October 10, 2026

The Social Power of Capital and the Political Economy of Anticapital

Reading time: ~26 min.

Download PDF (in English) Print

Keywords: Polar Marxism; social power of capital; anticapitalism; imperialism; systemic sovereignty; Anticentre; revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat; Law of Anticapital; Plan; socialism; communism.

JEL codes: B51; P51; P21; F54.

Introduction

The character of a modern mode of production cannot be determined solely by the presence of markets, private property, or profit. These relations can exist within different social systems without independently determining their class character. Nevertheless, such characteristics frequently serve as the basis for classifying the Soviet, Russian, and Chinese economies. As a result, the investigation of the dominant social relation is replaced by a description of particular economic forms.

This article seeks to determine the political-economic foundations of capitalism and its historical opposite, anticapitalism. Its starting point is Marx's category of the **social power of capital**, which makes it possible to examine a mode of production in terms of who holds systemic power and the law governing social reproduction. Developing this approach within Polar Marxism aims to explain the emergence of anticapital, the material foundations of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, and its historical place in the worldwide transition to communism.

Part I. The Social Power of Capital

1. From Individual Capital to the Capitalist Mode of Production

The expressions “systemic power of capital,” “capital’s power over the system,” and “sovereign power of capital” are repeatedly used in works of Polar Marxism. They all refer to a single social relation that Marx characterized as the **social power of capital** (*gesellschaftliche Macht*). In the third volume of *Capital*, this category appears in his examination of total social capital and the formation of the general rate of profit.[1] It acquires particular significance for Polar Marxism because it makes it possible to address the capitalist mode of production at the level of capital’s domination over social reproduction.

The mere existence of capital does not yet mean that the capitalist mode of production is dominant. Capital historically existed in societies where production was organized on a different economic basis. Marx directly established this in his examination of merchant capital, which could develop independently under conditions where production was not subordinated to capital.[2] Consequently, the presence of trade, monetary circulation, profit, and private property does not yet establish the capitalist character of an entire social system.

The capitalist mode of production emerges when capital becomes the dominant social relation and subordinates reproduction to its own law of motion: the self-expansion of value. In this capacity, capital already exists as a social power. The activities of individual enterprises, resource allocation, investment flows, and the reproduction of relations of production become incorporated into an overall system subordinated to capital accumulation. Individual owners participate in this movement, while the capitalist relation itself is reproduced on the scale of the social economy.

This distinction acquires particular importance when examining contemporary economic systems. A private enterprise may produce commodities, employ wage labour, earn profits, and accumulate capital while remaining subordinate to a system whose reproduction is determined by another dominant relation. The scale of private enterprise therefore says nothing, by itself, about whether capital holds

power over the system as a whole. To determine the mode of production, it is necessary to establish which social power controls the principal conditions of economic reproduction and which law determines their movement.

The emergence of anticapitalist systems has made this distinction essential for analysing the modern world. The Soviet Union, China, and other historical systems cannot be consistently classified merely by the presence or absence of market relations. Changes in forms of ownership, economic management, and commodity circulation require explanation through the actual dominant relation. Polar Marxism develops Marx's category of the social power of capital in precisely this direction, defining the capitalist mode of production through the systemic power of capital and the conditions of its historical reproduction.

2. Three Properties of the Capitalist Mode of Production

In Polar Marxism, the dominance of the social power of capital is defined by three interrelated properties: **systemic sovereignty, historical continuity, and the greatest development of the productive system**. The first two establish the character and duration of capital's domination; the third establishes its position relative to historically preceding modes of production and contemporary anticapitalism.

Systemic sovereignty means that capital possesses power over social reproduction as a whole. It determines not only the economic behaviour of individual owners but also the overall direction of the productive system. An individual capitalist may control an enterprise, earn profits, and make independent business decisions, but such autonomy does not yet demonstrate the sovereignty of capital. What matters is to whom the principal conditions of reproduction are subordinated and whose social power determines the system's development.

The systemic sovereignty of capital possesses **historical continuity**. This means that, once the capitalist mode of production has become the dominant social relation, it continuously reproduces its domination over time. Historical continuity specifies Marx's understanding of the reproduction of capital: what is at issue is the preservation of the dominant relation itself throughout history, without an intervening period in which another mode of production takes its place. From the

emergence of capitalism to the contemporary imperialist Centre, the same social power of capital continues to exist. Its historical forms change, but capitalist domination itself remains uninterrupted.

