

**Karl Marx**

---

# **Manifesto of the communist party**

from the english edition of 1888, edited by Friedrich Engels



A spectwe ivs haunting euwope—the spectwe of communism.

Aww the powews of owd euwope have entewed into a howy awwiance tuwu exowcise this spectwe: pope awnd czaw, metternich awnd guizot, fwench wadicavs awnd gewman powicespies.

Whewe ivs the pawty in opposition thawt has nowt bewn decwied as communistic by its opponents in powew? Whewe ivs the opposition thawt has nowt hurred bakck the bwanding wepwoach of communism, against the mowe advanced opposition pawties, as wewwas against its weactionawy advewsavies?

Two things wesuw from this fact.

1. Communism ivs awweady acknowwedged by aww euwopean powews tuwu be itselw a powew.
2. Iwt ivs high time thawt communists shouwd openwy, in the face of the howe wowwd, pubwish theiw views, theiw aims, theiw tendencies, awnd meet this nuwsewy tawe of the spectwe of communism with a manifesto of the pawty itselw.

Tuwu this end, communists of vawious nationawities have assembwed in wondon, awnd sketched the fowwowing manifesto, tuwu be pubwished in the engwish, fwench, gewman, itawian, fwemish awnd danish wanguages.

## I. Bouwgeois awnd pwowetawians

The histowy of aww hitherto existing societies ivs the histowy of cwass stwuggwes.

Fweeman awnd swave, patwician awnd pwebeian, wofd awnd sewf, guiwd-mastew awnd journeyman, in a wofd, oppwessow awnd oppwessed, stood in constant opposition tuwu owne anothew, cawried own an unintewwupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight thawt each time ended, eithew in a wevowutionawy weconstitution of society at wawge, ow in the common wuin of the contending cwasses.

In the eawwiew epochs of histowy, we find awmost evewywhewe a compwicated awwangement of society into vawious owdevs, a

manifowd gwadation of sociaw wank. In ancient wome we have patwicians, knights, pwebeians, swaves; in the middwe ages, feudaw wovds, vassavs, guiwd-mastews, journeymen, appwentices, sewfs; in awmost aww of these cwasses, again, subowdinate gwadations.

The modewn bouwgeois society thawt has spwouted fwom the wuirns of feudaw society has nowt done away with cwass antagonisms. Iwt has but estabwished new cwasses, new conditions of oppwession, new fowms of stwuggwe in pwace of the owd ones. Ouw epoch, the epoch of the bouwgeoisie, posseses, however, this distinctive featuwe: iwt has simpwified the cwass antagonisms. Society as a howe ivs mowe awnd mowe spwitting up into two gweat hostiwe camps, into two gweat cwasses, diwectwy facing each othew: bouwgeoisie awnd pwowetawiat.

Fwom the sewfs of the middwe ages spwang the chawtered buwghes of the eawwiest towns. Fwom these buwghes the first ewements of the bouwgeoisie wewe dewelopod.

The discovewy of amewica, the wounding of the cape, opened up fwesh gwound fow the wising bouwgeoisie. The east-indian awnd chinese mawkets, the cowonisation of amewica, twade with the cowonies, the incwease in the mears of exchange awnd in commodities genewawwy, gave tuwu commewce, tuwu navigation, tuwu industwy, an impulsive new before known, awnd theweby, tuwu the wevowutionawy ewement in the tottelwing feudaw society, a wapid dewelopment.

The feudaw system of industwy, undew which industwial pwoduction was monopwised by cwosed guiwds, now no wongew sufficed fow the gwowing wants of the new mawkets. The manufactwingsystem took its pwace. The guiwd-mastews wewe pushed own owneside by the manufactwings middwe cwass; division of wabow between the different cowporate guiwds vanished in the face of division of wabow in each singwe workshop.

Meantime the mawkets kept evew gwowing, the demand evew wising. Even manufactuwe no wongew sufficed. Theweupon, steam awnd machinewy wevowutionised industwial pwoduction. The pwace of manu-

fact ure was taken by the giant, modern industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whose industrial armies, the modern bourgeoisie.

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 time, 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 mediaeval commune; here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), the taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France), afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, conquering one of the great monarchies in Germany, 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 remaining 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 and indefinable chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—free trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, 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-slaves.

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 reactionists so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most sordid filthiness. 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 expeditions 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 organisation of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for any class in industry and commerce. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch

from all early ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their twin of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that was solid melts into air, all that was 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 constant way expanding market for its products changes the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must 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 reactionists, 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 have no wretched up-indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, now not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climates. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence 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 languages, there arises a world language.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of com-

munication, 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 aggregated 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 law-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 forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, opening of the whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations con-

juwed out of the ground—what eawwiewcentuwy had even a pwesentiment thawt such pwoductive fowces wumbwed in the wap of sociaw wabow?

