled by the magnificent grandloquency of well-structured theory of bourgeois ideology, but to reach consciousness of common workers. Ideology of the dominating class will become meaningless as the guiding principle if it fails to be related to daily consciousness of the dominated mass.

2. Private Property, Commodity Production and Bourgeois Democracy

Capitalism represents the most advanced state of commodity economy in which labour-power is a marketable good along with product of the labour. Commodity economy is the widest and deepest root of capitalism, and it is an organization of private ownership and social division of labour. In capitalism, social production is carried

3) Cf. V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism—An Infantile Disorder, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 31, pp. 64-65. and *do* Reply to P. KIEVSKY, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 23, p. 25.

4) Cf. *do.*, Fourth Conference of Trade Union and Factory Committees of Moscow, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 27, p. 464, and *do.*, Session of the All-Russia C.E.C., *ibid.*, pp. 292, 464.

out by independent individual producers. Private production does not have any security, yet it must prove *a priori* to be an essential and effective constituent of social production. Out of contradiction between social production and private production arises a movement in the shape of the competition between individual owners of commodity, and of the progress of social production through the anarchic competition of private production.

Spontaneously developed social-division-of-labour characterizes consciousness of independence and isolation of individuals based on their private property. This independence makes "society" appear as external and incomprehensible restriction, the battle of all against all. These are the universal content of consciousness of bourgeois individualism based on private ownership and commodity production. They are the origin of bourgeois ideology, and the basis in which the ideology penetrates and is accepted. Capitalistic commodity economy moves within the scope of private property and commodity production, and so long as all relationships are subject to this scope, it reproduces bourgeois individualism as the dominant consciousness of the society. At the same time, it dissolves the very private ownership; it creates and reproduces ever increasing number of proletariat, making domination of the consciousness ever more devoid of its material ground.

The bourgeois democracy is the superstructure of bourgeois control which originates from the commodity economy. According to the bourgeois concept, democracy grants equal rights to individuals who are isolated from and competing with each other in the society of commodity economy where wealth distribution is not equal. Consequently, in the domain of private rights, "freedom is that of a man as an isolated monad⁵⁾" and "the practical application of human rights of freedom is the right of private property⁶⁾."

For this reason, none of the so-called human rights goes beyond egoistic man, or man as individuals enclosed in the shell of his own self, his own interest and intention. Far from regarding man as genus in the human rights, the society, which is the very life of genus, appears as a framework of control over individuals or limitation of intrinsic autonomy of individuals.....Each man is compelled to find in other individuals not a realization of his own freedom, but an obstacle to his liberty⁷⁾.

In the reality of commodity economy, the equal right as "freedom of private ownership" on which isolated individuals are mutually excluding, opposing and fighting, is no other than a medium of expressing almighty private property in the universe of commodity, i.e., the right of movement of money as capital.

The circumstances in the domain of private rights characterize that of public rights. The equal right of political participation based on the private ownership and production of commodities is nothing but a form in which capital appears as the ultimate power. Domination by wealth in the realm of politics, through the medium of political freedom, is a form of politics adopted to the movement of capital which establishes itself

5) K. Marx, On Jewish Problem, *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. 1, p. 364.

6) *Ibid.*, p. 364.

7) *Ibid.*

through competition, i.e., the relationship between owners of commodity who enjoy equal rights in the world of economy. Because of the form of political equality, it can become all the more certain form of control. Therefore, "a democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and, therefore, once capital has gained possession of this very shell, it establishes its power so securely, so firmly.⁸⁾" Transformation of the equal rights into the form of free play for material inequality arises because of the power of wealth (capital) moving on the basis of private property and commodity production. The phenomenon is supported by the illusion of political citizenship, which is a shadow of consciousness of the equal rights of private ownership on the level of economics. The consciousness of citizenship is the political consciousness of bourgeois individualism. So long as the bourgeois state—as the materialization of democratic form in which the Majority's will of individuals who have the equality—is supported by the conscience of citizenship, its power lacks progressively its reality, while at the same time it gains universal character. Men are degraded to the position of "an imaginary constituent of a hypothetical sovereignty⁹⁾". For this very reason, in a society where bourgeois democratic control is firmly established, there generally is the predomination of a strong interest in the freedom as a selfish right, or private right of freedom, and far weaker interest in politics.

On the other hand, however, the capitalism, while constituted on the basis of private property and commodity production, can exist only on the negation of private ownership of others, i.e., wage labour of proletariat. As it is, the duality between "the domain of egoism, the realm of battle of all against all¹⁰⁾", which Marx expressed in 1843 by the term "civil society", and the "universality of equal rights" adopted by the state, is a contradiction. Lenin said as follows:

The democratic republic "logically" contradicts capitalism, because "officially" it puts the rich and the poor on an equal footing. That is a contradiction between the economic system and the political superstructure¹¹⁾.