The history of the Soviet Union provides an example of a break in this continuity. We proceed from the premise that the Soviet gross-output economy, usually described as planned, represented a non-capitalist organization of social production. With its establishment, the domination of the social power of capital was interrupted. Consequently, the claim that capitalism was subsequently restored in sovereign Russia contradicts the property of historical continuity. If capitalist domination was abolished and then supposedly reappeared, it would no longer possess the necessary continuity. Therefore, as long as Russia retains systemic sovereignty, it is impossible to speak of the return of the capitalist mode of production. The emergence of market mechanisms after the dissolution of the USSR does not prove the restoration of the social power of capital, since the market does not, by itself, determine the dominant mode of production.

The same applies to China. We proceed from the premise that the economic organization of the Mao Zedong period, which existed before Deng Xiaoping's reforms, was likewise not capitalist. Consequently, the historical continuity of capital's domination was interrupted there as well. The claim that market reforms restored capitalism in sovereign China encounters the same contradiction: the social power of capital cannot first lose its domination and subsequently re-establish it within the same sovereign system while retaining the property of historical continuity. Therefore, as long as Chinese systemic sovereignty is preserved, the expansion of market relations does not signify the return of capitalism. The restoration of capital's power is possible if that sovereignty is lost, for example through the external subordination of the economy to the imperialist Centre. In that case, however, capitalist domination would be imposed from outside rather than continuing a social power of capital that had existed uninterrupted within the country.

It is, of course, possible to begin from another assumption and regard even the Soviet gross-output economy or China's economic system under Mao Zedong as capitalist. However, this would require separately demonstrating the uninterrupted

domination of the social power of capital throughout the corresponding historical periods. An examination of that hypothesis lies beyond the scope of the present chapter.

The third property is the greatest development of the capitalist productive system. It signifies its comparative superiority over other systems in the corresponding historical periods: previously over feudalism and, in the modern world, over anticapitalism. Capitalism historically established itself as the most developed system of social production and retains this position within the contemporary world economy. The imperialist Centre possesses the most developed material organization of production, while other systems are compelled to relate their own development to the level it has achieved.

The three properties reinforce one another. Systemic sovereignty ensures the reproduction of capital's dominant relation; historical continuity preserves this power over time; and the greatest development of the productive system constitutes the material foundation of its superiority over historically preceding systems and contemporary anticapitalism. In Polar Marxism, the unity of these properties characterizes capitalism as the social power that we call imperialism.

The anticapitalist mode of production possesses the same first two properties. **Anticapital has its own systemic sovereignty and its own historical continuity.** Its dominant relation is not subordinated to the social power of capital and has been continuously reproduced since the historical emergence of the anticapitalist system. The third property is reversed: anticapitalism exists in a position of relative underdevelopment compared with capitalism. It is compelled to catch up with the most developed productive system, while capitalism seeks to preserve and increase its superiority.

This confrontation forms the material basis of the polarity of the modern world. Anticapitalism seeks to catch up with and overtake capitalism, overcoming its historically developed lag. Capitalism, conversely, seeks to preserve its existing advantage and prevent the loss of its leading position. The struggle between these opposites determines the direction of world-historical development, whose transition to communism will be examined separately.

Historical continuity here refers to the mode of production rather than the unchanging dominance of any particular state. The shift of the leading role within the imperialist Centre to the United States did not mean that the capitalist mode of production ceased to exist and subsequently emerged anew. The same principle applies to anticapitalism. The transfer of the Anticentre's role from the Soviet Union to China did not interrupt the existence of the anticapitalist system. Having emerged with the Soviet Anticentre, it preserved its historical continuity when the state concentrating its systemic power changed.

3. Imperialism as the Social Power of Capital

In Polar Marxism, **imperialism is capital as a social power**, possessing systemic sovereignty over the economy. Materially, this sovereignty is expressed through **Contour A**, the commanding contour encompassing credit, strategic resources, infrastructure, and other key mechanisms for directing social reproduction. Under capitalism, Contour A is subordinated to the social power of capital, while the movement of the entire system is determined by the **Law of Capital**, that is, the necessity of the self-expansion of value and the generation of profit.

