LITTLE STALIN LIBRARY No. 6

ON ORGANIZATION

J. STALIN

SIXPENCE NET

LITTLE STALIN LIBRARY

No. 1 Foundations of Leninism. 1s.

No. 2 Notes of a Delegate & Class and Party. 6d.

No. 3 On Lenin: Speeches and Articles. 6d.

No. 4 Dialectical and Historical Materialism. 6d.

No. 5 On the National Question. 6d.

No. 6 On Organization. 6d.

ON
ORGANIZATION

BY

J. STALIN

LONDON
LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD

CONTENTS

First Published 1942

Printed in England at The Curwen Press, Plaistow, E.13
(T.U. all departments)

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The ' Party of a new type ' founded by Lenin has led the people of the Soviet Union through obstacles apparently insurmountable to achievements unequalled, first in the building of Socialism and then in the great war of liberation against Hitler Fascism. But the basic principles of organization through which these victories have been won are shared by all the other Parties of a new type, that is, by all sections of the Communist International, however much their tasks and stages of development may differ. These organizational principles were first laid down by Lenin in his book, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*[1], and further developed by Stalin in his *Foundations of Leninism*.[2]

The present volume shows Stalin at work as an organizer and reveals what Bolshevik methods mean and what is " the key to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership " (p, 21). The extracts are taken from the following sources: " Problems of Organizational Leadership," from Stalin's Report to the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 1934; " Cadres decide Everything," from his Address to Graduates from Red Army Academies, 1935; " Selection, Promotion and Allocation of Cadres," from his Report to the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U., 1939.[3] The section entitled "On Practical Work" contains extracts from "Seven Questions Answered", Stalin's concluding words at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., March 1937. (Report published in pamphlets now out of print).

Two Appendices have been added. The first contains extracts from L. M. Kaganovitch's Report on Organizational Problems, which followed and supplemented that of Stalin at the 17th C.P.S.U. Congress.[4] In the second, G. Dimitrov applies Stalin's teaching on cadres to the work of the Communist International (7th World Congress of the C.I., 1935; Speech in Reply to Discussion[5]).

[1] Lawrence and Wishart, 1941; Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. II; see *History of the C.P.S.U. (B)* p. 46.

[2] Chapters 8 and 9, see *Leninism*, pp. 72-85; Little Stalin Library No. 1, pp. 95-112.

[3] For full texts, see *Leninism*, pp. 527-534; 543-545; 650-653.

[4] *Socialism Victorious* (Report of the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B)), 1939, p. 198.

[5] *The United Front*, by G. Dimitrov, 1938, p. 122.

ON PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Some people think that it is sufficient to draw up a correct Party line, proclaim it from the housetops, state it in the form of general theses and resolutions, and take a vote and carry it unanimously for victory to come of itself, spontaneously, as it were. This, of course, is wrong. It is a gross delusion. Only incorrigible bureaucrats and red-tapists can think so. As a matter of fact, these successes and victories did not come spontaneously, but as the result of a fierce struggle for the application of the Party line. Victory never comes by itself—it usually has to be attained. Good resolutions and declarations in favour of the general line of the Party are only a beginning; they merely express the desire for victory, but not the victory itself. After the correct line has been laid down, after a correct solution of the problem has been found, success depends on how the work is organized; on the organization of the struggle for the application of the Party line; on the proper selection of personnel; on the way a check is kept on the fulfilment of the decisions of the leading bodies. Otherwise the correct line of the Party and the correct solutions are in danger of being seriously prejudiced.

Furthermore, after the correct political line has been laid down, organizational work decides everything, including the fate of the political line itself, its success or failure.

As a matter of fact, victory was achieved and won by a stern and systematic struggle against all sorts of difficulties that stood in the way of carrying out the Party line; by overcoming the difficulties; by mobilizing the Party and the working-class for the purpose of overcoming the difficulties; by organizing the struggle to overcome the difficulties; by removing inefficient executives and choosing better ones, capable of waging the struggle against difficulties.

What are these difficulties; and wherein are they lodged?

They are difficulties attending our organizational work, difficulties attending our organizational leadership. They are lodged in ourselves, in our leading people, in our organizations, in the apparatus of our Party, state, economic, trade union, Young Communist League, and all other organizations. . . .

Bureaucracy and red tape in the administrative apparatus; idle chatter about " leadership in general " instead of real and concrete leadership; the functional structure of our organizations and lack of individual responsibility; lack of personal responsibility in work, and wage equalization; the absence of a systematic check upon the fulfilment of decisions; fear of self-criticism—these are the sources of our difficulties; this is where our difficulties are now lodged.

It would be naïve to think that these difficulties can be overcome by means of resolutions and decisions. The bureaucrats have long become past-masters in the art of demonstrating their loyalty to Party and government decisions in words, and pigeon-holing them in deed. In order to overcome these difficulties it was necessary to put an end to the disparity between our organizational work and the requirements of the political line of the Party; it was necessary to raise the level of organizational leadership in all spheres of the national economy to the level of political leadership; it was necessary to see to it that our organizational work guarantees the practical realization of the political slogans and decisions of the Party.

In order to overcome these difficulties and achieve success it was necessary to *organize* the struggle to eliminate these difficulties; it was necessary to draw the masses of the workers and peasants into this struggle; it was necessary to mobilize the Party itself; it was necessary to purge the Party and the economic organizations of unreliable, unstable and demoralized elements.

What was needed for this?

We had to organize:

1. Extensive self-criticism and exposure of the defects in our work;

2. The mobilization of the Party, state, economic, trade union, and Young Communist League organizations for the struggle against difficulties;

3. The mobilization of the masses of the workers and peasants to fight for the application of the slogans and decisions of the Party and of the Government;

4. The extension of emulation and shock work among the working people;

5. A wide network of Political Departments of machine and tractor stations and state farms and the bringing of the Party and Soviet leadership closer to the villages;

6. The division of the People's Commissariats, head offices, and trusts, and the establishment of closer contact between the business leadership and the enterprises;

7. The elimination of lack of personal responsibility in work and the elimination of wage equalization;

8. The abolition of the " functional " system; the extension of individual responsibility, and a policy directed towards doing away with collegium management;

9. The exercise of greater control over the fulfilment of decisions, while taking the line towards reorganizing the Central Control Commission and the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection with a view to the further enhancement of the work of checking up on the fulfilment of decisions;

10. The transfer of qualified workers from offices to posts that will bring them into closer contact with production;

11. The exposure and expulsion from the administrative apparatus of incorrigible bureaucrats and red-tapists;

12. The removal from their posts of people who violate the decisions of the Party and the Government, of "window-dressers" and windbags, and the promotion to their place of new people—business-like people, capable of concretely directing the work entrusted to them and of tightening Party and state discipline;

13. The purging of state and economic organizations and the reduction of their staffs;

14. Lastly, the purging of the Party of unreliable and demoralized persons.

These, in the main, are the measures which the Party has had to adopt in order to overcome difficulties, to raise our organizational work to the level of political leadership, and in this way to ensure the application of the Party line.

You know that this is exactly how the Central Committee of the Party carried on its organizational work during the period under review.

In this, the Central Committee was guided by the brilliant thought uttered by Lenin to the effect that the main thing in

organizational work is—*choosing the right people and keeping a check on the fulfilment of decisions.*

In regard to choosing the right people and dismissing those who fail to justify the confidence placed in them, I would like to say a few words.

Apart from the incorrigible bureaucrats and red-tapists as to whose removal there are no differences of opinion among us, there are two other types of executives who retard our work, hinder our work, and hold up our advance.

One of these types of executives is represented by people who rendered certain services in the past, people who have become aristocrats, who consider that Party decisions and the laws issued by the Soviet Government are not written for them, but for fools. These are the people who do not consider it their duty to fulfil the decisions of the Party and of the Government, and who thus destroy the foundations of Party and state discipline. What do they count upon when they violate Party and Soviet laws? They presume that the Soviet Government will not have the courage to touch them, because of their past services. These over-conceited aristocrats think that they are irreplaceable, and that they can violate the decisions of the leading bodies with impunity. What is to be done with executives of this kind? They must unhesitatingly be removed from their leading posts, irrespective of past services. (*Voices:* "*Hear, hear*!") They must be demoted to lower positions, and this must be announced in the Press. (*Voices:* "*Hear, hear*!") This must be done in order to knock the pride out of these over-conceited aristocrat-bureaucrats, and to put them in their proper place. This must be done in order to tighten up Party and Soviet discipline in the whole of our work. (*Voices:* "*Hear, hear*!") (*Applause.*)

And now about the second type of executives. I have in mind the windbags. I would say, honest windbags (*laughter*), people who are honest and loyal to the Soviet Government, but who are incompetent as executives, incapable of organizing anything. Last year I had a conversation with one such comrade, a very respected comrade, but an incorrigible windbag, capable of drowning any living cause in a flood of talk. Here is the conversation.

I: How are you getting on with the sowing?

He: With the sowing, Comrade Stalin? We have mobilized ourselves. (*Laughter.*)

I: Well, and what then?

He: We have put the question squarely. (*Laughter.*)

I: And what next?

He: There is a turn, Comrade Stalin; soon there will be a turn. (*Laughter.*)

I: But still?

He: We can say that there is an indication of some progress. (*Laughter.*)

I: But for all that, how are you getting on with the sowing?

He: So far, Comrade Stalin, we have not made any headway with the sowing. (*General Laughter.*)

Here you have the physiognomy of the windbag. They have mobilized themselves, they have put the question squarely, they have made a turn and some progress, but things remain as they were.

This is exactly how a Ukrainian worker recently described the state of a certain organization when he was asked whether that organization had any definite line: " Well," he said, " they have a line all right, but they don't seem to be doing any work." (*General laughter.*) Evidently that organization also has its quota of honest windbags.

And when such windbags are dismissed from their posts and are given jobs far removed from operative work, they shrug their shoulders in perplexity and ask: " Why have we been dismissed? Did we not do all that was necessary to get the work done? Did we not organize a rally of shock workers? Did we not proclaim the slogans of the Party and of the government at the conference of shock workers? Did we not elect the whole of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee to the Honorary Presidium? (*General laughter.*) Did we not send greetings to Comrade Stalin —what more do they want of us?" (*Loud laughter.*)

What is to be done with these incorrigible windbags? Why, if they were allowed to remain on operative work they would drown every living cause in a flood of watery and endless speeches. Obviously, they must be removed from leading posts and given work other than operative work. There is no place for windbags on operative work. (*Voices:* "*Hear, hear*!" *Applause.*)

I have already briefly reported on how the Central Committee handled the selection of personnel for the Soviet and economic organizations, and how it pursued the work of keeping a closer check on the fulfilment of decisions. Comrade Kaganovich will deal with this in greater detail in his report on the third item of the agenda of the Congress.

I would like to say a few words, however, about future work in connection with the task of keeping a closer check on the fulfilment of decisions.

The proper organization of the work of checking up on the fulfilment of decisions is of decisive importance in the fight against bureaucracy and office routine. Are the decisions of the leading bodies carried out, or are they pigeon-holed by bureaucrats and red-tapists? Are they carried out properly, or are they distorted? Is the apparatus working conscientiously and in a Bolshevik manner, or is it running with the clutch out? These things can be promptly found out only if a proper check is kept on the fulfilment of decisions. A proper check on the fulfilment of decisions is a searchlight which helps to reveal how the apparatus is functioning at any moment, exposing bureaucrats and red-tapists to full view. We can say with certainty that nine-tenths of our defects and failures are due to the lack of a properly organized system of check-up on the fulfilment of decisions. There can be no doubt that had there been such a system of check-up on fulfilment defects and failures would certainly have been averted.

But for the work of checking up on fulfilment to achieve its purpose, two conditions at least are required: first, that fulfilment be checked up systematically and not spasmodically; second, that the work of checking up on fulfilment in all the links of the Party, state, and economic organizations be entrusted not to second-rate people, but to people with sufficient authority, the leaders of the organizations concerned. . . .

Our tasks in the sphere of organizational work are:

1. To continue to adapt our organizational work to the requirements of the political line of the Party;

2. To raise organizational leadership to the level of political leadership;

3. To see to it that organizational leadership is fully equal to the task of ensuring the realization of the political slogans and decisions of the Party.

CADRES DECIDE EVERYTHING

. . . The old slogan, "Technique decides everything," which is a reflection of a period already passed, a period in which we suffered from a dearth in technique, must now be replaced by a new slogan, the slogan " Cadres decide everything". That is the main thing now.

