

# المسكين

Joseph Green Refuted:

*Grasp the Key Link to refute the Teng Hsiao-ping “three worlds theory”.*

[Originally published in Marxist-Leninist Newswire, July 1, 2001. Revised and edited March 11, 2004.]

By Majdur Travail

“As an old saying goes, 'once the key link is grasped, everything else falls into place.' Take hold of the key link and everything else will get into its proper place. The key link means the main theme. The contradiction between socialism and capitalism and the gradual resolution of this contradiction--that is the main theme, the key link.”

--Mao Tse-tung

Joseph Green bases his entire thesis that Mao Tse-tung was behind the “three worlds theory” on one quotation attributed to Mao and published one year after Mao’s death in an article published in the Peking Review, November 4, 1977 entitled *Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds Theory is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism*. Although Green keeps his references secret from the rest of us, and we are left to divine his sources, he asserts:

1. Mao did not fight “capitalist roaders” and when Mao said that he was fighting the capitalist roaders in the Party; Joseph Green asserts that Mao was “not serious”.
2. Those who upheld Mao's political line “incidentally was not the gang of four”.
3. The three worlds theory is Mao's.

This essay will prove, that of Joseph Green's several assertions;

If [2] is wrong then [1] must also be wrong.

If both [1] and [2] are wrong then [3] must also be wrong.

Joseph Green, like the and tradition originating from Enver Hoxa and Teng Hsiao-ping which he represents, blathers on and on that Mao was behind the “three worlds theory” and, like his political ancestors, he refuses to cite even one single quotation from Mao Tse-tung to support his assertion. We, however, agree with Cde. Sanmugathasan, Secretary General, *Communist Party of Ceylon*, who said:

“We vehemently repudiate the thesis that the anti-Marxist-Leninist Theory of the Three Worlds was a product of Mao Tse-tung Thought. There is no evidence whatever to support such a possibility. Comrade Mao Tse-tung is a leader who has expressed his point of view on almost all conceivable subjects that came within his purview. The fact that the apologists for the Theory of the Three Worlds cannot dig up a single quotation from Mao in support of this absurd theory is sufficient proof that he never did advocate the unity of the second and third world against the first world; or, worse still, advocate the unity of the second and third world along with one part of the first world against the other half.”

--*Enver Hoxa Refuted.*

Joseph Green has said it, as Enver Hoxa said it and Teng Hsiao-ping said it before him, and he would expect us to accept it at face value the wise words of an old sage, a true salt! We shall see. Joseph Green has been given ample time to cite his sources of information for the “three worlds theory”, but now he refuses to respond. We shall, therefore, begin our investigation of this topic without him [as we have no other choice]. The quotation regarding the “three worlds theory” attributed to Mao Tse-tung is as follows:

“In my view, the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong to the second world. We are the third world. The third world has a huge population. With the exception of Japan, Asia belongs to the third world. The whole of Africa belongs to the third world and Latin America too.”<sup>1</sup>

Rendered such as this, one year after Mao's death, with out reference except a statement that “Chairman Mao said this in a meeting with a third world leader in February 1974”. The Peking Review, for February and March 1974, reveals no such speech or comment by Chairman Mao although all of Mao Tse-tung's speeches made at meetings with foreign guests were faithfully reprinted, except this one. I maintain, therefore, that this is a hoax, coming on the heels of Teng's official political rehabilitation, perpetuated by the Hua Kuo-feng, Yeh Chien-ying and Teng Hsiao-ping clique in order to suppress the *red fraction*-Chiang Ching, and her so-called ‘gang’, their allies who still remained very popular, and their supporters who had not already been entirely liquidated.