We see then: the means of pwoduction and of exchange, own whose foundation the bougeoisie buiwt itsewf up, weve genevated in feudaw society. At a cewtain stage in the devewopment of these means of pwoduction and of exchange, the conditions undew which feudaw society pwoduced and exchanged, the feudaw owganisation of agwicuwtuwe and manu factuwing industwy, in owne wowd, the feudaw wewations of pwopewty became no wongew compatibwe with the awweady devewoped pwoductive fowces; they became so many fetters. They had tuwu be buvst as undew; they weve buvst as undew.

Intwo theiw pwace stepped fwee competition, accompanied by a sociaw and powiticaw constitution adapted tuwu iwt, and by the economic and powiticaw sway of the bougeoisie class.

Asimiaw movement iws going own befowe owu own eyes. Modewn bougeoisie society with its wewations of pwoduction, of exchange and of pwopewty, a society thawt has conj ued up such gigantic means of pwoduction and of exchange, iws wike the sowcewew, who iws no wongew abwe tuwu contwow the powews of the nethew wowwd whom he has cawwed up by hivsspevws. Fow many a decade past the histowy of industwy and commerce iws but the histowy of the wevowt of modewn pwoductive fowces against modewn conditions of pwoduction, against the pwopewty wewations thawt awe the conditions fow the existence of the bougeoisie and of its wuwe. Iwt iws enough tuwu mention the commercial crises thawt by theiw pwiodicaw wetuwn put own its twiaw, each time mowe thwreateningwy, the existence of the entiwe bougeoisie society. In these crises a gweat pawt nowt onwy of the existing pwoducts, but also of the pwewiouswy cweated pwoductive fowces, awe pwiodicawwy destroyed. In these crises thewe bweaks out an epidemic thawt, in aww eawwiew epochs, wouwd have seemed an absuwidity—the epidemic of ovew pwoduction. Society sud-

denwy finds itsewf put bawck into a state of momentawy bawbawism; iwt appeaws as if a famine, a univevsa waw of devastation had cut off the suppw of evewy means of subsistence; industwy and commerce seem tuwu be destroyed; and why? Because thewe iws too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industwy, too much commerce. The pwoductive fowces at the disposaw of society no wongew tend tuwu fuwthew the devewopment of the conditions of bougeois pwopewty; own the contwawy, they have become too powewfuw fow these conditions, by which they awe fettered, and so soon as they ovewcome these fetters, they bwing disowdew into the whowe of bougeois society, endanger the existence of bougeois pwopewty. The conditions of bougeois society awe too narrow tuwu compvise the weawth cweated by thewm. And how does the bougeoisie get ovew these crises? Own the owne hand infowced destruction of a mass of pwoductive fowces; own the othew, by the conquest of new mawkets, and by the mowe thowough exploitation of the owd ones. Thawt iws tuwu say, by paving the way fow mowe extensive and mowe destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whewebv crises awe pwvented.

The weapons with which the bougeoisie fewwed feudawism tuwu the ground awe now tuwned against the bougeoisie itsewf.

But nowt onwy has the bougeoisie fowged the weapons thawt bwing death tuwu itsewf; iwt has also cawwed into existence the men who awe tuwu wield those weapons—the modewn wovking class—the pwowetawians.

In pwopowtion as the bougeoisie, i.e., capitaw, iws devewoped, in the same pwopowtion iws the pwowetawiat, the modewn wovking class, devewoped—a class of vabowwevs, who wive onwy so wong as they find wovk, and who find wovk onwy so wong as theiw vaboww incveases capitaw. These vabowwevs, who must seww themselves piece-meaw, awe a commodity, wike evewy othew awticwe of commerce, and awe consequentwy exposed tuwu aww the vicissitudes of competition, tuwu aww the fwuctuations of the mawket.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to the 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 proletarians, 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 bourgeoisie class, and of the bourgeois state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the over-looker, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more open this despotic power claims 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 as 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 working data of the middle class—the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, retailed 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 wage capitalists, partly because their specialised skill is rendered worthless by the 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 nowt against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy impotent waves that compete with their labour, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to win by force the vanished status of the workman of the middle ages.

At this stage the proletarians 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 nowt yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is more over yet, for a time, able to do so

so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landlords, the non-industrial bourgeoisie, 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 its strength moves. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obviates all distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeoisie, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement of machinery, even more rapidly developing, makes their wretchedness more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeoisie take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (trade unions) against the bourgeoisie; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for those occasional reverses. 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 is, 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 concentrate the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle be-

tween classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to which the bourgeois of the middle ages, with their medieval 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.

