Project 01

# 1 – Introduction and What is Communism?

What is today’s live about?

Today’s live will be a summary of the basic principles of communism,

that is if you are getting in contact with communism for the first time,

maybe this video would be a good way to start.

And my goal here is to show the common bases of communism.

And why do I say 'common bases'?

Because there are different lines of thought on communism.

But I'll present the common bases of all these lines.

Except for some weird sects here and there.

Here we will see the very basic of the basics.

At the end of this live, I'll show a reading guide,

Sharing all the books for free except for one,

we'll talk about that one later,

and suggest a reading order, alright?

I strongly recommend that you read,

and don't only use this video as a reference.

It's really worth it to read and reread

even if you already master the topic for it to sink into your head.

It's also worth it to search for additional bibliography because what will show here is quite basic, okay?

Quite, quite basic.

So, let's go: the basic principles of communism.

Firstly, I want to thank Groselha Atômica.

@panquetriste who made this wonderful art that’s here on the screen.

I'd want to thank Thales Caramante and João Carvalho, too,

who helped me with the script of this video.

And I beg of you, Marxologist who has a Ph.D. in Marxism,

Please, understand that I'm talking in a basic, simplified way, right?

You don't need to quote the Grundrisse,

Or the letters Marx sent whoever, just don't, ok?

We know you know a lot about Marx.

And fine, we talk about that another day, right?

So, let's go: What's communism?

Anti-clickbait, the definition in the screen:

The communism is the doctrine of the conditions of the liberation of the proletariat.

This is a quote from Engels,

From the book called “[The Principles of Communism](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/11/prin-com.htm)”.

So, first of all, don't be scared of the word 'doctrine'.

Doctrine means a set of principles.

It isn't like indoctrination, doesn't conflate 'doctrine' with 'dogma'.

Today there is a lot of talk about indoctrination,

and people think this is permanently negative, right?

So, communism is the doctrine of the conditions for the liberation of the proletariat.

.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-

In case someone doesn't know, what's proletariat?

Proletarians are those who live from the sale of their labor power, and who work in exchange for a wage.

This is the proletariat.

Moreover, what is the goal of communism?

Communism aims for a society without social classes, that is,

a society without exploitation of human beings by other human beings.

And a society without classes can only exist through

a society without private ownership of the means of production.

And, ultimately, without State.

It is a society free of exploitation without social classes,

without private ownership or means of production, and without a state.

That's it. This is communism.

Has communism ever happened in history?

No, the Soviet Union was not a communist country, Cuba is not a communist country, and China is not a communist country.

Are there classes? It isn't communism. Is there a State? It isn't communism.

So communism is where we want to reach.

We'll talk about what the Soviet Union, Cuba, China, etc. are or were.

So, let's go.

Who outlined this set of principles for the first time?

Who described it? Who theorized this set of principles?

And now we have to talk about him, right?

Karl Marx. Marx is the most important theoretician of all the set of communist principles.

Marx is absolutely unavoidable.

It is impossible to be a communist without reading Marx. Impossible.

First of all: Marxism and communism are the same things?

No, Marxism and communism are not the same thing,

but they are deeply connected.

The difference between Marxism and communism will be a bit clearer as our presentation goes on, but remember that they are not exactly synonyms, okay?

And what Marxism consists of? What is Marxism?

Marxism contains three constitutive parts: A philosophical one,

an economic one and a political one.

The philosophical part consists of dialectical and historical materialism,

the economic part, of the critique of political economy,

and the political part, of scientific socialism.

These parts are not isolated from each other, right?

They are not isolated. They are intertwined, they interact.

In these three parts reside the common bases of any communist.

My goal here is not to tell

the life stories of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, right?

I'll tell just a little of Marx's story to be

a bit clearer about what I'm wanting to say.

So, in 1818, Marx was born in a town called Trier, which was formerly in Prussia, where today is Germany.

In the 1840s, he started writing for a Prussian newspaper

and he was banned from Prussia because he was

very critical of monarchist politics. Of Prussian monarchist politics.

In 1844, he goes to France as an exile,

and he meets a guy called Friedrich Engels.

The guy with the largest mustache I’ve ever seen.

Engels was a son of an industrial bourgeois

and would become Marx's friend, intellectual partner, and patron.

And for those who don't know, a patron is someone who funds some project.

So, yes, Engels was a bourgeois’s son, but Marx wasn't.

Marx studied Philosophy at the University of Berlin

and there he took part in a group called Young Hegelians.

Here there is an illustration of the Young Hegelians.

As the name says, while Marx studied philosophy in University of Berlin,

he was very influenced by the ruling philosophy in Germany at that time

which was Hegel's philosophy.

And there, in the 1840s, Marx and Engels start to elaborate

a critique of the Young Hegelians.

They start to differ from the Young Hegelians and from Hegel himself.

This critique that Marx and Engels do of Hegel and the Young Hegelians

will comprise the philosophical pillar of Marxism.

And right there I want to add a thing, right? Excuse myself (excuse me).

Maybe, in this live, maybe I'll start with the hardest part.

There are some who say that the philosophical pillar of Marxism is the hardest one.

But why did I choose to start talking about it first if it is the hardest?

Because Marx formulated the other pillars of the philosophy.

The philosophical pillar was the first to be formulated.

And this pillar gives us the Marxist method.

So, if you are having a hard time understanding it,

know that isn't uncommon at all. It is something that is quite usual.

I took too long to understand this philosophical pillar.

It demanded a lot of reading.

What I ask is that you give yourself a chance to try

To at least get familiar with this vocabulary.

In the end, as I said, I'll provide you with some extra reading to try

to improve this process a little.

So, let's go. Returning to the beginning of our explanation.

You know that communism is the set of principles for working-class liberation.

In other words, to be clearer: The final goal is the end of classes,

the private ownership of the means of production, and the State.

And it must already be popping up in the minds of some people

who are hearing this for the first time:

But isn't that utopian? Is this not idealism?

Have you ever heard that communism is utopian? What is a utopia?

Are communists idealists?

# 02 - Dialectical and Historical Materialism

Well, little do people that never got into contact with communism know

but communism appears as a critique of utopianism

and a critique of idealism.

Marxism's philosophical pillar is constituted

as a critique of utopianisms and idealisms

And that's what we're going to talk about now.

We'll talk about dialectical and historical materialism

and the name already sounds scary, right? This a philosophical mouthful

and that's why I said that I might have chosen to start with the most complicated part, but I beg you to give it a chance.

Alright then. Remember Marx was a Young Hegelian?

Well, even though he was a harsh critic of Hegel's philosophy,

Marx was heavily influenced by Hegel.

But influenced in what way?

Mainly regarding a thing called dialectics.

So, dialectical and historical materialism, we'll begin

by talking a bit about dialectics.

So, what is dialectics?