Can it be said that our people have fully grasped and realized the great significance of this new slogan? I would not say that. Otherwise, there would not have been the outrageous attitude towards people, towards cadres[1], towards workers, which we not infrequently observe in practice. The slogan " Cadres decide everything " demands that our leaders should display the most solicitous attitude towards our workers, " little " and " big," no matter in what sphere they are engaged, cultivating them assiduously, assisting them when they need support, encouraging them when they show their first successes, promoting them, and so forth. Yet in practice we meet in a number of cases with a soulless, bureaucratic, and positively outrageous attitude towards workers. This, indeed, explains why instead of being studied, and placed at their posts only after being studied, people are frequently flung about like pawns. People have learned to value machinery and to make reports on how many machines we have in our mills and factories. But I do not know of a single instance when a report was made with equal zest on the number of people we have trained in a given period, on how we have assisted people to grow and become tempered in their work. How is this to be explained? It is to be explained by the fact that we have not yet learned to value people, to value workers, to value cadres.

[1] *Cadres.* The word means literally a frame or framework. The comrades on whom the Party, throughout its various units of organization, can mainly depend to carry it forward are a living framework which must be constantly renewed and strengthened in the ways described here by Stalin and Dimitrov. Cadres are the new forces which must be developed and fitted for positions of responsibility in leadership.—*Ed.*

I recall an incident in Siberia, where I lived at one time in exile. It was in the spring, at the time of the spring floods. About thirty men went to the river to pull out timber which had been carried away by the vast, swollen river. Towards evening they returned to the village, but with one comrade missing. When asked where the thirtieth man was, they replied indifferently that the thirtieth man had " remained there". To my question, "How do you mean, remained there?" they replied with the same indifference, " Why ask—drowned, of course". And thereupon one of them began to hurry away, saying, " I've got to go and water the mare". When I reproached them with having more concern for animals than for men, one of them said, amid the general approval of the rest: " Why should we be concerned about men? We can always make men. But a mare . . . just try and make a mare".

Here you have a case, not very significant perhaps, but very characteristic. It seems to me that indifference of certain of our leaders to people, to cadres, their inability to value people, is a survival of that strange attitude of man to man displayed in the episode in far-off Siberia that I have just related.

And so, comrades, if we want successfully to get over the dearth in people and to provide our country with sufficient cadres capable of advancing technique and setting it going, we must first of all learn to value people, to value cadres, to value every worker capable of benefiting our common cause.

It is time to realize that of all the valuable capital the world possesses, the most valuable and most decisive is people, cadres. It must be realized that, under our present conditions, " Cadres decide everything". If we have good and numerous cadres in industry, agriculture, transport and the army, our country will be invincible. If we do not have such cadres, we shall be lame in both legs.

In concluding my speech, permit me to offer a toast to the health and success of our graduates from the Red Army Academies. I wish them success in the work of organizing and directing the defence of our country.

Comrades, you have graduated from institutions of higher learning, in which you received your first tempering. But school is only a preparatory stage. Cadres receive their real tempering in

practical work, outside school, in fighting difficulties, in overcoming difficulties. Remember, comrades, that only those cadres are any good who do not fear difficulties, who do not hide from difficulties, but who, on the contrary, go out to meet difficulties, in order to overcome them and eliminate them. It is only in the fight against difficulties that real cadres are forged. And if our army possesses genuinely steeled cadres in sufficient numbers, it will be invincible.

Your health, comrades!

SELECTION, PROMOTION AND ALLOCATION OF CADRES

A correct political line is not needed as a declaration, but as something to be carried into effect. But in order to carry a correct political line into effect, we must have cadres, people who understand the political line of the Party, who accept it as their own line, who are prepared to carry it into effect, who are able to put it into practice and are capable of answering for it, defending it and fighting for it. Failing this, a correct political line runs the risk of being purely nominal.

And here arises the question of the correct selection of cadres, the training of cadres, the promotion of new people, the correct allocation of cadres, and the testing of cadres by work accomplished.

What is meant by the correct selection of cadres?

The correct selection of cadres does not mean just gathering around one a lot of assistants and subs, setting up an office and issuing order after order (*Laughter.*) Nor does it mean abusing one's powers, switching scores and hundreds of people back and forth from one job to another without rhyme or reason and conducting endless "reorganizations." (*Laughter.*)

The proper selection of cadres means:

Firstly, valuing cadres as the gold reserve of the Party and the State, treasuring them, respecting them.

Secondly, knowing cadres, carefully studying their individual merits and shortcomings, knowing in what post the capacities of a given worker are most likely to develop.

Thirdly, carefully fostering cadres, helping every promising worker to advance, not grudging time on patiently " bothering " with such workers and accelerating their development.

Fourthly, boldly promoting new and young cadres in time, so as not to allow them to stagnate in their old posts and grow stale.

Fifthly, allocating workers to posts in such a way that each feels he is in the right place, that each may contribute to our common cause the maximum his personal capacities enable him to contribute, and that the general trend of the work of allocating cadres may fully answer to the demands of the political line for the carrying out of which this allocation of cadres is designed.

Particularly important in this respect is the bold and timely promotion of new and young cadres. It seems to me that our people are not quite clear on this point yet. Some think that in selecting people we must chiefly rely on the old cadres. Others, on the contrary, think that we must chiefly rely on young cadres. It seems to me that both are mistaken.

The old cadres, of course, represent a valuable asset to the Party and the State. They possess what the young cadres lack, namely, tremendous experience in leadership, a schooling in Marxist-Leninist principles, knowledge of affairs, and a capacity for orientation. But firstly, there are never enough old cadres, there are far less than required, and they are already partly going out of commission owing to the operation of the laws of nature. Secondly, part of the old cadres are sometimes inclined to keep a too persistent eye on the past, to cling to the past, to stay in the old rut and fail to observe the new in life. This is called losing the sense of the new. It is a very serious and dangerous shortcoming.

As to the young cadres, they, of course, have not the experience, the schooling, the knowledge of affairs and the capacity of orientation of the old cadres. But, firstly, the young cadres constitute the vast majority; secondly, they are young, and as yet are not subject to the danger of going out of commission; thirdly, they possess in abundance the sense of the new, which is a valuable quality in every Bolshevik worker; and, fourthly, they develop and acquire knowledge so rapidly, they press upward so eagerly, that the time is not far off when they will overtake the old fellows, take their stand side by side with them, and become worthy of replacing

them. Consequently, the thing is not whether to rely on the old cadres or on the new cadres, but to steer for a combination, a union of the old and the young cadres in one common symphony of leadership of the Party and the State. (*Prolonged applause.*)

That is why we must boldly and in good time promote young cadres to leading posts.

One of the important achievements of the Party during the period under review, in the matter of strengthening the Party leadership is that, when selecting cadres, it has successfully pursued from top to bottom, just this course of combining old and young workers.

Data in the possession of the Central Committee of the Party show that during the period under review the Party succeeded in promoting to leading State and Party posts over five hundred thousand young Bolsheviks, members of the Party and people standing close to the Party, over twenty per cent of whom were women.

What is our task now?

Our task now is to concentrate the work of selecting cadres, from top to bottom, in the hands of one body and to raise it to a proper, scientific, Bolshevik level.

ON PRACTICAL WORK

(*Extracts from "Seven Questions Answered"*)

HOW THE PARTY'S POLITICAL WORK IS TO BE STRENGTHENED

It is to be supposed that all have now understood, have realized, that to become excessively engrossed in economic campaigns and economic successes while underestimating and forgetting Party-political questions leads up a blind alley. Consequently it is necessary to turn the attention of our workers towards Party-political questions, so that economic successes will be combined with and accompany successes in Party-political work.

How in practice is the task of strengthening Party-political work, the task of freeing Party organizations from economic details, to be carried out? As can be seen from the discussion, some comrades are prone to draw from this the incorrect conclusion that we should now get away altogether from economic work. At any rate, there

were voices sounding the note: Well, now, thank God, we shall be rid of economic matters; now we can busy ourselves with Party-political work. Is this conclusion correct? No, it is not. When our Party comrades, carried away with economic successes, moved away from politics, this was an extreme which cost us big sacrifices. If some of our comrades, taking up the task of strengthening Party-political work, now think of moving away from economy, this will be the other extreme, which will cost us no less sacrifices. You must not jump from one extreme to another. You must not separate politics from economics. We cannot move away from economy, just as we cannot move away from politics. For the convenience of study, people usually separate the methodological questions of economics from the questions of politics. But this is done merely from the standpoint of method, artificially, only for the convenience of study. But in life, on the contrary, politics and economics are in practice inseparable. They exist together and act together. And he who thinks to separate in our practical policy economy from politics, to strengthen economic work at the cost of belittling political work, or contrarywise, to strengthen political work at the cost of belittling economic work, will find himself in a blind alley . . .

HOW WORKERS SHOULD BE SELECTED

What does it mean—to select workers correctly and correctly to distribute them to work?

This means to select workers, in the first place, according to a political criterion, i.e. are they worthy of political trusts, and in the second place, according to a practical criterion, i.e. are they suitable for such-and-such concrete work.

This means not to convert a business-like approach into a "business-man's" approach, when people are interested in the practical qualities of workers, but are not interested in their political physiognomy.

This means not to convert a political approach into the single and all-embracing approach, when people become interested in the political physiognomy of workers, but are not interested in their practical qualities.

Can it be said that this Bolshevik rule is carried out by our Party comrades? Unfortunately, this cannot be said. It has already been

spoken of here at the Plenum. But not everything was said. The fact is that this well-tried rule is violated right and left in our practice, and moreover in the grossest way. Most frequently, workers are selected not according to objective criteria, but according to fortuitous, subjective, narrow and parochial criteria. Most frequently, so-called acquaintances are chosen, personal friends, fellow-townsmen, people who have shown personal devotion, masters of eulogy to their patrons, irrespective of whether they are suitable from a political and a business-like standpoint.

Naturally, instead of a leading group of responsible workers, a family group, a company, is formed, the members of which try to live peacefully, not to offend each other, not to wash their dirty linen in public, to eulogize each other, and from time to time to send inane and nauseating reports to the centre about their successes.

It is not difficult to understand that in such conditions of kinship, there can be no place either for criticism of the shortcomings of the work or for self-criticism by the leaders of the work. . . . .

HOW THE WORK OF COMRADES IS CHECKED

What does it mean—to check-up on workers, to check-up on the fulfilment of tasks?

To check-up on workers means to test them, not on their promises and declarations but on the results of their work.

To test the fulfilment of tasks means to test them, not only in the office and not only according to formal reports, but first and foremost at the place of work according to the actual results of fulfilment.

Do we need such a check-up in general? Undoubtedly we do. We need it in the first place, because only such a check-up will make it possible to know a worker, to determine his real qualities. We need it, in the second place, because only such a check-up will make it possible to determine the good qualities and shortcomings of the executive apparatus. We need it, in the third place, because only such a check-up will make it possible to determine the good qualities and shortcomings of the tasks themselves.

Some comrades think that people can only be tested from above, when the leaders examine subordinates on the results of their

work. This is not true. Verifying from above is necessary, of course, as one of the effective measures for testing people and the fulfilment of tasks.

But testing from above far from exhausts the whole business of checking-up. There is still another kind of check-up, the check-up from below, where the masses, the subordinates, examine the leaders, point out their mistakes, and show them ways of correcting them. This kind of verification is one of the most effective methods of testing people.

The rank and file Party members verify their leaders at meetings of active Party workers, and conferences and congresses, by listening to their reports, by criticising their defects, and finally by electing or not electing some or other leading comrades to the leading Party organs. Precise operation of democratic centralism in the Party as demanded in our Party statutes, unconditional submission of Party organs to election, the right of putting forward and withdrawing candidates, secret ballot, freedom of criticism and self-criticism, all these and similar measures must be carried into life, in order incidentally to facilitate the check-up on and control over the leaders of the Party by the rank and file Party members.

The non-Party masses verify their economic, trade union and other leaders at meetings of non-Party active workers, at all kinds of mass conferences, where they hear reports of their leaders, criticize defects, and indicate ways of correcting them . . . . . .

TRAINING CADRES ON THE BASIS OF THEIR OWN MISTAKES

What does it mean—to train cadres on the basis of their own mistakes? Lenin taught that one of the surest means of correctly training and educating Party cadres, of correctly training and educating the working-class and the masses of the working people, is conscientiously to disclose the mistakes of the Party, to study the causes that have given rise to these mistakes, and to indicate the paths necessary for overcoming these mistakes. Lenin said:

> " The attitude of a political party to its mistakes is one of the most important and surest criteria of the seriousness of the Party and of its fulfilment in practice of its obligations to its class and the masses of working people. Openly to admit error, to reveal its causes, to analyse the situation that gave rise to it,

attentively to discuss the means of correcting the error—this is the sign of a serious Party, this is the fulfilment by it of its obligations, this is training and educating the class, and then the masses."

This means that the Bolsheviks are duty bound not to gloss over their mistakes, not to dodge the question of their mistakes, as often happens with us, but honestly and openly to admit their mistakes, honestly and openly to indicate the way of correcting these mistakes, honestly and openly to correct their mistakes.