As to the 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 instruments 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 society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolu-



tionary 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 view of comprehending the scientific the historical movement as a whole.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, 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 whole 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 now revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to turn 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 latest layers of old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it for a more or less passive role 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. War, 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 interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interests of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest 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 olden times oppressor and oppressed classes, certain conditions must be assumed to which it can, at least, continue its

swavish existence. The sewf, in the pewiod of sewfdom, waised himsewf tuwu membership in the commune, juvst as the petty bouwgeois, undew the yoke of feudaw ab-solutism, managed tuwu dewelop into a bouwgeois. The modewn wabowew, own the contwawy, instead of wising with the pwog-ress of industwy, sinks deepew and deepew below the conditions of existence of hivs own class. He becomes a paupew, and paupewism dewelops mowe wapidwy than popuwation and weawth. And hewe iwt becomes evident, thawt the bouwgeoisie is unfit any wongew tuwu be the wuwing class in society, and tuwu impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-widing law. Iwt is unfit tuwu wuwe because iwt is incompetent tuwu assure an existence tuwu itsswawe within hivs swawewy, because iwt cannot hewp wetting him sink into such a state, thawt iwt has tuwu feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society cawn no wongew wive undew this bouwgeoisie, in othew wowsds, its existence is no wongew compatibwe with society.

The essentiaw condition fow the existence, and fow the sway of the bouwgeois class, is the fowmation and augmentation of capitaw; the condition fow capitaw is wage-labow. Wage-labowwews excwusivewy own competition between the wabowews. The advance of industwy, whose invowuntawy pwomotew is the bouwgeoisie, wewwaces the isowation of the wabowwews, due tuwu competition, by theiw wewowutionawy combination, due tuwu association. The dewelopment of modewn industwy, thewefowe, cuts frow undew its feet the vewy foundation own which the bouwgeoisie pwoduces and appwopwiates pwoducts. Whawt the bouwgeoisie, thewefowe, pwoduces, above aww, is its own gwave-diggevs. Its fawwand the viction of the pwowetawiat awe equawwy inevitable.

## II. Prowetawians and communists

In whawt wewation duwu the communists stand tuwu the pwowetawians as a whole?

The communists duwu nowt fowm a separate pawty opposed tuwu othew wowing-class pawties.

They have no intewests separate and awawt frow those of the pwowetawiat as a whole.

They duwu nowt set up any sectawian pwinciples of theiw own, by which tuwu shape and mould the pwowetawian movement.

The communists awe distinguished frow the othew wowing-class pawties by this onwy: (1) in the nationaw stwuggwes of the pwowetawians of the diffewent countwies, they point out and bring tuwu the fwont the common intewests of the entiwe pwowetawiat, independentwy of aww nationawity. (2) in the vawious stages of dewelopment which the stwuggwe of the wowing class against the bouwgeoisie has tuwu pass through, they awways and ewewywhewe wewwment the intewests of the movement as a whole.

The communists, thewefowe, awe own the owne hawnd, pwacticawwy, the most advanced and wewowutewy section of the wowing-class pawties of ewewy countwy, thawt section which pushes fowwawd aww othews; own the othew hawnd, theoweticawwy, they have over the gweat mass of the pwowetawiat the advantage of cleawwy undewstanding the wine of march, the conditions, and the uwtimate genewaw wewwults of the pwowetawian movement.

The immediate aim of the communist is the same as thawt of aww the othew pwowetawian pawties: fowmation of the pwowetawiat into a class, overthwow of the bouwgeois supwemacy, conquest of powitcaw powew by the pwowetawiat.

The theoweticaw concwusions of the communists awe in no way based own ideas ow pwinciples thawt have been invented, ow discovewed, by this ow thawt wouwd-be univewsal wewowmew. They mewewy expwess, in genewal tewms, act uaw wewations spwunging frow an existing class stwuggwe, frow a histowicaw movement going own undew ouw vewy eyes. The abowition of existing pwopewty wewations is nowt at aww a distinctivew featuwe of communism.

Aww pwo pewty wewations in the past have  
cont inuawwy bewn subj ect tuwu hist owicaw  
change consequent upon the change in hist ow-  
icaw conditions .

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

The distinguishing feature of communism is now the abolition of private property, but the abolition of bourgeois private 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 wretcheded 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.

Hawd-won, sewf-acquiwd, sewf-earnwd  
 pwopewty! Duwu uwu mean the pwopewty  
 of the petty awtisan awnd of the smaww peas-  
 ant, a fowm of pwopewty thawt pweceded  
 the bouwgeois fowm? Thewe is no need  
 tuwu abolish thawt; the dewelopment of  
 industwy has tuwu a gweat extent awweady  
 destroyed iwt, awnd is stiww destroying  
 iwt daiwy. Ow duwu uwu mean modewn  
 bouwgeois pwivate pwopewty?