That's something we'd need ten volumes to answer,

but I'll try and summarize.

First of all, Hegelian dialectics was opposed to another philosophical method called metaphysics, which was the dominant philosophical method up to Hegel.

In order for us to understand dialectics

it's worth it to understand what metaphysics is

because one thing makes the other clearer.

That's the part of the stream where I'll cite the most, ok?

I'll avoid reading too many quotations

but I think these ones are helpful

because this part is quite difficult.

Right then, we’ve said that dialectics opposes metaphysics.

Engels: ["To the metaphysician, things and their mental reflexes, ideas, are isolated, are to be considered one after the other and apart from each other, are objects of investigation fixed, rigid, given once for all. He thinks in absolutely irreconcilable antitheses. His communication is 'yea, yea; nay, nay'; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. For him, a thing either exists or does not exist; a thing cannot at the same time be itself and something else. Positive and negative absolutely exclude one another"](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/soc-utop/ch02.htm).

That's metaphysics then.

In summary: metaphysics is a method that works with isolated,

fixed categories.

Dialectics, on the other hand, another quote from Engels:

["...comprehends things and their representations, ideas, in their essential connection, concatenation, motion, origin and ending. Such processes as those mentioned above are, therefore, so many corroborations of its own method of procedure".](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/soc-utop/ch02.htm)

That's referring to passages from the book I'm quoting, "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific" by Engels.

Dialectics is the philosophy that works with constantly moving categories that relate to each other by means of contradictions, or contraries.

So, a famous example Hegel gives is

the master-slave dialectics.

In summary, the master can exist only if there is a slave.

Master and slave aren't fixed, isolated, unchanging categories.

The category of master only exists through the existence of the slave category. Within the contradictions between master and slave.

These categories change throughout history

but I won’t get too much into the master-slave dialectics.

I'm just showing you how the categories that dialectics works upon

are interconnected and ever-changing. That's it then.

So, according to Engels, and I think that's a good analogy:

Metaphysics cannot see the woods for it is worried about the trees.

For him and for Marx,

dialectics was much more adequate for understanding

not only natural sciences phenomena but also society’s.

An example of dialectics Engels gives in this book I quoted

is Darwin's theory of evolution.

Darwin's theory of evolution was a huge blow to metaphysics

because it works with transformation,

with historical change in the very long term.

It made it impossible to work with fixed categories,

categories are now changing.

They transform, they emerge, and come to pass

as History goes on.

That's the dialectical principle of Marx's philosophy,

which is influenced by Hegel.

Let's go to the other part then, it was dialectical and historical materialism

Let's talk materialism. Materialism.

I want you to do a mental exercise now.

Look around you, wherever you are. Look around.

Look at everything that surrounds you.

Look if there's a table nearby, a computer, a cell phone,

a chair, anything.

I want you to think about this:

who made these things? Who manufactured them?

If there's a chair where you are, who manufactured it?

If there's a couch, who made that couch?

And further, who transported it there?

If the couch has metal parts, who mined the metals?

Whose hands extracted them from the veins of the earth?

Now I want you to reflect

on how little we think about that.

How little we think about who made the objects that surround us.

And no, guys, it wasn't machined, it wasn't just machines.

We are surrounded by an immense amount of human labor.

But we don't realize it.

We're disconnected from the human labor that surrounds us.

What is historical materialism, especially the materialism part? Materialism is the understanding that material production

is the basis for our social structure.

Not only do we have to think about who made what is around us

but what surrounds us is

the basis upon which we organize society.

The two things are connected.

That's materialism's great trump card.

Let's go back to Hegel for a bit.

Marx incorporated Hegel's dialectics.

But materialism arises from a critique of Hegel.

A critique of what exactly? Hegel was an idealist.

Remember I said Marxism came around as a critique of idealism?

And this critique of idealism is

mainly a critique of Hegel's philosophy.

So, Marx takes Hegelian dialectics but leaves out idealism.

Let's use a quotation from Marx himself then:

“My dialectic method is not

only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite.

To Hegel, the life process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking,

which, under the name of ‘the Idea,’ (with a capital “I”) he even transforms

into an independent subject,

is the demiurges (for those who don't know, demiurges means deity) of the real world,

and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of ‘the Idea.’

With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world

reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought".

That's a quotation from Capital.

Don't worry, I know it's complicated but I'll explain.

For Hegel, the reality is a manifestation of human ideas,

a manifestation of human thought.

And human thought in its turn is the manifestation of the original Idea

(With a capital “I”) that comes from the deity, from God.

Hegel's philosophy has a theological outlook.

And the Young Hegelians were also idealists.

They believed that what prevented society's development

were the ideas in people's minds.

There needed to be a revolution in people's thought

and only then from reason and thought, we would transform reality.

More than that, as capitalism developed

there appeared philosophers that saw what was happening,

the rise of poverty, misery,

and devised fairer, more egalitarian societies

that would free all of humanity.

Where? In their minds.

According to Engels, the more detailed these societies were, the further they drifted from reality.

These philosophers became known as Utopian socialists.

For those who don't know, utopia is a 'non-place'

Idealism means you create an idea in your head and try to apply it to reality.

Materialism is the opposite of that.

Marx puts this idea upside-down.

It's not reality that is created by our thoughts.

But rather our ideas are an abstraction of reality.

First, we get into contact with reality

and then we formulate ideas, not the contrary.

And there is an inseparable connection between material reality,

the objects that are around us, and how we organize society.

These two things are inseparable.

There's no social organization without a material backing, a material substrate.

There's no use in designing a society in our heads and trying

to apply it to reality while ignoring reality itself.

That's materialism. That's the difference, right?

So, what is material reality? To make it clearer,

it's not only nature but also the way we produce

Remember I told you to look around?

That is all produced to satisfy our material needs.

We have to sit down; we make a chair.

That's part of material reality as well.

But not only that, our production also satisfies

our cultural and intellectual cravings.

Not only eating, clothing, housing but also what we desire

to consume as culture.

This quote is by Marx and Engels:

"[What they [the individuals] are, therefore, coincides with their production,](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm)

[both with what they produce and with how they produce.](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm)

[The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production."](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm)

What we are depends on how we produce our existence.

What we are depends on how we eat, where we live,

what we wear, how we wear.

It depends on that, on how we transport ourselves,

how we satisfy our needs.

So, the way we produce reality,

we call it infrastructure.

Our infrastructure is the production of food, of clothing,

of houses, etc.

A social structure arises over this infrastructure. We call that superstructure.

It's what is above the infrastructure.

What is there in the superstructure? Culture, religion, morals, among other things. That is, our culture, our religion, our morals, are all above.

They are built upon a material basis.

That is to say, for example, that our religion has

everything to do with how we produce our material reality,

how we produce our food, our houses, our clothes.

That is all connected and we can never

lose sight of the material basis of reality.