The reader ought to be reminded that Teng Hsiao-ping was ousted from the CCP in 1966 and again in 1976. In Teng's self-criticism Oct. 23, 1966 he said:

“Chairman Mao hit the nail on the head when he pointed out the nature of our mistakes was that we, ‘stand on the side of reactionary bourgeois dictatorship, strike down the vigorous Great Cultural Revolution of the proletariat, stand facts of their head, juggle black and white, harass revolutionaries and suppress different opinions, practice white terror, feel very pleased with ourselves, and puff the arrogance of the bourgeoisie and deflate the morale of the proletariat. How sinister it is’. Chairman Mao's shot was very accurate; he really has my number.”<sup>2</sup>

Through Teng's self-criticism was he was politically rehabilitated, by majority vote, in the CCP and allowed to resume his duties in the CCP. Teng would be ousted again in 1976 by the leaders of what he would later called the ‘gang of four’--whom we call the *‘red fraction’*. The CCP Central Committee met secretly from July 16-21, 1977 and voted to restore Teng Hsiao-ping to his former post as Vice CCP Chairman, Vice Premier and Chief of the General Staff.

When Teng was ousted for the second time in 1976, after the reactionary T'ien An Men Square incident, the People's Daily, would publish an editorial denouncing him:

“Teng Hsiao-p'ing has been the arch unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party. Over a long period of time, he has opposed Chairman Mao, opposed Mao Tse-tung thought, and Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. Before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, he worked in collaboration with Liu Shao-ch'i in pushing a counterrevolutionary revisionist line; during the early stage of the Great Cultural Revolution, he, together with Liu Shao-chi, suppressed the masses and pressed on with a bourgeois reactionary line. Through criticism by the masses, he expressed his willingness to mend his ways and declared that he would ‘never reverse the verdict’. Chairman Mao saved him and gave him a chance to resume work. But he did not live up to Chairman Mao's education and help. Once back in a position to wield power in his possession, he relapsed and reversed the correct verdicts of the Great Cultural

Revolution and sought to settle scores with it. He dished up the revisionist program of 'taking the three directives as the key link', continued to pursue the counterrevolutionary revisionist line, and took the lead in stirring up the right deviationist wind."<sup>3</sup>

With respect to the T'ien An Men Square incident itself, the People's Daily, said:

"It further shows that the bourgeoisie is to be found inside the communist party. The two-line struggle in the party is a life-and- death struggle between two antagonistic classes--the proletariat and the bourgeoisie."<sup>4</sup>

There can be no doubt, then, that Hua and Teng were co-conspirators. For after Teng, a man who had admitted that he "[stood] on the side of reactionary bourgeois dictatorship" and that he was capable of "juggling black and white" and "standing facts on their heads", was swept back into power with the aid of Hua very shortly after the arrest of the *red fraction* lead by Mao's widow Chang Ching.

"Well before the official announcement of Teng's second comeback was made public Chairman Hua had virtually rehabilitated the former Vice Premier in all but name."<sup>5</sup>

One year after Mao's death the article *Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism* would be published and for more that a year the central propaganda organs would attempt to completely reverse the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution by cynically manipulating Mao Tse-tung's own words to conclude, inter alia:

1. That the Third World could be united with the Second World against the First World, that the Soviet Union was the principal enemy of China.<sup>6</sup>
2. That the "to each according to their work, to each according to their need";<sup>7</sup> as opposed to "from each according to their work, to each according to their need"<sup>8</sup> was a Marxist theory advocated by Mao and belittled by the 'gang of four'.
3. That the "gang" was a "Trotskyite conspiracy" against socialism.
4. And that the "key link" to socialism is "unity, stability and national economy" as opposed to "class struggle" advocated by the *red fraction*.<sup>9</sup>

Joseph Green would have us believe that the above assertions which appeared in the Peking Review after Chiang Ching's *red fraction* were jailed or killed are an accurate portrayal of Mao Tse-tung thought. Such political swindling by a so-called "communist voice" cannot be ignored, since it places the CVO firmly on the side of the arch unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping and the political swindler Enver Hoxa. The "three worlds" article continues on to say many incorrect things which are recognizable as revisionist by any elementary student of Marxism. But Joseph Green would have us believe that one simply attributes words to someone after their death and that we should accept those words as truth even if they contradict the course of that person's life and thought.