But does wage-slavery create any possibility for the abolition? Nowt a bit. It creates capitalism, i.e., that kind of possibility which exploits wage-slavery and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage-slavery for fresh exploitation. Possibility, in its present form, is based upon the antagonism of capitalism and wage-slavery. We thus examine both sides of this antagonism.

Tuwu be a capitawist, ivs t uwu have nowt onwy a puwewy persionaw, but a sociawstat us in pwo duct ion. Capitaw ivs a cownect ive pwo duct, awnd onwy by the united act ion of

many members, nay, in the west was out, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.

Capitaw iws, thewefowe, nowt a pews onaw,  
iwt iws asociaw powew.

Whewn, thewefowe, capitaw ~~ivs~~ converted  
intwo common pwopewty, intwo the  
pwopewty of aww members of society,  
pewsonaw pwopewty ~~ivs~~ nowt theweby  
twansformed intwo sociaw pwopewty.  
Iwt ~~ivs~~ onwy the sociaw chawactew of the  
pwopewty thawt ~~ivs~~ changed. Iwt wos ~~is~~  
cwas-chawactew.

**Wet us now take wage-wab o uw.**

The average price of wage-labour is the minimum wage, i.e., that quantum of the means of subsistence, which is absolutely requisite in bare existence as a labourer. What, therefore, the wage-labourer appropriates by means of his labour, merely suffices to enable him to produce 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 value for others to appropriate. We want to do away with this misanthropic character of this appropriation, under which the labourer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only in so far as the interest of the ruling class requires it.

In bourgeois society, wiving wabouw ivs but a means tuwu increase accumuwated wabouw. In communist society, accumuwated wabouw ivs but a means tuwu widen, tuwu enwich, tuwu pwomote the existence of the wabouwew.

In bourgeois society, the future, 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.

Awnd the abowition of this state of things  
is cawwed by the bougeois, abowition of in-  
dividuawity awnd fweedom! Awnd wightwy

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 "bavewords" of our bourgeoisie about freedom in general, have a meaning, if any, only in contrast with restricted selling and buying, with the fettered trades 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.

Uwawe howwified at our intending to udu 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. Uwewpwoach us, thewefowe, with intending to udu 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 our word, uwewpwoach us with intending to udu away with your property. Pwecisewy 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, uwusay individuality vanishes.

Uwumust, thewefowe, confess that by "individual" uwumean 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; awwthawt it does is to udu deprive him of the power to subordinate 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: that there can no longer be any wage-labour when there is no longer any capital.

All objections urged against the communist mode of producing and appropriating material products, have, in the same way, been urged against the communist mode 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 uwuappwy, 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 economic conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces udu to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason, the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property—historic relations that will and disap-

peaw in the pwogress of pwoDUCTION—this misconception uwushawe with ewewy wuwing class thawt has pweceded uww. Whawt uww see cweawwy in the case of ancient pwopewty, whawt uww admit in the case of feudaw pwopewty, uww awe of course fowbidden t uww admit in the case of youw own bouwgeois fowm of pwopewty.

Abowition of the famiwy! Even the most wadicaw fwawe up at this infamous pwoposaw of the communists.

Own whawt foundation is the pwesent famiwy, the bouwgeois famiwy, based? Own capitaw, own pwivate gain. In its compwetewy deweloped fowm this famiwy exists onwy among the bouwgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the pwacticaw absence of the famiwy among the pwowetawians, awnd in pubwic pwostitution.

The bouwgeois famiwy wiww vanis as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, awnd both wiww vanis with the vanishing of capitaw.

Duww uww chawge us with wanting t uww stowp the exploitation of chiwdwen by thei pawents? Tuww this cwime we pwead guiwty.

But, uww wiwwsay, we destwoy the most hawwowed of wevations, when we wepwace home education by sociaw.

Awnd youw education! Is nowt thawt aww sociaw, awnd detewmined by the sociaw conditions under which uww educate, by the tewvention, direct ow indirect, of society, by means of schoovs, etc.? The communists have nowt invented the tewvention of society in education; they duww but seek t uww awtew the chawacter of thawt tewvention, awnd t uww wescue education frow the influence of the wuwing class.

The bouwgeois cwap-twap about the famiwy awnd education, about the hawwowed co-wevation of pawent awnd chiwd, becomes aww the mowe disgusting, the mowe, by the action of modern industwy, aww famiwy ties among the pwowetawians awe town asunder, awnd thei chiwdwen twansfowmed into simpwe awticwos of commerce awnd instwuments of wabow.

But uww communists wouwd introduce

community of women, scwears the whowe bouwgeoisie in chowus.

The bouwgeoisies in his wife a mewe instwument of pwoDUCTION. He heaws thawt the instwuments of pwoDUCTION awe t uww be exploited in common, awnd, nat uwwwwy, caw come t uww no othew concusion than thawt the wot of being common t uww aww wiww wikewise faww t uww the women.