One thing depends on the other.

Is this a mechanical process, though?

Does that mean that every time we produce food in the same way

the same religion will emerge?

No, it doesn't mean that the same material basis

will always give rise to the same superstructure,

but that the superstructure is dependent on the material basis. Dependent.

It is not mechanically determined by it, but dependent on it.

This is really important;

once this superstructure has risen,

it impacts back on the material basis.

So, our culture, our religion, our morals can

impact on how we produce our reality.

But it doesn't exist without that reality.

That's a dialectical movement.

Remember we said dialectics was important?

In its connections, in its movement, and not in fixed categories.

Infrastructure and superstructure aren't fixed, unchanging categories.

They are connected, they interact with each other and they move.

I know it's complicated, but give it a chance and at least

get familiarized with this vocabulary: materialism, material basis,

infrastructure, superstructure, dialectics, etc.

So, do you remember what was dialectical and historical materialism?

Where does the historical part come in?

This method is such that Marx and Engels perceive

History through the ways people produced

their reality in order to satisfy their needs and how that affected the social structure.

So, for Marx and Engels the first historical fact is

the satisfaction of our needs.

The first time a human built a tool in order to satisfy a need. That’s the first historical fact.

From the moment we satisfy a need on, we create other needs. This is the historical process of creating new needs.

The wheel of History keeps on turning

as we satisfy our needs.

So, Marx and Engels look at History and ask:

how did they produce? From this production, what was the social structure?

How does the social structure of said society relate

to the way this society produces?

That's historical materialism.

For summarizing, there's a quotation that's a bit long,

but it ties together everything I've said.

"The materialist conception of history starts from the proposition that the production of the means to support human life and,

next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure;

that in every society that has appeared in history,

the manner in which wealth is distributed and

society divided into classes or orders

is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced,

and how the products are exchanged.

From this point of view, the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought,

not in men's brains, not in men's better insights into

eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange.

They are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics of each particular epoch."

This means that revolutions, including the bourgeois revolutions,

didn't happen in the way liberals themselves describe them.

The liberals say people started demanding more freedom

and that propelled the revolution forward.

No. Revolutions happen when our way of producing

and reproducing life changes.

Every revolution has a material basis, a material substrate.

It doesn't appear in someone's mind and is then applied to reality

because that's impossible, that goes against the laws of nature.

And that's what we call idealism.

# 03 – Critique of Political Economy

Marxism emerges as an opposition, as a critique of idealism and utopianism, ok?

So, pay attention to this last Engel's quote here:

"They are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics.”

That's what we are going to talk about now: the Critique of Economy.

So, one thing that I need you to pay attention to is this:

Why did I first explain through the philosophical pillar?

The philosophical pillar gives us the method.

And Marx and Engels analyze everything from now using this method.

Dialectical and historical materialism is always the perspective.

This method is applied to reality to understand reality.

And now we move on to the economic pillar of Marxism.

Remember I said that Marx was exiled to France and he met Engels there? So, Engels read Marx's texts and he criticized Marx's texts. He said: “Marx, there is an economic dimension missing from your analyses”

Then Marx closed himself inside a library

and read the writings of English economists,

especially these two on the screen: Adam Smith and David Ricardo.

And I need to clarify now:

Can you see that I'm using the term "Political Economy"

Back then, "Political Economy" term was dominant

because it was clear that "Economics" and "Politics" were inseparable.

As the bourgeois economy was becoming dominant,

they discard the "political" to give alleged neutrality for Economics. “No, no. Economics has nothing to do with Politics. Economics is Economics.

Economics is an exact science, we conduct a study of reality neutrally."

And for Marxists, until this day the expression used is "Political Economy", ok? Marxists don't disassociate the economy from politics. Never.

By the way, I even put here, look.

For those who don't know, Marx's masterpiece “Capital”, “Das Kapital”,

it's written here: “A Critique of Political Economy”,

“Capital: Critique of Political Economy", it's the subtitle.

So, the Marxist economy develops out

of a critique of the political economy of bourgeois economists.

And some would say, just to make it clear for you,

some would say there is no Marxist Economics,

that Marxist Economics is a bourgeois economy's critique,

but you'll see controversy about it.

Just to let you know that this exists.

What is the critique of Marx's Political Economy?

It's an analysis of capitalism, basically.

Marx lived at a time when capitalism was already dominant.

But what is capitalism, folks? What is capitalism?

And I'm telling you, this Critique of Political Economy's excerpt will be where I'll inject you with mandatory vocabulary to understand Critique of Political Economy, ok?

Here we are going to make a kind of glossary because it's needed, right? To truly understand; to know how to describe what these terms mean.

I'm going to talk like that, with just the cam, and we'll recap later.

Anyway, relax.

What is capitalism? Capitalism is a mode of production, mode of production.

What is a "mode of production"? Mode of production is the result of interactions

between productive forces and relations of production.

What are productive forces and relations of production? Productive forces are how humans act on nature.

Relations of production are how humans act on each other.

Therefore, we actuate on nature and each other. The interaction between these actions results in the mode of production, right?

Point number one: What are the capitalist productive forces?

Capitalist productive forces are the employment of industry, machinery,

automation of energy matrices, and especially division of labor.

In Capitalism, our work is segmented, it is broken down into small specialized parts.

Therefore, our capitalist productive force isn't just a machine, but it's how we divide up this work.

What are the relations of production? We talked about productive forces, now we have relations of production.

Capitalist relations of production are based on the exploitation of proletarian labor by the bourgeoisie, ok?

The foundation of the relations of production is exploitation.

We are going to explain exploitation further ahead.

First of all, that exploitation is based on a class division.

What is class? Class, folks, is a social division of labor.

Are there classless societies? Yes. In classless societies

everyone has to work, everyone benefits from the fruits of labor,

and the labor is divided by ability or skill.

This type of division we call "Natural Division".

In class societies, there is no natural division, there is a social division.

And what does it means? Imagine that you work in a factory .

The factory owner isn't less skilled than you to work in the factory.

So, why do you work at the factory and he doesn't?

Since he has the same skills as you.

Because he belongs to another class.

What determines the class is which position you occupy in the production chain.

And under capitalism, these classes are increasingly comprised of the bourgeois,

In other words, the class that doesn't work and owns the means of production,

and proletariat, the class that does work and owns nothing

other than their workforce.

What divides these classes is not skill, ability, not even vocation, it is a social division.

Well then, another characteristic of relations of production.

We have classes and one of them owns the means of production,

that is, these means of production are the private ownership of someone.

One of the central characteristics of capitalism is private property.

What is private property? There is a classical definition

From the bourgeois economists themselves: Private ownership is

the free disposal of another's labor power.

When we are talking about private ownership,

we are talking about private ownership of the means of production.

Why did private ownership, and only "private ownership",

become synonymous with private ownership of the means of production?