I would not say that many of our comrades undertake this business with satisfaction. But if the Bolsheviks really wish to be Bolsheviks they must find sufficient manfulness in themselves openly to admit their mistakes, to reveal their causes, to indicate the ways of correcting them and thereby to give the party cadres correct training and correct political education. For it is only on this path, only in circumstances of open and honest self-criticism that Bolshevik cadres can really be educated, that real Bolshevik leaders can be educated. . . . . .

Some comrades say that it is not advisable to speak openly of one's mistakes since the open admission of one's mistakes may be construed by our enemies as our weakness and may be utilized by them.

This is rubbish, comrades. Downright rubbish. The open recognition of our mistakes and their honest rectification can on the contrary only strengthen our Party, raise its authority in the eyes of the workers, peasants and working intellectuals, and increase the strength and power of our State. And this is the main thing. As long as we have the workers, peasants and working intellectuals with us all the rest will settle itself.

Other comrades say that open admission of our mistakes can lead not to training and consolidating our cadres, but to weakening and disconcerting them, that we must spare and take care of our cadres, that we must spare their self-esteem and tranquility. To this end they propose to slur over the mistakes of our comrades, to weaken the vigour of the criticism, and still better to disregard these mistakes. Such a line is not only fundamentally incorrect but also dangerous in the highest degree, dangerous first and

foremost for the cadres whom they want to " spare " and "take care of". To spare and preserve cadres by slurring over their mistakes means of a certainty to ruin these very cadres.

TEACHING THE MASSES—AND LEARNING FROM THEM.

Lenin taught us not only to teach the masses, but also to learn from them.

What does this mean?

It means, firstly, that we leaders must not become conceited, and we must understand that if we are members of the Central Committee or are People's Commissars this does not mean that we possess all the knowledge necessary for giving correct leadership. An official position by itself does not provide knowledge and experience.

This means, secondly, that our experience alone, the experience of leaders, is insufficient to give correct leadership, that consequently it is necessary that one's experience, the experience of leaders, be supplemented by the experience of the masses, by the experience of the rank-and-file Party members, by the experience of the working-class, by the experience of the people.

This means, thirdly, that we must not for one moment weaken, still less break our connections, with the masses. This means, fourthly, that we must pay careful attention to the voice of the masses, to the voice of the rank-and-file members of the Party, to the voice of the so-called " small men," to the voice of the people.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN—TO LEAD CORRECTLY?

This does not at all mean sitting in one's office and compiling instructions.

Correctly to lead means:

Firstly, to find a correct solution of the question. But a correct solution cannot be found unless account is taken of the experience of the masses who test the results of our leadership on their own backs.

Secondly, to organize the operation of the correct solution, which, however, cannot be done without direct aid from the masses;

Thirdly, to organize a check on the fulfilment of this decision which again cannot be done without the direct aid of the masses.

We leaders see things, events and people, from only one side, I would say from above; our field of vision consequently is more or less limited. The masses, on the contrary, see things, events and people from another side, I would say from below; their field of vision consequently is also in a certain degree limited. To receive a correct solution to the question, these two experiences must be united. Only in such a case will the leadership be correct.

This is what it means—not only to teach the masses, but also to learn from them. . . . . .

Thus it transpires that our experience alone, the experience of the leaders, is still far from adequate for the guidance of our affairs. In order to guide correctly, the experience of the leaders must be supplemented by the experience of the Party masses, by the experience of the working-class, by the experience of the toilers, by the experience of the so-called " small people".

And when is this possible?

It is possible only if the leaders are closely connected with the masses, if they are bound up with the Party masses, with the working-class, with the peasantry, with the working intellectuals.

Contacts with the masses, the strengthening of these contacts, readiness to listen to the voice of the masses. In this lies the strength and impregnability of Bolshevik leadership. It may be taken, as a rule, that so long as Bolsheviks keep contact with the broad masses of the people, they will be invincible. And contrary-wise, it is sufficient for Bolsheviks to break away from the masses, and lose contact with them, it is sufficient for them to become covered with bureaucratic rust, for them to lose all their strength and to be converted into nothingness.

In the system of mythology of the ancient Greeks, there was one famous hero, Antæus, who, as mythology declares, was the son of Poseidon, the god of the sea, and Gaea, the goddess of the earth. He was particularly attached to his mother, who had borne, fed and brought him up. There was no hero whom this Antæus did not vanquish. He was considered to be an invincible hero. Wherein lay his strength? It lay in the fact that every time he was hard pushed in a struggle with an opponent, he touched the

earth, his mother, who had borne him and fed him, and obtained new strength. But, nevertheless, he had a weak spot—the danger of being separated in some way from the earth. His enemies took account of this weakness of his and lay in wait for him. And an enemy was found who took advantage of this weakness and vanquished him. This was Hercules. But how did Hercules defeat him? He tore him from the earth, raised him into the air, deprived him of the possibility of touching the earth, and throttled him.

I think that Bolsheviks remind us of Antæus, the hero of Greek mythology. Like Antæus, they are strong in keeping contact with their mother, with the masses, who bore them, fed them and educated them. And as long as they keep contact with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible.

This is the key to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership.

Appendix One

L. M. KAGANOVITCH ON PARTY TRAINING AND INNER PARTY DEMOCRACY

When people are overburdened with office work and the writing of general resolutions, they overlook "trifles," they overlook human beings. They fail to see a new foreman, a new engineer, a new technician, they fail to see new heroes of labour, they fail to see the Young Communists, who are growing up, who could be promoted to new work.

People say that we are short of men, but this is not true. We have the men, able men, but we must be able to promote them, to put them into their proper place. We must be able to lead them properly. The man who is put into a job must be trained, must be raised in the process of his work; care must be taken that he does not become emasculated and dusty. From time to time we must take a rag and wipe away the dust that has accumulated on him. . . .

The organization of the proper acceptance of members in the Party is only half the business. We must see to it that the newly adopted Party member, when he is already in our ranks, properly equips himself ideologically, that he grows, that he should feel everyday guidance in his activity, that he be actively drawn into the work of the Party, and that he become politically hardened.

When we speak of Marxist-Leninist training, we not only mean class-room training, we mean the ideological equipment of the Bolshevik. The Party member must be trained in the Party school, but principally he must be trained in practical political work. That means that we must raise the Marxist-Leninist training of the Party members to a high level and improve the work of our Party organization. . . . . .

Lenin always linked up theoretical problems with everyday practice. Stalin gives us examples of how to combine the most complicated theoretical problems with the everyday struggle. And yet many of our Red professors put theory into one compartment and practice into another, and are quite unable to combine these two compartments. Unfortunately, instead of combining theory with practice they, like the philosopher in the fable, write very profound treatises upon " The Nature of a Rope", and as Marx and Engels have not said anything on this subject, they think they are making a wonderful contribution to the treasury of Marxism.

A number of our Soviet Party schools suffer mainly from the fact that the education is organized precisely on school lines. A Bolshevik is not a schoolboy, he is being trained politically and his schooling should be combined with the everyday political and practical struggle. He must be ideologically equipped both at school and at Party meetings. Hence, as you have no doubt observed, the new draft of the rules does not simply speak about training, but about ideologically equipping the Communist. Every Party member must be equipped with the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

If we put these demands to every Party member, how much more must we put them to the Party leaders? There must not be any sharp division between expert propagandists and expert organizers. Specialization is a very good thing, we are in favour of it, but we must not carry it to extremes. And excessive specialization is particularly unsuitable in Party work. Very often an organizer fails to carry on propaganda and agitation not only because he has not the time for it, but let us speak frankly, also because he is unable to. We say that a director of a factory must master knowledge. All the more reason therefore why we should

demand of every Party Committee secretary, of every district committee secretary, and of every Party organizer that they acquire the ability to use the compass of Marxism-Leninism. A Party leader must not only be an organizer and administrator in the best sense of the term, but he must also be a propagandist and an educator of the Party members.

We know that the level of our Party meetings has risen. Party members learn and should learn Bolshevism as much, if not more at Party meetings, as in the Party school. Everyone understands that.

Internal Party democracy and self-criticism have been and are the most important pivot of our whole Party work and education of the Party members. Internal Party democracy has risen to a new stage. Internal Party democracy is now understood in a new way. When you attend meetings of Communists now, you realize that they cannot be compared with what the position was a couple of years ago. . . . . .

We cannot deny, however, that we could have done much more had we succeeded in combining the work of the organizers and the propagandists. This would have raised the Marxist-Leninist ideological equipment of the Communists to a new stage. Cases occur when Party meetings are carried on in a stereotyped manner without serious preparation. People are called together and they are told: Comrades, we have tasks, we must fulfil so-and-so. Or they discuss some campaign or anniversary. In such cases, of course, all you get is mere tub thumping or else mere " business," and naturally, such meetings do not help to educate the Party members. And yet, every Party meeting should help to raise the ideological level of the Communists. The discussion of internal Party questions, of questions concerning the politics and practice of building up socialism, raises the intelligence of the Party members to the level of understanding the vanguard role of the Bolsheviks, as the organizers of the masses.

The Party member grows, becomes educated and hardened in the conditions of internal Party democracy, amidst the free and business-like discussion of all the questions of Party policy. At the same time he becomes hardened and educated in the struggle against all those who depart from the fundamental problems of

Party policy, who want to take advantage of the discussion of these problems in order to sabotage this policy, in order to undermine the Party leadership, and in order to shake its iron ranks. The experience of our internal Party life shows that our Party ranks have grown up, have become strong and hardened in the struggle against all those who depart from the policy of the Party, from Leninism, in the struggle for the compactness and unity of our Party ranks.

That is why we must continue to raise and harden these Party members in the struggle against the slightest manifestation of opportunism in our ranks.

The growth of the Party member depends upon the way internal Party work is organized, it depends upon the amount of attention that is paid to the Party member, and on the way he is led. . . .

Appendix Two

G. DIMITROV ON CADRES

Comrades, our best resolutions will remain scraps of paper if we lack the people who can put them into effect. Unfortunately, however, I must state that the problem of *cadres*, one of the most important questions facing us, received almost no attention at this Congress. The report of the Executive Committee of the Communist International was discussed for seven days, there were many speakers from various countries, but only a few, and they only in passing, discussed this question, so extremely vital for the Communist Parties and the labour movement. In their practical work our Parties are still far from realizing that *people, cadres, decide everything.* They are unable to do what Comrade Stalin is teaching us to do, namely, to cultivate cadres " as a gardener cultivates his favourite fruit tree," " to appreciate people, to appreciate cadres, to appreciate every worker who can be of use to our common cause".

A negligent attitude to the problem of cadres is all the more impermissible for the reason that we are constantly losing some of the most valuable of our cadres in the struggle. For we are not a learned society but a militant movement which is constantly in the firing line. Our most energetic, most courageous and most

class-conscious elements are in the front ranks. It is precisely these front-line men that the enemy hunts down, murders, throws into jail, puts in the concentration camps, and subjects to excruciating torture, particularly in fascist countries. This gives rise to the urgent necessity of constantly replenishing the ranks, cultivating and training new cadres as well as carefully preserving the existing cadres.

The problem of cadres is of particular urgency for the additional reason that under our influence the mass united front movement is gaining momentum and bringing forward many thousands of new working class militants. Moreover, it is not only young revolutionary elements, not only workers just becoming revolutionary, who have never before participated in a political movement, that stream into our ranks. Very often former members and militants of the Social-Democratic Parties also join us. These new cadres require special attention, particularly in the illegal Communist Parties, the more so because in their practical work these cadres with their poor theoretical training frequently come up against very serious political problems which they have to solve for themselves.

The problem of what shall be the *correct policy with regard to cadres* is a very serious one for our Parties, as well as for the Young Communist Leagues and for all other mass organizations—for the entire revolutionary labour movement.

What does a correct policy with regard to cadres imply?

First, *knowing one's people.* As a rule, there is no systematic study of cadres in our Parties. Only recently have the Communist Parties of France and Poland and, in the East, the Communist Party of China, achieved certain successes in this direction. The Communist Party of Germany, before its underground period, had also undertaken a study of its cadres. The experience of these Parties has shown that as soon as they began to study their people, Party workers were discovered who had remained unnoticed before. On the other hand, the Parties began to be purged of alien elements who were ideologically and politically harmful. It is sufficient to point to the example of Célor and Barbé in France who, when put under the Bolshevik microscope, turned out to be agents of the class enemy and were thrown out of the Party. In Poland and in

Hungary the checking up of cadres made it easier to discover nests of provocateurs, agents of the enemy who had sedulously concealed their identity.

