

People without history: first part on the discussion against dogmatism, sectarianism and eurocentrism

By Christian Tello, PRIM in Mexico

I am not a prisoner of history. I don't have to look to it for the meaning of my destiny. I must remind myself at all times that the true leap lies in introducing invention into existence.

- Frantz Fanon (1961)

Introduction

History, in its modern and teleological sense, begins with Hegel. When laying the foundations of universal history, Hegel alluded to the strangeness of an underworld that, from his perspective, was outside of history: the silent deserts of the sub-Saharan, the forgotten steppes of Patagonia or the hermetic jungles of Indochina, inhabited by humanoid figures that danced around the pagan midnight fire, emitting guttural screams and narrating myths about the stars and gods of ancient times. For Hegel, they were not even men, since they lived outside the habits, customs, values, ways of life, beliefs and geographies of the European continent and its civilizations. These people were on the margins of what he calls “the deployment of the Spirit” (*Entfaltung des Geistes*) as progress of self-consciousness and freedom in the rational state of things. In this way, “What we call universal history is not the history of all peoples at all times, but only the history of the peoples who are part of the development of the universal Spirit (Hegel, 1830).” In such a way that the deployment of the Spirit does not appear suddenly as something complete, but rather develops historically in stages. Each stage of history (Egypt, Greece, Rome) represents a form of consciousness, social organization and progress towards European modernity in which “everyone can be free” according to Hegelian teleology. Therefore, “Africa (And therefore America and Asia) is not a historical part of the world; It shows no movement or historical development of its own [...] What we understand by Africa is a world without history, without movement or development (Hegel, 1830: 259).”

Since this philosophical prelude, modernity acquired the form of a rational story against those peoples without history: a linear and homogeneous pre-conception of historical development; a story that emerges in Europe with the particular mission of illuminating those “dark areas” of the world populated by those figures “blunted” at the stake. From this civilizational project emerged a vision of the world called Eurocentrism, that is, an ideological vision that places Europe at the center of historical and cultural development, making invisible or subordinating other realities and historical experiences. Only then, Eurocentrism functions as part of a superstructure that justifies colonial expansion and global capitalist dominance. Initially, typical of the original accumulation of capital in the 15th century¹, Eurocentrism reproduced power relations that perpetuated the hegemony of Western capitalism over the rest of the world through overseas adventures and colonization processes in Africa, America and Asia.

As Marx warned, nothing escapes ideology, and this, in its concrete historical form, manifests itself as bourgeois ideology.² Marxism and its attempts at revision, consciously or inadvertently, inherited, in such a way, part of the preconceptions about universal history: European, linear, homogeneous and positivist that impostor laws of civilizational development in an eschatology that subordinated the culture, societies and economic forms of other colonized peoples. This has been one of the many ways in which dogmatism has broken into Marxist thought. From Engels' studies in *Anti-Dühring*³ on the development of the means of production through stages and verifiable historical laws, which later served to misappropriate and justify the civilizational policy of German social democracy with respect to the colonies, passing through the thesis of “socialism in one country” of Stalinism, to the omissions of the supporters of Eurocommunism in the second half of the 20th

¹ For greater detail, see chapter 24 of *Capital*, volume II Vol. I on original accumulation (We will go into detail about the issue in section 2).

² For Marx, bourgeois ideology is the set of dominant ideas in a society, which reflect the interests of the ruling class - the bourgeoisie - and which are falsely presented as universal, natural or neutral truths. These ideas work to hide the contradictions of capitalism, justify exploitation, and maintain the status quo. In this framework, positivism, especially in its more orthodox version inherited from Auguste Comte, served as a key ideological tool: by seeking to apply the methods of natural sciences to the study of history and society, positivism denied social conflict, dialectical contradiction and the historicity of social relations, reducing human processes to fixed and evolutionary, linear and ahistorical laws.

³ Garaudy, for example, criticized Engels for having crystallized a “dialectic of nature” that was never fully accepted by Marx. While, for Enzo Traverso, this “totalization” of thought, typical of a confusion of methods between historical dialectics and the laws of nature, can be interpreted as a step towards the Marxist-Leninist dogma that would later be institutionalized in the Second and Third Internationals.

century in the face of the anti-imperialist struggles in Algiers or Vietnam, the Eurocentric dogmatism of certain traditions has distorted the vocation of Marxism as a theory of revolution.

Unfortunately, this bias has even contaminated our tradition, making it difficult to analyze our perspectives, our program and the formation of our militancy in the neocolonial world. Therefore, the task of Marxism and any serious review process in the PRIM must begin by unmasking these errors and why not? make us feel ashamed⁴ and guilt in the face of the past and its defeats. Not from a paralyzing pessimism, but as a gesture of historical responsibility, an outstanding debt with the victims of that unjust policy.

We must illuminate those opaque spaces, closed by the vulgar, Eurocentric and dogmatic historicism of our tradition and that of many others in Marxism. To quote Walter Benjamin: "we must capture those fleeting moments that occur as flashes in history (Benjamin, 1942)." Only in this way can we return to the past not as a well of melancholy, but as a power to build a horizon of revolutionary hope. Only in this way is redemption possible, understood in Benjaminian terms: a redemption mired in guilt, discomfort, imbalance, and the impossibility of any easy reconciliation. Only in this way does a lucid hope make its way, a hope that does not idealize the future and closes the past, but faces the present with responsibility, in defense of those peoples "without history": the Peoples of the East that impressed Lenin, the Russian rural communes that Marx studied, the pre-Columbian communities that Mariategui admired or the black rebellions that gave hope to Fanon; those brown, yellow and black who knew how to show Europe a revolutionary power greater than what it ever offered them.

It is for this reason, and more, that our tradition has to open itself to the in-depth study of the peoples subordinated by imperialism, their historical experiences, their theoretical contributions to Marxism and revolutionary capacities to face a world certainly still divided by the scars of colonialism. What I will try to

⁴ This allusion comes from a letter that Marx wrote to Arnold Ruge in March 1843. In it, Marx reflects on the role of shame in political consciousness: "I see that you smile and say: what's the point of that? Revolutions are not made out of shame. And I answer: shame is already a revolution; it is, in reality, the victory of the French Revolution over the German patriotism that defeated it in 1813. Shame is a kind of anger turned inward. And if an entire nation were to feel shame, it would be like a lion that draws back to leap (Marx, 1843)."

portray below will be a series of introductory experiences that can contribute to the review process against sectarianism, mechanism and dogmatism that have erred in their analysis of the specific situation, since their object of study is outside the dialectical method.

