

# CAPITALISM WAKES UP

by DR. ALI SHARIATI



Dr Ali Shariati was born in Mazinan, a suburb of Mashad, Iran. Being one of the foremost exponents of socialism based on the teachings of Islam. He was continuously harrassed by the Shah's regime and twice served prison terms for political activity. He fled into exile in May 1977 and was murdered three weeks later on the 19th of June. This article was translated by Ali A Behzadnia and the Editorial collective cannot vouch for its accuracy.

## **rical revolution and cause its path to deviate in such a way as to safeguard its own capitalistic direction.**

Consequently, when one becomes aware of the fact that incidents are occurring to one's opponent's benefit, then one becomes aware of how to divert the direction of the incidents to one's favour. Thus, when capitalism learns that 'competition' is one of the causes of the proletarian revolution because it creates inflation and unemployment, then capitalism becomes able to eradicate that cause. In other words, capitalism acknowledges that these factors cause the proletarian revolution.

Therefore capitalism, by means of creating trusts, cartels and common markets, may stop or change these factors. That is to say, capitalism may make competition disappear, as a result of which, the huge factories would not jettison or burn billions of dollars of goods produced as was the case in the year 1820 or 1925. Some of the reasons attributed to this are the following:

1. In order not to lose their market shares, factories has to produce,
2. To pay their employees,
3. Being unable to reduce production to meet the reduction in consumption,
4. Increase in production has always been ahead of increase in consumption,
5. To keep production (supply level) inferior to the demand level in order to preserve high prices. All the above mentioned factors will cause capitalism to fall into a crisis or create critical unemployment which would expedite the proletarian revolution.

Another factor causing the proletarian revolution is the dialectical principle transferring quantity into quality. For example, if you read a poem or recite an anthem, you will not become as emotional or excited as when a group reads the same poem in which case you will become extremely excited. What is the reason behind this? Quantity. That is to say, if 500, 2000 or 5000 people were reading the poem, there would certainly be more feeling and excitement than if only five or six people were reading it. Thus, when quantity

is added, it changes into quality.

The same is true in the system of a social class structure. One of the reasons Marxism gave in the 19th century about **why the peasants revolution may occur late, or never happen at all, is attributed to their lack of self awareness** - workers should lead the peasants and give them the necessary awareness. This is called the problem of quantity, that is, the lack of concentration of farmers at their place of work.

Peasants are working over a vast area of land in a scattered manner, 100, 200 metres or even one or two kilometres from each other, whereas, in industry, workers are more concentrated. Another reason is the fact that workers live close to each other. In the fuedal system, the workers are very much spread out and dispersed. As the concentration of workers in industrial capitalism grows, it will cause the feudal system to pull back.

This will enable the labor force to become even more concentrated. Quality-wise, as capitalism grows, groups of 10, 20 or 30 who used to work together under 100 businessman will now have to work under five capitalists. Thus, concentration of the labor force, capital and pro-



*The lack of concentration of workers on farms results in a lack of self-awareness and therefore on awareness of their exploitation.*

I will now examine a very fundamental problem which I have always referred to but never discussed the problem of the tactics capitalism uses to rationalize itself. <sup>1</sup>

When a historian discovers laws of the transformations in history, factors which cause social revolution and the dialectical principles of history and when a historical philosopher shows which factors cause the formation of a social class and how and under what circumstances it is formed and how it grows until it explodes, and when he shows how the determinations of the dialectics of history cause one's social class to destroy its opposing class and then by means of an internal revolution, annihilate the ruling class and seize power, then the ruling class will certainly feel the danger of becoming the victim of the dialectics of history.

In view of the above, as the philosophy of history and the game of dialectics helps **the growth of the awareness in the proletariat about the factors creating a proletarian revolution which will destroy capitalism from within, by the same token, capitalism realizes the historical, social, class factors, the direction and behaviour that endanger its existence and which will ultimately destroy it.** <sup>2</sup>

Subsequently, according to Marxism, when man's self awareness, social consciousness, awareness of being part of the proletarian class and when the proletariat, who are the pioneer force, mobilize and form a political party, as a centre for their struggle against the ruling class, this could be one of the causes and factors leading to the expediting the revolution in favour of the proletariat. For the same reasons, the ruling or the exploiting class, that is to say, **capitalism, is able to have control over such factors as self awareness or scientific awareness and become familiar with the law of histo-**



*Concentration of workers leads to debates heightening the consciousness of workers.*

duction will lead to the concentration of the proletariat. This, in turn, would cause the number of workers to increase, thus accentuating the growth of workers solidarity.