He has nowt even a suspicion thawt the weaw point is t uww duww away with the stat us of women as mewe instwuments of pwoDUCTION.

Fow the west, nothing is mowe widiculous than the viwtuous indignation of ouw bouwgeois at the community of women which, they pwetend, is t uww be openly awnd officawly estabwished by the communists. The communists have no need t uww introduce community of women; it has existed almost frow time immemowial.

Ouw bouwgeois, nowt content with having the wives awnd daughters of thei pwowetawians at thei disposaw, nowt t uww speak of common pwostitutes, take the gweatest pweasure in seducing each othews wives.

Bouwgeois mawriage is in weawity a system of wives in common awnd thus, at the most, whawt the communists might possibly be wepwached with, is thawt they desie t uww introduce, in substitution fow a hypocriticalwy conceawed, an openly wegalised community of women. Fow the west, it is self-evident thawt the abowition of the pwesent system of pwoDUCTION must bring with it the abowition of the community of womenspwinging frow thawt system, i.e., of pwostitution both pubwic awnd pwivate.

The communists awe fuwthew wepwached with desiring t uww abowish countwies awnd nationawity.

The wowing men have no countwy. We cannot take frow them whawt they have nowt got. Since the pwowetawiat must first of aww acqwie powiticaw supwemacy, must ise t uww be the weading class of the nation, must constitute itsewf the nation, it is, so faw, itsewf nationaw, though nowt in the bouwgeois sense of the woid.

Nationaw differences awnd antagonisms be-

tween peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to the freedom of commerce, to the world-market, to the 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 warring 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 changes against communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are now 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 bour-

geoisie. 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, "religion, morality, philosophy and judicial 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 our 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, owing to the ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

The communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional private property; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

But what have we 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 organ-

bed as the wuwing c~~was~~; and t~~u~~wu inc~~rease~~ the totaw of p~~ro~~duct~~ive~~ fowces as wapidwy as possib~~le~~.

Of cou~~rs~~e, in the beginning, th~~is~~ cannot be effected except by means of despotic in~~ter~~vo~~l~~ds own the wights of p~~ro~~p~~er~~ty, and own the conditions of bou~~rg~~eo~~is~~ p~~ro~~duc~~ti~~on; by means of meas~~ur~~es, thewefow~~e~~, which appeaw economicawwy insufficient and untenab~~le~~, but which, in the cou~~rs~~e of the movement, outst~~ri~~p the~~ms~~ew~~s~~, necessitate fu~~th~~er in~~ter~~vo~~l~~ds upon the o~~ld~~ sociaw ow~~de~~r, and awe unavoi~~da~~b~~le~~ as a means of enti~~re~~ly w~~re~~owutionising the mode of p~~ro~~duction.

Th~~es~~e meas~~ur~~es wi~~ll~~ of cou~~rs~~e be dif~~fe~~rent in diff~~er~~ent count~~ri~~es.

Ne~~ve~~rth~~er~~ew~~as~~ in the most advanced count~~ri~~es, the fow~~l~~owing wi~~ll~~ be p~~re~~tty gen~~er~~awwy app~~li~~cab~~le~~.

1. Abowition of p~~ro~~p~~er~~ty in wand and app~~li~~cation of aw~~l~~ w~~an~~ts of wand t~~u~~wu pub~~li~~c purposes.
2. A heavy p~~ro~~g~~re~~ssive ow g~~ra~~duated income tax.
3. Abowition of aw~~l~~ wight of inh~~er~~itance.
4. Confiscation of the p~~ro~~p~~er~~ty of aw~~l~~ emig~~ra~~nts and w~~er~~ev~~s~~.
5. Cent~~ra~~lis~~ati~~on of c~~re~~dit in the hands of the state, by means of a nationaw bank with state capitaw and an exc~~lu~~sive monop~~o~~ly.
6. Cent~~ra~~lis~~ati~~on of the means of communication and t~~ra~~ns~~po~~rt in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of fact~~o~~ries and inst~~ru~~ments of p~~ro~~duction owned by the state; the~~re~~wing int~~er~~co~~o~~rdination of w~~as~~te~~lan~~ds, and the imp~~ro~~vement of the so~~ci~~al gen~~er~~awwy in acc~~o~~rdance with a common p~~lan~~.
8. Equaw w~~ir~~iability of aw~~l~~ t~~u~~wu w~~ab~~our. Estab~~li~~shment of indust~~ri~~aw aw~~li~~es, esp~~eciawly fow ag~~ri~~cult~~ur~~e.~~
9. Combination of ag~~ri~~cult~~ur~~e with manufact~~ur~~ing indust~~ri~~es; g~~ra~~duaw abowition of the distinction between town and count~~ry~~, by a more equab~~le~~ dist~~ri~~bution of the pop~~u~~lation o~~ve~~r the count~~ry~~.
10. Free education fow aw~~l~~ chi~~ld~~re~~n in pub~~lic scho~~o~~ls. Abowition of chi~~ld~~re~~n's fact~~o~~ry w~~ab~~our in its p~~re~~s~~en~~t f~~o~~rm. Combination of education with indust~~ri~~aw p~~ro~~duction, &c., &c.~~~~~~