It is true that the history of revolutions and Marxism in what we call today “the global south”, “neocolonial world” or “the periphery” (Africa, Asia, and Latin America) is so vast that even encyclopedic scholarship could not complete the task at hand. Therefore, I will make use of what Benjamin defines as *dialectical images*⁵. According to the most complete definition in Enzo Traverso, these images are flashes of truth that interrupt the continuity of historical time, points of condensation where past and present intersect to reveal a repressed historical experience and thus form a constellation of revolutionary experiences and horizons (Traverso, 2021: 15).⁶ It is not about linearly reconstructing a closed totality, but about capturing critical moments that break with the dominant vision of progress, in this case, the one that places Europe as the center and measure of historical development. These images allow us to build a responsible memory, rebellious to the linear and homogeneous narrative of Eurocentrism, which becomes a methodological tool to think from and with the historical subjects who were constitutive of peripheral capitalist development but excluded from its global narrative and that of the so-called “Marxism” that the CWI and ISA insisted on defending.

This work will be divided into four sections that articulate theory and historical experience: **1) Dialectics and its subject of study**, where problematizes the theoretical and political omissions of our debate, and how the dialectical movement can be recovered based on colonial and peripheral realities. **2) Original**

⁵ In *The book of passages* like an unfinished work, Benjamin returns to this idea already formulated in his essays on the concept of history: “the dialectical image is not a motionless image, but an image that emerges at the moment of danger. In it, what has been is brilliantly united with the now to form a constellation (Benjamin, 1982).”

⁶ Observe in *Revolution*, “Understanding history, Benjamin maintained, involves contemplating the past through its 'visuality' (*clarity*) and fix it 'perceptually'. As revolutions are 'dialectical leaps' that explode the 'continuum of history', writing their history means capturing their significance through images that condense them: the past 'crystallized as a monad'. Dialectical images emerge from the combination of two essential procedures of historical research: compilation and montage. [...] that is, not as a chronology of events nor as a linear history of causes and effects, but as a constellation of 'dialectical images' that condense historical experiences, collective imaginaries and utopian desires. These images condense past and present, failure and hope, memory and projection, and allow us to read revolutions not only as political events but as symbolic and intellectual productions.” (Traverso, 2020: 15). “Dialectical images are not mirror images; They are not the reflected views of past events, they are lamps that shed light on the past” (Traverso, *Ibidem*).

accumulation and accumulation by dispossession, examining how capital is not born solely from the internal European process, but from colonial plunder, forced labor and dispossession on the periphery of the global market, thus forming a capitalism with dynamics different from those of the center of global wealth accumulation. **3) The revolutionary subject**, which moves away from the single figure of the European industrial proletariat to rescue anti-colonial, peasant, indigenous and black struggles as legitimate forms of revolutionary action. And finally, **4) The peasant and slave revolutions**, where the historical experiences that challenged the colonial, capitalist and imperialist order are studied, such as the slave revolts in the Caribbean, the peasant and indigenous movements in Latin America, and the anti-colonial revolutions in Africa and Asia.

The sections presented are intended to warn about the challenge of thinking beyond the prefabricated formulas of the so-called “Marxism” and thus, redeem a past obstructed by confusions and superficialities in its analysis. Even today Lenin's words resonate as a sentence when he states that "our European petty bourgeois do not even dream that the coming revolutions in the Eastern countries, incomparably more populated, due to their diversity of social conditions, will undoubtedly offer them more peculiarities to theory than the Russian revolution (Lenin, 1979: 796)."⁷ Therefore, these entries do not intend to exhaust the debate, but rather to open it, generating a way to think about Marxism as a living and situated tool, deeply anticolonial and internationalist.

1) Dialectics and its subject of study

Colonial oppression has been a central theme in Marxist theory since its first debates. The approach to this problem focuses on the relationship between the world market, the international division of labor and the role that classes play in societies dominated by the logic of imperialism. Therefore, themes such as nationalism, revolutionary classes, violence, race, have a central role in each historical experience of the living movement of the working class. In short, the dialectical method of analysis plays a different role in the study of these realities that are not supported, for example, in the analysis of the historical development of

⁷ For more detail read: V, Lenin. (1979). V. I. Lenin selected works, volume 3 (Our Revolution). Progress Publishing House: Moscow. p, 796.

capitalism in Europe, with its own categories and concepts. Here, both the subject and the object of study of Marxism usually hide dynamics totally different from those studied by the ABC of our tradition. These realities make us rethink the capacity and challenges with which Marxism can become a universal theory that not only observes from the outside but also inherits the particular characteristics of each society, ethnicity, race, religion and language.

And here's the thing, if we discard the systematic study of the Marxist ABC of our tradition (which the majority of ISA obscenely repeated) we will realize that we have fatally omitted the systematic study of other authors or revolutionary experiences in the global south that were considered politically unreliable, exotic or contrary to the antiquated dogma that preceded the political ideas of the old ISA leadership. In Mexico, we had the embarrassing situation of being criticized by the leadership of the American section of ISA for integrating José Carlos Mariategui into our branches' readings. Mariategui, one of the great Latin American Marxists and revolutionaries, was dismissed by these people by accusing him of being postmodern without even hearing his name or discussing his writings beforehand. This is a small example of the political unrest that we had been predicting in informal discussions, meetings and international debates with comrades from other sections when ISA still existed.

While we strive to learn every detail of the Russian Revolution, learn about Marx, Lenin and Trotsky and debate the latest from Peter Taaffe, we forget the Haitian Revolution in a trunk of memories, we distantly ignore the ideas of Mariategui, Fanon, Cabral and Guevara and we superficially land the late discussions on decoloniality, populism, Bonapartism and left-wing progressivism in the global south. We still remember the discussions of the Latin American bureau that ended protocol by sentencing and ignoring the limits of progressivism and its interclass dynamics while not advancing beyond the obscene formulas of their understanding. We celebrated 100 years of the left-opposition at the last ISA summer school, and it was completely forgotten that Latin America was celebrating 200 years of the Haitian revolution, the first slave, Black, and Caribbean revolution in history.

Even now, in the last Summer School, during the discussion on the Marxist approach to oppression, a comrade who had been active in Trotskyism for decades mentioned being amazed at studying *Black Skins and White Masks*, by Fanon, for the first time in a meeting like this while his former comrades still they qualified to the Martinique writer as a “petty-bourgeois revisionist.”