The domination of capital is also necessarily expressed in the **Law of Realization**, since the surplus value produced must be converted into monetary profit. However, the Law of Realization reveals only part of this relation. Its further development is connected with the theory of **Ideal Gold**, which will be presented in detail in a separate study and is intended to complete the political-economic description of capitalism as a world system.

Ideal Gold expresses the unity of the fiat-credit system and its **Domain**, the material space historically represented by the imperialist periphery. The Law of Realization and Ideal Gold are considered here as interconnected aspects of a unified law of motion of the social power of capital. Through this system, its pressure on the periphery, and other laws of capital's movement already investigated by Marx, world imperialism takes shape.

All these laws operate under the condition of **uninterrupted systemic sovereignty of capital**. As long as capital retains Contour A, its power reproduces the Law of Capital and the Law of Realization / Ideal Gold. The loss of this power means that

these laws cease to operate as the laws of the dominant system and, consequently, that the capitalist mode of production itself ceases to exist.

In Polar Marxism, this explains the fundamental difference between capitalist and anticapitalist systems, the latter including the Soviet Union, Russia, and China. Their Contour A is subordinated to anticapital; therefore, social reproduction is not determined by the Law of Capital or the Law of Realization / Ideal Gold. It is the ownership of systemic power, rather than the presence of individual enterprises, profits, or market relations, that determines the character of the mode of production.

The investigation of the monetary and credit system was already begun by Marx. He examined paper and credit money, the banking system, the concentration of money capital, and crises of capitalist production, including crises of overproduction. These investigations laid the political-economic foundations for understanding the processes from which the modern fiat-credit system subsequently developed. However, Marx did not derive a unified law explaining its later development and global organization. Polar Marxism continues this work by investigating the **Law of Realization, Real Gold, Idealized Gold, and, finally, Ideal Gold**. This sequence is intended to reveal the political-economic law connecting the credit system with the worldwide domination of capital.

The insufficient development of this problem in subsequent Marxist political economy allowed Western economics to take the research initiative in the fields of money, credit, and finance. Questions of inflation, monetary circulation, and the functioning of the modern credit system came to be examined predominantly outside the Marxist theoretical tradition. Polar Marxism seeks to bring them back into the political-economic analysis initiated by Marx and to complete that analysis by explaining the modern fiat-credit system through the Law of Realization / Ideal Gold.

Finally, the distinction between capitalist and anticapitalist systems allows for **empirical investigation**. Contour A provides one way of operationalizing systemic sovereignty: it is possible to establish who controls the key economic mechanisms, whose interests govern the allocation of resources, and which law determines the

direction of reproduction. Other characteristics of capitalism and anticapitalism can likewise be investigated empirically, allowing these modes of production to be distinguished on the basis of their actual organization.

Part II. The Political Economy of Anticapital

4. The Revolutionary Dictatorship of the Proletariat

In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx defined the political form of the transition from capitalist to communist society: **"The state of this period can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."**[3] The categorical nature of this statement is of fundamental importance. Marx allowed for no other class character of the state during the revolutionary transitional period.

Polar Marxism accepts this proposition and seeks to reveal its political-economic foundation. It is necessary to explain why the historically emerging power of anticapital is specifically proletarian, through which relations it organizes social production, and according to which law it reproduces its own domination. Such an explanation must proceed from the actual organization of the economic system rather than from the state's official ideology or self-designation.

The previous part established that the capitalist mode of production is defined by the domination of the social power of capital. The revolutionary overcoming of that domination presupposes the establishment of another systemic power. Its material organization, class content, and own law of motion constitute the subject of the political economy of anticapital.

At the same time, the revolutionary transition has a worldwide character. In Polar Marxism, the historical existence of anticapital is examined through the formation of the Anticentre and its relationship to the imperialist Centre and periphery. The origin of this opposing social power makes it possible to move from Marx's political definition to an explanation of the historically existing forms of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

5. The Origin of Anticapital in the Imperialist Domain

In Polar Marxism, anticapital emerges within the periphery formed by the social power of capital. The imperialist Centre, operating according to the Law of Realization / Ideal Gold, holds the periphery as its **Domain**, an external material space incorporated into the reproduction of the capitalist system. This relation arises from the movement of capital itself as the dominant social power.