This contradiction becomes real when the majority of civil society, i.e., the proletariat, unite themselves into a social class in the real sense of the word, and enter the political scene as the opposition to bourgeoisie who are the minority *a priori*. Democracy then starts to change itself from a mere form of bourgeois' control to the condition that "makes the class struggle more direct, wider, more open and pronounced¹²⁾."

Generally speaking, capitalism makes all relationships subject to the conditions of private property and commodity production, and by destroying all conventional ties, reduces men into isolated individuals. By so doing, it develops individuality, independence, sense of freedom and cultural level; on the other hand, individuals are isolated and then organized into the relationship of mutual competition and made subject to

8) V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 25, p. 393.

9) K. Marx, *op. cit.*

10) *Ibid.*

11) V. I. Lenin, *A Caricature of Marxism and Imperalist Economism*, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 23, p. 47.

12) *Ibid.*, p. 73.

capital. Bourgeois' individualism is the consciousness of this relationship and transmits day after day this relationship. Its political concept is illusion of citizenship. Where declaration of democratic equal rights and the form of political participation are combined on those premises, it is no wonder that capital can found itself on an extremely reliable and solid base. Such a state is the one where "capitalism is fully developed and democratic culture and organization are given to the last citizen."

Consequently, mutual struggle among isolated individuals and domination of bourgeois individualism are the conditions of bourgeois democracy, and the conditions which dissolve incessantly unification of the class, a necessary condition for the revolution to start. On the contrary, if the people—particularly the proletariat—stop mutual competition and unite themselves, there are conditions needed to implement democracy as a means of class struggle.

Those states which have well-developed capitalism are at the same time those in which the majority of people exist as proletariat. Why the proletariat without property of their own have to be subordinated to the competition among themselves organized under the capital? Why the capital can place the proletariat under the hegemony of bourgeois individualism? Answer to those questions will show the necessity of overcoming the problem and its basis.

II Competition Among Workers

Capital formation and multiplication are the basic conditions to its own survival, and a prerequisite to this is the presence of wage labour. In 1845, Engels already saw that in a capitalistic state of England, just after the Industrial Revolution, the prerequisite was maintained by capital by the sole means of competition among the workers, and pointed out as follows:

Competitions is the complete expression of the battle of all against all which rules in modern civil society. This battle, a battle for life, for existence..... is fought not between the different classes of society only, but also between the individual members of these calsses. Each is in the way of the other..... The workers are in constant competition among themselves..... But this competition of the workers among themselves is the worst side of the present state of things in its effect upon the worker, the sharpest weapon against the proletariat in the hands of the bourgeoisie¹³⁾.

1. "Apparent Freedom" in the Sale of Labour-Power

Capital organizes workers into the general frame of private property and commodity production in the form of buying and selling labour power as simple circulation.

This sphere that we are deserting, within whose boundaries the sale and purchase of labour-power goes on, is in fact a very Eden of the innate rights of

13) F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working-Class in England*, *C.W.M.E.*, Vol. 2, pp. 306-307, and K. Marx, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, *C.W.M.E.*, Vol. 4, pp. 473-474.

man. There alone rule Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham. Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labour-power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract as free agent..... Equality, because each enters into relation with the other, as with a simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent. Property, because each disposes only of what is his own. And Bentham, because each looks only to himself. The only force that brings them together and puts them in relation with each other, is the selfishness, the gain and the private interests of each. Each looks to himself only, and no one troubles himself about the rest¹⁴⁾.....

For a modern worker who is “free” in the double sense, sale of his labour-power is made on two conditions that as a free man “he can dispose of his labour-power as his commodity¹⁵⁾” and also that he “has no other commodity for sale, is short of everything necessary for the realization of his labour-power”, and for this reason, he “must be obliged to offer for sale as a commodity that very labour-power, which exists only in his living self¹⁶⁾.” Therefore, in actual transaction, a labourer is really “no free agent¹⁷⁾” and “the time for which he is free to sell his labour-power is the time for which he is forced to sell it¹⁸⁾.” Nevertheless, purchase and sale of labour-power is done within the limit of simple circulation as an equivalent relationship between two free owners of merchandise. This prepares an appearance—“The appearance of a contract between free persons¹⁹⁾”—: on one hand the owner of capital stands as a mere owner of money, while on the other hand a worker stands as a free owner of commodity called labour-power.

This “Eden” of illusory freedom, which can stand only in the aspect of simple circulation, makes workers aware of themselves as if they are the private owners of labour-power just like any other kind of goods, enjoying equal private rights with those enjoyed by the capitalists. In this instance also, the inter-relationship of “selfishness” and “the private interests” is embodied by competition. “Each looks to himself only, and no one troubles himself about the rest.” Owners of labour-power are to have competition not only with owners of money (capital) but also among each other. Within the framework of this apparent freedom, workers naturally believe bourgeois’ ideal of individualism. This subordination of workers to the bourgeois ideal is a reflection of their subordination on bourgeoisie in the actual life. For this very reason, the aspect of simple circulation becomes a favourite viewpoint of bourgeois ideologue “by which he judges a society based on capital and wages²⁰⁾.” Even today, it is not uncommon

14) K. Marx, *Capital*, C.W.M.E., Vol. 23, pp. 189–190.