Recently in the project, during the discussion on the criminal genocide in Gaza, comrades who left the ISA section in Israel-Palestine, made a substantial political call about the need for the sensitivity of our analysis and program to the reality of the Palestinian people. The problem of the national question has been discussed on several occasions, the difficulty of adapting a socialist program in the midst of the contradictions that Israeli society represents, the concessions to the international movement in solidarity for Palestine or even the use of words like genocide in our slogans. Everything has been mentioned, pointed out and discussed, however, do you remember the contributions of comrades of the Third World on the issue? How many Palestinian, Arab and Muslim workers are part of the debate? What does the part that lives with the reality of this debate say, in its own voice? The comrades have mentioned it in a simple and direct way, we must listen and learn from the masses before formulating empty slogans, vague programs and liquidationist speeches that are more reminiscent of a pastoral catechesis than the revolutionary analysis of Marxism.

It is evident that we, who are battered by war and the misery of imperialist governments, are still on the sidelines of the debate on this issue among the major European sections. We do not produce our own documents, translation is slow, and the demands are exhausting. A clear example of this occurred during the Summer School: during the debate on the genocide in Gaza, the Irish, Belgian, and Israeli sections jumped from the war camp to the discussion of the concessions granted to the international movement in the solidarity camps held at universities in Europe and the United States. We, the sections in the neocolonial world, remained silent for much of the debate, observing and trying to understand how alien the polemic seemed to us. Amidst strangeness, we found ourselves talking in a corner of the auditorium, the Brazilian and Mexican comrades. Ask yourselves why these camps were not reproduced on a massive scale in the neocolonial world? One of the answers is: for us, death is our daily bread. Violence, even massive and

extraordinary violence, in the colonial world does not in itself cause solidarity and mobilization among the working class immediately, because the immediacy of life is lived in constant explicit violence. Today, 500 Palestinians die in bombings; tomorrow, drug cartels execute 43 students in Mexico; the next day, 800 indigenous people from a rival tribe are murdered in Sudan; and next week, 146 workers die in a textile factory collapse in Laos.

The death, violence, and cruelty we experience daily, a product of the colonial legacy in our dependent societies, becomes normal, indifferent, and even indispensable for the reproduction of life. What a macabre dialectic is at work here: the violence of capital renders the life of the colonized insensitive, and its only human expression is its reproduction through other channels. Thus, the colonized masses go beyond the camps: they set fire to the streets of Cairo, assault Israeli embassies in Buenos Aires, blow up foreign capital's gas pipelines in La Paz, or storm the government palace in Sri Lanka. For us, this reality is our reality, alien and distant from the reality underlying the debate in the European sections. We could end every speech at international meetings by calling for international workers' solidarity, but this solidarity is still abstract in the way that the sections in imperialist countries don't fully understand the struggles against foreign capital, the scars of colonialism, and the logic of violence in neocolonial countries. By not fully understanding, they keep us on the sidelines of the debate.

The colonial world is a Manichean world, Fanon warned, and in that Manichaeic world, still latent in societies like ours, discussions like these are not expressed explicitly in the consciousness and nightmarish experience of the masses oppressed by imperialism.⁸ Gege, during the debate, has expressed this clearly by highlighting in his participation the crudeness in which a Palestinian worker has told how his entire family was annihilated by the bombings of the Israeli army. How can you ask him to think about solidarity with the Israeli working class when the only thing he knows about them is their desire to see them die behind the rubble of fire and lead? Similarly, two years ago, during an informal discussion with Yassim about

⁸In *Black skin, white masks*, Chapter 5, Fanon says about the question: "the lived experience of the black": "The black man is not a man. There is no ontology for the black man. The colonial situation is defined by the exclusion of the indigenous from the human world. In a society where racism reigns, the black man cannot recognize himself in the class struggle, because before class, he is race. The colonial proletariat is not a proletariat like the European one: it is a subman, subjected not only to exploitation, but to dehumanization."

the international movement in solidarity for Palestine in Tunisia, he mentioned the difficulty and absurdity of introducing or trying to explain the program of the I-P section of ISA in its national context, since it would be a betrayal of the very anti-imperialist consciousness that survives among the workers of the Maghreb, those who lived through the most bitter and bloody national liberation struggles.

In the Manichean world the oppressed masses only know the violence of the colonizer and the suffering of their people, therefore, when it comes to frontal combat there are no concessions. It is either the physical destruction of the oppressor or the complete extinction of the oppressed species. Violence, consequently, is the only rational means of containing social forces prepared to clash. It can be said that not all of the Israeli working class directly participates in or supports the genocide of the Palestinian people, but the prefabricated formula falters as it takes its first steps into the field of real movement. In the colonial system, whether under the modality of apartheid or the modern Israeli occupation, violence envelops all national life. By not understanding this, this hesitation ends up arbitrarily reducing the complexity of the analysis of the internal dynamics of the movement. Let us think, as Fanon says, of that support that springs from the daily indifference of the colonizer who enjoys the nightly gatherings in the city's Cabaré while the rat hunts begin in the Arab Cabash (*Chasse aux rats*)⁹, of the dear brothers who serve in the military or the areas occupied by neighborhoods with people of impeccable morals. In one way or another, in the eyes of the colonized, they are all the same, collaborators, representatives of the regime, first-class citizens, colonizers. "Either it's them or it's us", because what he has known all his life is that Manichean world that makes him animalistic, and the violence invested against the colonizer is finally the only redoubt of his humanity.

In the discussions we have prioritized sensitivity to the suffering of the Palestinian masses but we have not understood how that suffering turns into rage, the driver for the unique expression of all that flow of energy that is violence against

⁹ The expression "rat hunt" in the context of Algeria during the French colony refers in a brutal and dehumanizing way to the torture, raids and military, repressive and systematic persecution operations that the French colonial forces carried out against the Algerian population, especially during the War of Independence (1954-1962). In the movie "*The Battle of Algiers*" (1966), directed by Gillo Pontecorvo, graphically represents how the French military organized these nocturnal "hunts" in the Casbah while the European neighborhoods slept peacefully. Authors such as Pierre Vidal-Naquet and Henri Alleg documented the torture and repressions in works such as *The question* (1958).

the colonizer and against everything he represents, be it his people, his national culture and his parties. Thus "the violence of the colonial system and the violent response of the colonized constitute a fatal cycle. It is a closed universe, cut in two (Fanon, 1961)." Not understanding this character inevitably makes us take a Eurocentric position for the "poor" and "defenseless" colonized people who need help from abroad; It is a position dominated by the egomania of bourgeois altruism and the paternalism of the good colonizer who rejects the use of violence for Christian morality. It is the racist dialectic that liberal hypocrisy hides. Therefore, we cannot understand the massive support in those testimonial videos of the fighters and martyrs carried in coffins, after attacking the Israeli army despite the approaching bombing, who fight for different pro-Palestinian military organizations and who we decide to reject their political program.