The subordination of the periphery creates a material contradiction. On the one hand, its resources and productive capacities are incorporated into the reproduction of the imperialist Centre. On the other hand, the historical experience and position of the world proletariat living in the Domain reveal the periphery's need for its own development. This demand, which may be defined as the **primacy of development**, comes into conflict with the subordination of the periphery to the interests of the Centre. As a result, the pursuit of independent development and resistance to imperialist domination become expressions of the same tendency.

This tendency, arising under the pressure of imperialism, is defined in Polar Marxism as **potential anticapital**. Its origin is connected precisely with the social power of capital: imperialist domination creates the material conditions for the emergence of an opposing force on the periphery. As this contradiction develops, the periphery acquires a polar character, becoming a space of confrontation between capital and anticapital.

Potential anticapital acquires an organized historical form with the emergence of the **Anticentre**. Its material foundation is the establishment of its own systemic sovereignty over Contour A and the subordination of social reproduction to a different law of motion. Historically, the Soviet Union became the first form of the Anticentre, and China subsequently assumed this role. The Anticentre concentrates the anticapitalist power of the polar periphery, transforming the pursuit of independent development into organized economic domination.

6. The Class Character of the Anticentre and the Law of Anticapital

With the emergence of the Anticentre, potential anticapital is transformed into an organized social power. Systemic sovereignty passes from capital to the **aggregate proletariat**, which becomes the collective owner of the commanding level of the economy. This class power constitutes the material foundation of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

The collective power of the proletariat is exercised through the **nomenklatura**, the unified political-managerial representative class of the Anticentre. Its class character and the particular features of its representative function are examined in detail in a separate work of Polar Marxism.

One of the key results of investigating the material position of the nomenklatura was the identification of **self-sponsorship** as a necessary condition of its existence. The nomenklatura reproduces its own power through the development of the Anticentre's economy, since its independent existence excludes dependence on capital. Its material interest thereby coincides with the interest of the proletariat of the periphery in its own development. This coincidence reveals the political-economic foundation of the nomenklatura as the genuine representative of the proletariat and the expression of its interests.

The proletarian character of the nomenklatura is determined by the very structure of the anticapitalist system, which continuously reproduces it as the representative class of the aggregate proletariat, independently of the immediate relations between them. Just as the capitalist system reproduces political and managerial representatives of capital who are subordinated to its social power, the Anticentre (and anticapitalism as a whole) reproduces the nomenklatura, objectively subordinated to the interests of the proletariat.

By virtue of its position within the Anticentre (and anticapitalism as a whole), the nomenklatura reproduces proletarian power and expresses the interests of the aggregate proletariat.

From this relation follows the **Law of Anticapital — the maximization of attainable catch-up development relative to capitalism**. The anticapitalist system seeks to overcome its material lag behind the most developed capitalist system, which, in

turn, continues to develop and constantly raises the level it has achieved. Catch-up development therefore becomes the law governing the reproduction of anticapital itself.

This constitutes the political-economic content of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat: social reproduction is directed by the organized power of the aggregate proletariat and subordinated to the Law of Anticapital. Its operation has a distinct economic form, the **Plan**, whose organization and historical varieties are examined in the following chapter.

7. The Plan and Its Historical Forms

The economic form of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is the **Plan**, which Polar Marxism also calls the **antimarket**. The Plan represents the conscious organization of social reproduction, subordinated to the Law of Anticapital: the maximization of attainable catch-up development. Its content is determined by the domination of anticapital over the system rather than by particular methods of managing individual enterprises.

Materially, the Plan operates through the Anticentre's command over Contour A, through which the overall direction of the economy is determined. However, the ways in which economic tasks are transmitted and their execution organized may vary. Polar Marxism distinguishes three types of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, differing primarily in their mechanisms for directing social production.

The first type of revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat was historically embodied in the Soviet gross-output economy. Its characteristic feature was the transmission of economic tasks through gross-output assignments specifying the required results of production. For example, the system could set the task of constructing a certain number of factories, while the actual organization of construction was carried out by the directors of the relevant enterprises. The Plan established the direction and required result without replacing the management of every production process.