"In appearance, this theory of Chairman Mao's seems to involve only relations between countries and between nations in the present day world, but in essence, it bears directly on the vital question of present-day class struggle on a world scale. In the final analysis, national struggle is a matter of class struggle.<sup>10</sup> The same holds true of relations between countries. Relations between countries or nations are based on relations between classes, and the are interconnected and extremely complicated...In waging struggle on the international arena, the proletariat must unite with all those who can be united in light of what is imperative and feasible in different historical periods, so as to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the diehards. Therefore, we can never lay down any hard and fast formula for differentiation, the world's political forces (i.e., differentiating ourselves, our friends and our enemies in the international class struggle)."<sup>11</sup>

According to this we should fall back to Hegel's nation spirit thesis and reject Marx. The principal contradiction, according to Marxist analysis is, in capitalist countries, the contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the national proletariat. Proletarian internationalism refers to the fact that proletarians have no countries, therefore, "you can't take from them what they haven't got". According to the above rendition of Mao Tse-tung thought there are no "hard and fast rules" for determining who is the proletariat and who is the bourgeoisie, notwithstanding Engles' statement that the proletariat is those "who live solely by the sale of their own labor" [*Principles of Communism*].<sup>12</sup> It lumps together socialist countries with reactionaries and implies that an alliance can be made on the part of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie. The purpose to the "three worlds theory" is to confuse the issue of imperialism to make it appear that hegemonic block of imperialist power can be united on the grounds that one block represents the "poor and oppressed" while the other block represents the "rich and exploiting", but ignores the issue of the national bourgeoisie within each capitalist country. The Teng clique needed to do that in order to divert the struggle from the rising bourgeoisie in the CCP. The red fraction was, following Mao's leadership, attempting to elucidate the fact that a bourgeoisie had indeed grow within the ranks of the CCP. We have only begun our investigation, if Maoists blanched at the previous perversion of Mao Tse-tung's thought; we shall boil by the end of this. The so-called "gang of four" was actually six, but Hua Kuo-feng's bodyguards killed Mao Yuan-hisn and Ma Hsiao-liu.

The CCP official version of the arrest of the 'gang of four' said:

"On October 7 [1976] Hua Kuo-feng asked Chiang Ching, Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao and Yao Wen-yuan to attend a meeting. Instantly, there were vehement exchanges and armed clashes followed. Hua's guards killed Mao Yuan-hisn and Ma Hsiao-liu (Deputy Commander in Chief of the Peking Militia). Wang Hung-wen was shot in the left leg. The 'gang' was routed. Apart from the casualties, all were seized."<sup>13</sup>

Teng was subsequently reinstated July 21, 1977. In November of that year the infamous article on the so-called "three worlds theory" would appear-- attributed to Mao but was really a product of the Teng clique who intended to reverse the correct verdicts of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and take the capitalist road. Hind sight being twenty/twenty we can now see clearly that this is indeed what happened. China is now a capitalist country and the revision began immediately after Teng's political rehabilitation in the CCP. But Joseph Green maintains that Mao was a capitalist and that China was, therefore, always a capitalist country and, furthermore, there was no real change in the CCP between Teng and Mao. Joseph Green, in fact, asserts that Teng upheld Mao Tse-tung thought and that the red fraction did not.

Let us first begin with Joseph Green's assertion [2] that the people who upheld Mao's line "incidentally was not the 'gang of four'". Chow Ching-wen, editor of Peking Informers (Continental Research Institute, Hong Kong), representing the liberal wing of the bourgeoisie, reported June 16, 1976:

"The Maoist campaign to liquidate Teng Hsiao-ping has apparently entered into a new phase following publication in Peking's mass news media of a major article in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the Cultural Revolution. The new stage of the anti-Teng campaign is characterized by the broadening of the area of attack to include all 'capitalist roaders' and 'new class on the capitalist road,' that is, all government functionaries not favored by the Maoist radicals, not just Teng Hsiao-ping alone...the Maoist radicals have explicitly called for 'deepening' the anti- Teng drive...the criticism of Teng is to be likened with the actual class struggle."<sup>14</sup>

Up to the very moment of the Hua Kuo-feng coup the Peking Informers was declaring that the "Maoists" were still in control of the Communist Party of China [CCP] and the Chinese government.