All these examples are to show a discomfort that still persists in the ranks of our organization and that it is necessary to eradicate with dialectics acting in a totally different way from the formulas offered by our tradition. From this perspective, dialectics operates in a sense of absolute negation. There is no reconciliation between the colonizer, his society and the colonized, violence is a violence that humanizes¹⁰, the working class operates in terms of consciousness very different from that which lives in the imperialist centers, etc... Wherever one goes, each topic turns out to cause greater complications for the Marxists of our time who rely on a half-method.

It is necessary for this reason to reconstruct our understanding of Marxist dialectics. The underlying error in the dominant Marxist tradition has not only been political, but methodological. We did not understand dialectic as a living and totalizing method, but as a series of fixed conclusions that were repeated without life. As Georg Lukács warns in *History and class consciousness*, Marxism does not consist of the unquestionable acceptance of Marx's results, but rather of fidelity to the dialectical method, to its revolutionary character. This dialectical method is based

¹⁰ "When the peasants receive the rifles, the old myths fade, the prohibitions disappear one by one; the weapon of a combatant is his humanity. Because, in the first moments of the rebellion, one must kill: to kill a European is to kill two birds with one stone, to suppress at the same time an oppressor and an oppressed: there remains a dead man and a free man; the survivor, for the first time, feels a national soil under the soles of his feet. At that moment, the Nation does not distance itself from him: it is found wherever he goes, wherever he is—never further away, it is confused with his freedom (Sartre, 1961: 12)."

on the idea that the concrete totality is the central category, that is, that the truth of social phenomena can only be understood from its location in the total historical process, in its internal contradictions, in its movement. Therefore, the struggles of the colonized peoples, far from being “exceptions” or “particularities”, were concrete and legitimate expressions of the uneven and combined development of world capitalism. They were, in the strict sense, dialectical forms of political subjectivation against capital. They understood—with or without European categories—that their liberation could not go through formal stages, nor through passive waiting for capitalism to mature its contradictions. The dialectic of the oppressed, like the insurgent thought of Fanon, Mariátegui or Cabral, starts from concrete life, from the material and spiritual relationships of people in struggle. That is why their understanding of dialectics is total, even if it does not conform to the doctrinal canon that organizations like ISA have maintained with sterile rigidity. Organizations that fail to theoretically develop even half of what these revolutionary thinkers produced.

We, on the other hand, have failed to apply that method. We turn it into dogma, we fix it in a Eurocentric framework, and with this we move away from the concrete totality that Lukács requires for any real analysis. As he says, “Marxism is not a series of abstract theses that are applied mechanically to facts, but the knowledge of the concrete process in its development and contradictions.” By abandoning that vision we omitted the contradictions that constituted the effective understanding of the oppressed masses, and therefore, we failed to offer a program with solid demands for their liberation. We thus break the unity between theory and revolutionary practice.

This theoretical distancing has a political price: a Marxism without a people, without a body, without a soul. While Fanon understood that “violence is the only means by which the colonized can reappropriate his humanity,” we continued looking for answers in old resolutions that knew nothing about the pain of Gaza, the uprising in Chiapas, the drums of Bois Caïman. Dialectic, understood from Lukács, is precisely the opposite: it is the art of thinking about the present from its contradictions, not from nostalgia for the past. And in that sense, studying Fanon or Cabral is not only a passionate act of political justice, but of methodological coherence.

What we have experienced in our internal discussions—by omitting or qualifying as a complement experiences such as the Haitian Revolution, Fanon's ideas, and anticolonial struggles in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—is not simply a political omission: it is a moral and historical failure. It is the expression of a poorly processed shame, of a left that, in the name of ideological purity, refused to listen to the oppressed of its time.

The anticolonial struggle is not a complement to Marxism: it is its historical proof. There is no revolution possible without the recognition of the Manichean world that Fanon describes, where colonizing violence structures not only the territory but the subjectivity of the oppressed. In this context, talking about reconciliation or abstract solidarity between classes without addressing the colonial wound is repeating the same silence that the victors have imposed, making us collaborators in the massacre. That is why Benjamin reminds us that “only through desperate love for the defeated does the historian have the right to light the spark of hope in the past” (Thesis VII).

This desperate love is not romanticism. It is consciousness. It is to assume that revolutionary history does not begin or end in Petrograd 1917, but also burns in Haiti 1804, in Morelos with Zapata, in Algeria, Tunisia, Palestine, Chiapas or Soweto. It is understanding that the redemption of the past does not occur from the altar of the most accomplished leaders nor from the paternalism of the colonizer with morals, but from the rage of the people who still struggle to exist and that we must extract from them a living voice of their knowledge. That is our method, and the method is so political that it translates into concrete political corrections.

2) Original accumulation and accumulation by dispossession

For Marx, capitalism began in a specific chapter of human history, comparable in his words to the “original sin” of the Christian myth.

From this original sin arises the poverty of the great masses who still today, despite how hard they work, have nothing to sell other than themselves and the wealth of the few, wealth that does not stop growing, although its owners have long since stopped working (Marx, 1867: 652).

Capitalism, as an economic formation in history, does not arise from a free association of producers in a market dominated by the harmonious law of supply and demand, nor did it manage to be formed from the good will of liberalism, free trade and Christian morality of European nations. The origin of capitalism or the “process of original accumulation” as Marx defines it, came into the world “dripping blood and mud from every pore, from the feet to the head” (Marx, 1867: 654). What may seem like a metaphor in Marx makes sense when studying the history of capitalism since the 15th century, recognizing the role of the bloody conquest of Latin America and Africa, the profitable slave trade in the Atlantic Sea, the violent dispossession of communal lands in Europe, the abrupt conversion of millions of peasants into wage workers, the genocide of indigenous civilizations and the imprisonment of millions of women to unpaid domestic work and motherhood. (Mies, 2019: 17).