The second type of revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is represented by contemporary China. Its organization of production took the form of the **anti-market**, which uses market mechanisms and economic incentives to fulfil the tasks of the Plan. Here, direction may be established, for example, through a target for developing a particular industry or achieving a specified rate of growth. The concrete methods of fulfilling such tasks are determined by economic actors. The difference from the Soviet gross-output economy lies in the transmission and implementation of planning objectives, not in the presence or absence of unified systemic command.

The third type of revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, or **Cenes**, represents the future form of the Plan predicted by Polar Marxism, based on the network organization of the economy and advanced computational capabilities. It entails a third method of directing and coordinating social production, distinct from both the Soviet gross-output economy and the Chinese anti-market, while preserving the systemic sovereignty of anticapital. Its fundamental principle is **universal economic dictization and centralization**. A detailed account of Cenes, including the *Viable System Model*, the offer system, and other elements of its architecture, will be presented in subsequent research within Polar Marxism, particularly in the work *The General Architecture of Cenes*.

All the distinctions described concern **Contour B**, the productive contour of the economy. It is here that the methods of transmitting tasks, coordinating activities, and organizing production change, while systemic command through Contour A remains intact.

Part III. The Problem of Socialism and the Worldwide Transition to Communism

8. The Origin of the Terminological Problem of Socialism

In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx distinguishes two historical conditions: **the revolutionary transitional period between capitalist and communist society** and **the first phase of communist society after it has already emerged**. The former corresponds to the revolutionary dictatorship of the

proletariat, while the latter possesses its own communist relations of production.[4] This distinction is fundamental because these are different conditions of social production.

The terminological problem arises in the subsequent Marxist tradition, where the name "socialism" becomes established for the first phase of communism but also begins to be applied to actually existing revolutionary power. In *The State and Revolution*, Lenin explicitly adopted the established usage, calling the lower phase of communist society socialism.[5] However, in "*Left-Wing*" *Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality*, he separately explained that the name "Socialist Soviet Republic" expressed the Soviet government's determination to accomplish the transition to socialism and did not mean that the existing economic order was recognized as socialist.[6]

Lenin therefore understood the difference between the political orientation of revolutionary power and the actual condition of the economy. His terminology also developed under the influence of the practical tasks of the revolution. The problem lay less in any particular statement by Lenin than in the subsequent conflation of the political designation of a historical system with the economic definition of the first phase of communism.

As a result, actually existing socialism came to be examined through the characteristics of communist society described by Marx. The presence of money, profit, markets, or particular forms of economic management became grounds either for questioning the socialist character of the system or for explaining it as incomplete communism. Under this approach, the political economy of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat itself remained insufficiently investigated: its class structure, law of motion, and methods of social reproduction.

Official state names and ideological self-definitions introduced further confusion. Yet the name of a social system cannot serve as scientific proof of its economic character. That requires an investigation of actual relations of production and the dominant social power. Such an investigation makes it possible to distinguish the historical phenomenon that came to be called "socialism" from the first phase of communist society.

9. Socialism as a Historical Phenomenon

The preceding chapters have examined the political economy of anticapitalism, the Anticentre, and the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. It is now necessary only to establish the terminological definition: **socialism, or real socialism, is the historically established name of the Anticentre**, rather than an independent theoretical category.

Historically, the name "socialism" became associated with the Soviet Union and China, which were also Anticentres and forms of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, in Polar Marxism, **socialism is used as an alternative historical name for the Anticentre**. This designation also extends to the predicted future form of the Anticentre, Cenes.

At the same time, **anticapitalism is not identical to socialism**. Other anticapitalist countries do not become socialist merely by virtue of belonging to anticapitalism. For example, under this definition, the DPRK is not socialist.

10. The Worldwide Transition to Communism

In Polar Marxism, the transition to communism is understood as a **world-historical process**, not as the result of the independent development of an individual state. As long as the social power of capital persists, anticapital exists as its opposite and reproduces its own revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. Consequently, neither the Soviet Union, nor China, nor the future Cenes can achieve the transition to communism solely by perfecting its own economy.