“With the passing of Chairman Mao-Tse-tung more than a month ago, no signs of any change in the present Maoist leadership or in its foreign and domestic policies appear to have emerged...The Maoists appear to still be in control of the mass media, with the published articles mainly reflecting the views and intentions of the Maoist faction...the Maoists are still stressing the need to ‘deepen the criticism of Teng and carry the struggle to repulse Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts to its completion’.”<sup>15</sup>

Red Flag recently published an article which stated:

“At any time and under any circumstances, we must consciously adhere to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, unremittingly carry out prolonged struggle against the capitalist roaders in the Party who are vainly trying to alter the Party's basic line and persisting in carrying to its completion the great struggle long led by Chairman Mao against revisionism.”<sup>16</sup>

These statements, published by the Peking Informers, disposes of Joseph Green's assertion, that the *red fraction* did not uphold Mao's line, in short work. It is plain from the above reports that the *red fraction*, contra Green, was indeed struggling against “capitalist roaders” and was, therefore up-holding Mao's call to do so.

“Those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the Party, the government, the army, and various spheres of culture are a bunch of counterrevolutionary revisionists. Once conditions are ripe, they will seize political power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie...You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. Its right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road.”

If, of Joseph Green's assertions, [2] and therefore [1] are false; then [3] must also be false. If, according to Joseph Green,

1. If those who up-held Mao Tse-tung thought were not the *red fraction* lead by Chang Ching,
2. then those who upheld Mao Tse-tung thought must have been Teng Hsiao-ping clique.
3. If Chiang Ching, et al, opposed the “three worlds theory”,
4. then the “three worlds theory” must have been Teng's, since Teng upheld Mao.
5. Therefore, the “three worlds theory” is Teng's, not Mao's.
6. because, the *red fraction* upheld Mao *supra* and opposed the “three worlds theory” *infra*.

“In our own country, there are persons who frantically oppose Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds. They are none other than Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao, Chang Ching and Yao Wen-yuan, or the ‘gang of four’.”<sup>17</sup>

If, as Joseph Green asserts, Mao Tse-tung was a capitalist roader and that Teng Hsiao-ping, and not Chiang Ching, upheld Mao Tse-tung thought, then why would the Peking Informers suddenly report Dec. 1, 1976:

“Great changes have taken place in the leadership structure of the CCP hierarchy since the collapse in early Oct. of the radical camp led by Mao's widow, Chiang Ching, Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-Chiao and Yao Wen-yuan. One change that has manifested itself is the new leadership's attention to production and economic work in all its practical manifestations, to the neglect of ideological purity.”<sup>18</sup>

It had become clear to Chow Ching-wen, a self described middle of the road socialist<sup>19</sup>, that by Oct. 16, 1977:

“The removal in early October last year of the ‘gang of four’ radical leaders from the Chinese scene was in essence a palace coup staged by the military-bureaucrat group headed by Hua Kuo-feng and Yeh Chien-ying. It amounted to a complete negation of the gains of the Cultural Revolution, a negation of Mao Tse-tung’s political line and of the ‘new things’ that have appeared since the political upheavals of 1966-68. One year after the palace coup and despite the new leadership efforts to dismantle what Mao had established in a bid to steer a post-Mao China from a dogmatic to a pragmatic course, the influence of the Maoist radical remains strong and the resistance of the ‘gang of four’ followers not initially wiped out, especially in the provinces.”<sup>20</sup>

It should now occur to Joseph Green that there is more to Marxist analysis than merely tossing in the word “seriously” from time to time. To assert that those who up-held Mao Tse-tung thought “incidentally was not the ‘gang of four’” is academic fraud. Joseph Green, like Enver Hoxa and Teng Hsiao-ping, continues to put forward the idea that “unity, stability, and national economy”, or Mao Tse-tung’s “three directives”, are the “key link” to differentiating between socialist and capitalist political lines, whereas the *red fraction* took “class struggle as the key link”.