15) *Ibid.*, p. 183.

16) *Ibid.*

17) *Ibid.*, p. 319.

18) *Ibid.*

19) *Ibid.*, p. 419.

20) *Ibid.*, pp. 190–191.

to find an attempt to demonstrate the basis of “the existence within the structure” of workers, which causes almighty power of bourgeois state, in the identity of capitalist and workers as private owners.

However, as soon as we shift our eyes from “this noisy sphere, where everything takes place on the surface and in view of all men” to the aspect of production in which capital not only produces goods but “capital is produced²¹⁾” as well, the image of free worker as owner of labour-power very quickly fades away. Owners of money become pure capitalists and owners of labour-power are subordinated as workers dominated by the capitalists.

Once it is transferred, the labour-power, like any other merchandise, will be free for use of the purchaser, i.e., “labour-power in use is labour itself²²⁾”, and labour “is carried on under the control of a capitalist and on his behalf²³⁾.” Under these circumstances, “the will in consonance with purpose²⁴⁾” which is unique to human labour, no longer belongs to the worker, but it appears as the will of capital against the worker. It is “capital’s command” and “capital’s autocracy”. On the other hand, since labour-power as a merchandise “exists in a human beings²⁵⁾”, it cannot be separated from the seller, unlike other goods. Consequently, the process of labour which occurs as consumption of merchandise called labour-power under the control of capital takes place as subordination (within a specific limit) of workers to the will of others. The worker cannot sell labour-power as his property unless he is not “a free man”, but he can be a real worker only during such time as he is subordinated to the will or despotism of others.

Therefore, the reality that the output of his labour does not belong to him and the labour is performed under the control of capital during the time in which he is “not free” causes an antagonism against the despotism of the capital, indifference to the purpose and process of the work on one hand, and interest in the working conditions and time of labour, as natural consequence on the part of the worker.

Nevertheless, the fundamental issue to the worker in a process of production is the fact that his labour is an element of creation of value—particularly that of the surplus value at the same time, and “capital, therefore, is not only.....the command over labour, and it is essentially the command over unpaid labour²⁶⁾”. In other words, the consciousness of production of surplus value, yet this “is beyond the cognisance of the ordinary mind²⁷⁾.” Why?

2. Transformation of the Value and Price of Labour-power into Wages and the Illusion of “Property Based on Work”

The fact that a worker is exploited by the capital in terms of the unpaid portion

21) *Ibid.*, p. 189.

22) *Ibid.*, p. 192.

23) *Ibid.*

24) *Ibid.*, p. 193.

25) *Ibid.*, p. 181.

26) *Ibid.*, p. 556.

27) *Ibid.*, p. 563.

of his work does not arise naturally in the mind of the worker, and that “the decisive importance²⁸⁾” of transformation of “value and price of labour-power” into wages by means of money entirely depends on this issue.

Because of the unique character of labour-power as a commodity, there is a time gap between the sale of labour-power and shift of its utility value in the hands of the purchaser. Therefore, in accordance with the rule of exchange of commodities, the purchaser’s money functions as a means of payment, and the price for the labour-power (wage) is payable only after the labour is performed for a fixed period of time²⁹⁾. Payment for labour force now appears in the form of payment for the labour, and consequently “extinguishes every trace of the division of the working day.....into paid and unpaid labour”, and “all labour appears as paid labour”. Thus, “here the money-relation conceals the unrequited labour³⁰⁾”.

As it is, “this phenomenal form, which makes the actual relation invisible, and, indeed, shows the direct opposite of that relation, forms the basis of all the juridical notions of both labourer and capitalist, of all the mystifications of the capitalistic mode of production, of all its illusions as to liberty, of all the apologetic shifts of the vulgar economists³¹⁾.” These phenomenal forms “appear directly and spontaneously as current modes of thought; their hidden substratum must first be discovered by science³²⁾.”

It follows that while the appearance of workers’ freedom and equal rights in the simple circulation aspect fades away continuously in front of the reality of production process, value of labour-power as compensation payable to workers for his work, in “current modes of thought” of the workers, gets incessantly reconstructed and maintained as it appears in “this phenomenal form which shows direct opposite” to the reality. “Do ut facias, facio ut des” (I give you for what you do for me, and you give me for what I give you).....represents a legal interpretation of quid pro quo, and “the work is hard, but worth working,” the sentiment of worker.