I call the increase in the proletariat and its ever growing concentration, a quantity-wise increase — just like the increase in water temperature. This quantity will then be transferred to quality which is the awakening and self awareness of the proletariat, called revolution. You may have noticed that in places where people work or study as a group during the day and then disperse at night, they are more sensible than emotional towards problems. The reason is that they are concentrated at work and where they live. The result is not the same when they are scattered. **The more the concentration of workers grows, the more they will get involved in debates and the exchanges of ideas,** thus attracting more and more workers. **These are the factors which cause an awakening, an alertness, a class feeling, the expression of class needs, the making of decisions, the belief in self and worker power, organization, analysis and evaluation of the environment and conditions of life in order to confront the ruling class. All these factors pave the way for a revolution.**

**On the other hand, the capitalist is also aware of all the above problems.** He is no longer the old unintelligent hoarder of money. The capitalist can now employ sociologists, philosophers, scientists and even the most reknown socialists and Marxist experts. As the capitalist is informed of all the dangers facing his existence, he will mobilize all his powers to change the direction of history in his favour.

Capitalism in the West has been very successful in its mission. As I mentioned before, a proletarian revolution had even started in the 19th century, but we hear nothing about it in the 20th century. **In some French villages, the proletariat even votes for the right wing. In France and**

**Italy, the election boards show exactly those who have leftist or rightist tendencies.** Moreover, during elections, the proletarian tendencies are shown by a curve on the political board.

**When living standards show signs of improvement, the political board indicates that the tendencies are towards the right wing.** That is to say that even the proletariat and the exploited class in Europe mentioned by Marx have rightist tendencies. But **when living standards drop and the French economy is badly hurt because of war, etc, the political board shows tendencies of moving towards the left wing.** But today, as compared with the 19th century, the board is indicating all the signs to be in favour of the right wing.

### STOPPING WORKER SOLIDARITY

The proletariat, which according to the dialectics of history, had to bring about a revolution, is now moving further away from the direction of history. The reason is that capitalism is now aware of all the factors and is working hard to stop the concentration of workers.

In the old times, for example, in Lancashire, England, all the factories used to be built in industrial areas. Thus, an industrial town would be created with its employees living close to the factories and also to each other. Moreover, they used to have a common workers club, common swimming pool, common village, common cinemas and common beaches, etc.

Today this is no longer the case. Efforts are towards having all workers living quite a distance from their place of work. Instead of building one single living conglomerate for all workers, they now build several scattered conglomerates.

In most industrial towns, there are villages two or three kilometers from each other, which are separated by means of deserts or unnecessary parks and open spaces. That is to say

that in a vast area there are several living conglomerates which have no contact with each other. Each village uses its own cinema, clubs and shops within their own conglomerate. The distance to the next conglomerate is great and they have no contact with other conglomerates. This is how capitalism is destroying workers concentration and solidarity.

### CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS

**The major factor which would expedite a revolution of the proletariat is the consciousness of that class.** As I have mentioned before, it is the feeling of poverty which starts a movement. **The necessary factor that would persuade a social class to rise is the consciousness of being exploited rather than the mere fact of being exploited.**

It is the dialectic that is moving. We have witnessed the fact that unlike frozen dialectics, **thesis and antithesis have been living together happily and peacefully for 1000 or 2000 years.** Class consciousness is the factor which hastens the revolution. It is a factor of the dialectical movement. How could a blind class find consciousness? Or divert it? Or postpone it? If one understands class consciousness, one can stop it. It is very clear. It is just like a doctor who knows all the symptoms of the illness and can then fight it.

**One of the major factors bringing about the exploited classes awareness of self is deprivation.** <sup>3</sup>

Thus, it is natural that the more I feel deprived, the more I will become aware of my class. Now, what factors will make me feel deprived? Through experiences in your society, you may notice that it is not enough to be hungry in order to feel that you are hungry. It has been observed that not only do some people who are hungry not feel it but they even thank God that they are leading a good life. Their stomachs are hungry but they are not conscious of it. Or they are aware of their hunger but they are not aware of their unnatural deprivation. They feel natural. <sup>4</sup>

There are many factors through which one can either fool oneself or be fooled by others. What is that fact through which a deprived person may realize that he is deprived? To



*People aware of hunger but not of their unnatural deprivation.*

conceive and to lead a natural life and to know what a normal person must have in a normal life is a big problem. But one must realize all of those things which one does not have, while one is not aware of this.

### Under Consumption

What makes a person realize that he is deprived in life? It is neither low income nor no income, nor low production, nor even small ownership nor little capital. The answer is under consumption. When one feels that one has a very low share of consumption in whatever is produced one feels one is being exploited. Consumption could be basic, such as that relating to food and clothes or it could be luxurious like that relating to cars, etc.

You can realize the feeling of being exploited via under consumption through class antagonisms. The symptoms of class differences are neither capital nor production but consumption. In other words, a social class will not realize how backward it is even if it possessed capital a million times more than another social class. When the backward class actually conceives of the differences existing between the basic and luxurious consumption of the other class with itself, then it will really feel deprived.

**Therefore, it is through comparisons and contractions that man basically realizes and conceives of reality. In a closed environment a person may claim to be the most knowledgeable person on earth, thus having no need for education. It is only when he finds himself in a situation where he meets with other persons that he finds out how little he knows.**

Eventually 'I do not know' is the phrase I would feel when I would meet others who knows a lot. **The time I would feel deprived, exploited, poor and hungry is when I would become aware and see how my antagonistic class eats, the clothes it wears, the things it enjoys and the life it leads.**

Consequently, it is consumption that creates deprivation. What makes me realize my under consumption is the consumption of others.