Because the private ownership of the means of production was

the first form of private ownership.

So, in the time of Marx, Smith, and Ricardo, talking about private ownership meant private ownership of the means of production.

Back to a definition: Private ownership is

the free disposal of another one's labor power.

I give an example: remember that mode of production is

the interaction between productive force and relations of production?

Did we have other modes of production? Yes.

We had, for example, the feudal mode of production.

We had, for example, the slave-owning mode of production.

For example, in the slave-owning mode of production.

What is private ownership in the slave-owning mode of production?

The slave. Remember that private ownership is

the free disposal of another one's labor power?

How does the slave owner dispose of the labor force of others?

Owning the person. Another person's work is

freely available to the slaveholder.

The person is the owner's private ownership.

How this works in capitalism? People are not the property of the capitalist, but the capitalist owns the means of production.

Means of production, that is, what is necessary for executing labor is taken from the hand of workers, and the capitalists control

the worker's productive forces through wage labor.

Workers are forced to sell their labor power to work on the means of production that have been taken from their hands.

And how this capitalist can take

these means of production out of the worker's hand?

Because he owns something called "Capital".

What is capital? Capital can be summed up in a simple few sentences

"Capital is value that creates value"; "resources that create resources";

"Wealth that creates wealth"

Capital. Capital is money? No. But capital can be money? Yes.

They aren't synonymous, it's that what I mean.

What you have in your wallet now isn't capital, ok?

Capital is a resource that can be in form of money that is used in the acquisition of means of production.

Factory, machine, land, energy, raw material and, workforce.

Once such means are acquired they become part of the capital.

So, factory, machine, energy, and raw material are part of the capital, ok? That's why capital isn't just money.

Therefore, in short, capitalist relations of production are based

on class division. One class owns the means of production and doesn't work,

and the other only owns its own labor power and has to sell it.

This brings us to the last characteristic of relations of production:

the Commodification of Social Relations.

In capitalism, the commodity is the center of social relations.

In capitalism, we don't produce our existence,

we buy our existence.

You don't produce your food, you buy your food.

You don't sew your clothes, you buy your clothes.

You don't build your house, you buy your house.

And you sell your labor force too,

your labor force becomes a commodity.

But what is a commodity? A Commodity is something that is produced

for someone else's consumption and to be traded on the market.

This commodity element deserves more attention.

Because, again, as a commodity is the center of all

social relations in capitalism, it needs to be understood.

Before that, let's review everything.

C'mon, vocabulary:

Mode of Production: interaction between productive forces and relations of production.

Capitalism is a Mode of Production.

What are Productive Forces: how humans act on nature.

What are Relations of Production: how humans act on each other.

What is Class: social division of labor (as opposed to the natural work division),

position occupied in the productive process.

Is class determined by how much work you get? No.

If you earn wages, you are a worker, ok?

If you earn wages, you are a proletariat.

"Oh, my salary is 100k/month", you are a proletariat.

Class is determined by the social division of labor.

Class is determined by where you are in the productive process.

What makes it so confusing is that, nowadays, we use such terminology as "upper class", "middle class", "lower class".

What determines class for Marxism is

the position you occupy in the productive process, right? So that's right.

Private ownership: free disposal of another's labor power.

Remembering that we are talking about the private ownership of means of production. It's not your house, your old truck, or your flip-flops.

Means of production: what is necessary for the execution of work.

Factories, raw material, energy.

Capital: value that creates value, resource that creates a resource, wealth that creates wealth.

Commodity: something produced to be consumed by the other,

to be sold in the market, okay?

# 4 – Value and Surplus Value

So, let’s move on to a subject that is a bit more complicated, but fundamental to our understanding of Marx's critique of Political Economy.

Remember that the commodity is the center of our social relations?

This commodity has something called Value.

So, the question that comes up is: what is Value? How is Value determined?

Ok, so I'll begin with a quote that made me understand Value once and for all.

But I'll start with the quote and then we are gonna describe Value, not the contrary.

["...if I say a quarter of wheat exchanges with iron in a certain proportion, or the Value of a quarter of wheat is expressed in a certain amount of iron, I say that the Value of wheat and its equivalent in iron are equal to some third thing, which is neither wheat nor iron, because I suppose them to express the same magnitude in two different shapes.](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1865/value-price-profit/ch02.htm)

[Either of them, the wheat o](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1865/value-price-profit/ch02.htm)r the iron, must, therefore, independently of the other, be reducible to this third thing which is their common measure."

I've never forgotten this quote.

If a certain amount of wheat is equal to a certain amount of iron, it does not mean that one is the same as the other, but that they are equal to a third thing.

And this third thing is Value. Ok, so, Value.

Value is maybe one of the most complicated concepts of Political Economy, even Marx recognized that.

Marx says in the Introduction to Capital that the first chapter was the most complicated, and it is the one in which he describes Value.

We have commodities in society, we buy our things.

These commodities have Value.

Do you remember when I told you to look around and think about who made the things you have?

All the objects you possess, all of them, without exception, have one substance in common. Do you know what this substance common to all the things you have is? Labor.

Labor, folks, is a social substance.

Every commodity has in it some amount of crystallized labor.

Is Value the same thing as price? No, no. Is price Value, chat? No.

Every time you think you're not understanding what Value is, be sure you're not confusing it with price, ok?

So, what determines the Value of a commodity?

The labor is socially necessary for the production of this commodity.

Folks, what has more Value, a glass or a car? A car.

Why? Because the amount of labor needed to make a car is way bigger. Making a car requires way more labor than making a glass.

Therefore, a car has much more Value than glass.

Does this mean that if I had a glass factory, and it took me the same amount of time needed to make a car, to make this glass, the glass would get more expensive? No, ok? No. For the love of God, no.

Value is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor.

The social criteria are fundamental.

What determines Value is the amount of labor in a certain social state and under specific productive conditions of an entire society.

It's how much labor is required to produce glass in the entire society, and not how much you, an individual, needs to produce a glass, ok?

And price? So, if Value is not price, what is price, then?

Price is the expression of value as money, an expression in money.

Price usually gravitates around value.

This price gravitates around Value, Adam Smith, not Marx, called it central price.

Once a commodity is produced by labor and it goes out to be sold in the market. It (the commodity) will get closer to its value.

Value is not price, value is a property of the commodity, and value is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor.

Very well, remember we said that the commodity is the center of all social relations?

In Capitalism, our labor power is also a commodity.

We sell our labor power at market price.

If our labor power is a commodity, and value is a property of a commodity,

What is the value of our labor power?

The value of our labor power is also determined by the socially necessary labor,

but in another way, the value of your labor power is determined by all that reproduces you.

It's the value of everything you need to exist.

Food, clothing, roof, heating, etc.

All that you consume to exist has in it the socially necessary labor needed to produce it.