Second, *proper promotion of cadres.* Promotion should not be something casual but one of the normal functions of the Party. It is bad when promotion is made exclusively upon the basis of the ability of the various Party workers to discharge particular functions, and of their popularity among the masses. We have examples in our Parties of promotions which have produced excellent results. For instance, we have a Spanish woman Communist, sitting in the Presidium of this Congress, Comrade Dolores. Two years ago she was still a rank-and-file Party worker. But in the very first clashes with the class enemy she proved to be an excellent agitator and fighter. Subsequently promoted to the leading body of the Party she has proved herself a most worthy member of that body.

I could point to a number of similar cases in several other countries, but in the majority of cases promotions are made in an unorganized and haphazard manner, and therefore are not always fortunate. Sometimes moralizers, phrasemongers and chatterboxes who actually harm the cause are promoted to leading positions.

Third, *the ability to use people to the best advantage.* We must be able to ascertain and utilize the valuable qualities of every single active member. There are no ideal people; we must take them as they are and correct their weaknesses and shortcomings. We know of glaring examples in our Parties of the wrong utilization of good, honest Communists who might have been very useful had they been given work that they were better fit to do.

Fourth, *proper distribution of cadres.* First of all, we must see to it that the main links of the movement are in the charge of strong people who have contacts with the masses, have sprung from the very depths of the masses, who have initiative and are staunch. The more important districts should have an appropriate number of such militants. In capitalist countries it is not an easy matter to transfer cadres from one place to another. Such a task encounters a number of obstacles and difficulties, including lack of funds, family considerations, etc., difficulties which must be taken

into account and properly overcome. But usually we neglect to do this altogether.

Fifth, *systematic assistance to cadres.* This assistance should take the form of careful instructions, comradely control, rectification of shortcomings and mistakes, and concrete, everyday guidance.

Sixth, *proper care for the preservation of cadres.* We must learn promptly to withdraw Party workers to the rear whenever circumstances so require, and replace them by others. We must demand that the Party leadership, particularly in countries where the Parties are illegal, assume paramount responsibility for the preservation of cadres. . . . Remember the severe losses the Communist Party of Germany suffered during its transition to underground conditions! . . .

Only a correct policy in regard to cadres will enable our Parties to develop and utilize all available forces to the utmost, and obtain from the enormous reservoir of the mass movement ever fresh reinforcements of new and better active workers.

What should be our *main criteria* in selecting cadres?

First, *absolute devotion* to the cause of the working class, *loyalty to the Party*, tested in face of the enemy—in battle, in prison, in court.

Second, the closest possible *contact with the masses.* The comrades concerned must be wholly absorbed in the interests of the masses, feel the life pulse of the masses, know their sentiments and requirements. The prestige of the leaders of our Party organization should be based, first of all, on the fact that the masses regard them as their leaders, and are convinced through their own experience of their ability as leaders, and of their determination and self-sacrifice in struggle.

Third, *ability independently to find one's bearings* and not to be afraid of *assuming responsibility in making decisions.* He who fears to take responsibility is not a leader. He who is unable to display initiative, who says: " I will do only what I am told," is not a Bolshevik. Only he is a real Bolshevik leader who does not lose his head at moments of defeat, who does not get a swelled head at moments of success, who displays indomitable firmness in carrying out decisions. Cadres develop and grow best when they

are placed in the position of having to solve concrete problems of the struggle independently, and are aware that they are fully responsible for their decisions.

Fourth, *discipline* and *Bolshevik* hardening in the struggle against the class enemy as well as in their irreconcilable opposition to all deviations from the Bolshevik line.

We must place all the more emphasis on these conditions which determine the correct selection of cadres, because in practice preference is very often given to a comrade who, for example, is able to write well and is a good speaker but is not a man or woman of action, and is not as suited for the struggle as some other comrade who perhaps may not be able to write or speak so well, but is a staunch comrade, possessing initiative and contacts with the masses, and is capable of going into battle and leading others into battle. Have there not been many cases of sectarians, doctrinaires or moralizers crowding out loyal mass workers, genuine working class leaders.

Our leading cadres should combine the knowledge of *what* they must do—with *Bolshevik stamina, revolutionary strength of character and the will power to carry it through.* . . . .

Comrades, as you know, cadres receive their best training *in the process of struggle*, in surmounting difficulties and withstanding tests, and also from *favourable* and *unfavourable* examples of conduct. We have hundreds of examples of splendid conduct in times of strikes, during demonstrations, in jail, in court. We have thousands of instances of heroism, but unfortunately also not a few cases of pigeon-heartedness, lack of firmness and even desertion. We often forget these examples, both good and bad. We do not teach people to benefit by these examples. We do not show them *what* should be emulated and *what* rejected. We must study the conduct of our comrades and militant workers during class conflicts, under police interrogation, in the jails and concentration camps, in court, etc. The good examples should be brought to light and held up as models to be followed, and all that is rotten, non-Bolshevik and philistine should be cast aside.

Since the Leipzig trial we have had quite a number of our comrades whose statements before bourgeous and fascist courts have shown that numerous cadres are growing up with an excellent

understanding of what really constitutes Bolshevik conduct in court.

But how many even of you delegates to the Congress know the details of the trial of the railwaymen in Rumania, know about the trial of Fiete Schulz who was subsequently beheaded by the fascists in Germany, the trial of our valiant Japanese comrade Itikawa, the trial of the Bulgarian revolutionary soldiers, and many other trials at which admirable examples of proletarian heroism were displayed?

Such worthy examples of proletarian heroism must be popularized, must be contrasted with the manifestations of faint-heartedness, philistinism, and every kind of rottenness aud frailty in our ranks and the ranks of the working class. These examples must be used most extensively in educating the cadres of the labour movement.

Comrades: Our Party leaders often complain that *there are no people;* that they are short of people for agitational and propaganda work, for the newspapers, the trade unions, for work among the youth, among women. Not enough, not enough—that is the cry. We simply haven't got the people. To this we could reply in the old yet eternally new words of Lenin:

> " *There are no people—yet there are enormous numbers of people.* There are enormous numbers of people, because the working class and the most diverse strata of society, year after year, advance from their ranks an increasing number of discontented people who desire to protest, who are ready to render all the assistance they can in the fight against absolutism, the intolerableness of which is not yet recognized by all, but is nevertheless more and more acutely sensed by increasing masses of the people. At the same time we have no people, because we have no leaders, no political leaders, we have no talented organizers capable of organizing extensive and at the same time uniform and harmonious work that would give employment to all forces, even the most inconsiderable.[1]

These words of Lenin must be thoroughly grasped by our Parties and applied by them as a guide in their everyday work. There are

[1] V. I. Lenin: *What is to be Done?* Little Lenin Library, No. 4, *Selected Works*, Vol. II., p. 142.

plenty of people. They need only be discovered in our own organizations, during strikes and demonstrations, in various mass organizations of the workers, in united front bodies. They must be helped to grow in the course of their work and struggle; they must be put in a situation where they can really be useful to the workers' cause.

Comrades, we Communists are people of action. Ours is the problem of practical struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of imperialist war, the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. It is precisely this *practical* task that obliges Communist cadres to equip themselves *with revolutionary theory*. For, as Stalin, that greatest master of revolutionary action, has taught us, theory gives those engaged in practical work the power of orientation, clarity of vision, assurance in work, belief in the triumph of our cause.

But real revolutionary theory is irreconcilably hostile to all emasculated theorizing, all barren play with abstract definitions. *Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action,* Lenin used to say. It is *such* a theory that our cadres need, and they need it as badly as they need their daily bread, as they need air or water.

Whoever really wishes to rid our work of deadening, cut-and-dried schemes, of pernicious scholasticism, must burn them out with a red-hot iron, both by *practical*, active struggle waged together with and at the head of the masses, and by un*tiring effort* to master the mighty, fertile, all-powerful teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

In this connection I consider it particularly necessary to draw your attention to the work of our *Party schools*. It is not pedants, moralizers or adepts at quoting that our schools must train. No! It is practical front-rank fighters in the cause of the working class that must leave their walls—people who are front-rank fighters not only because of their boldness and readiness for self-sacrifice, but also because they see further than rank-and-file workers and know better than they the path that leads to the emancipation of the toilers. All sections of the Communist International must without any dilly-dallying seriously take up the question of the proper organization of Party schools, in order to turn them into *smithies* where these fighting cadres are forged.

The principal task of our Party schools, it seems to me, is to teach the Party and Young Communist League members there how to apply the Marxist-Leninist method to the concrete situation in particular countries, to definite conditions, not to the struggle against an enemy " in general " but against a particular, definite enemy. This makes necessary a study not merely of the letter of Leninism, but its living, revolutionary spirit.

There are two ways of training cadres in our Party schools:

First method: teaching people abstract theory, trying to give them the greatest possible dose of dry learning, coaching them how to write theses and resolutions in literary style, and only incidentally touching upon the problems of the particular country, of the particular labour movement, its history and traditions, and the experience of the Communist Party in question. Only incidentally!

Second method: theoretical training in which mastering the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism is based on a practical study by the student of the key problems of the struggle of the proletariat in his own country. On returning to his practical work, the student will then be able to find his bearings independently, and *become an independent practical organizer and leader capable of leading the masses in battle against the class enemy.*

Not all graduates of our Party schools prove to be suitable. There is a great deal of phrases, abstractions, book knowledge and show of learning. But we need real, truly Bolshevik organizers and leaders of the masses. And we need them badly this very day. It does not matter if such students cannot write good theses (though we need that very much too) but they must know how to organize and lead, undaunted by difficulties, capable of surmounting them.

Revolutionary theory is the generalized, *summarized experience* of the revolutionary movement. Communists must carefully utilize in their countries not only the experience of the past but also the experience of the present struggle of other detachments of the international labour movement. However, correct utilization of experience does not by any means denote *mechanical transposition* of ready-made forms and methods of struggle from one set of conditions to another, from one country to another, as so often happens in our Parties.

Bare imitation, simple copying of methods and forms of work even of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in countries where capitalism is still supreme, may with the best of intentions result in harm rather than good, as has so often actually been the case. It is precisely from the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks that we must learn to apply effectually, to the specific conditions of life in each country, the *single international line;* in the struggle against capitalism we must learn pitilessly to cast aside, pillory and hold up to general ridicule all *phrasemongering, use of hackneyed formulas, pedantry and doctrinarianism.*

It is necessary to learn, comrades, to learn always, at every step, in the course of the struggle, at liberty and in jail. To learn and to fight, to fight and to learn. We must be able to combine the great teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin *with Stalinist firmness* at work and in struggle, with *Stalinist irreconcilability on matters of principle* towards the class enemy and deviators from the Bolshevik line, *with Stalinist fearlessness in face of difficulties, with Stalinist revolutionary realism.*

LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY

1	The Teachings of Karl Marx	6d.
2	The War and the Second International	1/-
3	Socialism and War	6d.
4	What is to be Done?	2/-
5	The Paris Commune	1/-
6	The Revolution of 1905	1/-
7	Religion	1/-
8	Letters from Afar	9d.
9	The Task of the Proletariat	9d.
10	The April Conference	1/-
11	The Threatening Catastrophe and How to Avert It	1/-
12	Will the Bolsheviks Maintain Power?	9d.
13	On the Eve of October	9d.
14	State and Revolution	9d.
15	Imperialism	1/6
16	'Left Wing' Communism	9d.
17	Two Tactics of Social Democracy	1/6
18	The Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade	1/6
19	The Deception of the People	6d.
20	War and the Workers	6d.
21	Lenin and Stalin on Youth	9d.
22	Opportunism and Social Chauvinism	6d.
23	Lenin and Stalin on the State	6d.

All prices subject to alteration without notice

LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD., 2 SOUTHAMPTON PLACE, LONDON, W.C.1

MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

KARL MARX & F. ENGELS

The authorised translation of 1888, containing five prefaces by Marx and Engels. The latter checked and approved the translation and annotated it. This is the edition authorised by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, Moscow.

4d

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

MANIFESTO

OF THE

COMMUNIST PARTY

AUTHORISED ENGLISH TRANSLATION

EDITED AND ANNOTATED BY FREDERICK ENGELS

LAWRENCE and WISHART
LONDON

AUTHORISED BY THE
MARX - ENGELS - LENIN
INSTITUTE MOSCOW

Reprinted 1934
Reprinted 1934
Reprinted 1935
Reprinted 1936
Reprinted 1937
Reprinted 1938
Reprinted 1939
Reprinted 1941
Reprinted 1942
Reprinted 1943

Printed in England
by
Hardy Press Limited
Bournemouth.

CONTENTS

From the Publishers

We publish *The Communist Manifesto* in the version revised and authorised by one of its authors, Frederick Engels, as issued in London in 1888. The preface by Engels to that edition is given before the text of the *Manifesto*: all other prefaces by the authors to a number of the editions of the *Manifesto* in various languages are printed after the text. The translations of these last named prefaces have been done practically anew. The foot-notes are as penned by Engels for the English edition of 1888.