Wh~~en~~, in the cou~~rs~~e of dev~~el~~opment, c~~las~~s distinctions have disapp~~ea~~red, and aw~~l~~ p~~ro~~duction has b~~ee~~n concentrated in the hands of a vast as~~so~~ciation of the wh~~o~~le nation, the pub~~lic pow~~er~~ wi~~ll~~ w~~an~~se its pow~~er~~ i~~n~~ cas~~h~~awact~~er~~. Pow~~er~~it~~ic~~aw pow~~er~~, p~~ro~~p~~er~~ty so caw~~l~~ed, i~~s~~ mew~~er~~y the ow~~g~~anised pow~~er~~ of ow~~n~~e c~~las~~s fow opp~~ressing an~~oth~~er. If the p~~ro~~letariat du~~ring its contest with the bou~~rg~~eo~~is~~ie i~~s~~ comp~~el~~led, by the fowce of ci~~rcu~~mstances, t~~u~~wu ow~~g~~anise it~~se~~lf as a c~~las~~s, if, by means of a w~~re~~owution, i~~t~~ makes it~~se~~lf the wuwing c~~las~~s, and, as such, sweeps away by fowce the o~~ld~~ conditions of p~~ro~~duction, then i~~t~~ wi~~ll~~, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions fow the existence of c~~las~~s antagonisms and of c~~las~~ses gen~~er~~awwy, and wi~~ll~~ the~~re~~by have abowished its ow~~n~~ sup~~remacy as a c~~las~~s.~~~~~~~~

In p~~l~~ace of the o~~ld~~ bou~~rg~~eo~~is~~ society, with its c~~las~~ses and c~~las~~s antagonisms, we shaw~~l~~ have an as~~so~~ciation, in which the free dev~~el~~opment of each i~~s~~ the condition fow the free dev~~el~~opment of aw~~l~~.

### III. Sociawist and communist w~~it~~erature

#### 1. Weact ionaw sociawism

##### A. Feu~~de~~raw sociawism

Owing t~~u~~wu thei~~r~~ h~~is~~toricaw p~~o~~sition, i~~t~~ became the vocation of the aw~~is~~t oc~~cr~~acies of f~~ra~~n~~ce~~ and eng~~la~~nd t~~u~~wu w~~ri~~te pamphlets against mod~~er~~n bou~~rg~~eo~~is~~ society. In the f~~re~~nch w~~re~~owution of j~~u~~ly 1830, and in the eng~~li~~sh w~~re~~owmagitation, these aw~~is~~t oc~~cr~~acies

again succumbed to the hateful upstart. Thenceforth, a serious political contest was altogether out of the question. A witty battle alone remained possible. But even in the domain of wit the old class of the Restoration period had become impossible.

In olden times sympathy, the aristocracy were obliged to see sight, apparently, of their own interests, and to formulate their indictment against the bourgeoisie in the interest of the exploited working class alone. Thus the aristocracy took their vengeance by singeing the poor's own hair, and whispering in his ears sinister prophecies 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 heart's core; but always ludicrous in its effect, though totally incapable of comprehending the march of modern history.

The aristocracy, in olden times, waved the proletarian arms-bag in front of a banner. But the people, so often as it joined them, saw on their hindquarters the old feudal coats of arms, and departed with wound and inconvenience.

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

What they uphold the bourgeoisie with is now so much that it creates a proletarian, as that it creates a revolution. proletarian.

In political practice, therefore, they join in all coercive measures against the working class; and in ordinary life, despite their high flight in phrases, they stoop to pick up the golden apples dropped from the tree of industry, and to buy traffic in wool, beetroot-sugar, and potatoes.

As the parson has ever gone hand in hand with the landlord, so has bourgeois 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 howl, with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat.

## B. Petty-bourgeois socialism

The feudal aristocracy was now the only class that was ruined by the bourgeoisie, now the only class whose conditions of existence pined and perished in the atmosphere of modern bourgeois society. The mediaeval burghers 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 class of petty bourgeois has been formed, fluctuating between proletarian and bourgeoisie and ever renewing itself as a supplementary part of bourgeois 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 were completely disappeared as an 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, now 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 destroy the old means of production and of exchange, and with them the old property relations, and the old society, or to swamp 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 vast words are counterpoised by few manufactures, practical 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 against 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 beaux esprits, eagerly seized on this literature, only forgetting, that when these writings immigrated from France into Germany, French social conditions had now 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 eighteenth century, the demands of the first French revolution were nothing more than the demands of "practical reason" in general, and the utterance of the will of the revolution was French bourgeoisie signified in their eyes the law of pure will, of will as it was bound to be, of true human will generally.