The Value of your labor power is the sum of the values of all the things you need to exist.

And, in Capitalism, especially, with an extremely unqualified workforce,

the labor power's value gets close to the bare minimum you need to maintain your existence.

So, when you sell your labor power in the labor market, that's why we call it the labor market,

you are selling it by your value, and the value of your labor power is determined by what you need to keep existing.

And this you can derive from reality, folks.

Your salary is being paid to you so that you can buy what you need to continue existing.

Why is all of that so important?

Because understanding what value is makes us comprehend the greatest discovery of Marxist Political Economy, which is Surplus Value.

Without understanding value, we would not understand the surplus value.

"Surplus" can also be "surplus value".

Got it? To understand surplus value, we need to understand value.

So: according to Engels, the discovery of the surplus value is a discovery of the same magnitude as Darwin's Theory of Evolution. Why?

Because it can expose, strip naked, the internal mechanisms of exploitation.

When we talk about exploitation in Capitalism, folks, we are not judging it.

We are describing the mechanism of Capitalism.

Talking about exploitation in Capitalism is not a judgment on moral grounds, it's merely descriptive.

And this is only understood when you understand what value and surplus value are.

So, let's go over it again: what determines the value of a commodity is the socially necessary labor contained in this commodity.

Who does this labor?

It's the worker, not the bourgeois. The bourgeois doesn't work, who works is the worker.

Very well, after working and creating this value, in exchange, the worker receives a wage.

But the wage of the worker is equal to the value of his labor power, and not the value they created while laboring!

That means that while the worker is working, and laboring, they create value, create value, create value, but they receive the equivalent of the value of the labor power in the form of a wage.

That is, what they create has no connection with what they receive.

What they receive has a connection with what they need to live.

Imagine the following: If you have an 8-hour workday

and in four hours you produce the value equivalent to your salary,

the other four hours you worked for free.

This free labor we call surplus labor.

The value created in this surplus period is appropriated by the bourgeois in the form of surplus value.

Surplus value is the mechanism by which the bourgeois profit.

And we have three types of surplus value: absolute, relative, and extraordinary.

Absolute surplus value expands as the labor hours expand.

Remember what I said? You need 4 daily hours to generate the value of your salary, and your workday has 8 hours.

Out of a sudden, your workday goes up to 10 hours, without a wage increase. You've created more surplus value.

Absolute surplus value: the workday increases, so the capitalist's profit increases.

Now, relative surplus value is: imagine that you work 8 hours a day, but the factory got optimized.

Instead of producing x chairs, you produce, in the same amount of time, 2x chairs.

But you receive the same salary.

You relatively increase the extraction of value; the labor time needed is the same, but you can produce way more.

And the extraordinary surplus value has to do with the production of the same objects, of the same commodities, but in other companies.

For example: if there are many companies producing chairs, and one of them discovers a much faster way to produce when this commodity goes to the market, it, being sold at a similar price as the others, will yield more profit.

So, extraordinary surplus value is relative to the industry as a whole, when some company discovers a way to lower their costs.

This surplus value tends to find an equilibrium in two ways: either when some other company also gets optimized, or when one company breaks all the others creating a monopoly.

And the point is: the final goal of every bourgeois is the increase in the extraction of surplus value. The increase. The increase.

This is not a moral judgment.

Marx at no moment makes some moral judgment.

He doesn't say "it's bad", "good", "ugly", "stupid", or "melon face".

Saying that the goal of the bourgeois is the increase of surplus value is descriptive because this is observable, we can verify it in reality.

And what is important here?

As profit is extracted utilizing the surplus value, the bourgeois incorporates this profit back into their capital.

When the surplus value is extracted, the bourgeois reinvests it in production to increase the extraction of this surplus value.

They refine this extraction each time more, in an endless and unceasing cycle.

Capitalism has shown a cyclical crises since its beginnings.

Already in the ‘70s of the 19th century, Engels talked about seven crises of capitalism. Seven! In the 19th century.

This is when capitalism was way smaller than it is today; when it was restricted to only a couple of countries.

So, let's wrap it up?

Marx's critique of Political Economy focuses on analyzing capitalism.

Capitalism is a mode of production based on the employment of big industries. in the division of labor, in class society, in private ownership, in the commodity as the center of social relations, and the constant expansion of capital.

Let's recap some concepts. We have seen the value and surplus value.

Value: it is a "property of the commodity.”

And this property is "determined by the socially necessary labor.”

Surplus value is the "value created by the worker which is appropriated by the bourgeois", and that doesn't return to the worker.

This surplus value can be "absolute", when the working hours increase; "relative" when productivity increases; and "extraordinary" when the productivity in comparison to other factories increases. Ok?

And why is it all that important?

Weren't we going to talk about communism? Why are we talking so much about capitalism?

Understanding the capitalist mode of production is necessary so we can walk towards some other mode of production, and transform our productive forces and our relations of production.

Remember we said that Marxism and Communism have an aversion toward utopianism? Towards utopia, idealism?

Every Marxist analysis, starts from material reality.

This is Marx's object of study: observing capitalism's reality, the reality in which he was living.

Ok? And then, we go to the last pillar of Marxism,

which we call scientific socialism.

# 05 – Scientific Socialism

So, by now we've got a basic, and I mean really basic, analysis

of the way capitalism works, then what?

We've seen that capitalism exploits us and throws us into poverty.

so, what do we do with this?

Very well, capitalism has developed our productive forces in a way never seen before.

It brought an unprecedented level of productivity, unknown to humanity by then.

However, at the same time, it threw a huge part of humanity into misery,

A huge chunk of people was proletarianized, lost everything they had,

and turned to sell their workforce in exchange for the bare minimum to survive

while bearing strenuous work hours.

So, how did we sharply increase productivity and poverty at the same time?

How did we enlarge machinery and automation levels and workload simultaneously?

Why is it that there's more and more automation and workload never decreases?

Those are the contradictions that will be our aim in this next analysis.

Okay, next: "Analyzing Capitalism",

We've concluded that capitalism is based on exploitation, right?

This being, the first thing we can know for a fact is:

there are no exploiters without the ones being exploited, this has always been the case, right?

Guys, we’re there always exploiters and the exploited?

Let's dig into that.

We know also that the mechanism of exploitation comes through private ownership.

Marx, through the method (dialectical and historical materialism),

come to the reasoning that there has not always been private ownership.

And not just that, he also found that there have been different kinds of private ownership throughout history.

The same goes for social classes, those weren't always on the scene,

throughout history, social classes are quite a lot different.

What can we take out of these observations of Marx?

It's that the existence of social classes and private ownership

Is linked to a certain phase of the development of production.

What's so relevant about that?

This conclusion by Marx makes us be able to see that

These social organizations, these human organizations, are not indispensable.

Private ownership isn't indispensable for human society.

Social classes aren't imperative for human society.