### Contradiction

For example, a certain big businessman, who is able to buy half the city, sits in a very tiny office, wearing cheap clothes, looking quite poor in a dirty room with an extremely cheap desk. At noon time he eats soup or bread and yoghurt. Life is worthless. Why? Because his employee who sits close to him sees that usually his clothes are nicer than those of his boss. He also sees that his appearance, his child and wife are better than the businessman's.

As the employee sees that his boss is even more deprived than himself, he



Exploited people live in houses which are identical.

does not feel exploited at all. We notice that our own capitalism rationalized itself before Europe did. The external facade of the old village houses does not differ very much from each other in the classical towns of Kashan and Yazd. All doors look alike in the houses of the classical merchants of the bazaar unless those houses belong to the big landowners and the feudal lords. Usually all the walls are made of mud and straw and look so much alike that aside from their different sizes, all houses seem as if they belonged to one family in the town. You do not notice a large class difference.

### SHOWING OFF

However, the case would be different once you entered the houses. When you see all the carpets and the food that is served, you would feel the big difference between this and the very next house. They would be incomparable. This is entirely contrary to what exists in our cities today and our present class system. More contradictions are being noticed in modern towns. Modern man uses his utmost effort to beautify the outside of his house. Since he himself does not see the outside and since it has no effect on his life, he does this only for the sake of others. He wants to indicate that he belongs to an upper class. This relieves his morale. Otherwise, the style of the outside of his house does not change his real life.

This class life is a way of life that we have learned. In the old times all doors looked alike. Today, everybody's aim is to make, paint or deco-



His car and clothes have to be unique. He's got to be different.

rate them in such a way as to be completely different from others. **Nowadays, one tries to look unique in his district. The colour and model of one's car must be unusual. One's clothes must be exceptional. To be unique is to show that one is different and unmatched. One belongs to another class.** Thus, one continues to pay attention to one's appearance. One even wishes to exaggerate these contradictions and differences. Once these kinds of actions, whether real or unreal, are presented to the deprived class, it would certainly belittle them. This is the spirit of the West's class differences which has infiltrated into our society and has influenced our so-called modern people. This is a factor which irritates and awakens the deprived class.

The aristocratic tradition has always been more noticeable in the West. Because of the system of ownership in the Islamic economy, such aristocratic traditions have never existed in Muslims society. Islamic ethics have always struggled and resisted such aristocratic dispositions to the point where it has extremely weakened the aristocratic sumptuousness with regard to richness, opulence, comfort, showing off and belittling others. This state, however, is still at its highest stage in Europe.

Two centuries after the great French Revolution which caused the disappearance of the aristocracy, today's aristocrats still walk and wear clothes differently. **They even frequent their own 'closed restaurants'. That is to say that whatever amount of money you are willing to pay you may not enter those restaurants.** They have their own clubs, closed entertainment and closed marriages. They are all firmly and aristocratic clubs which admit special persons holding membership cards. As a whole, aristocratic families have relationships with each other. Their actions, kinsmanship, relationships and their social etiquette bear a kind of rigid formality, all of which is intended to show that this group or class is superior to others. This class wishes to enforce itself upon others. It wishes to persuade other people that its superiority is basically natural; it is a quality of its blood, life, nature and temper which still exist. It

tries to sell this idea even though nobody is willing to buy it.

This spirit of showing off the class antagonism, with regard to consumption, has caused the following, certainly to a greater extent in Europe than in Iran and other Third World countries. First, it has created complexes for the deprived class. It has made the said class realize how poor it is and how different it is from the upper class. Generally, 100 or 200 years ago, the difference between the capitalist and the rich class, excluding the small capitalists (the same opulent landowners and businessmen), with the middle and lower class was much more than what it seemed to be in appearance. But to day, this class difference is less than its appearance. **As a person's salary today is increased by \$30 or \$40 it is soon echoed everywhere. He will belittle everybody with his car, clothes, house, his appearance, his looks and also with the changing of the curtains, carpets and furniture.** He will show his family, competitors, friends and all the people on his street that he is now superior to the others. He even makes false presumptions and therefore consumes in a false way. His lunch table is curtailed everyday while adding to his car. His reasoning being that people cannot see your stomach but this (my car) shows my prestige. His living room is the best place of his house, it receives the most sunshine, it is sanitary, big, and nice. This is the living room of a very rich person which is used once or twice a year. But he himself, his wife and his children are living in the worst place of the house and in the worst state of life. He curtails all possibilities regarding the natural and real needs of his family in order to pay more attention to the appearance of things which are more noticeable to outsiders. This antagonism in consumption awakens the exploited class. That is to say, that this class always seeks with its own eyes the things that others possess but it still does not have. There, day and night, it sees, hears and feels the terms 'haves and have nots' This awakens it and makes it aware of what to do. These things will mobilize it and cause it to hold a grudge against others.