Time and time again the bourgeoisie attempts to fashion a criticism against communism by asserting that capitalist economy is more productive than socialist economy. Socialist frequently defends by asserting “liberation of productive forces” under socialism is a historical and material fact. As true as this may be, socialist cannot allow themselves to be diverted from the fact that socialism main claim is the transformation of social relations which intends to destroy the class structure of the capitalist system--i.e., the elimination of “exploitation of man by man”. The *theory of productive forces* is a revisionist theory negates taking class struggle as the key link and putting politics in command. Class struggle, therefore, is taken as the “key link” to socialism.

The validity of the socialist programme rests on the fact that when classes are eliminated we will have socialism in practice. Joseph Green, and the Teng-Hoxa tradition, attempt to revise Marx on this issue and maintain that success in production is an authentic gauge to which the success of socialism is compared. “From each according to their work, to each according to their need” is touchstone of the transformation of social relations not a milestone in production. The *red fraction*, lead by Chiang Ching, understood that class struggle inevitably leads to the elimination of classes, “national economy” and the increase in productive capacity does not.

Joseph Green vigorously applies himself to theories of production inferring that a new theory will eliminate lying on the part of factory bureaucrats and that the solution may be found somewhere in the “elimination of value”, contra Marx.<sup>21</sup> Whereas, Maoist understand that it is in class struggle against the new bourgeoisie within the communist party which solves these problems. In a practical sense, Chiang Ching under took this important two line struggle for the correct line. It ought to be apparent that one cannot simply stand behind a portrait of Mao Tse-tung and speak though a hole cut in the mouth in order to justify overturning Mao Tse-tung thought and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution--the greatest advance toward socialism in the history of the world.

But, furthermore, one must also ask the question, why did the Teng clique, Hoxa and Green after them, feel the need to use Mao as a mouthpiece for their own revisionist programme if it were not for the fact that Mao Tse-tung was, and still is, loved and respected by millions? In the last analysis, Joseph Green supported Teng’s revisionist program and his political swindling against Mao, but when the Teng clique was exposed as a new bourgeoisie in China, Joseph Green was caught floundering and has sought his way out by attempting to denounce both Teng and Mao. Unable to swim to either shore, he clings the debris of the political shipwreck Enver Hoxa and proclaimed his third “independent” position.

It is important at this particular time, when the red fraction is on the rise again world wide, that cadre study the Hua coup and these documents first hand in order to be aware of how the Teng clique was able to cynically manipulate the worlds of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao to distort an entire generation’s view of the events that took place immediately after Mao Tse-tung’s death, that we be armed with this

knowledge and thereby be enabled to continue the two line struggle against the bourgeoisie which has smuggled itself into current revolutionary movements. That we come to truly understand the meaning of the phrase “take class struggle as the key link”.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism*, Peking Review 20, no. 45 (Nov. 4, 1977): 11.

<sup>2</sup> People's Republic of China 1949-1979: A Documentary Survey, (Scholarly Resources, Wilmington, 1980): 1629.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.: Vol. 5: 2559-2560.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.: 2561.

<sup>5</sup> *Political Rehabilitation of Teng Hsiao-ping*, Peking Informers 35, no. 3 (Aug. 1, 1977): 1.

<sup>6</sup> Hsu Hsiang-chien, *Heighten Our Vigilance and Get Prepared to Fight a War*, Peking Review 21, no. 32 (Aug. 11, 1978): 9. “Soviet social-imperialism is our chief and most dangerous enemy, so we must take it on all seriousness.”

<sup>7</sup> Li Hung-lin, *To Each according to his Work: Socialist Principle in Distribution*, Peking Review 21, no. 7 (Feb. 17, 1978): 6-7. “He who works more gets more, he who works less gets less and he who does not work, neither shall he eat. This is a great revolution in the system of distribution. It is a new thing which can emerge only in socialist society...The theorists fostered by the ‘gang of four’ said that after the completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, bourgeois right (what they meant was the principle ‘to each according to his work’) was the ‘soil’ on which the bourgeoisie grew. That is to say, due to the practice of the principle ‘to each according to his work’, those with higher incomes will constitute a new bourgeoisie...This is a distortion of the socialist system.”