So, the notion that there will always be employers and employees is false.

Not only this, but through the material analysis of capitalism,

Marx got to the conclusion that we already have resources to march toward another society,

With different social relations.

So, let’s go, a little quote from Marx here for us to discuss, a quote from the Communist Manifesto:

“[…] an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity - the epidemic of over-production.

[…] The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them.”

What does Marx mean here?

By the first time in history, human society was dealing with the inverse of its usual problem.

Until then, society had only dealt with the issue of lacking production.

Society had a scarcity trouble.

The capitalist mode of production brought a new problem: excess production.

The catch is: there's only excess of production in capitalism,

for the capitalist means of production are illogic, are irrational.

Capitalism does not produce to satisfy our needs, it does to sate the needs of the capital.

If production doesn't become capital it is disposed of.

Meaning, the capitalist means of production jeopardize our production capability.

We're hindered from producing more and better due to capitalism.

So according to Marx, the capitalist ways are obsolete. OBSOLETE.

They need to be transformed.

Is such transformation possible? Not only possible. according to Marx, it's very likely. Why?

Throughout capitalism's development, it creates its contradictions

which will be what brings its downfall, unavoidably.

By expanding, capitalism generates proletarians,

proletarian by proletarian, more, more and more

This class that it creates is the one that antagonizes it.

Marxism's greatest asset was to perceive that there are not only classes

and that those classes are unavoidably antagonistic to each other.

They'll never reach harmony, for they have contradictory interests.

This antagonism between the two main classes of capitalist society,

we call class struggle. Class struggle.

For Marxism, every doctrine, each set of principles

that attempts to balance classes, and harmonize classes are utopian.

It's fallacious. It's a facade.

If there is an exploited class, there will be an exploiter class above it. Every time.

The Utopians, which we talked about before, had no perspective of any class.

They sought a society that balanced all of humanity.

having the perspective of the classes is knowing that they are antagonistic.

it is fundamental to what we call Scientific Socialism; which is how Engels name it.

This expression appeared to contrast with Utopian Socialism.

So, why does this matter?

According to Marx, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat

will lead to a rupture with capitalism.

What's relevant about Marx is that not only does he identify the classes,

But he also credits the revolutionary protagonist to the exploited class.

The proletariat becomes the revolution's Subject.

The proletariat belongs to the class that will conduct revolution, unlike the Utopians.

Utopians believed that the working-class we’re unable to lead any change.

That any change would come top-down.

Marx said otherwise: it will come bottom-up.

# 06 - Dictatorship of the proletariat

And how will this rupture be conducted?

The proletarian class, becoming aware of itself, will organize

And seize the power of the State and institute something called the dictatorship of the proletariat.

What does the dictatorship of the proletariat mean?

To Marx, we live in a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The State does not arise as an apparatus that balances society.

You'll see idealists, to this day, saying that the State arises

to reduce society's conflicts. No.

For Marx, the State is an apparatus of specific class violence.

The State arises so the ruling class maintains the ruled one in its due place,

through violence.

In the capitalist society, who has the State apparatus is the bourgeoisie.

The State is puppeteered by the bourgeoisie to maintain the bourgeoisie on power. Alright?

So, for Marx, we live in something called the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

If there is capitalism, there's dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Well, if the State is necessarily an apparatus of specific class violence

when the working-class takes the State, won't it still be that?

Yes, exactly. But this pyramid will be turned.

The State is an apparatus of specific class violence;

with the working-class taking the State apparatus,

it will use the State apparatus for, through violence,

eradicate the bourgeoisie as a class.

The State is an apparatus of specific class violence, and it will still keep being as such.

So, the State in the hands of the working-class will oppress the bourgeoisie until it vanishes,

and while the other classes vanish, the State becomes obsolete.

Once there are no more classes to oppress, the State no longer needs to exist,

and it languishes. It disappears. It becomes useless.

That's Marx's vision of the transition from socialism to communism.

That's the way the State dies out from the Marxist point of view.

Alright? So, let's recapitulate.

"The scientific socialism: demonstrates that the existence of classes

it's connected only to certain phases of production development.”

Once, they did not exist. They can cease to exist.

With private ownership, it's the same thing.

"The class struggle conduces, necessarily, to proletariat's dictatorship",

and "this dictatorship is nothing more than the transition to the abolition of all classes,

and to a classless society."

That's Marx's great discovery.

And here, we have to make a small observation:

I've been using the terms socialism and communism,

but we need to distinguish one from another.

So, firstly: socialism and communism

only have the meaning they have today after the Russian Revolution.

Socialism is the step of the transition to communism.

During socialism, the working-class will be in power

and it will oppress the bourgeoisie until the classes vanish.

During communism, the classes no longer exist.

Marx doesn't use these terms.

Marx uses "the first stage of communist society" and "superior stage of communist society".

The reason behind it, after the Russian Revolution, the terms are switched,

it's historical, and it has a reason to be so.

It made sense at the time it came about.

But do know that, from now on, I will use "socialism" as a transition

and "communism" as destiny.

Another thing: Marx doesn't determine the specific characteristics of socialism.

Marx was a materialist. For him, any prediction or recipe was idealism.

All societies should start with a material analysis. A real one, ok? Not ideal.

Marx can't make the same mistake he criticized in the Utopians.

So, Marx only gives the general ideas: socialism is the working-class in power,

dictatorship of the proletariat, and transition in direction of a society without classes.

That's why every time someone asks "how many brands of washing powder will exist in socialism?",

anything we could answer is going to be speculation. There's no way to know.

We'll know the details from experience.

And the soviets detail much more about what is socialism. Why?

Because they had a socialist experience! Marx didn't.

Therefore, he didn't dare to predict the future beyond what he knew was possible.

He knew the working class might take the State apparatus;

He knew that it was possible that the working-class to use the State apparatus to oppress the bourgeoisie;

He knew it was possible. And it was possible. And it was done!

All of this was made from the material analysis.

Another thing: that means that, after the revolution,

on day one of socialism, all the contradictions will go away?

Contradiction's gone. The capitalism died, any opposer died, and everything died.

No. Marx’s quote:

"What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its foundations, but, on the contrary,

just as it emerges from capitalist society;

[a communist society], which is thus in every respect, economically, morally, and intellectually,

still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges".

So, just remember:

in this quote, Marx is using the word communism as we use the word socialism today, alright?

Here, Marx is talking about the first stage of communism.

That's why I had to clarify the vocabulary here.

What's the point here? A society that comes from the womb of another,

and with that, it carries its birthmarks.

If we have a capitalist, sexist society and we go through a revolution,

the new society will still be sexist. This contradiction will not disappear.

The question is, the new society gives us the possibility to overcome sexism,

while capitalism doesn't.

Capitalism doesn't give us the opportunity of overcoming many contradictions.