I mentioned that rich men and the classical bourgeois tried to hide or lessen the appearance of their consumption. In general they spend little. But when capitalism awakes, it changed the whole story completely, that is to say that capitalism increased the apparent consumption of the deprived and the proletariat, but it did not lower its own.

### Sops to workers

Suppose I was a French worker, what were all the aims and comforts belonging to the aristocrats that we did not possess? They had beaches and they would go to the sea. **Going to the sea was an aristocratic and**

**rich entertainment for those who owned cars, while the poor people had to go for a walk to the local town square. The capitalist accepts to allow the proletariat to the beaches. This would not be very expensive while it would make his complexes disappear. The problem is going to the beach. This would not be very expensive to a capitalist. He goes to the beach for the sake of feeling relieved, comfort and entertainment, while a worker goes for the sake of his prestige.** Often he has no more than one day. He rushes to the beach from Tehran just to touch the water and come back. This is not only for the sake of showing others that he, too, went to such and such a place, making all complexes psychologically blow up, but it also causes the envy he feels towards them to die out. This a personal, internal psychological problem. He is first saturated and then satisfied.

In Paris, there are cinemas whose tickets cost 10 francs, or 100 francs. There are 3 or 4 cinemas which are off bounds to a poor and deprived person. They were a source for envy and formed a boundary. He may not go to a cinema on the Champs Elysees. As a whole, neither could he or any of his friends, nor any member of his family or any one from his class go there. **Capitalism will now admit him to these places - without really giving him anything - that is to say that he only feels he has joined the aristocratic class and has acquired its dispositions.** What is capitalism really doing?

Nothing. **Capitalism only removes a small constraint.** The worker can now go to the very same cinema and watch the same film. He now goes to the same places that his boss and all industry owners go to. He also sits on the very same chair and feels relieved. The chair is still warm when, just like them he provides himself and his wife, with sandwiches, and waits, just like the aristocrats who used to go to cinema in the past. Now he has also gone to a cinema. **He also drinks a beer as his boss used to drink whisky.** It makes no difference. he imitates



Credit Purchasing

them in the best cinemas of the world. The worker used to have a very small and insignificant constraint. **The only difference is that, unlike his boss, he can go to cinemas on Thursday only. That is to say that the same cinema ticket is only one franc on Thursdays thus enabling the worker to go to such a cinema.** Therefore he has succeeded in reaching the symbolic places and cafe's which were always closed to the people of his class.

The opera, the Paris Opera in particular, belongs to the aristocrats, to that very intellectual class and to those who possess the highest university education. It is built by the artists who were linked to the Louis' and Versailles. Its art belonged to them as a whole. He could neither enter nor approach such an opera with his simple clothes. The waiter, alone, is several times more luxurious than he is, which makes him feel complexed. Also, the culture of the worker class is not rich enough to watch an opera by Moliere. He will neither understand nor like it at all. Even though he likes his own songs, he goes to the opera. The day they announce that the opera ticket is, for example, 2 francs, he takes his wife, children and uncle there. This is just for the sake of overcoming his own and his grandfather's complex, which he had for years. This is a kind of spiritual and psychological consumption.

### Credit Purchasing

We will give them refrigerators and cars which are the symbols of aristocracy. How? Do we give them the possibility to buy? No. If we give



The Rich at Play

then purchasing power, then we would abolish class differences. **The problem of self rationalization of capital is to make the working class not hungry and have everything while being and remaining poor.** Nothing has changed. Although you cannot afford a refrigerator, you wish to have one? Yes. You may have one without paying for it. You wish to have a T.V.? You may have one without paying a cent for it. Take it. But there is a box here that you put pennies in for every time you wish to switch it on. It is nothing. Anyway he now possesses something which is a symbol of aristocracy. That is to say that the biggest French capitalist does not possess more than this T.V. You have one too. But he has a small debt. What will he do? His children used to get change and spend it enjoying themselves. His wife used to save the change until it would reach \$30 or \$40 and then she would spend it when necessary. Then there was this small change that he would donate to the needy and spend when urgent. All these monies have to go into that box now, the T.V. box. He watches T.V. and after 15 minutes it automatically turns off.

He wants to watch the continuation. Finally he has to borrow from friends to switch the T.V. on again. When his neighbour comes over to his home, he would not ask him to turn the T.V. on, he would pay himself and watch the T.V. The capitalist is constantly sucking the money of his neighbours friends and relatives. The capitalist does not ask his workers for money. It is free. But what has happened? The worker possesses one of the biggest signs of aristocracy. He owns one of the best, most luxurious, most beautiful and most prestigious tool of a comfortable life in his house. Well, he thanks God that he is better off now. He could not even have dreamt of it.