PREFACE

The *Manifesto* was published as the platform of the Communist League, a working men's association, first exclusively German, later on international, and, under the political conditions of the Continent before 1848, unavoidably a secret society. At a Congress of the League, held in London in November, 1847, Marx and Engels were commissioned to prepare for publication a complete theoretical and practical party programme. Drawn up in German, in January, 1848, the manuscript was sent to the printer in London a few weeks before the French revolution of February 24th. A French translation was brought out in Paris, shortly before the insurrection of June, 1848. The first English translation, by Miss Helen Macfarlane, appeared in George Julian Harney's *Red Republican*, London, 1850. A Danish and a Polish edition had also been published.

The defeat of the Parisian insurrection of June, 1848—the first great battle between proletariat and bourgeoise—drove again into the background, for a time, the social and political aspirations of the European working class. Thenceforth, the struggle for supremacy was again, as it had been before the revolution of February, solely between different sections of the propertied class; the working class was reduced to a fight for political elbow-room, and to the position of extreme wing of the middle-class Radicals. Wherever independent proletarian movements continued to show signs of life, they were ruthlessly hunted down. Thus the Prussian police hunted out the Central Board of the Communist League then located in Cologne. The members were arrested, and, after eighteen months' imprisonment, they were tried in October, 1852. This celebrated "Cologne Communist Trial" lasted from October 4th till November 12th: seven of the prisoners were sentenced to terms of imprisonment in a fortress, varying from three to six years. Immediately after the sentence, the League was formally dissolved by the remaining members. As to the *Manifesto*, it seemed thenceforth to be doomed to oblivion.

When the European working class had recovered sufficient strength for another attack on the ruling classes, the International Workingmen's Association sprang up. But this association, formed with the express aim of welding into one body the whole militant proletariat of Europe and America, could not at once proclaim the principles laid down in the *Manifesto*. The international was bound to have a programme broad enough to be acceptable to the English trades' unions, to the followers of Proudhon in France, Belgium, Italy, and Spain, and to the

Lassalleans* in Germany. Marx, who drew up this programme to the satisfaction of all parties, entirely trusted to the intellectual development of the working class, which was sure to result from combined action and mutual discussion. The very events and vicissitudes of the struggle against capital, the defeats even more than the victories, could not help bringing home to men's minds the insufficiency of their various favourite nostrums, and preparing the way for a more complete insight into the true conditions of working-class emancipation. And Marx was right. The International, on its breaking up in 1874, left the workers quite different men from what it had found them in 1864. Proudhonism in France, Lassalleanism in Germany were dying out, and even the conservative English trades' unions, though most of them had long since severed their connection with the International, were gradually advancing towards that point at which, last year at Swansea, their president could say in their name "Continental Socialism has lost its terrors for us." In fact, the principles of the *Manifesto* had made considerable headway among the workingmen of all countries.

The *Manifesto* itself thus came to the front again. Since 1850 the German text had been reprinted several times in Switzerland, England and America. In 1872, it was translated into English in New York, where the translation was published in *Woodhull and Claftin's Weekly*. From this English version, a French one was made in *Le Socialiste* of New York. Since then at least two more English translations, more or less mutilated, have been brought out in America, and one of them has been reprinted in England. The first Russian translation, made by Bakunin, was published at Herzen's *Kolokol* office in Geneva, about 1863; a second one, by the heroic Vera Zasulich, also in Geneva in 1882. A new Danish edition is to be found in *Socialdemokratisk Bibliothek*. Copenhagen, 1885; a fresh French translation in *Le Socialiste*, Paris, 1886. From this latter, a Spanish version was prepared and published in Madrid, in 1886. The German reprints are not to be counted, there have been twelve altogether at the least. An Armenian translation, which was to be published in Constantinople some months ago, did not see the light, I am told, because the publisher was afraid of bringing out a book with the name of Marx on it, while the translator declined to call it his own production. Of further translations into other languages I have

*Lassalle personally, to us, always acknowledged himself to be a disciple of Marx, and, as such, stood on the ground of the *Manifesto*. But in his public agitation, 1862-64, he did not go beyond demanding co-operative workshops supported by State credit.

heard, but have not seen. Thus the history of the *Manifesto* reflects, to a great extent, the history of the modern working class movement; at present it is undoubtedly the most widespread, the most international production of all Socialist literature, the common platform acknowledged by millions of working men from Siberia to California.

Yet, when it was written, we could not have called it a *Socialist* manifesto. By Socialists, in 1847, were understood, on the one hand, the adherents of the various Utopian systems: Owenites in England, Fourierists in France, both of them already reduced to the position of mere sects, and gradually dying out; on the other hand, the most multifarious social quacks, who by all manners of tinkering, professed to redress, without any danger to capital and profit, all sorts of social grievances, in both cases men outside the working class movement, and looking rather to the "educated" classes for support. Whatever portion of the working class had become convinced of the insufficiency of mere political revolutions, and had proclaimed the necessity of a total social change, called itself Communist. It was a crude, rough-hewn, purely instinctive sort of Communism; still it touched the cardinal point and was powerful enough amongst the working class to produce the Utopian Communism of Cabet in France, and of Weitling in Germany. Thus, in 1847, Socialism was a middle class movement, Communism a working class movement. Socialism was, on the continent at least, "respectable"; Communism was the very opposite. And as our notion, from the very beginning, was that "the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself," there could be no doubt as to which of the two names we must take. Moreover, we have, ever since, been far from repudiating it.

The *Manifesto* being our joint production, I consider myself bound to state that the fundamental proposition which forms its nucleus, belongs to Marx. That proposition is: That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles form a series of evolutions in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the

bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles.

This proposition, which, in my opinion, is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology, we both of us, had been gradually approaching for some years before 1845. How far I had independently progressed towards it is best shown by my *Condition of the Working Class in England.** But when I again met Marx at Brussels, in spring, 1845, he had it already worked out, and put it before me, in terms almost as clear as those in which I have stated it here.

From our joint preface to the German edition of 1872, I quote the following:

However much the state of things may have altered during the last 25 years, the general principles laid down in this *Manifesto* are, on the whole, as correct to-day as ever. Here and there some detail might be improved. The practical application of the principles will depend, as the *Manifesto* itself states, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing, and for that reason, no special stress is laid on the revolutionary measures proposed at the end of Section II. That passage would, in many respects, be very differently worded to-day. In view of the gigantic strides of modern industry since 1848, and of the accompanying improved and extended organisation of the working class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details become antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, *viz.*, that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." (See *The Civil War in France; Address of the General Council of the International Working-men's Association*, 1871, where this point is further developed). Further, it is self-evident, that the criticism of Socialist literature is deficient in relation to the present time, because it comes down only to 1847; also, that the remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition parties (Section IV), although in principle still correct, yet in practice are antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed, and the progress of history has swept from off the earth the greater portion of the political parties there enumerated.

But then, the *Manifesto* has become a historical document which we have no longer any right to alter.

The present translation is by Mr Samuel Moore, the translator of the greater portion of Marx's *Capital*. We have revised it in common, and I have added a few notes explanatory of historical allusions.

Frederick Engels.

London, January 30th, 1888.

*The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Florence K. Wischnewetzky, New York, Lovell—London, W. Reeves, 1888. [English edition, Allen and Unwin.]

MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

By KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS

A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as communistic by its opponents in power? Where is the Opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of Communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

Two things result from this fact:

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European powers to be itself a power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the spectre of Communism with a manifesto of the party itself.

To this end, Communists of various nationalities have assembled in London, and sketched the following manifesto, to be published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages.

I.

BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIANS*

The history of all hitherto existing society** is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master*** and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guildmasters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society, has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered

*By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labour. By proletariat, the class of modern wage-labourers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour power in order to live.

**That is, all *written* history. In 1847, the pre-history of society, the social organisation existing previous to recorded history, was all but unknown. Since then Haxthausen [August von, 1792-1866] discovered common ownership of land in Russia, Maurer [Georg Ludwig von] proved it to be the social foundation from which all Teutonic races started in history, and, by and by, village communities were found to be, or to have been, the primitive form of society everywhere from India to Ireland. The inner organisation of this primitive communistic society was laid bare, in its typical form, by Morgan's [Henry, 1818-1881] crowning discovery of the true nature of the *gens* and its relation to the *tribe*. With the dissolution of these primaeval communities, society begins to be differentiated into separate and finally antagonistic classes. I have attempted to retrace this process of dissolution in *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigenthums und des Staats*, 2nd edition, Stuttgart, 1886. (*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*).

***Guild-master, that is a full member of a guild, a master within, not a head of a guild.

burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never known before, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, in which industrial production was monopolised by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild-masters were pushed aside by the manufacturing middle class; division of labour between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labour in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, modern industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois.

Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the mediæval commune*; here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France); afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper,

*"Commune" was the name taken, in France, by the nascent towns even before they had conquered from their feudal lords and masters, local self-government and political rights as "the Third Estate." Generally speaking, for the economical development of the bourgeoisie, England is here taken as the typical country, for its political development, France.

serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, corner-stone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part.

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which reactionaries so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting

uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionaries, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilised nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones ; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production ; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus

rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class interest, one frontier and one customs tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?

We see then: the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the com-

mercial crises that by their periodical return put the existence of the entire bourgeois society on its trial, each time more threateningly. In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity —the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence ; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. And why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property ; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces ; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians.

In proportion as the bourgeoise, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed—a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital. These labourers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery, and to division of labour, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of

him. Hence the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore, also of labour, is equal to its cost of production. In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time, or by increased speed of the machinery, etc.

Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of labourers, crowded into the factory, are organised like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overlooker, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.

The less the skill and exertion of strength implied in manual labour, in other words, the more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labour of men superseded by that of women. Differences of age and sex have no longer any distinctive social validity for the working class. All are instruments of labour, more or less expensive to use, according to their age and sex.

No sooner is the exploitation of the labourer by the manufacturer, so far at an end, that he receives his wages in cash, than he is set upon by the other portions of the bourgeoisie, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.

The lower strata of the middle class—the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which modern industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population.

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly

exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves ; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeoisie. Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie ; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number ; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious ; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (trades' unions) against the bourgeois ; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages ; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever expanding union of the workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry, and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralise the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every

class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletarians, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. Thus the ten-hours' bill in England was carried.

Altogether, collisions between the classes of the old society further in many ways the course of development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself, whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for its help, and thus, to drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie.

Further, as we have already seen, entire sections of the ruling classes are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the

bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat; they thus defend not their present, but their future interests; they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.

The "dangerous class," the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.

In the conditions of the proletariat, those of old society at large are already virtually swamped. The proletarian is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labour, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests.

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand, sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lower stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.

Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks

out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeois, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois. The modern labourer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident, that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

The essential condition for the existence and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of modern industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.

II

PROLETARIANS AND COMMUNISTS

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties.

They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theoretical conclusions of the Communists, are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer.

They merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes. The abolition of existing property relations is not at all a distinctive feature of Communism.

All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historical change consequent upon the change in historical conditions.

The French revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favour of bourgeois property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property.

But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

We Communists have been reproached with the desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labour, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence.

Hard-won, self-acquired, self-earned property! Do you mean the property of the petty artisan and of the small peasant, a form of property that preceded the bourgeois form? There is no need to abolish that; the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it, and is still destroying it daily.

Or do you mean modern bourgeois private property?

But does wage-labour create any property for the labourer? Not a bit. It creates capital, ie., that kind of property which exploits wage-labour, and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labour for fresh exploitation. Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage-labour. Let us examine both sides of this antagonism.

To be a capitalist, is to have not only a purely personal, but a social, *status* in production. Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.

Capital is therefore not a personal, it is a social power.

When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, into the property of all members of society, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. It loses its class character.

Let us now take wage-labour.

The average price of wage-labour is the minimum wage, i.e., that quantum of the means of subsistence which is absolutely requisite to keep the labourer in bare existence as a labourer. What, therefore, the wage-labourer appropriates by means of his labour, merely suffices to prolong and reproduce a bare existence. We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labour, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labour of others. All that we want to do away with is the miserable

character of this appropriation, under which the labourer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only insofar as the interest of the ruling class requires it.

In bourgeois society, living labour is but a means to increase accumulated labour. In Communist society, accumulated labour is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the labourer.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.

And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois, abolition of individuality and freedom! And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.

By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying.

But if selling and buying disappears, free selling and buying disappears also. This talk about free selling and buying, and all the other "brave words" of our bourgeoisie about freedom in general, have a meaning, if any, only in contrast with restricted selling and buying, with the fettered traders of the Middle Ages, but have no meaning when opposed to the Communist abolition of buying and selling, of the bourgeois conditions of production, and of the bourgeoisie itself.

You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population, its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society.

In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend.