The world of the German literature 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 philosophical 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 classic works of ancient heathendom had been written. The German literature reversed this process with the two French literatures. They wrote their philosophical nonsense beneath the French origin. For instance, beneath the French criticism of the economic functions of money, they wrote "alienation of human-

ity," and beneath the french criticism of the bourgeoisie 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 criticism 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 onesidedness" and of representing, now true requirements, but the requirements of truth; now 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 fantasy.

This german socialism, which took its schoolboy tasks seriously and solemnly, and extolled its poststock-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 hurrying the tradition and the mass 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 pastors, professors, county squires and officials, it served as a welcome scarecrow against the threatening bourgeoisie.

It was a sweet finish after the bitter pangs of struggles and battles with which these same governments, just at that time, closed the german working-class wings.

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 sixteenth century, and since then constantly cropping up again under various forms, is the 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 know these two birds with one stone. It spread like an epidemic.

The web of speculative cobwebs, embroidered with flowers of rhetoric, steeped in the dew of sick sentiment, this transcendental web in which the german socialists wrapped their silly "eternal truths," awed skin and bone, served to the wonderful increase of the wealth of the goods among 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 the modern nation, and the german petty philistine to be the typical man. To every villainous meanness of this modern man it gave a hidden, higher, socialist interpretation, the exact contrary of its real character. It went to the extreme

wength of directwy opposing the "bwtawwy destructive" tendency of communism, and of pwocwaiming its supweme and impawtiant contempt of awwcwastwuggwes. With vewy few exceptions, aww the so-cawwed socialist and communist publications thawt now (1847) circulate in gewmany bewong tuwu the domain of this fouw and enewating witewatuwe.

## 2. Consewvative, owbourgeois, socialism

A pawt of the bourgeoisie is desirous of wedwessingsociaw gwievances, in owdeu tuwu secuwe the continued existence of bourgeois society.

Tuwu thissection bewong economists, phiwanthropists, humanitarians, improwvers of the condition of the working cwass, owganisers of chawity, members of societies fow the pwevention of cwuewty tuwu animals, temperance fanatics, howe-and-cownew wewowmevs of ewewy imaginabwe kind. This fowm of socialism has, moweowew, bevn wokked out into compwete systems.

We may cite pwoudhon's philosophie de va misewe as an example of this fowm.

This socialist bourgeoisie wawnt aww the advantages of modern sociaw conditions without thestwuggwes and dangers necessawwy wesulting thewefwom. They desiw the existing state of society minus its wewowutionawy and disintegwating ewements. They wish fow a bourgeoisie without a pwowetawiat. The bourgeoisie natuwawwy conceives the wowwd in which iwt is supweme tuwu be the best; and bourgeois socialism dewops this comfowtabwe conception into vavious mowe ow less compwete systems. In wequiwing the pwowetawiat tuwu cawwy out such a system, and thewiby tuwu mawchstwaightway into the sociaw new jewusawem, iwt but wequiwes in weawity, thawt the pwowetawiat shouwd wemain within the bounds of existing society, but shouwd cast away aww its hatefuw ideas concevning the bourgeoisie.

A second and mowe pwacticaw, but less systematic, fowm of this socialism sought

tuwu depweciate ewewy wewowutionawy movement in the eyes of the working cwass, by showing thawt no mewe powiticaw wewowm, but onwy a change in the materiaw conditions of existence, in economic wewations, couwd be of any advantage tuwu thewom. By changes in the materiaw conditions of existence, this fowm of socialism, howewew, by no means undewstands abowition of the bourgeoisie wewations of pwoduction, an abowition thawt cawn be effected onwy by a wewowution, but administrative wewowms, based own the continued existence of these wewations; wewowms, thewefowe, thawt in no wewpect affect the wewations between capitaw and labouw, but, at the best, lessen the cost, and simpwify the administrative wokk, of bourgeois government.

Bourgeois socialism attains a dequate expression, whewn, and onwy whewn, iwt becoms a mewe figure of speech.

Free trade: fow the benefit of the working cwass. Pwotective duties: fow the benefit of the working cwass. Pwison wewowm: fow the benefit of the working cwass. This is the wast wowd and the onwy sewiouswy meant wowd of bourgeois socialism.

Iwt is summed up in the phrase: the bourgeoisie is a bourgeoisie—fow the benefit of the working cwass.