### Imperialism

He can now own a car in the same way. Credit purchasing can do miracles in life. Without increasing the standard of living or purchasing power or class difference, it gives him false sense of purchasing power, and aids consumption. Loan, bank credits and credits given by the Westerners to the Easterners have a dual purpose. First, these backward people should not become so poor that the list of our goods for consumption be drastically reduced. If those people were to become very poor then they would be unable to buy our goods, thus we would lose our market. On the other hand, they should not become so rich as to become able to produce. They should be in between. That is why we would give them a false sense of purchasing power. How? One way is through "credits" We even have to be a little lenient. For example we used to take uranium and diamonds from Tanzania at \$5 a gram. Now we will increase it to \$7 a gram. This



means that we have shown good intentions and at the same time we have increased their purchasing power and they become satisfied.

This increase in purchasing power would create a bigger market for our goods. As we donate \$2 as an increase for the price of diamonds, tomorrow we will witness that the sales curve of our capitalistic goods to the same country has increased by 30%. This would make the poor country happy because, politically, their pride is saturated as well as socially and economically. They would serve progress. At the same time their unhealthy consumption has increased because they can now buy more. This is an unauthentic feeling. All hopes given to them that they would become an advanced country and would no longer belong to the backward and exploited class are nothing but empty words. Worthless. Now this deprived class — the proletariat — can go to the best aristocratic cinema as well as to the beach even though it is lower than the aristocratic beach. But it does not make much difference. Aristocrats own a lot of commodities and they also go to the beach anyway. We will give him cars, refrigerators, T.V. and etc. which are the symbols of the bourgeoisie class, thus making him feel well-off without having changed his class status

### Social Security

Another factor is the social advantages, such as insurance, social security, wages, etc. A portion of each of


the above is given to them by capitalism. This is where capitalism is really making an investment. It is no more very unhealthy. He is investing. **An uncertain future is one of the conditions which would cause the worker to revolt.** He always feels, "I am getting old in this place and if tomorrow my hand is chopped off, I would be fired. Well if I became poor, old, and disabled, then my wife, my child and all of them will be left hungry. We have no kind of security. He has full dominance over our fate and can fire us at his will."

**Therefore, the capitalist, through giving the worker class security and assurances, abolishes this kind of instability, insecurity and wavering.** So much rest for this period of work or this much to be paid as retirement benefits are some of the forms of the class security given by the capitalist to the exploited class. He says that I will deduct 5% for his social insurance while he deducts 10% and explains that the difference is to provide him with life insurance. "We will provide him with whatever he likes such as insurance and social security even for his wife and child. We will pay him \$35 for every newborn child." All these are the alms given to him. **But the amount that the capitalist invests in him causes his anger to be abolished for good. This state of contradictions is replaced with a state of competition.**

### Religion

What has changed? The change is that in the capitalistic system of the 19th century, the proletariat had no hope and all the factors helped in belittling him. **The church used to say, "You are born so, God has made you just like this. Jesus Christ is Kind. He has wished and made you so. You have to be like this. Religion would say, on behalf of God, that you have to remain in this state of deprivation. You are created and have to live in this way, just as the capitalist and the well-to-do feudal lords are created to live the way they are living.** As a whole, God has separated you and the well-to-do class by a heavy, large and invincible wall."

All these factors had made him hopeless. All philosophers, socialists, writers and poets were at the service of the capitalist. Everyone obeyed him



*The imperial crown and Orb of the Holy Roman Empire. The biggest share of capitalism in the West belongs to the Roman Catholic Church.*

in order to remain in their present state in the name of being virtuous and ethical. If not they would be called sinners, spoiled people who ignore other people's rights. They would obey him in the name of spirit, religion, ethics or anything else. They were helpless. Therefore, the more the aristocratic class showed itself to be superior, to have advantages, to be well-to-do, eager for money and the exploiter of this class, the less they would think of breaking this wall and sharing a little of their life and alms with the deprived class.

But in the present class cycle, when the proletariat obtains class awareness at any cost, they would realize that what all the capitalists has said on behalf of God, was what they had previously said about the gods. The proletariat would then abandon religion.

As you see in the struggles in the 19th century **the worker supports materialism because religion was totally at the service of and dedicated to the Gods of gold and power.** Generally, gold, power and fraud were all prefabricated. As we see, the biggest share of capitalism in the West belongs to the Roman Catholic Church. The biggest investments in the world belongs to them. Thus, it was not at the service of the people. This is why workers revolts against religion and this kind of class system. They knew that their only salvation is through revolution, through breaking and destroying everything. They had nothing to lose.