From the moment when labour can no longer be converted into capital, money, or rent, into a social power capable of being monopolised, i.e., from the moment when individual property can no longer be transformed into bourgeois property, into capital, from that moment, you say, individuality vanishes.

You must, therefore, confess that by "individual" you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible.

Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the

products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by means of such appropriation.

It has been objected, that upon the abolition of private property all work will cease, and universal laziness will overtake us.

According to this, bourgeois society ought long ago to have gone to the dogs through sheer idleness; for those of its members who work, acquire nothing, and those who acquire anything, do not work. The whole of this objection is but another expression of the tautology: There can no longer be any wage-labour when there is no longer any capital.

All objections urged against the Communistic mode of producing and appropriating material products, have, in the same way, been urged against the Communistic modes of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as to the bourgeois, the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, etc. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will, whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason, the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property—historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production—this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you. What you see clearly in the case of ancient property, what you admit in the case of feudal property, you are of course forbidden to admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of property.

Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when

its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

Do you charge us with wanting to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? To this crime we plead guilty.

But, you will say, we destroy the most hallowed of relations, when we replace home education by social.

And your education! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, etc. The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.

The bourgeois claptrap about the family and education, about the hallowed correlation of parent and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of modern industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labour.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, screams the whole bourgeoisie in chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion than that the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women.

He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Our bourgeois, not content with having the wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each other's wives.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalised community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident, that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e, of prostitution both public and private.

The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality.

The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word.

National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action of the leading civilised countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination.

Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views, and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?

What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.

When people speak of ideas that revolutionise society, they do but express the fact, that within the old society, the elements of a new one have been created, and that the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence.

When the ancient world was in its last throes, the ancient religions were overcome by Christianity. When Christian ideas succumbed in the 18th century to rationalist ideas, feudal society fought its death-battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, merely gave expression to the sway of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philo-

sophical and juridical ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality, philosophy, political science, and law, constantly survived this change."

"There are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc., that are common to all states of society. But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience."

What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs.

But whatever form they may have taken, one fact is common to all past ages, viz., the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

The Communist revolution is the mosts radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

But let us have done with the bourgeois objections to Communism.

We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy, to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e, of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production.

These measures will of course be different in different countries.

Nevertheless in the most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable.

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state ; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

9. Combination of agriculture with maiufacturing industries ; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc.

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class ; if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

III

SOCIALIST AND COMMUNIST LITERATURE

I. REACTIONARY SOCIALISM

a. Feudal Socialism

Owing to their historical position, it became the vocation of the aristocracies of France and England to write pamphlets against modern bourgeois society. In the French revolution of July, 1830, and in the English reform agitation, these aristocracies again succumbed to the hateful upstart. Thenceforth, a serious political struggle was altogether out of the question. A literary battle alone remained possible. But even in the domain of literature the old cries of the restoration period* had become impossible.

In order to arouse sympathy, the aristocracy was obliged to lose sight, apparently, of its own interests, and to formulate its indictment against the bourgeoisie in the interest of the exploited working class alone. Thus the aristocracy took their revenge by singing lampoons on their new master, and whispering in his ears sinister prophesies of coming catastrophe.

In this way arose feudal socialism: half lamentation, half lampoon; half echo of the past, half menace of the future; at times, by its bitter, witty and incisive criticism, striking the bourgeoisie to the very hearts' core, but always ludicrous in its effect, through total incapacity to comprehend the march of modern history.

The aristocracy, in order to rally the people to them, waved the proletarian alms-bag in front for a banner. But the people so often as it joined them, saw on their hindquarters the old feudal coats of arms, and deserted with loud and irreverent laughter.

One section of the French Legitimists and "Young England," exhibited this spectacle.

In pointing out that their mode of exploitation was different to that of the bourgeoisie, the feudalists forget that they exploited under circumstances and conditions that were quite different, and that are now antiquated. In showing that, under their rule, the modern proletariat never existed, they forget that the modern bourgeoisie is the necessary offspring of their own form of society.

For the rest, so little do they conceal the reactionary character of their criticism, that their chief accusation against the bour-

*Not the English Restoration, 1660 to 1689, but the French Restoration, 1814 to 1830.

geoisie amounts to this, that under the bourgeois regime a class is being developed, which is destined to cut up root and branch the old order of society.

What they upbraid the bourgeoisie with is not so much that it creates a proletariat, as that it creates a *revolutionary* proletariat.

In political practice, therefore, they join in all coercive measures against the working class ; and in ordinary life, despite their high-falutin phrases, they stoop to pick up the golden apples dropped from the tree of industry, and to barter truth, love, and honour for traffic in wool, beetroot-sugar, and potato spirits.*

As the parson has ever gone hand in hand with the landlord, so has Clerical Socialism with Feudal Socialism.

Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. Has not Christianity declaimed against private property, against marriage, against the state? Has it not preached in the place of these, charity and poverty, celibacy and mortification of the flesh, monastic life and Mother Church? Christian Socialism is but the holy water with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat.

b. Petty Bourgeois Socialism

The feudal aristocracy was not the only classs that was ruined by the bourgeoisie, not the only class whose conditions of existence pined and perished in the atmosphere of modern bourgeois society. The mediæval burgesses and the small peasant proprietors were the precursors of the modern bourgeoisie. In those countries which are but little developed, industrially and commercially, these two classes still vegetate side by side with the rising bourgeoisie.

In countries where modern civilisation has become fully developed, a new classs of petty bourgeois has been formed, fluctuating between proletariat and bourgeoisie, and ever renewing itself as a supplementary part of bourgeoisie society. The individual members of this class, however, are being constantly hurled down into the proletariat by the action of competition, and, as modern industry develops, they even see the moment approaching when they will completely disappear as an

*This applies chiefly to Germany where the landed aristocracy and squirearchy have large portions of their estates cultivated for their own account by stewards, and are, moreover, extensive beetroot-sugar manufacturers and distillers of potato spirits. The wealthier British aristocracy are, as yet, rather above that ; but they, too, know how to make up for declining rents by lending their names to floaters of more or less shady joint-stock companies.

independent section of modern society, to be replaced, in manufactures, agriculture and commerce, by overlookers, bailiffs and shopmen.

In countries, like France, where the peasants constitute far more than half of the population, it was natural that writers who sided with the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, should use, in their criticism of the bourgeois regime, the standard of the peasant and petty bourgeois, and from the standpoint of these intermediate classes, should take up the cudgels for the working class. Thus arose petty-bourgeois Socialism. Sismondi was the head of this school, not only in France but also in England.

This school of Socialism dissected with great acuteness the contradictions in the conditions of modern production. It laid bare the hypocritical apologies of economists. It proved, incontrovertibly, the disastrous effects of machinery and division of labour ; the concentration of capital and land in a few hands ; overproduction and crises ; it pointed out the inevitable ruin of the petty bourgeois and peasant, the misery of the proletariat, the anarchy in production, the crying inequalities in the distribution of wealth, the industrial war of extermination between nations, the dissolution of old moral bonds, of the old family relations, of the old nationalities.

In its positive aims, however, this form of Socialism aspires either to restoring the old means of production and of exchange, and with them the old property relations, and the old society, or to cramping the modern means of production and of exchange within the framework of the old property relations that have been, and were bound to be exploded by those means. In either case, it is both reactionary and utopian.

Its last words are: Corporate guilds for manufacture ; patriarchal relations in agriculture.

Ultimately, when stubborn historical facts had dispersed all intoxicating effects of self-deception, this form of Socialism ended in a miserable fit of the blues.

c. German or "True" Socialism

The Socialist and Communist literature of France, a literature that originated under the pressure of a bourgeoisie in power, and that was the expression of the struggle againsts this power, was introduced into Germany at a time when the bourgeoisie, in that country, had just begun its contest with feudal absolutism.

German philosophers, would-be philosophers, and men of letters eagerly seized on this literature, only forgetting that when

these writings immigrated from France into Germany, French social conditions had not immigrated along with them. In contact with German social conditions, this French literature lost all its immediate practical significance, and assumed a purely literary aspect. Thus, to the German philosophers of the 18th century, the demands of the "Practical Reason" in general, and the utterance of the will of the first French Revolution were nothing more than the demands of revolutionary French bourgeoisie signified in their eyes the laws of pure will, of will as it was bound to be, of true human will generally.

The work of the German *literati* consisted solely in bringing the new French ideas into harmony with their ancient philosophical conscience, or rather, in annexing the French ideas without deserting their own philosophic point of view.

This annexation took place in the same way in which a foreign language is appropriated, namely by translation.

It is well known how the monks wrote silly lives of Catholic saints *over* the manuscripts on which the classical works of ancient heathendom had been written. The German *literati* reversed this process with the profane French literature. They wrote their philosophical nonsense beneath the French original. For instance, beneath the French criticism of the economic functions of money, they wrote "alienation of humanity," and beneath the French criticism of the bourgeois state, they wrote, "dethronement of the category of the general," and so forth.

The introduction of these philosophical phrases at the back of the French historical criticisms they dubbed "Philosophy of Action," "True Socialism," "German Science of Socialism," "Philosophical Foundation of Socialism," and so on.

The French Socialist and Communist literature was thus completely emasculated. And, since it ceased in the hands of the German to express the struggle of one class with the other, he felt conscious of having overcome "French one-sidedness" and of representing, not true requirements, but the requirements of truth; not the interests of the proletariat, but the interests of human nature, of man in general, who belongs to no class, has no reality, who exists only in the misty realm of philosophical phantasy.

This German Socialism, which took its schoolboy task so seriously and solemnly, and extolled its poor stock-in-trade in such mountebank fashion, meanwhile gradually lost its pedantic innocence.

The fight of the German and especially of the Prussian bourgeoisie against feudal aristocracy and absolute monarchy, in other words, the liberal movement, became more earnest.

By this, the long-wished-for opportunity was offered to "True" Socialism of confronting the political movement with the Socialist demands, of hurling the traditional anathemas against liberalism, against representative government, against bourgeois competition, bourgeois freedom of the press, bourgeois legislation, bourgeois liberty and equality, and of preaching to the masses that they had nothing to gain, and everything to lose, by this bourgeois movement. German Socialism forgot, in the nick of time, that the French criticism, whose silly echo it was, presupposed the existence of modern bourgeois society, with its corresponding economic conditions of existence, and the political constitution adapted thereto, the very things whose attainment was the object of the pending struggle in Germany.

To the absolute governments, with their following of parsons, professors, country squires and officials, it served as a welcome scarecrow against the threatening bourgeoisie.

It was a sweet finish after the bitter pills of floggings and bullets, with which these same governments, just at that time, dosed the German working class risings.

While this "True" Socialism thus served the governments as a weapon for fighting the German bourgeoisie, it, at the same time, directly represented a reactionary interest, the interest of the German Philistines. In Germany the petty bourgeois class, a relic of the 16th century, and since then constantly cropping up again under various forms, is the real social basis of the existing state of things.

To preserve this class, is to preserve the existing state of things in Germany. The industrial and political supremacy of the bourgeoisie threatens it with certain destruction—on the one hand, from the concentration of capital; on the other, from the rise of a revolutionary proletariat. "True" Socialism appeared to kill these two birds with one stone. It spread like an epidemic.

The robe of speculative cobwebs, embroidered with flowers of rhetoric, steeped in the dew of sickly sentiment, this transcendental robe in which the German Socialists wrapped their sorry "eternal truths," all skin and bone, served to wonderfully increase the sale of their goods amongst such a public.

And on its part, German Socialism recognised, more and more, its own calling as the bombastic representative of the petty bourgeois Philistine.

It proclaimed the German nation to be a model nation, and the German petty Philistine to be the typical man. To every villainous meanness of this model man it gave a hidden, higher, socialistic interpretation, the exact contrary of its real character.

It went to the extreme length of directly opposing the "brutally destructive" tendency of Communism, and of proclaiming its supreme and impartial contempt of all class struggles. With very few exceptions, all the so-called Socialist and Communist publications that now (1847) circulate in Germany belong to the domain of this foul and enervating literature.

2. CONSERVATIVE OR BOURGEOIS SOCIALISM

A part of the bourgeoisie is desirous of redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society.

To this section belong economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, organisers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every imaginable kind. This form of Socialism has, moreover, been worked out into complete systems.

We may cite Proudhon's "*Philosophie de la Misère*" (Philosophy of Poverty) as an example of this form.

The socialistic bourgeois want all the advantages of modern social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat. The bourgeoisie naturally conceives the world in which it is supreme to be the best; and bourgeois Socialism develops this comfortable conception into various more or less complete systems. In requiring the proletariat to carry out such a system, and thereby to march straightway into the social New Jerusalem, it but requires in reality, that the proletariat should remain within the bounds of existing society, but should cast away all its hateful ideas concerning the bourgeoisie.