“Oh, but what about Cuba? wasn’t Cuba a misogynist? wasn't Cuba homophobic?"

Cuba had left a misogynist and homophobic society.

It would be strange if it wasn’t so anymore on day one of the revolution.

So, we can't generalize socialism as well,

because each socialist experience will emerge from a different capitalist experience;

with their particularities and with their particular contradictions. Alright?

That was all about Marxism.

We have dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, and scientific socialism.

# 07 – Leninist Party and Reading Guide

Now, we go to the last basic part which is necessary and essential.

We're going to talk about Lenin now.

This Lenin, here.

So, let's go. Why are we talking about Lenin?

By now, you should know that the first successful revolution

of a socialist nature was the Russian Revolution of 1917.

On the Russian Revolution, and the whole Soviet experience,

I would need to do a separate video.

But today we are going to talk about the greatest leader of this revolution,

which is Vladimir Ilyich Ulianov, or Lenin.

Because Lenin is the greatest Marxist after Marx and Engels.

For those who don't know, Lenin is a great theoretician.

And not only big, but he is also unavoidable.

It was because of Lenin's theoretical work that the Russian Revolution was possible.

And why is Lenin so important? Because Lenin gives an operational dimension to Marxism,

he develops a method for the practical application of Marxism.

And there are several elements of what we call Leninism today, but today I'm just going to talk about one,

which is perhaps the main one, which is the party.

And come on, let's talk about the party.

Since the time of Marx and Engels, it was already known that it was necessary to organize the class.

What did Lenin do? He observed reality, just like Marx and Engels did,

he saw how the class was organized and proposed a new form of organization.

This new form of organization is called the Leninist party.

And then the question is the following: when we think of a party,

we think of several subtitles, with acronyms, that dispute the parliamentary elections.

They dispute the Congress, dispute Executive powers.

I'll tell you something in advance: that's not what a Leninist party is about.

In fact, he has no intention of winning the election, okay?

The Leninist party does not come about to win elections.

What is the Leninist Party?

The Leninist party is the organized detachment of the working-class.

Lenin used to say, his quote:

“In its struggle for power, the proletariat has no other weapon but organization.”

The Leninist party, unlike parties contesting elections,

organizes itself on a revolutionary basis.

The party's idea is to prepare and mobilize the class to take power;

not in a peaceful way, but in a combative way

The seizure of power needs to be done in a combative way

because the ruling class will not voluntarily relinquish power.

In Russia, that party was the Bolshevik party.

What are the elements of this party?

Firstly, the party must be the vanguard detachment of the class. What does vanguard mean?

Vanguard is a military term. Vanguard means who is in front, it is the opposite of rearguard.

The vanguard is the best element of the working-class:

the most experienced, most dedicated, most revolutionary, most enlightened workers.

That party must arm itself with a revolutionary theory;

Another quote from Lenin, also famous:

“Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement.”

But this party cannot serve only to absorb what the working-class thinks.

The party appears, and then the idea is not to see what the working-class is thinking

and represent the class from what it is spontaneously thinking.

The party has to arm the class with revolutionary theory;

because, for Lenin, the working-class organizes spontaneously.

But this working-class organization is limited.

The class, when organized spontaneously,

usually fights for the improvement of their immediate condition

- salary improvement, reduced working hours, labor rights -

but it does not fight toward overthrowing the system. Why it is so?

Because it cannot see the mechanism of this system.

Since capitalism is a system, it is a synthesis, it is an abstraction,

you cannot approach the worker, point, and say “capitalism is there”.

But they can see that they can't pay the bills,

they can see that they are working too hard,

and they can see that when they get sick they get screwed.

They can see all of this. And then the class will organize itself.

But the party cannot just absorb this demand.

It has to arm the class with something else. And that something else is the overthrow of the system!

That's why this party needs to be leading the class.

And mind you, it's not above! It's not above. It's ahead! It's ahead.

The party has to be the political leader of the class. Why?

Because it can arm the class with revolutionary tactical theory.

But this party can never disconnect from the masses.

It has to have the advanced detachments of the class, but not isolate himself from the class.

It has to be connected to the masses and has to convince the masses.

The party needs to work closely with the entire working-class

to gain moral credit and political credit through example, through persuasion.

And for that, it needs to be organized. What does that mean?

Within a Leninist party, discipline must be ironclad but willing.

When you join the party, you willingly submit to iron discipline.

And this is to awaken the revolutionary spirit in the classes, through example.

Does this mean that the party should be the only organization?

It does not. Should not. Cannot even.

Society must have a series of class organizations:

Unions, cooperatives, organizations, associations, and youths.

In the case of Russia, there was a very important one: the soviets.

The soviets, folks, were the factory councils that were formed spontaneously.

The point is: the party cannot work in all areas of the working-class alone.

The party must work closely with these organizations

to connect these organizations in favor of the emancipatory struggle.

He must centralize the tactics of these organizations.

How? Forcibly? No, through persuasion.

Party members will join these organizations, talk to the workers,

convince the workers, demonstrate the need to fight by example,

approach these organizations and win the political support of the masses.

The Bolshevik party did exactly that.

The Bolshevik party did not make a revolution until it gained a majority in the soviets.

The soviets were the main organs of the working-class;

the party worked closely with the soviets

trying all the time to convince the soviets of the need for a revolution,

It managed to convince the class, won a majority in the soviets, and then he led a revolution.

Lenin not only theorized, but he also did! He applied it!

Do you understand the importance of this guy?

So, the party has two functions (in short, okay?):

Leading the class into the revolution and, after the revolution, maintaining the revolution;

that is, it has a pre-revolution and a post-revolution function.

Regardless of what you think of everything I said;

“Oh Ian, I don't like it. Not at all. I found the party... bad. I found it authoritative. Did not like it";

Regardless of what you think, Lenin's method is extremely efficient.

Ever heard of China? Cuba? Korea? Vietnam? Albania? Burkina Faso?

Everyone, each one of them used the Leninist method.

Regardless of what you think, the Leninist party is an extremely efficient method

for the seizure of power by the class. Extremely efficient.

So, let's go. Shall we review?

“Party." The Leninist party is the “organized detachment of the class”.

This detachment must be a “vanguard”; i.e. to be at the head of the class, not above.

That party must be “armed with theory”, revolutionary theory.

This party has willing and ironclad discipline.

That party “must mobilize the class for the Revolution”, and after the revolution “it must maintain the revolution”.

That's the party. There are many, many, many other Leninist elements about the organization

and other things.

The point is: Lenin was a machine. The guy wrote compulsively.

When he had a stroke, the doctors had to ask for God's sake

for him to stop writing, for him not to die.

He was limited to writing ten minutes a day so he wouldn't have another stroke.

Lenin is a Marxist machine. So, to understand the organization, you have to read Lenin.

You have to read it.

Let's head into the end, guys?