What is very important here is that both in the case of time-wage and that of piece-wage—which is a more appropriate form of wage in the capitalistic production—it appears as if price for the labour-power is decided on the basis of volume of labour or quantity of labour output (fruit)—particularly in case of piece-wage—and “determinedby the capacity for the work of the producer³³⁾.”

Because to each worker, wage is a determinant condition to his personal welfare (the process of personal consumption), the false conscience that the amount of money available for his livelihood is determined by the quantity of his labour makes it possible for the capital to fortify workers’ tendency to regard their capability as a private asset of their

28) *Ibid.*, p. 562.

29) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 188.

30) *Ibid.*, p. 562.

31) *Ibid.*

32) *Ibid.*, p. 564.

33) *Ibid.*, p. 574.

own and thus to lead them into competition for better life and for more labour.

There, the concept of possession based on own labour and private property (means of production), petit-bourgeois form of bourgeois individualism, is characterized as well as stereotyped. There is a chain of consciousness—false but appears very real the more fierce competition becomes—of ownership (possession of the means of livelihood, sufficient only for daily consumption and not at all for accumulation) based on work (labour not for the self, but paid work for others) by means of own possession (labour capability and not means of production).

In the competition among workers themselves, which organized by capital, individual workers certainly have something to gain by working more, i.e., “to strain his labour-power as intensely as possible” and “to lengthen the working-day” as “raising (his) individual wages above the average” as demonstrated by the piece-wage system³⁴⁾. Realization of personal gain out of such mutual competition among workers provides some kind of reality to the consciousness of petit-bourgeois individualism. On the other hand, however, this very fact that such quest for personal gain can only be made possible by general deterioration of working conditions as well as by a drop in the level of average wages, and that this eventually damages workers’ personal interests gives them the only way to overcome the false consciousness.

This contradiction takes the following form when we shift our eyes from the field of production for individual capital to the capitalistic production on a social scale:

In the same measure as the labourers work more, as they produce more wealth for others, and as the productive power of their labour increases, so in the same measure even their function as a means of the self-expansion of capital becomes more and more precarious for them³⁵⁾.

In this instance also, movement of the capitalistic law of demand and supply of labour serves on one hand for the capital to organize workers into competition for employment, and for more work, on the social scale, in order to realize a despotism of the capital, and on the other hand, it motivates the workers to cease mutual competition among those employed and to organize a planned cooperation among themselves and those unemployed into an attempt to prevent “the absolute dependence of the working-class upon the capitalist class³⁶⁾”.

Once it is recognized that a real motive of overcoming the bourgeois individualism among workers lies in the recognition that competition among individual workers for their personal gain only leads to strengthening of capitalistic despotism and damage to their own interest. Therefore, it would be a new inter-relationship between the personal labour and social labour which guarantees a better ground, perpetuity and organization for eliminating the mutual competition among the workers.

34) *Ibid.*, pp. 577-578.

35) *Ibid.*, p. 669.

36) *Ibid.*, pp. 669-670.

III Socialization of Production and "Collective Labourers"

1. Socialization of Labour—Inter-relationship Between Individual Labour and Social Labour

Large-scale cooperation and social productivity of labour (or productivity of social labour), as shown in the use of machine—this is the unique productive force under the capitalistic production system.

In this process of cooperative labour, work is directly integrated into the society and individual workers exist as a part of "the collective labourers, or social body of labour³⁷⁾," and their labour becomes a constituent part of the social labour. Next, productive power of the social labour is not a mere arithmetic total of productive power of each individual, but an entirely different capacity made possible by combination of the social labour. Lastly, organization, discipline and command—"directing, superintending, and adjusting³⁸⁾"—in other words, which are indispensable for any social or cooperative labour conducted on a large scale, achieve full control and coordination of individual labour and "the general functions that have origin in the action of the combined organism³⁹⁾."

Thus, in the socialized production which obviously cannot exist without individual workers, the work performed by individuals is no longer individual. It can demonstrate its capability only in the framework of the socialized production, the organization and discipline of social labour. The framework provides an inter-dependence between individuals and social labour on the basis of organization and discipline, and the new relationship between individuals and group, as a consequence of social labour, which is inevitable in any large scale industry of the modern times.

Obviously, the process of socialized labour is also the process of production of surplus value in which organization and discipline, arising from the nature of the social labour, as well as the supervisory function originating from antagonism inherent in exploitation, appear as the right of command by the capital.

The workers' "union into one single productive body and the establishment of a connexion between their individual functions, are matters foreign and external to them, are not their own act, but the act of the capital that brings and keeps them together. Hence the connexion existing between their various labour appears to them, ideally, in the shape of a preconceived plan of the capitalist, and practically in the shape of the authority of the same capitalist, in the shape of the powerful will of another, who subjects their activity to his aims⁴⁰⁾." "The separation of the intellectual powers of production from the manual labour, and the conversion of those powers into the might of capital over labour, is.....finally completed by modern industry erected on the foundation of machinery. The special skill of each individual insignificant factory operative vanishes as an infinitesimal quantity before the science, the gigantic physical forces, and the mass of

37) *Ibid.*, p. 442.