All these aspects, events and historical situations that preceded the modern history of capitalism are, for Marx, an essential and characteristic part of its origin. Thanks to them, the creation of a global market was possible that for the first time connected all corners of the world in a system divided between the center of the global accumulation of wealth, Europe, and the peripheries in the overseas colonies where it came from. Europe is literally the creation of the Third World¹¹. It allowed, in turn, an international division of labor of exchanges between producers at global distances. It managed to increase production from 1 to 100 through the dispossession of large indigenous lands converted into private property for the trade of tobacco, wool, cotton, sugar cane and livestock (De Angelis, 2012: 15). It reduced the role of women in society to the private life of the home to maintain domestic tasks that were the basis of the continuous global reproduction of the labor force (children who were born, raised and ended up in factories) (Mies, 2019: 164). It built entire cities, like Manchester or Lisbon, from the trade of black and maroon slaves

¹¹ Quoting Fanon on the issue, "the wealth of the imperialist countries is also our wealth. On a universal level, this statement absolutely does not mean that we feel affected by the creations of Western technology or arts. Very specifically, Europe has inflated itself in a disproportionate way with the gold and raw materials of the colonial countries; Latin America, China, Africa. From all those continents, against which today's Europe raises its opulent tower, the people have been leaving for that same Europe for centuries. diamonds and oil, silk and cotton, wood and exotic products. Europe is, literally, the creation of the Third World. The riches that suffocate it are those that have been stolen from the underdeveloped peoples. The ports of Holland, Liverpool, the docks of Bordeaux and Liverpool that specialize in the slave trade owe their fame to the millions of deported slaves. of the unhappy underdeveloped peoples, we do not tremble with gratitude. On the contrary, we tell ourselves, "it is a just reparation that they are going to make to us (Fanon, 1861: 51)."

(Leinbaugh, 2004: 129). It reinforced the strategic alliance between Church and State with the reform process, in 1545, against the peasant revolts in Europe and the creation of the Holy Inquisition to hunt down women accused of witchcraft, anticlerical religious radicals and commoners who escaped in the colonial incursions to the Americas (Federici, 2004: 34). Wherever one looks, the victims are innumerable in different situations and locations on the globe.

In the history of original accumulation all the transformations that serve as a point of support for the nascent capitalist class, and above all the moments in which large masses of men are suddenly and violently stripped of their means of subsistence and thrown into the labor market as free and disinherited proletarians. Its history presents a diverse modality in each country, and in each of them it goes through the different phases in different degrees and in different historical periods (Marx, 1990 [1867]: 654).

The transatlantic slave trade, the dispossession of indigenous communal lands, the witch hunt throughout continental Europe, the colonization and evangelization of Africa and America, the exploration of new Asian trade routes through religious wars, etc... If one puts the puzzle together, one obtains the global image, the historical reconstruction of the mythical and most distant times of the emergence of capitalism. A long story of blood, horror, lead, mud and misery.

Let's take some historical examples of this puzzle. Silvia Federici (2004), in her work *"The Caliban and the Witch"* It tells the story of the witch hunt between the 15th and 17th centuries in Europe and how this campaign managed to discipline sexuality and the body of women through penance (Federici, 2004, Mies, 2019). At the same time, it shows the relationship between hunting and the success of the landowning bourgeoisie in the firewood trade, alcohol and the textile industry, enriched by hunting campaigns and the burning of accused persons at the stake.

In the *"Hydra of the revolution"*, Peter Linebaugh (2005), gives voice to those sailors, African slaves, buccaneers, petty criminals, vagabonds and religious radicals who were forced by the laws of the British crown to travel and work in enormous galleys for years at sea. These ended up being the corpses on which the great transatlantic trade was born. In literary works such as *The Tempest* From William Shakespeare we find a historical vision that is not far from the European conception

of that time about the oppressed masses of the Caribbean, the figure of Caliban is crucial here, Caliban is enslaved by Prospero, who represents the European colonizer who arrives at an inhabited island, takes it as his own and subjugates its inhabitants. The language that Prospero uses to refer to Caliban is clearly dehumanizing: he calls him “beast,” “monster,” “devil,” alluding to both his non-European origin and his supposed lack of civilization.¹².

In “*The limit of capital*” David Harvey (1982) tells us where the misery of Latin America and Africa comes from, based on the bloody conquest of Europe, the accumulation due to clerical dispossession of lands, the pandemic of European diseases such as smallpox, and the ruthless insertion of indigenous peoples into the global market based on the great slave business of the haciendas and mining companies that exported gold, silver, and agricultural products. These are just some recommended readings, which despite particular controversies, are useful to understand the global, long and historical image of capitalism.

For Marx, the violent intrusion of capitalism into human history produced the most contradictory and fundamental element of modern societies, the process of separation. In which, in his words, the means of production and reproduction of life were separated from its producers. Artisans, peasants and free workers were stripped of the most essential aspects that determined their work and the ways in which they lived with the land they harvested, the tools they made, nature and the animals they cared for, the family relationships they fertilized and even the religious worldview they professed. It is, in retrospect, the beginning of the process of alienation in which, according to Marx

The worker feels like a stranger in his own work. Your activity is not your own activity; It is a means to live, not a manifestation of its essence. Man is alienated from his own essence when he cannot appropriate the products of his work, becoming a stranger to his own creation (Marx, 2001 [1844]: 57).

Although Marx delimited the scope of this process in a specific chapter of history, the truth is that capitalism has taken and continues to take more and more from the

¹² However, Caliban also has a voice. He claims: “This island is mine, by Sycorax my mother, / and you took it from me.” (The Tempest, Act I, Scene II). Later, authors such as Aimé Césaire in *Une Tempête* (1969), will make an anti-colonial and Afro-Caribbean rereading of Shakespeare's work, turning Caliban into an anti-colonial revolutionary: “*Call me X! I will no longer answer to the name Caliban. That is not my name. My true name has been erased by the master!*” (Cesaire, *A Storm*).

planet, from the people and our work. How is it possible that it happens? Are they the echoes of primitive accumulation? For authors, such as Rosa Luxemburg, primitive accumulation was only one historical event in a long chain of events that maintain new cycles of accumulation, reinvention and innovation of the capitalist system. Luxemburg identifies two processes, on the one hand the one mentioned by Marx, the process of primitive accumulation, and the second as the accumulation process (properly speaking) or “accumulation process for the expanded reproduction of capital.” What does this mean? That the survival of capitalism depends on its constant expansion and in the words of Luxembourg, "capitalism cannot exist without the expansion of its market. Accumulation continually requires the incorporation of new areas into the capitalist system" (Luxembourg, 2005 [1913]: 121).