Su Shao-chih and Feng Lan-jui, *Refuting Yao Wen-yuan's Fallacy that the Principle ‘To Each According to his Work’ Breeds Bourgeoisie*, Peking Review 21, no. 6 (Feb. 10, 1978): 11. “‘To each according to his work’ is not an obsolete capitalist principle; on the contrary, it is a newborn socialist thing, a socialist principle that comes into force only after the proletariat has overthrown the capitalist system and established the socialist system.”

<sup>8</sup> Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program, (Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1972): 17. “From each according to their work, to each according to their needs.”

<sup>9</sup> Chou Cheng, “On ‘Grasping the Key Link’”, Peking Review, 21, no. 9 (March 3, 1978): 12. “[The ‘gang of four’] flaunted the banner ‘take class struggle as the key link’ not for continuing the revolution, but for overthrowing Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping and a large number of leading cadres of the Party, government and army.”

<sup>10</sup> Here a Reference is made to a statement made Mao Tse-tung and read upon the request of Robert Williams regarding the African American liberation struggle in the United States wherein Mao stated: “The speedy development of the struggle of the American Negroes is a manifestation of the sharpening of class struggle and national struggle within the United States.” (Peking Review, Aug. 8, 1963).

<sup>11</sup> *Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism*, Peking Review 20, no. 45 (Nov. 4, 1977): 11-12.

<sup>12</sup> Marx, Capital, Vol. II, (International Publishers, N.Y., 1967): 33. “The wage-labourer lives only by the sale of his labour-power.”

<sup>13</sup> *A Closer Look at the Charges against the ‘Gang of Four’*, Peking Informers 33, no. 11 (Dec. 1, 1976): 1.

---

<sup>14</sup> *Purging the 'Capitalist Roaders' and suppressing the 'Counter-Revolutionaries'*, Peking Informers 32, no. 12 (June 16, 1976): 1-2.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> *The Maoist Hierarchy As Seen From Red Flag Articles*, Peking Informers 33, no. 8 (Oct. 16, 1976): 4-5.

<sup>17</sup> *Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism*, Peking Review 20, no. 45 (Nov. 4, 1977): 18.

<sup>18</sup> *Peking Gives Priority to Production*, Peking Informers 33, no. 11 (Dec. 1, 1976): 2.

<sup>19</sup> In a eulogy for Mao after his death, Chow Ching-wen would say, "I knew him very well...He was a Marxist, an advocate of class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat...I embraced the idea of government of the whole people...I was advocating the socialist system under guarantees of democratic principles." Peking Informers 33, no. 9 (Nov. 1, 1976): 1.

<sup>20</sup> *Purges to Continue a Year After Collapse of Maoist Radicals*, Peking Informers 35, no. 8, (Oct. 16, 1977): 6.

<sup>21</sup> Marx, Capital, Vol. I, (International Publishers, N.Y., 1977): 36-39. "The utility of a thing makes it a use-value...Use-values become a reality only by use or consumption; they also constitute the substance of all wealth...We see then that that which determines the magnitude of the value of any article is the amount of labour socially necessary, or labour-time socially necessary for its production...The total labour-power of society, which is embodied in the sum total of the values of all commodities produced by that society, counts here as one homogeneous mass of human labour-power, composed though it be of innumerable individual units. Each of these units is the same as any other, so far as it has the character of the average labour-power of society...*Commodities, therefore, in which equal quantities of labour are embodied or which can be produced in the same time, have the same value.*" [Emphasis added].

Capital, Vol. I: 45. "Since the magnitude of the value of a commodity represents only the quantity of labour embodied in it, it follows that all commodities, when taken in certain proportion must be equal in value."

Ibid.: 61. "Every product of labour is, in all states of society, a use-value."

Ibid.: 71. "The mythical character of commodities does not originate, therefore, in their use-value."

Marx, Capital, Vol. II, (International Publishers, N.Y., 1967): 30. "The capital-relation during the process of production arises only because it is inherent in the act of circulation, in the different fundamental economic conditions in which the buyer and seller confront each other, in their class relation. *It is not money which by its nature creates this relation; it is rather the existence of this relation which permits of the transformation of a mere money-function into a capital-function.*" [Emphasis added].