38) *Ibid.*, p. 350.

39) *Ibid.*

40) *Ibid.*, p. 351.

labour that are embodied in the factory mechanism and, together with that mechanism, constitute the power of the 'master'⁴¹⁾."

Thus, the natural dependence of individual labour and the social labour built on socialization of production is caricatured in the "helpless dependence (of workers) upon the factory as a whole, and therefore upon the capitalist" along with simplification of workers' functions as "the life-long speciality of serving one and the same machine" which is unique to capitalism⁴²⁾.

This relationship is all the more apparent in the inversion of the relationship between the subject and the object in capitalistic production. Extensive use of machinery in production apparently suggests existence of workers as operators as the principal or the subject, i.e., "the collective labourer, or social body of labour" exists "as the dominant subject" and "the mechanical automation as the object." Nevertheless, in "the use of machinery by capital" and therefore "the capitalist factory system", "the automation itself is the subject, and the workmen are merely conscious organs, and subordinated to the automation". "An automation" reigns as "an autocrat"⁴³⁾.

Therefore, socialization of labour in the modern, large-scale industry, by promoting above the mutual dependence of various types of labour (cooperative), makes the integrated totality of workers as a social labour unit—*de facto* subject of social production process. As the cooperative character of working process becomes more strong, the need for leadership also increases, and the capitalist finds it necessary to assign to increasing extent even its proper function of control to specific types of workers. Existence of the combined workers—the subject of production—demonstrates uselessness of the role of capital in production, and the collective workers become the subject or principals of production.

At the same time, this makes it possible for the capital to give individual labour a capitalistic structure by simplification of individual functions of workers and by assigning ever more important part of the controlling function to the other, in order to maintain separation of mental functions from manual or physical function of production by organizing a sort of "barrack discipline"⁴⁴⁾ over the division of "the workpeople into operatives and overlookers, into private soldiers and sergants of an industrial army"⁴⁵⁾.

By achieving this, the capital can eliminate direct combination between workers, and by reducing the workers to the status of working part, it can subordinate them to "the totality" of capital's authority, as the workers can display their capability only when they are integrated by the capital, and to organize mutual antagonism and competition among themselves.

Those dual aspects in the social labour are the reflections of antagonistic character of capitalistic production system inside large-scale mechanized industry. Underlying

41) *Ibid.*, p. 446.

42) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 445.

43) *Ibid.*, p. 442.

44) *Ibid.*, p. 447.

45) *Ibid.*

is the contradiction between the true nature of modern, large-scale industry (productive power) and its capitalistic form (the relationship of production). At the time when large-scale industry was still new, Marx already recognized the contradiction and noted as follows:

The technical basis of modern industry is revolutionary..... By means of machinery, chemical processes and other methods, it is continually causing changes not only in the technical basis of production, but also in the functions of the labourer, and in the social combinations of the labour-process. At the same time, it thereby also revolutionizes the division of labour within the society, and incessantly launches masses of capital and of workpeople from one branch of production to another. But if Modern Industry, by its very nature, therefore necessitates variation of labour, fluency of function, universal mobility of the labourer, or the other hand, in its capitalistic form, it reproduces the old division of labour with its ossified particularizations. We have seen how this absolute contradiction between the technical necessities of Modern Industry, and the social character inherent in its capitalistic form, dispels all fixity and security in the situation of the labourer; how it constantly threatens, by taking away the instruments of labour, to snatch from his hands his means of subsistence, and, by suppressing his detail-function, to make him superfluous. We have seen, too, how this antagonism vents its rage in the creation of that monstrosity, an industrial reserve army, kept in misery in order to be always at the disposal of capital; in the incessant human sacrifices from among the working-class, in the most reckless squandering of labour-power, and in the devastation caused by a social anarchy which turns every economic progress into a social calamity. This is the negative side. But if, on the one hand, variation of work at present imposes itself after the manner of an overpowering natural law..... Modern Industry, on the other hand, through its catastrophes imposes the necessity of recognising, as a fundamental law of production, variation of work, consequently, fitness of the labourer for varied work, consequently the greatest possible development of his varied aptitudes. It becomes a question of life and death for society to adapt the mode of production of the normal functioning of this law. Modern Industry, indeed, copels society, under penalty of death, to replace the detail-worker of today, crippled by life-long repetition of one and the same trivial operation, and thus reduced to the mere fragment of a man, by the fully developed individual, fit for a variety of labours, ready to face any change of production, and to whom the different social functions he performs, are but so many modes of giving free scope to his own natural and acquired powers⁴⁶⁾.