By defining processes of accumulation in the history of capitalism we can identify moments of boom, decline, crisis and stabilization, either due to the dynamics of the anarchy of production and the decreasing law of the rate of profit in the global market. These are repeated again and again, forming cycles in a long-lasting linear history, and only in view of this tendency can one understand the self-destructive and at the same time innovative character of a system that seeks to preserve itself in every geographical corner and individual aspect of human life. The expansion that accumulation requires subsumes every aspect of life and the territory where capital can make profits (De Angelis, 2012). The crisis can present itself as an economic catastrophe, a war, a pandemic or even a natural event that constrains the productive forces of capital and forces them to reproduce themselves again through military campaigns, the expansion of monopolies, the financialization of the economy, the construction of infrastructure, the relocation of value chains, etc...

For a new accumulation process to be carried out, it has to inherently start from a previous crisis that threatens its own existence. That is, capitalism cannot exist if it does not live in constant crisis. And in this way a vicious tendency is formed in the system that leads us to the final catastrophe. In a world with an environmental crisis where natural resources are finite and living conditions are detrimental. Since the 1970s, a large Latin American current of Marxist thought developed a study on the expanded reproduction of capital and *sui generis* capitalism of the colonial periphery, inserted in the dynamics of global accumulation. The reading of capitalism as a historical system of accumulation through non-exclusively economic means was

critically taken up by authors of the Marxist theory of dependency, among them Ruy Mauro Marini, who made one of the most erudite and radical contributions to the analysis of capitalism in Latin America.

Marini understood that Latin America (and it can be said about the entire case of the capitalist periphery) was not inserted into world capitalism late or incompletely, as the developmentalist and Eurocentric approaches of the mid-twentieth century maintained among the left, but rather that from its origin, the region was functionally integrated into the development of capital on a global scale as *dependent economy*. This dependence was not the result of "underdevelopment," but of a specific form of development: one structurally subordinated to the accumulation needs of the capitalist center and its cycles of expanded reproduction. Thus, the superexploitation of labor, a central concept in his work, implied that Latin American and colonial world workers not only produced surplus value, but were forced to reproduce their labor power below its value (Absolute surplus value)¹³, which allowed a constant drainage of wealth towards the center, without the need for local autonomous development and with the entire dependence of the national bourgeoisie on the interests of foreign capital.

This approach demystifies the idea that capitalism works in the same way in all places, and denounces that in the periphery - unlike the center of global accumulation - the development of capital does not eliminate pre-existing forms of domination, but rather resignifies, incorporates and exploits them.¹⁴ It is at this point

¹³ Note the exact definition that Marx offers about absolute surplus value in Volume I, Section IV, Chapter 16: "Absolute surplus value and relative surplus value." "The production of absolute surplus value consists, therefore, in the extension of the working day beyond the point at which the worker has reproduced the equivalent of his salary, that is, the value of his labor power. If the normal working day is 12 hours and the worker reproduces the value of his salary in 6 hours, the remaining 6 hours constitute absolute surplus value (Marx, 1867: 355)." Absolute surplus value refers to the increase in value extracted from wage labor through the extension of the working day, without changing the technological conditions or productivity of work. That is, it is obtained by making the worker work more hours for the same salary, thus reducing the value of his salary below its reproduction.

¹⁴ As Trotsky has already developed in his study on the laws of the uneven and combined development of capitalism, "The laws of history have nothing in common with pedantic schematism. Unequal development, which is the most general law of the historical process, is nowhere revealed to us with the evidence and complexity with which it is evident in the destiny of backward countries. Lashed by the whip of material needs, backward countries are forced to advance in leaps and bounds. From this universal law of unequal development is derived another that, for lack of a more appropriate name, we will describe as the law of combined development, alluding to the approximation of the different stages of the path and the combination of different phases, to the amalgamation of archaic and modern forms. [...] The law of unequal development, which is manifested in the history of all nations, can only lead, in the conditions of the imperialist epoch, to the

where Marini's theory connects deeply with the concept of *accumulation by dispossession* formulated by David Harvey and which explains the dynamics of capitalism in the peripheries of the global system.

For Harvey, accumulation by dispossession is the contemporary form of the original accumulation described by Marx: a continuous process, renewed in each crisis of capital, through which common goods, labor rights, indigenous territories, communal lands, public services and even ecological resources are expropriated. This form of accumulation does not only belong to the origins of capitalism, but constantly reappears, especially in the territories of the Global South. Latin America has witnessed this through the forced privatizations of the 1980s and 1990s, the expansion of agribusiness and extractive megaprojects in indigenous territories, such as the case of Belo Monte in Brazil or the Mayan Train in Mexico. Africa, for example, has been the target of new enclosures by dispossession through land grabbing by foreign companies, such as the case of the current vulture funds of the Asian Development Bank (Directed by China). In Asia, the forced displacement of peasants due to infrastructure megaprojects, such as those linked to the Belt and Road Initiative, also exemplifies this process.

Both perspectives—Marini's structural dependence and Harvey's accumulation by dispossession—agree that capitalism has not stopped expanding through the systematic violence that Marx already studied and that in turn acted with entirely different dynamics on the periphery of the capitalist system. In this way, we are faced with a *sui generis* capitalism outside the integral development of capitalism in the historical centers of global accumulation. Far from an internal logic of harmonious self-regulation, capitalist accumulation in the periphery is reproduced through the systematic plundering of entire regions of the planet, perpetuating colonial relations in new forms. The periphery is not an anomaly in the capitalist system; It is one of its pillars, its rule. So much so that the European welfare model in the post-war decades was based on the superexploitation of the workers and peasants of the periphery who supported the concessions offered by that "Welfare State."¹⁵

combination of the most diverse forms of economy and culture, to the fusion of different stages of the historical path (Trotsky, 1930)."

¹⁵ In the words of Wallerstein: "The welfare state in the countries of the center was financed, in part, by the flow of surplus value transferred from the periphery. While in the center high wages and social

Returning to Benjamin's dialectical images, these historical processes must be captured not as linear sequences, but as meaning-laden constellations, where the past is illuminated in the present. Thus, today's superexploitation in Latin America, Africa or Asia is not a simple colonial legacy, but a contemporary update of that violent past that never stopped operating, an expanded and constant reproduction of it, as Luxemburg points out. Capital continues to absorb life, nature and entire cultures through new forms of dispossession, often legitimized by progressive discourses of development, technological innovation or modernization.

This analysis not only allows us to reinterpret the uneven development of global capitalism, but also connects an anti-Eurocentric Marxist critique. Marini, Harvey and Luxemburgo force us to reformulate, faced with the *sui generis* dynamics of peripheral capitalism, the historical subject, no longer as a spectator of European capitalist development, but as a fundamental actor in its formation and contradictions. Dialectic ceases to be a European method and becomes a tool for thinking from the South. In the articulation between Marx, Harvey and Marini, we understand that structural violence is not a past event, but a constant principle of capital. Accumulation occurs in cycles that repeat and reconfigure expropriation in the periphery. Thus, far from being limited to the industrial proletariat of the center as a central actor in the process of separation, the revolutionary subject in the periphery includes peasants, indigenous peoples, women, precarious workers and pigeonholed laborers, whose struggles are expressed dialectically in the face of permanent cycles of dispossession and the dynamics of superexploitation that present the payment of their salary below its value.