**Now capitalism realizes that it should give something to the worker so that if there were a revolution, he would envy its loss.** So, the feeling of possessing something he likes, has made his life more comfortable and hold him from taking any risks. **Also, when a worker owns something, he becomes conservative. While he may keep his revolutionary ideas if he wishes to, he is allowed to do anything in his revolutionary thoughts.**

This same proletariat and revolutionary class in 19th century France, who saw that, that year they were

working seven hours as compared to eight hours the year before, started a guild struggle and later went on strike. He was able to reduce his working hours half an hour and increase his wages. He was becoming better off. He obtains better social security, better and larger insurance, he becomes better off, and receives more possibilities and can go on more strikes. **Capitalism offers him a syndicate as a break to go on a strike for a couple of hours when he becomes very angry. Finally they would compromise with their leaders and solve all the difficulties.** I would like to mention the logic and rationale which lies behind such reasoning. That is to say, the disappearance of 'the difference in consumption for the purpose of safeguarding the differences in production, ownership and classes'. **This is when 'capitalism becomes rational.' In other words, capitalism's tactic is to donate a little to saturate the worker. Now that the worker owns something, he is no longer willing to run a risk of losing it whether in a revolution, rebellion or uprising.** This might even kill his class awareness because he can see that he possesses whatever his boss owns. **But as I said before, while he own nothing, he is apt to break, destroy, blow up, revolt, adjust and abolish the capitalist society.**

He is prone to destroy the system in order to own something. He sees that he is gradually being given things like wages, syndicates, insurance, beaches, refrigerators, etc. He feels that hope is replacing disappointment in him — disappointment because by protecting capitalism and the class system, he can have a human life while he was disappointed and would have ended up in a historical revolution. But this process of gradual donation to the worker or creating a false feeling of being well-to-do or granting him a syndicate instead of an ideology<sup>5</sup> will make a worker hopeful. During these seven or eight years that he has begun to become better off, he has also become hopeful that if he is able to preserve his present situation, by means of struggling through his

syndicate, or through gaining more power, then he will acquire more and more advantages. That is how hope makes him feel relieved. The false feeling of being well-to-do makes him feel satisfied and his showing off by differences between consumption, or the disappearance of all the pride and the aristocratic tendencies of luxury during the bourgeois period, which would then reduce the contradictory crises. And the syndicate will find their way to divert all social complexes.

### Awakening of Capitalism

**Indeed this is the 'awakening of capitalism,' that is to say that through their tactics, capitalism tries to invest even from its own pocket.** During the bourgeoisie period, it desires to obtain the absolute maximum profit. **But capitalism, in order to destroy the revolution, spends a little and gives away some of its profit.** For example, on a 20% profit he is willing to give away about 5% of it in favour of the workers or for the sake of the society in order to destroy the revolution. He foresaw that if the extent of exploitation was to be continued as it did during the 19th century, there would have been a revolution ten years from then, **so he has to reduce the prevailing extent of exploitation in order to postpone the revolution.** He gives away a little in favour of his enemy in order to delay the revolution to 20 years, 30 years, 1000 years or even to completely destroy it. We can also see that he has also been successful to a certain extent.

But what is the main reason for such a success? Unfortunately, even Marx, who was at the peak of his reputation and thinking in the second half of the 19th century, has not referred to this problem. It is astonishing and unbelievable that he who is so sensitive and observant about the exploitative relationship between the proletariat and his employer in the capitalistic system does not refer to that problem. It would be acceptable from such and such a French, Dutch, or English capitalist in the 19th century but not from Marx, who is so considerate about the problems of brotherhood, class system, exploitation, the rights of the deprived class and the proletariat. He who has depicted the most profound problems on the basis of economic exploitation, he who more than anybody else has worked towards the creation of self awareness of the proletariat and the deprived class which is the main factor of awareness and consciousness as far as the exploitation and class system is concerned. I Wonder why<sup>6</sup>

### Colonialism

During the periods 1850, 1860 and 1870, the most dreadful forms of murder and animal-like exploitation of Latin America, Africa and Asia existed. **That is to say that the animal-like imperialism, similar to a wolf attacking people of the third world**

-today's term bit and killed them. They destroyed everything, such as culture, morale, ethics and normal life. <sup>7</sup> They would formally mass murder, plunder our best cultural and artistic works as well as all of our raw materials. Often they would take a group of local workers with themselves.

All African tribes were captured as slaves in the worst animal-like forms. Then while taking them to the U.S.A., they would put these slaves in a special way in their huge vessels. <sup>8</sup> How is it that under such conditions where a group of African labourers on coffee fields had a maximum to eat in order to survive, had no clothes, and under such conditions here all of the East, Africa, and Latin America was plundered in order for the West's capitalism to be created, those most progressive of all groups, in the West during this period, who struggle more than others for human rights, against exploitation and class differences and who show more sensitivity and who even fight for it, never talk or say a word about the contradictions the horrible imperialistic differences, just like the relationship between a wolf and a sparrow? **It even astonishes me that in the West's analysis of capitalism is no such problem as plundering of the East's raw materials.** Why don't they even mention this? **Why do they not discuss the problem of where all the capital accumulated now in England, Germany, and France with which they exploit the European worker, came from?** Marx says that this capital should be put at the service of the proletarian class, or at the service of the people's government. What belongs to the people, to the governments of Europe and must be nationalized? As a whole, to whom should it belong?