Thus, modern large-scale industry, through socialization of labour, not only forms a unit of social labour as the hidden subject of production in each process of work; while it reproduces structurized division of labour in its capitalistic forms, it constantly alters

46) *Ibid.*, pp. 511-512.

workers' functions and form of their social integration in the social labour unit, and by reorganizing continuously social division of labour, the industry makes it inevitable the "evolution of labour, flow of functions and overall mobility of workers" over the total aspects of social production. Large-scale industry thus requires as the real principles of production worthy of its nature and as replacement for partialized individuals, those "totally developed individuals", and the unification of those individuals, the principals of future society who perform directly socialized labour on the total social scale. In the meantime, however, capital adapts itself to the mobility of labour functions and workers by the sheer destruction and waste of labour force, with the resultant surplus, unemployment, deterioration of living conditions and anguish. In this process of adaptation, the capital utilizes those phenomena by depriving workers of their weapon to compete with the capital (i.e., capability as independent workers) and to compete among themselves. At the same time, it amply demonstrates the fragility of bourgeois individualism on the part of individual workers, its falsehood and unreality which act as a motive to prepare antagonism of workers on large scale.

2. "Socialization" and Bureaucratic Ossification of Management

Well-developed capitalism is characterized by socialization of labour on ever increasing scale, an even closer, more thorough and versatile combination of social division of labour, and a great advance of socialization of production based on large-scale industry, as well as the almighty control by a few monopolistic organs. Lenin's observation concerning the relationship between those characteristics and monopoly is very meaningful as it related to the promises and the difficulties which lie ahead of them:

It becomes evident that we have socialization of production, and not mere "inter locking"; that private economic and private property relations constitute a shell which no longer fits its contents, a shell which must inevitably decay if its removal is artificially delayed, a shell which may remain in a state of decay for a fairly long period (if, at the worst, the cure of the opportunist abscess is protracted), but which will inevitably be removed⁴⁷⁾.

The most revealing factor to illustrate such decay is the phenomenon of "socialization of administration and control" which characterizes today's socialization of production. The function of management and control which capital assigns to workers as socialization of labour takes place has developed not only to large organizations in big business of today. Domination of financial oligarchy has already provided a large administrative organizations on total society.

The modern state possesses an apparatus which has extremely close connexions with the banks and syndicates, an apparatus which performs an enormous amount of accounting and registration work, if it may be expressed this way..... A single State Bank, the biggest of the big, which branches in every rural district, in every factory..... This will be country-wide book-keeping, country-wide accounting of the production and distribution of good, this will be, so to

47) V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 22, p. 303.

...speak, something in the nature of the skeleton of socialist society.....(And this) actual work.....is performed by employees, the majority of whom themselves lead a proletarian or semi-proletarian existence⁴⁸).

Organization, integration, education, enlightenment, and cultivation which are offered by large-scale capitalism to proletariat⁴⁹) have already reached the level of a threshold leading to a new social order. Socialization of production as such implies the fact that it leads, so to speak, directly to the formation of social body of labour combined on all-social scale. At the same time, it also exposes the fact that capital has no longer any role to play not only in each process of work but also in the social production itself. This is the "shell" mentioned by Lenin, reached to the advanced state of decay.

This, again, is however but a side of the entire situation. Another aspect is that the socialization of production and management has now become a means with which (finance) capital manipulates huge amount of funds at will and "penetrates into every sphere of public life⁵⁰"; the basis of financial manipulation⁵¹), "the instrument for the fleecing by a handful of 'completely organized' monopolists⁵²", and the weapon for the development and struggle of monopolies which increase "the anarchy inherent in capitalist production as a whole" and "the disparity of the development⁵³". Generally, "under the general conditions of commodity production and private property, the 'business operation' of capitalist monopolies inevitably lead to the domination of a financial oligarchy⁵⁴", and as "an apparatus which performs accounting" becomes a means of "domination and the violence that is associated with it" which are "inevitably have resulted from the formation of all-powerful economic monopolies⁵⁵", it is "capitalistically multilated⁵⁶."

This becomes a reality by the power of money which is maintained under the general conditions of private property and commodity production. Lenin's concern on the relationship between monopolies and political power, while a short one, provides the key to understand this point:

Once we have the dominance of commodity production, of the bourgeoisie, of the power of money—bribery is "achievable" under any form of government and under any kind of democracy⁵⁷).

Acquisition can be made under whatever form of government, and under "any kind of democracy" because it can make its own purpose for political powers and bureaucratic system, and because it can fully display its almighty power under private property

48) *Do.*, Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 26, pp. 105–106.

49) *Do.*, A Great Beginning, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 29, p. 420.

50) *Do.*, Imperialism, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 22, p. 237.

51) *Ibid.*, p. 207.

52) *Ibid.*, p. 218.

53) *Ibid.*, p. 208.