Experiences such as the slave revolts in the Caribbean, the Andean peasant insurrections, the guerrillas against the Japanese occupation or the jihad against Christianity in the Maghreb are not pre-modern residues, but advanced expressions of the class struggle in contexts of dependency (*Sui Generis Capitalism*). They are dialectical images that illuminate the possibility of a Marxism that thinks from the margins of capital, outside the dogmas and teleological meanings of universal history. Together, these perspectives allow us not only to reinterpret the past, but

security were guaranteed, in the periphery superexploitation, low wages and labor repression reigned" (The modern world system, vol. III). "One can integrate several hundred million Western workers without the system becoming unprofitable, but if one were to integrate the billions of Third World workers, there would be nothing left for capital accumulation" ([1995], p. 25)."

also to intervene in the present. The task is not only to understand capitalism as a global system, but overflow it with the theoretical and political tools that emerge from those peoples who have been its condition of possibility. From there, Marxism becomes not only more faithful to its original spirit, but also more universal.

Some historical examples account for this statement, and in this way they reconstruct the images of a clear constellation of experiences against accumulation by dispossession in peripheral contexts. The slave insurrection in Haiti not only challenged the French empire in 1804, but also altered the entire Caribbean slave plantation system, depriving capital of one of its main sources of income. Here, the “original accumulation” was questioned and seized by the insurgent blacks themselves, showing that the revolutionary subject was not always the nascent industrial worker and craftsman who rose during the French Revolution of 1789, a social model that prevailed during the first half of the 19th century. The revolutionary subject in this peripheral context was the rebellious slave who sang the *Marseillaise*, as one of the first internationalist symbols of the *Revolution*, while Napoleon's troops charged against those irrational beings.

From Túpac Amaru II in Upper Peru (present-day Peru and Bolivia) to the Mayan insurrections in Yucatán, indigenous peoples have resisted accumulation by dispossession through revolts that demanded the restitution of their lands, knowledge and ways of life that Mariategui already materialized politically in the figure of the *ayllu* as an ancient form of indigenous communism, where land was collectively owned and work was done in community¹⁶. In Mexico, the Zapatistas' *Plan de Ayala*, in 1911, already contained this programmatic demand, defending pre-modern forms of communal organization with modern ideas of socialism. The defense of the so-called “*ejido*” as a form of collective property, rooted in the indigenous traditions of the center and south of the country went against the form of private property of capitalism. Thus, the slogan “*Tierra y Libertad*” consecrates the

¹⁶ "Communism, in Peru, will not be a copy or a carbon copy, but a heroic creation. Inspired by our realities, including the collectivist forms of the *ayllu* (Mariategui, 1928: 22)." "The laws of the Indies protected indigenous property and recognized their communist organization. The legislation relating to indigenous "communities" was adapted to the need not to attack institutions or customs indifferent to the religious spirit and political character of the colony. The agrarian communism of the *ayllu*, once the Inkaiko State was destroyed, was not incompatible with one or the other. Quite the opposite. The Jesuits took advantage precisely of indigenous communism in Peru, in Mexico and on an even larger scale in Paraguay, for its catechization purposes. The medieval regime, theoretically and practically, reconciled feudal property with community property (Mariategui, 1928: 50)."

political action of an indigenous peasantry and agrarian worker, who fought for the heroic creation of a socialism based on the experiences of their history. Although later co-opted by bourgeois sectors, the Mexican Revolution was born as a peasant struggle against the landowning oligarchy and foreign capital. Zapatismo and Villismo embodied self-managed forms of community life and agrarian distribution, against a regime based on the systematic dispossession of indigenous and peasant lands that were completely dedicated to the satisfaction of European industry. "*Tierra y Libertad*" is a radical critique of capitalist accumulation based on the model of haciendas, striped stores and pigeonholed peons.¹⁷

In Africa and Asia, revolutionary processes influenced by the Viet Minh in Vietnam, the FLN in Algeria or the MPLA in Angola were not mere wars of national independence organized by organizations with defects rooted in pre-modern logic (See the case of religious bases and telluric that maintained popular support for these projects), but were projects capable of reinventing the struggle for socialism in its context, even with the "variegated" and archaic historical forms in which colonial societies lived together with capitalism as a whole. In this regard, the National Liberation Front did not use the term "Islamic socialism" formally, but in its writings and statements, they did emphasize the need to build a socialist society based on the historical values of Islamic societies. A relevant fragment is the following, taken from its 1954 Manifesto: "The socialism we defend is not Western socialism, it is a socialism based on our traditions, our Islam, our history and our people. The State will be the guarantor of equality, social justice and collective ownership of natural and productive resources, always in accordance with Islamic principles (FLN, 1954)." Regarding this issue, it is important to understand the historical relationship of Islam, the fight for national liberation and socialism in the rebellions of the people of the Maghreb.¹⁸

¹⁷ Of this type of worker, typical of the capitalist periphery, Marx studied with particularity and makes a substantial definition, "In Mexico, for example, despite the legal reforms introduced by Benito Juárez, the situation of the classified peons has not changed substantially. These workers remain tied to the haciendas through debts and obligations that keep them in a condition of servitude. (Marx, 1867: 143)".

¹⁸ Already in 1921, during the Congress of the Eastern Peoples in Baku-Azerbaijan, convened by the Third International, Gregori Zinoviev proposed understanding Marxism through the historical and cultural features of Islamic societies, using jihad and the teachings of the prophet Muhammad to defend a modern socialist program. In the issue he stated: "The lackeys of the Tehran government have seized the land that, according to Islamic law, was common property. They deal with this land as they want and impose taxes and duties as they see fit. [...] "Now we call them to the first real Holy War, under the red flag of the Communist International. We call for a jihad for your own well-being, for

In Central America, liberation theology also played a similar role to socialism with Islamic values advocated by the FLN. This political movement articulated revolutionary aspirations with pre-modern forms of religious organization. Inspired by a Marxist reading of Christianity, this movement proposed a preferential option for the poor, finding fertile ground among indigenous communities, where popular Catholicism already coexisted with ancestral worldviews. Thus, liberation theology not only served to denounce the structural oppression imposed by imperialism and local oligarchies, but also to revitalize the forms of community and solidarity characteristic of indigenous peoples, giving them a spiritually rooted socialist horizon. As Salvadoran Bishop Óscar Romero, a martyr of this cause, stated: "A Church that does not suffer persecution, but rather enjoys the privileges and support of those in power, is a suspect Church. The true Church is the one that stands in solidarity with the poor and becomes their voice." In this sense, Fanon warns: "Religion in the colonies is often the refuge of the exploited masses. While it is true that religion has been used by colonizers to calm and manipulate oppressed peoples, we cannot ignore that in the struggle for liberation, religion can also become an engine of resistance (Fanon, 1961)."

