

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

By Prabhat Patnaik
29.01.2024

The Theoretical Significance of Lenin's Book "Imperialism"



Sources: Rebellion Translated from English for Rebellion

by Beatriz Morales Bastos

The significance of Lenin's *Imperialism* lies in the fact that it completely revolutionized the idea of revolution. Marx and Engels had already foreseen the possibility of colonial and dependent countries having their own revolutions even before the proletarian revolutions took place in the metropolises, but these two scenarios of revolution were considered to be unrelated and neither the trajectory of the revolution in the periphery nor its relation to the socialist revolution in the metropolis was clear. Lenin's *Imperialism* not only related the two scenarios of revolutions, but also considered that revolution in the peripheral countries was part of the process of humanity's advance towards socialism.

By Consequently, the work Lenin considered that the revolutionary process was an integrated whole; Contemplated A Single World Revolutionary Process that after break the weakest link in the chain, without Matter Where That link was located, it was going to overthrow the whole system. And also He claimed that the time had come for that world revolution, because Capitalism had arrived to a phase where, from now on I was going to drag to mankind to Catastrophic wars: there were "covered" everyone without leaving "empty spaces", which means He had totally divided into spheres of influence the different Powers metropolitan, so that now there could only be a new Partition of the world and this new Delivery could only happen through inter-imperialist wars, A classic example of which was the first World war.

The *Imperialism's* theoretical stance broadened Marxism at least five main ways. First of all Included in the field from the world revolution to the "distant regions" of the world, those countries which Hegel had despised for lack of history; Indeed, as Time passed and the hope that he would a revolution in Europe after the Bolshevik Revolution, These countries went on to occupy The Venue Main Stage of the world revolution. In a of his last works Lenin not only He pinned his hopes on the a revolution in China and India succeeded the Russian Revolution, but even rejoiced of the fact that the populations of Russia, China and India together were almost the half of humanity, so that the revolutions in these three countries together were going to Tilt Shape the balance in favour of socialism is decisive. It's not No wonder that the Communist International that he had contributed to create doesn't look like Nothing I'd ever known the world until then; in She delegates of India, China, Mexico, and Indochina rubbed shoulders with those of France. Germany and the United States.

Second, and in parallel, *Imperialism* broadened the scope of Marxism from being a theory of proletarian revolution in the advanced capitalist countries to a theory of world revolution. Of course, understanding the much wider scope of Marxism, a reflection of the

world domination by capital that *Imperialism* had highlighted, still demanded that the specific task of analysing the history of non-European societies on the basis of Marxist theory be undertaken. But the extension of Marxism to the Third World and its flourishing there was to provide the basis for such an analysis promoted by the Comintern, even if the specific political readings of it turned out to be wrong. Thus, Lenin's *Imperialism* gave Marxism an unprecedented vitality.

There is no doubt that Lenin was not the first to speak of imperialism. Rosa Luxemburg had already made a very sharp and insightful analysis before him that explained why capitalism needed to invade pre-capitalist markets. But Luxemburg's analysis failed to consider that the result of this invasion was the integration of the pre-capitalist sector into capitalism. The pre-capitalist sector did not remain a devastated entity, but became part of the capitalist sector. Thus, Luxemburg's analysis remained focused on the European proletarian revolution. Despite some observations to the contrary, he did not consider that metropolitan capitalism had created a permanently segmented world. *Lenin's imperialism*, on the other hand, did see that world as permanently segmented, and therein lies its strength.

In Third, Lenin's theory provided an interpretation of the radically new concept of the "historical obsolescence" of the capitalism. Until Then, and based on the brief remarks which Marx had made in the preface to *Contribution to the Critique of political economy*: it was understood that a mode of production was becoming obsolete and could therefore be overthrown, only when they exhausted the possibilities of further developing their forces Productive. Himself He supposed that this exhaustion manifested itself in the form of a crisis. Of In fact, the absence of such a crisis had led Bernstein to ask for that Marxism should be "revised," that the system should be reformed instead of to overthrow it, as the proletariat desired. Supporters of the revolutionary tradition and opponents of Bernstein tried to to show that even though It still wouldn't have been Once that terminal crisis had occurred, it was inevitable.