A second and more practical, but less systematic, form of this Socialism sought to depreciate every revolutionary movement in the eyes of the working class, by showing that no mere political reform, but only a change in the material conditions of existence, in economical relations, could be of any advantage to them. By changes in the material conditions of existence, this form of Socialism, however, by no means understands abolition of the bourgeois relations of production, an abolition that can be affected only by a revolution, but administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations; reforms, therefore, that in no respect affect the relations

between capital and labour, but, at the best, lessen the cost, and simplify the administrive work of bourgeois government.

Bourgeois Socialism attains adequate expression, when, and only when, it becomes a mere figure of speech.

Free trade: for the benefit of the working class.. Protective duties: for the benefit of the working class. Prison reform: for the benefit of the working class. This is the last word and the only seriously meant word of bourgeois Socialism.

It is summed up in the phrase: the bourgeois is a bourgeois—for the benefit of the working class.

3. CRITICAL-UTOPIAN SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

We do not here refer to that literature which, in every great modern revolution, has always given voice to the demands of the proletariat, such as the writings of Babeuf and others.

The first direct attempts of the proletariat to attain its own ends, made in times of universal excitement, when feudal society was being overthrown, these attempts necessarily failed, owing to the then undeveloped state of the proletariat, as well as to the absence of the economic conditions for its emancipation, conditions that had yet to be produced, and could be produced by the impending bourgeois epoch alone. The revolutionary literature that accompanied these first movements of the proletariat had necessarily a reactionary character. It inculated universal asceticism and social levelling in its crudest form.

The Socialist and Communist systems properly so called, those of St. Simon, Fourier, Owen and others, spring into existence in the early undeveloped period, described above, of the struggle between proletariat and bourgeosie (see Section I. Bourgeois and Proletarians).

The founders of these systems see, indeed, the class antagonisms, as well as the action of the decomposing elements in the prevailing form of society. But the proletariat, as yet in its infancy, offers to them the spectacle of a class without any historical initiative or any independent political movement.

Since the development of class antagonism keeps even pace with the development of industry, the economic situation, as they find it, does not as yet offer to them the material conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat. They therefore search after a new social science, after new social laws, that are to create these conditions.

Historical action is to yield to their personal inventive action; historically created conditions of emancipation to phantastic

ones; and the gradual, spontaneous class organisation of the proletariat to an organisation of society specially contrived by these inventors. Future history resolves itself, in their eyes, into the propaganda and the practical carrying out of their social plans.

In the formation of their plans they are conscious of caring chiefly for the interests of the working class, as being the most suffering class. Only from the point of view of being the most suffering class does the proletariat exist for them.

The undeveloped state of the class struggle, as well as their own surroundings, causes Socialists of this kind to consider themselves far superior to all class antagonisms. They want to improve the condition of every member of society, even that of the most favoured. Hence, they habitually appeal to society at large, without distinction of class; nay, by preference, to the ruling class. For how can people, when once they understand their system, fail to see in it the best possible plan of the best possible state of society?

Hence, they reject all political, and especially all revolutionary action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavour, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by the force of example, to pave the way for the new social gospel.

Such phantastic pictures of future society, painted at a time when the proletariat is still in a very undeveloped state and has but a phantastic conception of its own position, correspond with the first instinctive yearnings of that class for a general reconstruction of society.

But these Socialist and Communist publications contain also a critical element. They attack every principle of existing society. Hence they are full of the most valuable materials for the enlightenment of the working class. The practical measures proposed in them—such as the abolition of the distinction between town and country, of the family, of the carrying on of industries for the account of private individuals, and of the wage-system, the proclamation of social harmony, the conversion of the functions of the state into a mere superintendence of production—all these proposals point solely to the disappearance of class antagonisms which were, at that time, only just cropping up, and which, in these publications, are recognised in their earliest, indistinct and undefined forms only. These proposals, therefore, are of a purely utopian character.

The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite

shape, this phantastic standing apart from the contest, these phantastic attacks on it, lose all practical value and all theoretical justification. Therefore, although the originators of these systems were, in many respects, revolutionary, their disciples have, in every case, formed mere reactionary sects. They hold fast by the original views of their masters, in opposition to the progressive historical development of the proletariat. They, therefore, endeavour, and that consistently, to deaden the class struggle and to reconcile the class antagonisms. They still dream of experimental realisation of their social utopias, of founding isolated *phalansteres*, of establishing "Home Colonies," or setting up a "Little Icaria"*—pocket editions of the New Jerusalem—and to realise all these castles in the air, they are compelled to appeal to the feelings and purses of the bourgeois. By degrees they sink into the category of the reactionary conservative Socialists depicted above, differing from these only by more systematic pedantry, and by their fanatical and superstitious belief in the miraculous effects of their social science.

They, therefore, violently oppose all political action on the part of the working class; such action, according to them, can only result from blind unbelief in the new gospel.

The Owenites in England, and the Fourierists in France, respectively, oppose the Chartists and the *Reformistes*.

IV

POSITION OF THE COMMUNISTS IN RELATION TO THE VARIOUS EXISTING OPPOSITION PARTIES

Section II has made clear the relations of the Communists to the existing working class parties, such as the Chartists in England and the Agrarian Reformers in America.

The Communist fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement. In France the Communists ally themselves with the Social-Demo-

**Phalansteres* were socialist colonies on the plan of Charles Fourier; Icaria was the name given by Cabet to his Utopia and, later on, to his American Communist colony.

crats,* against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie, reserving, however, the right to take up a critical position in regard to phrases and illusions traditionally handed down from the great Revolution.

In Switzerland, they support the Radicals, without losing sight of the fact that this party consists of antagonistic elements, partly of Democratic Socialists, in the French sense, partly of radical bourgeois.

In Poland they support the party that insists on an agrarian revolution as the prime condition for national emancipation, that party which fomented the insurrection of Cracow in 1846.

In Germany they fight with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary way, against the absolute monarchy, the feudal squirearchy, and the petty bourgeoisie.

But they never cease, for a single instant, to instil into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, in order that the German workers may straightway use, as so many weapons against the bourgeoisie, the social and political conditions that the bourgeoisie must necessarily introduce along with its supremacy, and in order that, after the fall of the reactionary classes in Germany, the fight against the bourgeoisie itself may immediately begin.

The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution that is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilisation and with a much more developed proletariat than that of England was in the 17th, and of France in the 18th century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution.

In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time.

Finally, they labour everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries.

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims.

*The party then represented in Parliament by Ledru-Rollin, in literature by Louis Blanc [1811-1882], in the daily press by the *Reform*. The name of Social-Democracy signifies, with these its inventors, a section of the Democratic or Republican Party more or less tinged with Socialism.

They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

Working men of all countries, unite!

APPENDIX

I. PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1872

The Communist League, an international association of workers, which, owing to the conditions obtaining at that time, could exist only as a secret organisation, commissioned us, the undersigned, at the Congress held in London in November, 1847, to write for publication a detailed theoretical and practical programme of the Party. Such was the origin of the *Manifesto* following, the manuscript of which was sent off to London to be printed a few weeks before the February Revolution. First published in German, it has been republished in that language in Germany, England, and America in at least twelve different editions. In English it appeared first in 1850 in the *Red Republican*, London, translated by Miss Helen Macfarlane, and in 1871 in at least three different translations in America. The French version appeared first in Paris shortly before the June insurrection of 1848, and recently in *Le Socialiste* of New York. A new translation is in the course of preparation. A polish version appeared in London shortly after it was first published in German. A Russian translation appeared in Geneva in the sixties. Into Danish, too, it was translated shortly after its first appearance.

However much the state of things may have altered during the last 25 years, the general principles laid down in this *Manifesto* are, on the whole, as correct to-day as ever. Here and there some detail might be improved. The practical application of the principles will depend, as the *Manifesto* itself states, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing, and, for that reason, no special stress is laid on the revolutionary measures proposed at the end of Section II. That passage would, in many respects, be very differently worded today. In view of the gigantic strides of modern industry since 1848, and of the accompanying improved and extended organisa-

tion of the working class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February Revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details become antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." (See *The Civil War in France; Address of the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association*, 1871, where this point is further developed). Further, it is self-evident, that the criticism of Socialist literature is deficient in relation to the present time, because it comes down only to 1847; also, that the remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition parties (Section IV), although in principle still correct, yet in practice are antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed, and the progress of history has swept from off the earth the greater portion of the political parties there enumerated.

But then, the *Manifesto* has become an historical document which we have no longer any right to alter. A subsequent reprint may perhaps appear with an introduction which will bridge the gap from 1847 to the present day; but this reprint was sprung upon us too suddenly to leave us time to write such an introduction.

Karl Marx. Frederick Engels.

London, June 24, 1872.

2. PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1883

The preface to the present edition must, alas, be signed with my name alone. Marx, the man to whom the whole working class of Europe and America owes more than to any one else, rests at Highgate cemetery and the first grass is already growing over his grave. Since his death, the idea of rewriting or of supplementing anything in the *Manifesto* can be entertained still less. But it is all the more essential that I should here again expressly state the following:

The basic thought underlying the *Manifesto*—that the economic production and the structure of society of every historical epoch necessarily arising therefrom constitute the foundation for the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently (ever since the breaking up of the primaeval communal ownership of land) all of history has been a history of

class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated classes and dominating classes at various stages of social evolution; that this struggle, however, has now reached a stage when the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie), without at the same time freeing the whole of society forever of exploitation, oppression and class struggles—this basic thought belongs solely and exclusively to Marx.*

I have already stated this many times; but just now it is necessary that it should be put in front of the *Manifesto* itself.

F. Engels.

London, June 28, 1883.

3. PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1890.

Since the above was written, a new German edition of the *Manifesto* has again become necessary, and besides various things have happened with the *Manifesto* itself which should be recorded here.

A second Russian translation—by Vera Zasulich** appeared at Geneva in 1882; the preface to that edition was written by Marx and myself. Unfortunately, the oirginal German manuscript has gone astray and so I have to translate back from the Russian version and the text will in no way improve in the process! It runs:

"The first Russian edition of the *Manifesto* of the Communist Party, in Bakunin's translation, was published early in the sixties by the printing offices of the *Kolokol*. At that date a Russian edition of the *Manifesto* could at best possess for the West the significance of a literary curiosity. To-day such a view is no longer possible. How limited the sphere of distribution of the proletarian movement was at the time the *Manifesto* was first published (January, 1848) is best shown by the last section. *The Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Opposition Parties.* There is no mention there indeed of either Russia

*This proposition—as I wrote in the preface to the English translation—which, in my opinion, is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology, we, both of us, had been gradually approaching for some years before 1845. How far I had independently progressed towards it, is best shown by my *Condition of the Working Class in England*. But when I again met Marx at Brussels, in Spring, 1845, he had it already worked out, and put before me, in terms almost as clear as those in which I have stated it here.

**As a matter of fact the translation was done by G. V. Plekhanov, as stated by himself in the Russian edition of the *Manifesto* in 1900.—Ed.

or the United States. It was the time when Russia constituted the last great reserve of European reaction and when emigration to the United States absorbed the surplus forces of the European proletariat. Both countries provided Europe with raw materials, and served at the same time as markets for the sale of its manufactured goods. Both appeared therefore, in one way or another, as pillars of the European social order.

"What a change has taken place since then! Precisely European emigration has promoted the enormous growth of agriculture in North America, which through its competition is shaking the very foundations of the great and small landed properties of Europe. At the same time it enabled the United States to begin the exploitation of its vast industrial resources, and with such energy and on such a scale that, before long, it must put an end to the industrial monopoly hitherto exercised by Western Europe. These two circumstances react in their turn upon the United States in a revolutionary direction. More and more do the small and medium-sized holdings of the independent farmers, the basis of the whole political system of America, lose ground before the competition of gigantic farms, while at the same time a numerous proletariat is emerging for the first time in the industrial regions alongside of a fabulous concentration of capital.

"Let us now turn to Russia. At the time of the Revolution of 1848-1849, not only the European monarchs, but the European bourgeoisie as well, looked upon Russian intervention as the only salvation from the proletariat, which was then for the first time becoming aware of its own strength. The Czar was acclaimed the leader of the European reaction. To-day he sits in Gatchina, a prisoner of war of the revolution, and Russia forms the vanguard of the revolutionary movement in Europe.

"The object of the *Communist Manifesto* was to proclaim the inevitable downfall of present-day bourgeois property. But in Russia we find, side by side with the feverishly growing capitalist swindle and the bourgeois landed estates just taking shape, more than half the land owned in common by the peasants.

"The question which arises is: can the Russian peasant commune, this form of primaeval common ownership of land, although already greatly broken up, pass directly to a higher communist form of ownership of land, or must it first pass through the same process of breaking up as in the course of the historical evolution of the West?