These ideas and political experiences, from a specific historical context, can be problematically clarified in working-class political programs other than the secular factor of revolutionary movements in Europe. And although they may be problematic and open to criticism, as in the case of the FLN with the conservative ties with Islam. Without falling into romanticism, the truth is that criticism begins with an understanding of the phenomenon before advancing into the realm of the recognizable. Listen before you speak, be silent before you hear, this is the path Marxism has always followed. A priori judgments are not characteristic of dialectics, and proud vanguards with a finished program are not characteristic of a humble militancy connected to the working-class movement.

Likewise, at the end of the century, during the Zapatista insurrection of 1994, the EZLN emerged in Chiapas as a response to the Free Trade Agreement and neoliberalism, new forms of accumulation by dispossession. Their armed and

your own freedom, for your own life! Britain, the last powerful imperialist predator left in Europe, has spread its dark wings over the Eastern Muslim countries and is trying to turn the peoples of the East into its slaves, its spoils. (Proceedings of the Baku Conference, 1921)."

autonomous resistance challenged capitalist logic from the worldview and forms of social organization of the Tzotzil people united with the dialectic of Marxist criticism towards capital as a totality (Despite being far from the political conclusion on the seizure of power¹⁹). The Zapatistas became a living dialectical image, denouncing colonialism as a fact that is still present and that seeks to submerge all communal forms of social organization in the modern and cold logic of calculation and profit. For example, they currently denounce the processes of dispossession of water and territory that are plaguing all of Latin America and are the result of the new dynamics of accumulation and expanded reproduction of capital.

Conclusion

In summary, the uneven and combined forms of capitalist development in the colonial world of the past and the post-colonial world of the present reveal archaic and primitive elements that coexist with forms of working-class political activity. When comparing the facts, it is evident that a revolutionary program for the working class cannot be based on notions, formulas, slogans, and demands that call for the socialist transformation of society without first understanding the old and present transformations of a reality that affirms its necessity. For Marxists, major peculiarities must be clarified in a colonized society where the national and anti-imperialist factor plays a progressive and decisive role, where the peasant class or agricultural day laborers play a much more combative role than the urban proletariat, where communes, neighborhoods, and community assemblies replace bureaucratized union leaderships, where daily struggles are in constant contact with the explicit violence of capital without covert mediation. Obviously, these characteristics have been historically outdated, and it would be pointless to mechanically fit them into the current perspectives and demands of our program. Most of the examples presented

¹⁹ On the question of power, there is still a bitter dispute between sectors of the Marxist and Zapatista left. However, despite being politically distant from the political conclusions of theorists such as John Holloway, who advocate "changing the world without taking power", they offer a particular definition of the logic in which Zapatismo acts as a project that aims to "crack" capital in a particular context where pre-colonial indigenous forms of social organization converge with the commitment to an anti-capitalist horizon. In the words of Sergio Tischler, Holloway's own collaborator, he defines that "time in capitalism is a secularized and reified category. Zapatismo, by building its autonomy, proposes a break with this linear and cumulative conception of time, betting on horizontal time in collective social construction (Tischler, 2020: 249)."

are just that—examples; they do not seek to formulate an ahistorical canon that falls into the doctrinal notions of Marxism-Leninism and the Marxist caricature currently presented by some old Stalinists (Dinosaurs in danger of extinction).

What has been demonstrated so far have been dialectical images in the history of the workers movement, viewed from the perspective of "peoples without history." In this way, history is not only presented as a progression of events, stages, or productive needs toward communism, based on historical laws of Eurocentric inheritance —influenced by Hegelian teleology and the natural sciences of the 19th century²⁰— but rather offers a point of support in the past to break the continuum of presentism and open up the revolutionary possibilities of a socialist future. A future that preserves the traditions and aspirations of those peoples without history, ready to burst into it. This is how dialectics effectively operates.

The dialectical method, simply and plainly, is the procedure that accounts for reality in its rational and immanent unity, reproducing itself through thought based on a synthesis of consciousness that recognizes its necessity in the multiple determinations of reality. The universality of the method is based on the necessity discovered in the concrete, because it is the path to the synthesis of the reason for the existence of the concrete. The dialectical method does not impose on reality any necessity that is not contained within it; it adheres to its internal unity. It is a leap from reality to its necessity, and in this leap, mediations such as categories, concepts, historical experiences, and national realities overcome the mechanical, primitive, and vulgar logic that has long prevailed in certain aspects of the old CWI and ISA material²¹. Understanding this fact, we must advance the reconstruction of

²⁰ We do not blame Engels for his intention to systematize Marx's thought into verifiable historical laws, as noted at the beginning of the document with the Duhring polemic. It is inevitable that individuals in their given historical epoch fall under the influence of the latest advances in human science and technology, just as it was for Engels the marvelous discoveries of the natural sciences that permeated the philosophy, study of history, and politics of English society. It is enough to observe the decisive impact of Darwin's contributions on the origin of species for Marx and Engels, who insistently declared in their correspondence. In a letter to Lasalle in 1861, Marx insists: "Although clumsily developed in the English style, this is the book which contains the natural-scientific foundation of our outlook." He also comments to Engels in another letter dating from 1862 on Darwin's incredible intention behind his work: "It is remarkable to see how Darwin recognizes in animals and plants his own English society, with its division of labor, its competition, its opening of new markets, its inventions, and its Malthusian struggle for life. This is Hobbes's bellum omnium contra omnes, and recalls Hegel's Phenomenology, where civil society intervenes as the "animal kingdom of the Spirit," while in Darwin it is the animal kingdom that intervenes as civil society."

²¹ This aspect is intended to be addressed in more detail in the second part of the document, with the discussion through quotes and statements from the old material.

the dialectical method to achieve this transition from necessity to action, that is, to move from dialectical understanding to the construction of a transitional program that elevates the ambitions, hopes, and dreams of the working class.