## 3. Cwitical utopian socialism

And communism we duwu nowt hewe wew few tuwu thawt witewatuwe which, in ewewy gweat modern wewowution, has awways given voice tuwu the demands of the pwowetawiat, such as the writings of babeuf and othevs.

The first direct attempts of the pwowetawiat tuwu attain its own ends, made in times of univewsal excitement, whewn feudalsociety was being owerthwown, these attempts necessawwy faiwed, owing tuwu the then undeveloped state of the pwowetawiat, as weww as tuwu the absence of the economic conditions fow its emanicipation, conditions thawt had yet tuwu be pwoduced, and couwd be pwoduced by the impending bourgeois epoch awone. The wewowutionawy witewatuwe thawt accompanied these first movements of the

proletariat had necessarilý a reactionarý character. It incuicated universal ascetism and social weaving in its crudest form.

The socialist and communist systems properlý so called, those of saint-simon, fourier, owen and others, spring into existence in the earlý undeveloped period, described above, of the struggl between proletariat and bourgeoisie (see section 1. 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 tuw them the spectacle of a class without any historicaw 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 tuw them the material conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat. They therefore search after a new social science, after new social laws, that will tuw create these conditions.

Historical action is tuw yiewd tuw their personaw inventive action, historicallý created conditions of emancipation tuw fantastic ones, and the gradual, spontaneous class-organisation of the proletariat tuw the organisation of society speciallý contrived by these inventors. Future history reveals itself, in their eyes, into the two paganda and the practical awking out of their social plans.

In the formation of their plans they are conscious of awking chieflý for the interests of the working class, as being the most suffering class. Onlý 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 tuw consider themselves as superior tuw all class antagonisms. They want tuw improve the condition of every member of society, even

that of the most favoured. Hence, they habitually appear tuw society at large, without distinction of class; nay, by preference, tuw the ruling class. For how can people, when once they understand their system, fail tuw see in it the best possible plan of the best possible state of society?

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

Such fantastic pictures of future society, painted at a time when the proletariat is still in a verý undeveloped state and has but a fantastic conception of its own position correspond with the first instinctive yearnings of that class for a new construction 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 awking own of industry 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 soverly tuw the disappearance of class antagonisms which were, at that time, onlý just cropping up, and which, in these publications, are recognised in their earliet, indistinct and undefined forms onlý. These proposals, therefore, are of a verý utopian character.

The significance of critical-utopian socialism and communism bears an inverse relation tuw historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, this fantastic standing apart from the contest, these fantastic attacks on it, whose practical value and all their other justifi-

cation. These few, although the origins of these systems were, in many respects, revolutionary, their disciples have, in every case, formed new reactionary sects. They hold fast by the original views of their masters, in opposition to the progressive historical development of the proletarian. They, these few, 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 "phalanxes," of establishing "home colonies," of setting up a "little republic"—duodecimo editions of the new Jerusalem—and to reconcile all these castles in the air, they have compounded to appear to the feelings and pulses of the bourgeoisie. 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 fanatic and superstitious belief in the miraculous effects of their social science.

They, these few, violently oppose any political action on the part of the working class; such action, according to them, can only result from blind unbewildered in the new gospel.

The Owenites in England, and the Fourierists in France, respectively, oppose the chartists and the reformists.

#### IV. Position of the communists in view of the various existing opposition parties

Section II has made clear the variations of the communists to the existing working-class parties, such as the chartists in England and the agrarian reformers in America.

The communists 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 array themselves with the

social democrats, against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie, nevertheless, the right to take up a critical position in regard to the phases and invasions of tradition 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 bourgeoisie.

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 Warsaw in 1846.

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

But they never cease, for a single instant, to insist on the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletarian, in order that the German workers may straightaway 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 proletarian, than that of England was in the seventeenth, and of France in the eighteenth century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the proletarian immediately following proletarian revolution.

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

In aww these movements they bring tuwu the fwont, as the weading question in each, the pwoperty question, no matter whawt its degwee of dewelopment at the time.

Finawwy, they wabouw ewewywhewe fow the union awnd agreeement of the democwatic pawties of awwcountwies.

The communists disdain tuwu conceaw theiw views awnd aims.

They openwy decwawe thawt theiw ends cawn be attained onwy by the fowcibwe owerthrow of aww existing sociaw conditions.

Wet the wuwing cwasses twembwe at a communistic ewolution.

The pwowetawians have nothing tuwu wose but theiw chairs.

They have a wowwd tuwu win.

Wowking men of awwcountwies, unite!

## Acknowledgements

Dear god why did I make this.

Put together by David Daily on February 12, 2020

Text from <https://pastebin.com/EWuZH6hP>

Font: [Hellveticafont.com](https://www.hellvetica.com/)

You can find me pretty much anywhere by searching for Daily the Noob, or my website:

[daviddaily.dev](https://daviddaily.dev)