54) *Ibid.*, p. 226.

55) *Ibid.*, p. 207.

56) *Do.*, Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 26, p. 106.

57) *Do.*, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 23, p. 47.

and commodity production in organizing various powers, organizations and individuals in the race to serve the purpose. This power is exercised indirectly, but all the more surely under bourgeois-democratic domination⁵⁸⁾. There, capital rarely appears as the sovereign.

When the capital delegated authority of management and control to those managers and sergeants of an industrial army⁵⁹⁾ at a relatively early stage of socialization of labour, it did not give up the position of "a leader of industry⁶⁰⁾" The capital, having decayed to the point of becoming financial capital, private property and power of money, while keeping its right as the supreme commander, is gradually retreating from the stage front of industry in order to become the emperor of industry and finance. It maintains its rule by setting the goals and targets for the survival, in terms of multiplication of financial capital and organizing its generals, officers, noncommissioned officers and soldiers for the purpose of competition to attain the goal. Thus, the socialized control, deformed by the capital to the point of becoming a kind of bureaucracy, makes those workers integrated on the social scale appear as if they are individuals whose purpose is effective achievement of the goals set by the capital, which reduces workers to the status of constituents of bureaucratic structure (constant mobility and structural reform, inside and out). For those individuals, this one-sided function of being able to develop effectiveness of achieving given goals and targets and to achieve them is separated in their consciousness of reality of social labour and their existence as constituents thereof, and the function or capability is now considered as function and capability proper to themselves.

The monopoly, while being the direct opponent of free competition, yet exists on the basis of competition, which is the basis of private property and commodity production; on this basis, workers are converted into individual competitors and servants of the mammon, and the organized power under the rule of monopoly is at the same time what Lenin called "plunder of public" which produces a reaction to strengthen organization of workers' competition for livelihood. These are the basic conditions of the domination of monopolies. When principles of bourgeois democracy are combined on such bases, subordination of individuals who live on the illusion of their proper functional skill and existence as free citizens to the power of totalitarian monopoly appears as the bourgeois democratic organization, of the ruler and ensures the organized and supreme domination of the power of money. This is the alliance between the governmental bureaucracy complex (Army, Police, and Administrative Network) and financial institutions—industry complex under the cover of citizens' political participation. To individuals who are obsessed by the illusion and aspiration of "independent citizen", it is natural that such a structure should appear to them as "flexible and slippery" monster. The illusion of "independent citizen" as the owners of functional skill of their own, thus, is a mere product of capitalistic and bureaucratic structures of "socialized control".

58) F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, *C.W.M.E.*, Vol. 21, p. 167.

59) K. Marx, *Capital*, *C.W.M.E.*, Vol. 23, p. 351.

60) *Ibid.*, p. 352

Nevertheless, this is the modern and real form of those characteristics like "apparent freedom" in conjunction with sale of labour power, and "illusion of property based on own work" in connexion with wages. The illusion serves as the basis of people's consciousness of all types of bourgeois ideology and opportunism which Lenin said would help survival of "decaying shell of relationships of private property". To flatter the illusion, and to promote and lead the illusion, is the heart of bourgeois ideology when superficial affectations and ornaments are removed from it.

For those individuals who identify goals and targets set by the capital (the most advanced form of which is yield or return on investment) as the goals and targets of their own, those who find their own independence, individuality and authority in possession of functional skills which give the maximum display of competence and purposiveness in achieving those goals and targets while competing fiercely with others (this fallacy becomes more pronounced as we go down the hierarchy of organizations), it is necessary to give up their own identity and to let the fallacy dominate them, since they are not allowed to question the validity of those goals and targets on which their competence depends. One must respect rationality in the quest of profit, while accepting at the same time fallacy concerning men and society. This results in isolation of individuals and fierce battle of all against all throughout the society. This is the subordination to the ideals of bourgeois individualism, surrender to bourgeois rationalism and fallacy, the inevitable twins, and acceptance of pragmatism. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that they must depend not upon their functional competence but on those irrational feeling like 'willingness' and 'guts' to fight out the competition, since their very functional skills are of such volatile nature.

An individual who is isolated and obsessed by this type of mentality will find some sympathy to bourgeois ideology however inconsistent it may seem to be. For instance, ideologues explain the topsyturvy relationship between mechanized automat and men, which is characteristic of capitalism, as human destiny in the 'technological age'. They identify the control arising from cooperative character of production process and the capitalistic caricatures of structurized control (in spite of the fact that the bourgeoisie considers the administration and control as expenditures). They commend administration and control, and those who are in charge of those functions (management) as the key figures in production. They advocate 'the age of management' in which capitalists are absent (who do not show up in the domain of production because of the decay) and consider, for the same reason, bureaucracy to be the destiny of modern times. They also favour the way of life in which men travel incessantly between the two contrasting world of mechanized and rationalized control and the world of private illusion and pleasure. They regard those anti-social and anti-organizational acts of hippies, vagabonds and agitators as humanistic warfare. Generally speaking, they try to contrast "man" with machine, administration, organization and society without the context of production; therefore, "man" becomes the subject of individual independence, and by emphasizing the sympathy with natural attributes to those subjects like expectations, disappointment, resignation, escape, indignation etc.; they try to cover up the real