### "Third World"

I undoubtedly believe in the antagonism existing between the employer and proletarian relationship. I believe in it globally as well as scien-

tifically. Especially since it is the word of the day in Europe and a group for struggle and revolution that the proletarian class is invited to revolt. There is no revolt. There is no misunderstanding between the relationship of the proletariat and the capitalist. **But the real problem is whom does this capital belong to? Where has it come from?** Despite the fact that I believe infinitely in Mr. Schwartz whom you have seen me mentioning often and although I believe in his scientific thought and social path — he is also the founder of the three party system, that is to say the united Socialist parties <sup>9</sup> — very very astonishingly he says that capitalism had become rationalized and gives away a portion of it's capital and profit to the proletarian class, and creates a bourgeois-looking life for him. **The reason why Marx's prediction was not realized and the revolution in Europe was delayed and the proletariat does not possess that revolutionary state of being is firstly due to the awakening of the capitalist class and secondly the proletariat becoming bourgeois-like. They look and live like the bourgeoisie.**

I ask the question, why do you not contribute this to the awakening of capitalism, a result of which it has been able to provide ample possibilities such as salary, social advantages, social security, insurance, purchasing power, price reductions etc. Where has the capitalist acquired all this money from? Is it due to its awakening? Or is it because the third world is sinking into continuous poverty and increasing misery and becoming more backward in order for your proletariat class to be changed to the bourgeoisie? Which one is the reason?

Mr. Yves Lacoste is then author of a book entitled 'The Geography of Hunger' which has recently been translated. He compares the prices of all the raw materials exported from backward countries to Europe during 20 to 30 years in exchange for already cooked and made com-

modities. <sup>10</sup> The result of this comparison is incredibly grotesque.

If his research and method were not written as a world reknown economist we could not even think that all the consumer goods exported from Europe to our countries during the last 20 or 30 years often had a 300%, 400% to 600% price increase. On the other hand, the raw material which they receive from us, Africa, Asia, and many Latin American countries, contrary to the demand and supply rules which state price increases in every 30 or 40 years, some of these raw material curves had small slopes and some none.

The price of most of the exported raw materials from the backward countries to Europe had declined compared to 30 years ago. It has often been halved.

Contrary to the last analysis of the most highly ranked, intellectual, progressive, and revolutionary, socialist, <sup>11</sup> which says that it is the self rationalization of capitalism which has destroyed the revolution and has made the proletariat become bourgeois I believe that the only thing we can pay them with in order to guarantee their exports, is our poverty.


#### The 'Triangular trade'

*Ships sailed from the 'mother country' with manufactured goods, which they exchanged on the West Coast of Africa for slaves.*

*The cargoes of slaves were taken across the Atlantic (the journey became known as the 'Middle Passage') and sold in the West Indies, North and South America, to work on the plantations there.*

*The same ships were then loaded with the products of the plantations, i.e. food, luxuries and raw materials, which were taken back and sold in the 'mother country'.*

*Thus the slave trade, or the 'triangular trade' as it became known, made profits at each of these three stages — profits which went to the merchant capitalists who financed it, and which made seaport towns like Bristol and Liverpool very wealthy indeed.*



# Footnotes Referred to in CAPITALISM WAKES UP

1. As this is neither a theoretical problem nor a scientific theory or ideology, but rather a real and contemporary problem which deals especially with the fate of the third world in which we live, it must be discussed thoroughly and independently.

2. In other words capitalism is becoming wise. Why? "Because", explains a writer, "as much as Marxism has helped the awareness and self-consciousness of the proletariat it has indirectly helped the awareness and self-consciousness of capitalism."

3. Even though the external factor of the problem of self awareness is objective — the problem of self-awareness is a subjective matter.

4. A friend of mine used to narrate that someone was complaining about poverty, hardships in life, debts, and deprivation. He believed that his life was worsening everyday. Then, he would reflect a moment and say, "We still have to thank God that in this summer heat I am not ill because if I were ill then the doctor would tell me to go and sleep close to the heater then what would I have done! Thank God that I am not ill and I am leading a good life."

5. And to destroy an ideology, he creates syndicalism to protect the worker's profits within his guild than in his society or his class and solve the problem in relation to the capitalist, or to enforce it upon the capitalist. But it will not endanger the capitalistic system. It will rather put so and so capitalist or factory owner under pressure and divert the direction of the flow.

6. The reason I say "no" — in relation to the same ground on which the problem is posed — is because my judgement would then differ, because problems are always to be tackled from all its aspects in order to get the right result, not on the same grounds on which the problem is posed, because then the judgement would be different.

7. The capitalist, in order to make his factory run, would even destroy all or half of the agriculture, the normal life of its people, forest and even the natural resources, water and the animals of that state or country in order to employ a cheap work force for his factory.

8. In order to place 1200 slaves in a vessel with a capacity of 300 men, in order to deliver to the U.S.A. about 650 to 700 living slaves, it would still be advantageous for example to place them in a way that even if 300 out of 1000 of them die, there would still be 700 to deliver alive to the U.S.A.