"To-day there is only one possible answer to this question. If the Russsian Revolution sounds the signal for a workers' revolution in the West, so that the one complements the other,

then the prevailing form of common ownership of land in Russia may serve as the starting point for a communist development."

London, January 21, 1882."

At about the same date, a new Polish version appeared in Geneva: *Manifest Kommunistyczny*.

Further, a fresh Danish translation was issued by the *Social-demokratisk Bibliothek*, Kjobenhavn, 1885. Uufortunately it is not quite complete ; certain essential passages, which seem to have presented difficulties to the translator, have been omitted, and in addition there are signs of carelessness here and there, which are all the more to be regretted, seeing from the translation, that had he taken a little more pains, the translator would have produced an excellent piece of work.

A new French version appeared in 1886 in *Le Socialiste*. This is the best to date.

Somewhat later in the same year a Spanish version was published in *El Socialista* of Madrid, and then reissued in pamphlet form: *Manifesto del Partido Communista* por Carlos Marx y F. Engels, Madrid, Administration de El Socialista, Hernan Cortes 8.

As a matter of curiosity I may mention that in 1887 an Armenian version was offered to a publisher in Constantinople. That worthy had not the courage to publish something bearing the name of Marx and suggested that the translator set down his own name as author, which however the latter declined.

After a succession of the more or less inaccurate translations made in the United States had been repeatedly reprinted in England, an authentic version appeared at last in 1888. This was by my friend Samuel Moore and we went through it together once more before it went to press. It is entitled: *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Authorised English translation, edited and annotated by Frederick Engels, 1888, London, William Reeves, 185 Fleet Street, E.C. I have added some of the notes of that edition to the present one.

The *Manifesto* has had a history of its own. Greeted with enthusiasm, at the time of its appearance, by the small handful of those who then constituted the vanguard of scientific socialism (as is shown by the translations mentioned in the first preface), it was soon forced into the background by the reaction which followed upon the defeat of the Parisian workers in June, 1848 and was finally proscribed " by law " in the sentences passed on the Cologne Communists in November, 1852. With the disappearance from the public scene of the workers' movement which began with the February Revolution, the *Manifesto* too passed into the background.

When the European workers again gathered sufficient strength for a new onslaught against the power of the ruling class, the International Workingmen's Association came into being. Its aim was to weld together into one huge army all the fighting forces of the working class of Europe and America. It could therefore not *set out* from the principles laid down in the *Manifesto*. It had to have a programme, which would not shut the door on the English trades' unions, the French, Belgian, Italian and Spanish Proudhonists and the German Lassalleans. This programme—the principles underlying the statutes of the International—was drawn up by Marx with a master hand acknowledged even by Bakunin and the anarchists. As to the final triumph of the ideas set forth in the *Manifesto*, Marx relied entirely upon the intellectual development of the workers which was necessarily to ensue from united action and discussion. The events and vicissitudes of the struggle against capitalism, the defeats even more than the successes, could not but demonstrate to the fighters the inadequacy of the universal panaceas they had clung to hitherto and make their minds more receptive to a thorough understanding of the real conditions of working class emancipation. And Marx was right. The working class of 1874, at the dissolution of the International Workingmen's Association, was altogether different from what it had been at the date of its birth in 1864. Proudhonism in the Latin Countries and the specific Lassalleanism in Germany were passsing away, and even the then arch-conservative English trades' unions were approaching the point where in 1887 the chairman of their Swansea Congress could say in their name: "Continental socialism has lost its terrors for us." Yet, by 1887 continental socialissm had become almost completely the theory heralded in the *Manifesto*. Thus, to a certain extent, the history of the *Manifesto* reflects the history of the modern working class movement since 1848. At present it is undoubtedly the most widely circulated, the most international product of all socialist literature, the common programme of many millions of workers in all lands from Siberia to California.

Nevertheless, when it appeared we could not call it a socialist Manifesto. In 1847 two kinds of people were considered Socialists. On the one hand were the adherentes of the various utopian systems, notably the Owenites in England and the Fourierists in France, both of whom at that date had already dwindled to mere sects slowly dying out. On the other hand, the manifold types of social quacks who wanted to eliminate the social ills by means of their universal panaceas and all kinds of tinkering, without in the least hurting capital and profit. In both cases

they were people who stood outside the labour movement and who looked for support rather to the "educated" classes. However, the section of the working class which, convinced that mere political revolution was not enough, demanded radical reconstruction of society—that section then called itself *Communist*. It was still a rough-hewn, only instinctive and frequently somewhat crude communism. Yet it was sufficiently powerful to bring into being two systems of utopian communism—in France the "Icarian" communism of Cabet, and in Germany that of Weitling. Socialism in 1847 stood for a bourgeois movement, communism for a working class movement. Socialism was, on the Continent at least, quite respectable, whereas communism was the very opposite. And since already at that date we were very decidedly of the opinion that "the emancipation of the workers must be the task of the working class itself," we could have no hesitation as to which of the two names we should choose. Nor has there ever been any inclination on our part to repudiate that name.

"Working men of all countries, unite!" But few were the voices to respond when we launched these words into the world forty-two years ago on the eve of the first Revolution in Paris in which the proletariat came out with demands of its own. On September 28, 1864, however, proletarians of most countries of Western Europe joined hands in the International Workingmen's Association of glorious memory. True, the International itself lived for only nine years. But that the eternal union of the proletarians of all countries created by it is still alive and lives stronger than ever, there is no better witness than this day. Because to-day, as I write these lines, the proletariat of Europe and of America is reviewing its fighting forces mobilised for the first time, mobilised as *one* army, under *one* flag, for *one* immediate aim: an eight hour working day to be established by legal enactment, as proclaimed by the Geneva Congress of the International in 1866, and again by the Paris Workers' Congress in 1889. And the spectacle we are witnessing to-day will open the eyes of the capitalists and landlords of all lands to the fact that to-day the working men of all countries are indeed united.

If only Marx were with me to behold this with his own eyes!

F. Engels.

London, May 1, 1890.

4. PREFACE TO THE SECOND POLISH EDITION OF 1892.

The circumstance that a new Polish edition of the *Communist Manifesto* has become necessary gives food to various thoughts.

First of all, it is necessary to record that of late the *Manifesto* has become to a certain degree an index of the development of large-scale industry on the European continent. To the extent that large-scale industry develops in a given country, the workers of that country increasingly strive to understand their position as the working class towards the possessing classes, socialist ideas spread among them and the demand for the *Manifesto* increases. Thus, the number of copies of the *Manifesto* circulated in a given national language makes it possible to estimate, with a fair amount of accuracy, not only the state of the labour movement but also the degree of development of large-scale industry in each country.

So also the new Polish edition of the *Manifesto* indicates a decisive progress of Polish industry. And there can be no doubt whatever that such progress has actually taken place during the ten years which have elapsed since the publication of the last issue. The Kingdom of Poland* has become a large industrial region of the Russian state.

Whereas the Russian large-scale industry is scattered sporadically—a part round the Gulf of Finland, a part in the central gubernias (Moscow and Vladimir), and a part along the coasts of the Black and Azov Seas—Polish industry has been concentrated within a relatively small area and is enjoying both the advantages and the disadvantages of such a concentration. The advantages have been acknowledged by the competing Russian manufacturers, who demand protective tariffs against Poland, in spite of their ardent desire to Russianise all the Poles! The disadvantages for the Polish manufacturers and the Russian government appear in the rapid spread of socialist ideas among the Polish workers and in the steadily growing demand for the *Manifesto*.

But the speedy growth of Polish industry, far outstripping that of Russia, is in its turn a new proof of the inexhaustible vital energy of the Polish people and a fresh guarantee of the future national rebirth. And the rebirth of a strong and independent Poland is a matter affecting not only the Poles but all of us. A sincere international collaboration of the European peoples is possible only if each of these peoples is fully master of its own house. The revolutions of 1848 which, under the banner of the

In the text the word "Kongresowka," i.e., *Congress Poland*, is added meaning the part of Poland annexed by Russia according to the provisions of the Vienna Congress of 1815.—Ed.

proletariat, merely led the fighters of the proletariat to pick the chestnuts out of the fire for the bourgeoisie—this revolution at the same time through its testamentary executors, Louis Napoleon and Bismarck, secured the independence of Italy, Germany and Hungary; while Poland, which since 1791, had done more for the cause of the Revolution than these three countries put together, was left to her own resources when in 1863 she succumbed to Russisan violence, surpassing her strength tenfold.

The Polish *szlachta** was unable either to maintain or to gain independence; for the bourgeoisie it is, for the present at least, immaterial. It can be gained only by the young Polish proletariat, and in its hands it is secure. For the workers of the rest of Europe need the independnce of Poland not less than the Polish workers themselves.

F. Engels.

London, February 10, 1892.

5. PREFACE TO THE FIRST ITALIAN EDITION OF 1893.

To the Italian Reader:

The publication of the *Manifesto of the Communists Party* practically coincided with March 18, 1848, the date of the revolutions in Milan and Berlin, which were uprisings of two nations situated in the centre, one in the centre of the continent of Europe, the other—of the Mediterranean Sea; of two nations which up till then had been enfeebled owing to division, and internal strife, and had thus fallen under foreign domination. While Italy was subjected to the dominion of the Emperor of Austria, Germany was under the yoke, not less effective though indirect, of the Czar of all the Russias. The consequences of March 18th freed both Italy and Germany from this disgrace. If from 1848 to 1871 these two great nations had been reconstituted and to a certain extent left to lead their own lives, this was because, as Karl Marx expressed it, the very people who had suppressed the revolution of 1848 became in their own despite its testamentary executors.

Everywhere this revolution was the work of the working-class; it was it that built the barricades and that sacrificed its life-blood. Only the Parisian workers, however, had, while overthrowing the government, the very definite intention of overthrowing the bourgeois regime as well. but although they understood perfectly the antagonism existing between the working class and the bour-

*Nobility.—Ed.

geoisie, still, neither the economic development of the country nor the intellectual development of the mass of French workers has as yet reached the stage which would have made a social reconstruction possible. In the end therefore the fruits of the revolution fell into the hands of the capitalist class. In other countries, Italy, Germany and Austria, the workers from the very outset did nothing but help the bourgeoisie rise to power. But in no country is the rule of the bourgeoisie possible without national independence. Therefore the revolution of 1848 had to establish the unity and independence of those nations which theretofore did not possess the same: Italy, Germany, Hungary. Poland will in due course follow the same path.

Thus, if the revolution of 1848 was not a socialist revolution, it nevertheless paved the way for the latter, prepared the ground for it. Along with the mighty impetus given by the bourgeois order to large-scale industry in all countries, this order has during the last forty-five years created everywhere a numerous, concentrated and powerful proletariat. It has thus created, to use the language of the *Manifesto*, its own grave-diggers.

Without re-establishing the unity and independence of each nation, it is impossible to create the international unity of the proletariat, nor the peaceful and intelligent collaboration of these nations towards common aims. Just imagine an international action of the Italian, Hungarian, German, Polish and Russian workers under the political conditions prevailing down to the year 1848!

The battles fought in 1848 were thus not fought in vain. Nor have the forty-five years which separate us from that revolutionary epoch passed by to no purpose. The fruits are beginning to ripen, and all I wish is that the publication of this Italian translation may augur well for the victory of the Italian proletariat, just as the publication of the original was a harbinger of international revolution.

The *Manifesto* gives full justice to the revolutionary action which capitalism accomplished in the past. Italy was the first capitalist nation. The close of the feudal Middle Ages, the dawn of the contemporary capitalist epoch, was marked by an overtowering figure. It was that of an Italian, Dante, who was at one and the same time the last poet of the Middle Ages and the first poet of the new era. To-day, as in 1300, a new era is approaching. Will Italy give us another Dante who will mark the hour of birth of the new, the proletarian era?

F. Engels.

London, February 1, 1893.

LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY

1	The Teachings of Karl Marx	6d.
2	The War and the Second International	1/-
3	Socialism and War	6d.
4	What is to be Done?	2/6
6	The Revolution of 1905	1/-
7	Religion	1/-
8	Letters from Afar	9d.
9	The Tasks of the Proletariat	9d.
10	The April Conference	1/-
11	The Threatening Catastrophe and How to Fight It	1/-
12	Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?	9d.
13	On the Eve of October	9d.
14	State and Revolution	9d.
15	Imperialism	1/6
16	'Left Wing' Communism	9d.
17	Two Tactics of Social Democracy	1/6
18	The Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade	1/6
19	The Deception of the People	6d.
20	War and the Workers	6d.
21	Lenin and Stalin on Youth	9d.
22	Opportunism and Social Chauvinism	6d.
23	Lenin and Stalin on the State	6d.
24	Lenin on Propaganda	6d.
25	Dictionary of Terms and Quotations	9d.

All prices subject to alteration without notice

LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD.,
2 SOUTHAMPTON PLACE, LONDON, W.C.1.