Remember I said I was going to give you a reading guide for you to delve into?

So, let's get into our reading guide, and what I'm going to talk about is this:

I'm going to suggest an order, and it's going to be that order that I'm going to present here.

All the books, except the one on the screen,

will be available for free in the video description.

So, let's go. If you, after watching the live, are still feeling insecure,

read this book by Grespan, “Marx: an introduction”.

It's a super short book that serves to introduce everyone to the Marxist vocabulary,

and I recommend it even to anyone who wants to learn to teach Marxism because it is a very didactic book.

There, the first text I suggest after this live

is a very short text by Lenin called “The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism”.

It's a text that Lenin inscribed on the 30th anniversary of Marx's death,

and Lenin talks about the Marxist sources

that have precisely these three elements that we talked about: philosophy, politics, and economics.

I highly recommend reading it, it is a very small and very enlightening text.

Remembering that Lenin did not have access to all of Marx's texts, which we have access to today.

So, there are texts that are missing, simply because he did not have access to them.

Next. There are two together here, look:

“Basic Principles of Communism” by my boy Engels,

and “Manifesto of the Communist Party” by homies Marx and Engels.

A little story for you:

Marx and Engels, in the 1840s, joined something called the League of the Just.

What was the League of the Just?

It was an organization of emigrants from Germany,

which was a mixture of German idealism and utopian socialism.

Marx and Engels enter the league under the condition that they can change the political line of the league.

So, they: change the name of the League of the Just to the League of Communists;

change the motto from “all men are brothers” to “workers of all countries, unite!”;

and are in charge of writing the League's program.

At the first meeting of the League, Engels goes, but Marx doesn't.

And then Engels is in charge of writing and he writes his book, “Basic Principles of Communism”.

But he writes in the form of a catechism, in questions and answers.

Marx doesn't like the catechism format and proposed the manifesto format.

And then they together write “The Manifesto of the Communist Party”.

The first book by Engels, Basic Principles of Communism, was never published.

Not in life, he was published later.

There are topics that Engels doesn't respond to, because he was a draft.

The Communist Manifesto is a very important book

because it is the most well-finished first book on Marxism with all its core elements.

It has three important things: a historical analysis as a starting point;

the perspective of classes as an axis;

and to place the proletarian class as revolutionary, a revolutionary subject.

The Communist Party Manifesto is the most important political document in history.

That document changed the world. Well worth reading and rereading and reading again.

Moreover: in 1877, Engels already old, already elderly, writes a book called “Anti-Dühring”,

which is a critique of the philosophy of a guy called Eugen Dühring.

Engels makes such a concise critique, and expounds Marxism so competently,

that the book is somewhat of an unexpected success.

And then he extracts three chapters from Anti-Dühring, which is a big book,

and publishes it in the form of this book here: “From Utopian Socialism to Scientific Socialism”

in which he talks about some utopian thinkers

and contrasts with the thought of historical and dialectical materialism.

This one is very interesting, equally short, and well worth reading.

One more: “Value, Price and Profit”.

Value, Price and Profit is a lecture given by Marx in 1865 to the International Workers' Association.

And in that book,

Marx is just talking about how the wage is not related to the price of the commodity.

And here, to explain this, he explains value and surplus value.

So, I recommend it too. It is a short text because it is a lecture;

and I recommend it as Marx's first text on the critique of political economy.

But if you're feeling daring;

The critique of political economy, Marx's magnanimous "Capital".

Capital is three books, three huge books, like that, which took him 16 years to write.

It's worth reading. But if you're not feeling so daring, I'll recommend another book:

“Handbook of Political Economy” of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union.

It's an equally gigantic book;

but it has, due to the Soviet experience, an excerpt that Capital does not have,

which is about the socialist mode of production.

So, if you have these doubts like: “how is the organization of work under socialism?”,

“How is surplus value in socialism?”, “how is the factory in socialism?”,

“How is the mode of production?”, and such; this book talks about it.

I recommend these two, okay? But they are gigantic books,

they are not books to leave by your bedside and read every night, they are to be consulted.

One more: “The German Ideology”.

Lenin did not have access to this text. This text is a text that Marx and Engels wrote in 1846,

criticizing the Young Hegelians, and it's the best example we have of historical materialism.

Despite the book being gigantic, I recommend only the first chapter, the most important one, which is “Feuerbach”.

That book was the one I read in college to understand historical materialism.

It looks big, but in fact, only the first chapter is the most essential.

One more: “Critique of the Gotha Program”.

“Oh, Ian, I don't even know what Gotha is. Why would I read this book when I don't even know what Gotha is?"

The Gotha Program was the program for the unification of German workers' parties.

Marx, when criticizing the unification program of these parties,

Expounded much more about socialism.

So, he talks about: a dictatorship of the proletariat, the first phase of communism,

The higher stage of communism talks about the role of the State.

He talks about the period of transition from socialism to communism.

This book is very important; he's short, too. Very short.

And then, moving on to Lenin. People say all the time: “read Lenin, read Lenin!”

Let's read Lenin then, shall we?

First book: “What is to be done?”. What is to the done? is a book that Lenin writes in 1902,

for the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party.

Lenin was part of a party at that time, the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party,

and he writes this book to present his party ideas,

that would become the Leninist Party in Congress.

This book is a perfect example of how Lenin thought about revolutionary party organization.

One more: “The State and the Revolution”.

This book is book that is even good to read as Lenin's first book, too. Why?

Here, Lenin talks about the role of the State in a revolution

- Much like what Marx does in the Critique of the Gotha Program -

talking about what is the role of the State in a revolution, how the working-class should manage the State,

what is it for; and what is the State, he theorizes about the State, too.

This book here, if you're going to read it, is Marx and Engels through and through.

Here you can see how he mastered the subject.

And finally, a part of Leninist theory that I haven't mentioned but is just as important.

Lenin identifies that capitalism has entered a new phase: the imperialist phase.

Capitalism expands in such a way

that it becomes monopoly capitalism, and the countries at the center of capitalism

begin to dispute the division of the territory of planet Earth for resources.

Lenin theorizing of the new phase of capitalism is what made the Russian Revolution possible, folks.

So, this book here [Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism] is essential, because imperialism is still our greatest enemy.

Understanding the role of imperialism in global capitalism

is fundamental to any revolutionary perspective, anyone.

I will leave all these books for free in the description, free of charge.

All are available on marxists.org, in Portuguese, except for this one.

This one, as Mr. Jorge Grespan needs to pay his bills,

this book here needs to be purchased.

But that's it, folks. This was today's live, "Basic Principles of Communism".

I hope you've learned something.

It's a live I did to be advisory, and I encourage you to ask questions, okay?

If you want to ask me something unclear, you can ask me.

I just don't promise to reply quickly because I've been getting a lot of messages.

But I do my best because as a teacher I need to answer questions like that too.