9. He and his group divorced from the French Communist Party due to the latter's choice of very inhumane and reactionary directions regarding the problem of Algeria and Hungary. The French Communist Party has also compromised with the capitalists and they had all become one. Djimole used to be in a Socialist Party. Maurice Tours was the head of the Communist Party. Djimole was the person who compromised with Israel and hence attacked Egypt. He had compromised with England too. Yet he was a socialist. Also, Maurice Tours owned a Villa and a castle near to Brigitte Bardot's villa. They (Mr Schwartz and his group) left the Communist Party and became Free Socialist and Intellectuals who had no obligation towards the big powers and foreign governments. They formed a very clean and clear-cut intellectual group which had no engagement towards the big powers, but which felt obligation towards the proletarian class.

10. Very well, I give wool and he makes it into clothes. Thank God, he makes us wear new clothes! He is making us civilized!

11. Thus they say: the revolution in Europe is destroyed, postponed or deferred due to the fact that the capitalist has become a sociologist, aware, wise, and has understood that he has to share a portion of his profits with the proletariat. He has to create a oriented life and thus change the proletariat to a bourgeoisie as a result of which the workers become conservative and attack and oppose any revolutionary risk and class consciousness.

## CONTINUED FROM PAGE 20

anti-BC stance of the SAM & DC must add grist to the mill of those who are arguing for the isolation of white South Africa in the medical world.

The inquiry into the Biko doctors and the promise of the Attorney Generals of the Cape and the Transvaal to open a murder docket for the Biko killings if new evidence comes to light will certainly not take the place of the Azanian equivalent of the Nuremberg Trial. **Colonel Goosen was, after all, promoted to the rank of Brigadier in 1982- we are quite convinced that this was remuneration for the murder of Steve Bantu Biko.**

AZAPO maintains that nothing has changed in racist South Africa since Makana was dragged to Robben Island. Our advice to the South African medical practitioner is:

### PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF

which means that any physician truly committed to his profession needs to dedicate himself to the struggle for national emancipation.

## CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9

Frelimo represented working class interests and visualised the structuring of a socialist state. Its violent pro-capitalist neighbours — South Africa and Rhodesia — subverted Frelimo's attempts at carrying out its aims. Ever since Frelimo has taken over the country it has never stopped being at war with the counter-revolutionary forces which were backed by Rhodesia and South Africa. Imperialism has had a centuries-old grip on Mozambique, but Frelimo has made honest efforts at trying to get rid of it. Frelimo's association with the 73-year-old African National Congress which claims to be in opposition to the Botha regime, has antagonised South Africa and led to frequent raids by the South African Defence Force (SADF) into Mozambique. In the few years that Mozambique has been in power, it has not been able to establish a socialist structure. It is the height of arrogance to condemn a hard-pressed Frelimo and not give Mozambique a chance.

Zimbabwe is only five years old yet it comes under the wrath of this little intellectual group. If they had bothered to read the history of Zimbabwe before commenting, they would have known that Robert Mugabe's Zanu (PF) was forced by the frontline states to negotiate with the Smith regime and sign the Lancaster House "agreement". That "agreement" has prevented Zanu (PF) from implementing socialist structures in the country from 1980 to 1990. Zanu (PF) leaders have said frequently that they would like to scrap the

"agreement", but cannot because they are bound to their promise to let matters ride for 10 years. Zanu (PF) should be judged by what it does in the years after 1990 and not before. Mugabe is not a populist leader. He was one of the main proponents of working class interests during the bush war and in the years that followed he has sanctioned and established socialist structures in spheres that the "agreement" allowed him to. If you are looking for populist and anti-working class leadership in Zimbabwe you should cast focus no further than Mugabe's political opponent — Joshua Nkomo.

The intellectual attitude that does not take into cognisance the reality of this country shines through in the slogan used by the group: "international working class solidarity". I say so because nowhere in the letter was there reference to the "black" working class. The "international working class" perspective reads that the interests of the white working class and the black working class are one and the same and that the two groups form a monolithic working class entity with common interests. No cognisance is taken of the privileged position of the white working class in this country and the fact that the Botha regime receives much of its support from this class when acting against the black working class.

The intellectual arrogance comes through again with the call for a united workers' front because it is plain to see that from the attitude of this group they want to impose leadership on that front. It seems their arrogance will not allow independent working class leadership to form.

What we need is working class aspirations expressed through a socialist party. Once that party has achieved its takeover of this country, we will establish an assembly, an international solidarity and a workers' front expressing itself through socialist state formations.

**PAUL ALBERT**

Bosmont, Johannesburg

### CAL

• I understood the main impetus of the National Forum to be a united front of Black organizations. It is obvious that the broad liberation movement is riven by hegemonic conflicts and "ideology" is used to mask the attempts by ambitious politicians (as against revolutionaries) to create and fortify their own little fiefdoms.

It is equally obvious to me that every people's organization uses the language and ideas implicit in the BC philosophy while addressing the masses in the ghettos, the factories and the farms although they adopt an apologetic and submissive posture at the tea parties in Lower Houghton or La Lucia or the cheese-and-wine "dos" at Rondebosch or at Sandton.