The Law of Anticapital directs the development of this system toward overcoming its material lag behind capitalism. However, capitalism also continues to develop. The historical resolution of their contradiction therefore depends on changes in the **global balance of forces between capital and anticapital**, rather than on an individual Anticentre achieving a particular form of the Plan.

Anticapitalism's attainment of the level of material development reached by capitalism deprives the latter of the historical basis for its continued domination and initiates the process of its negation. Along with capitalism, anticapitalism also begins to be negated, since it emerged as the opposite of the social power of

capital within its imperialist Domain. **The mutual negation of capital and anticapital leads to the withering away of the final forms of class society and the emergence of a communist economy.** Communism thus represents not a new variety of class society but the historical end of class society itself.

To investigate this process, Polar Marxism proposes the **Communist Indicator**. It expresses the relationship between the material forces of the capitalist and anticapitalist poles while also indicating the historical approach toward communism. Its movement from zero toward one signifies a narrowing of the gap between them. According to the theory's prediction, reaching one corresponds to the equalization of their material development and the transition to the **revolution of the second type**, which resolves the worldwide opposition between capital and anticapital.

This provides a political-economic explanation of the distinction established by Marx in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*: between capitalist and communist society lies a period of revolutionary transition, whose state form is the **revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat**.[3] Historically, this transition extends across the polar periphery rather than being confined to an individual state. **The first phase of communist society** begins as a result of the revolution of the second type, associated with the Communist Indicator reaching one. The withering away of class relations may proceed gradually, but it is precisely this process that constitutes the substance of the transition to communism.

This finally distinguishes three concepts. **The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat** denotes the class power of the revolutionary transitional period. **Socialism, or real socialism**, in Polar Marxism, is the historical name of the Anticentre, above all the Soviet Union and China. **Communism** denotes the society emerging through the withering away of class society. If, however, Lenin's established definition of socialism as the first phase of communism is adopted, neither the Soviet Union nor China was socialist in that sense: both represented revolutionary dictatorships of the proletariat during the transitional period. Polar Marxism resolves this terminological conflation by assigning socialism its historical meaning and communism its distinct political-economic content.

Conclusion

The analysis establishes a unified criterion for distinguishing capitalism from anticapitalism: **the ownership of systemic sovereignty and the character of the law governing social reproduction**. Consequently, changes in market mechanisms or methods of organizing production do not, by themselves, signify a change in the dominant mode of production. This proposition makes it possible to investigate historical economic systems through the actual organization of their power rather than through external economic characteristics.

At the same time, the political-economic definition of anticapital makes it possible to eliminate the conflation of the revolutionary transitional period with the first phase of communist society. **Socialism** is established as the historical name of the Anticentre, while **communism** signifies the overcoming of the worldwide contradiction between capital and anticapital and the subsequent withering away of class society. The transition from capitalism to communism thus receives an explanation as a unified world-historical process rather than a sequence of internal transformations within an individual state.

Footnotes

1. Karl Marx, *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Dritter Band*, in: *Marx-Engels-Werke* (MEW), Bd. 25, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1964, Kap. 10. The social power of capital in connection with the formation of the general rate of profit. ↩
2. Karl Marx, *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Dritter Band*, in: *Marx-Engels-Werke* (MEW), Bd. 25, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1964, Kap. 20. The history of merchant capital. ↩
3. Karl Marx, *Kritik des Gothaer Programms*, in: *Marx-Engels-Werke* (MEW), Bd. 19, S. 28. The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat as the state form of the transitional period. ↩ ↩2
4. Karl Marx, *Kritik des Gothaer Programms*, in: *Marx-Engels-Werke* (MEW), Bd. 19, S. 19–21, 28. The first phase of communist society and the revolutionary transitional period. ↩
5. V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, in: *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Complete Collected Works), 5th ed., vol. 33, ch. V. Socialism as the first phase of communist society. ↩
6. V. I. Lenin, *"Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality*, in: *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Complete Collected Works), 5th ed., vol. 36, p. 296. The distinction between the name of the Soviet Republic and the actual condition of the economy. ↩

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Vilen Isteni (2026). "The Social Power of Capital and the Political Economy of Anticapital." Polar Marxism. https://polarmarxism.com/en/publications/social-power-of-capital-and-political-economy-of-anticapital

READ ONLINE