conditions. In all events, these attributes cannot exist without flirtation with the illusion and aspiration of "independent citizenship" based on "individuals' functional competence." Sometimes, protagonists speak up frankly—"The aim of all schemes..... is to make him (worker) feel like an 'owner'. Yet, the job is the worker's real ownership in the enterprise—profit-sharing or stock-ownership are extras and as such very nice, but hardly central⁶¹⁾."

So long as the bourgeois individualism is constantly reconstructed and maintained, power of money is firmly established by means of bureaucratic, deformed organization of "social" control and the bourgeois democratic organization for the control. Bourgeois individualism is not the opponent of bureaucratic control as it is assumed to be; it is the basis, the brother of bureaucratic control.

3. From Bourgeois Individuals to Social Class

When socialization of production is taken as a total comprising those two aspects, we find not only the monopoly, but rather the essence of private ownership, in that the tendency on the part of a handful of financial capital which has been degenerated to the status of mere power of money, to achieve oligarchy in one part, and the social labour on the other hand extending over the entire society, and these two aspects are contradicting with each other. Lenin's following statement becomes particularly meaningful under these circumstances:

Capitalism in general, and imperialism in particular, turn democracy into an illusion—though at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses, creates democratic institutions, aggravates the antagonism between imperialism's denial of democracy and the mass striving for democracy⁶²⁾.

When Lenin made reference to the prejudice of bourgeois democracy among the 'retarded mass of workers' as one of the conditions which made the revolution in the countries of Western Europe where capitalism was fully developed, it is apparent that bourgeois individualism was considered to be the ideological chain to maintain workers in the state of 'retarded mass'. The superior power of money, given a free play in the prevailing conditions of private property and commodity production, the two deepest roots of the capitalism, reduces workers into individuals organized into mutual competition. On this basis, bourgeois individualism and illusion of citizenship, backed up by private property and commodity production, becomes a prevailing ideal and way of life. Thus, capitalism can readily convert democracy into illusion. As capitalism is more advanced, as it subordinates conventional relationships to private property and commodity production, as the money becomes even more powerful, as individuals are more organized into competition, and as the means to organize the competition becomes more effective as well as versatile, and as the monopolistic administration is more closely combined with the ruling bourgeois democratic institutions, the base becomes more

61) P. F. Drucker, *The Practice of Management*, p. 279.

62) V. I. Lenin, Reply to P. KIEVSKY, *L.C.W.*, Vol. 23, pp. 24-25.

conceptual than real, but it is reconstructed and maintained incessantly. Development of capitalism, to be sure, is the development of imperialistic exploitation and bribery of upper class workers, thereby the base is further established.

On the other hand, because workers are proletariat, because labour is socialized, because workers are socially integrated, capitalism provides an objective base to transform ruling bourgeois democracy into something completely opposite to it. For this very reason, capitalism necessarily produces will for democracy among workers and establishes democratic institutions. The real key to produce this transformation is to stop competition among workers, i.e., unification of workers, and to replace bourgeois individualism with the united social class as the subject of democracy. The following words of Engels, concluding his views on the achievement of labour movement in the early part of 19th century, grasp the crucial points of capitalistic transformation of democracy into illusion:

These Unions and the strikes imply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion..... The working-men cannot attack the bourgeoisie, and with it the whole existing order of society, at any sorer point than this. If the competition of the workers among themselves is destroyed, if all determine not to be further exploited by the bourgeoisie, the rule of property is at an end⁶³).

Obviously, unification of workers, i.e., formation of social class, which is based on the conditions prevailing in large-scale industry, is not only a shift of subject from bourgeois individuals to social class, but it contains establishment of individuals in a higher level characterized by mutual relationships substantiated by organization and disciplines for individual labour and social labour, individual workers and social labour body. This is the mutual dependency between individuals and unification, the transformation from "battle of all against all" to "individuals for all, and all for individuals".

A pair of Lenin's thesis introduced in the beginning might be set for the premise of the struggle to reorganize democracy into the mutual dependency between individuals and unifications. The second thesis does not mean that actual conditions of democracy in the states of Western Europe warrant the 'normal' establishment of socialism. It is the meaning of the first thesis that the democracy backed up by those conditions of Western Europe, i.e., the illusion of citizenship on bourgeois individualism, was nothing but a guarantee to perpetual existence of rule of the bourgeoisie.

63) F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working-Class in England, C.W.M.E.*, p. 436.