The Lenin's theory of imperialism opened up a completely new path. novel in this sense. The manifestation of the the historical obsolescence of capitalism and the fact that it was the The time to overthrow him was not due to an economic crisis, but to the fact that he had entered a phase into which he was dragging mankind to devastating wars, wars in which the workers of a country would be forced to fight in The Trenches Against the workers from another country. When this happened It would be time to turn imperialist

wars into wars civilians and To stop targeting fellow workers in the trenches to target the capitalists of each country.

In Fourthly, socialism was Now the goal of all revolutions with independence whence take place. In *Lenin's Two The tactics of the Social-Democracy* had already given rise to the idea that the democratic revolution would not be revolutionized. It was going to produce in those countries that had arrived late to the capitalism because of the bourgeoisie, which historically had played the role of being its forerunner: In these societies, the The task of making the democratic revolution was to to the proletariat, which was going to Establishing an alliance with the peasantry, and once the democratic revolution had been led, It wouldn't stop there, but I would go on to build the socialism. But Now it's gone mainstream the possibility of produced a revolution in a peripheral society, at first against the imperialism and based on a broader class alliance of workers and peasants, who It would then advance to the socialist phase. To put it simply, the The task of building socialism was no longer a matter of the working people in advanced countries, but it was a task that was to be accomplished in stages and that was included in the agenda of all societies.

Finally, a fundamental question was posed: why had there been such a rise of "reformism" among the movements of the European working class that so many leaders of the Second International had taken opportunist or blatantly social chauvinist positions during the war. And building on an earlier suggestion by Engels, Lenin gave an answer to this question by developing the concept of a "labor aristocracy" that had been "bribed" with the superprofits of imperialism.

Imperialism was a magnificent theoretical achievement. Lenin had once pointed out that the strength of Marxism lay in its truth. The same can be said of Lenin's theory of imperialism. This theory, a remarkable *tour de force*, very lucidly provided answers to a whole series of questions that had been raised in the new conjuncture and demanded answers. One could argue about this or that detail of Lenin's arguments, but the overall sense of the work is correct for the most part. And proof that he is correct is the extraordinary way in which he foresaw the events that took place in the world in the period between 1914 and 1939.

However, today the world is different from what Lenin had written in *Imperialism*. A fundamental feature of this difference is that the centralization of capital is much greater than in Lenin's time, which has given rise to an international finance capital instead of the national finance capitals that prevailed then. Consequently, inter-imperialist rivalries have

been attenuated because international finance capital does not want the world to be divided into different spheres of influence, but wants a world that is not divided so that it can move through it without restriction. Therefore, the question of wars provoked by inter-imperialist rivalries no longer arises.

With Everything, that doesn't mean the dawn of an era of peace. The the incessant offensive of international finance capital against all attempt In the third world of Achieve economic independence and economic self-sufficiency (including food) has led to a whole series of conflicts that confront a united imperialism against certain Countries. At the same time, greatly intensified the exploitation of people Tailor-made Third World Workers that the oligarchy corporate-financial institutions of this third world have become Been integrating in international finance capital. The result of this is a enormous growth of inequalities in the Third World, up to the end of the point that much of the of its population suffers from increasing absolute poverty in terms of nutrition. At the same time, the greater willingness of the metropolitan capital to relocate its activity in the Global South It has weakened the trade unions in the metropolis and led to a increasing inequalities within the metropolis itself. By Consequently, the hegemony of finance capital, which is expressed in An order neoliberal, has meant a significant worsening in relative terms and even absolutes of the conditions of the world's working people.

This has provoked A crisis of overproduction for which there is no solution within of the neoliberal global order. And This crisis has led to a major rise in fascism and neo-fascism in the world, and the alliance of oligarchies financial institutions of various countries with fascist groups to to maintain its hegemony. Thus, it has become Foreground: the struggle for democratic rights, against unemployment and for civil liberties; And this struggle has joined the struggle for socialism. The Revolutionary change of perspective that brings Lenin of the World Revolution Continues valid, but the immediate objective of the Revolution has changed over time.

https://peoplesdemocracy.in/2024/0121_pd/theoretical-significance-lenin's-imperialism

*This is the case Translation may be freely reproduced as long as it respects its integrity and mention **the** author, **the** translator and Rebellion as the source of the translation.*

Rebellion 27.01.2024