

The Little Red Library

No. 3.

Principles of Communism

By FREDERICK ENGELS

[Engels' Original Draft of the
Communist Manifesto]

Translated by
MAX BEDACHT



PRICE 10 CENTS

PUBLISHED FOR
THE WORKERS PARTY OF AMERICA

BY

The Daily Worker Publishing Co.
CHICAGO, ILL.

INTRODUCTION

The years immediately preceding the revolutionary period of 1848 were years of indescribable political misery in Germany. Its several dozens of miniature monarchs were just that many bulwarks of reaction, so much so, that even thinking of a political change was regarded as a major crime and prosecuted as such. It is true there existed a budding capitalist class which dreamt of a unified nation and that possessed aspirations toward acquiring the political rule over this nation. But the behavior of the German bourgeoisie towards its hereditary parasitical princelings has ever been characterized by cowardice, and this cowardice enhanced by fear of the independent revolutionary ambitions of the newly developing proletariat, resulted in the bourgeoisie never permitting its dreams to become inspirations to action. And even when in an unguarded moment they were drawn into the turmoil of the revolutionary struggles in the days of March, 1848, the bourgeois quickly became frightened by their own courage and repaid in decades of slavish servility for the moments of insubordination.

In this stifling atmosphere of pre-revolutionary Germany it was impossible for men with spirit and intelligence to live. For the privilege of thinking, speaking or writing, the best men of the nation paid the price of exile in this period. One need only mention the names of Karl Marx and Heinrich Heine as examples.

During this epoch when the old semi-feudal order in Germany was pregnant with the new, capitalist order, revolutionary thinking was not confined solely to the proletarian elements. The revolutionary circles of German refugees in the large cities of Europe, in Brussels, Paris, London, were therefore by no means heterogeneous groups. Alongside of the proletarian elements, the

revolutionary bourgeois intellectuals were quite numerous. Among the proletarian elements it was the most intelligent and most advanced itinerary journeymen (Handwerksburschen), that dominated. This class, not yet fully proletarianized, had developed its own ideology which found its clearest expression in the theories of one of their number, Wilhelm Weitling, a journeyman tailor.

Thus these groups of emigrant revolutionists developed the queerest ideas and programs for their circles. The Socialist ideas of the ingenious journeyman tailor, Weitling, the teachings and preachings of the revolutionary bourgeois intellectuals in their midst, the influence of the labor movement in the countries in which they lived, like that of the Chartist movement in England and of the Proudhonists or the Blanquists in France—all these together resulted in a theoretical mess extremely conducive to fruitless squabbles that were barren of all practical results and revolutionary activity.

Such were the conditions that prevailed in the circles of revolutionary proletarian emigrants from Germany in Brussels, in Paris and in London in 1847. Repeated attempts were made to unite these groups organizationally, these efforts culminating finally in the organization of the "League of Communists" in 1846. In converting these clubs of philosophizing, debating and quarrelling emigrants into active revolutionary organizations with proletarian predominance, Marx and Engels were tirelessly active. Marx later wrote about these activities as follows:

"We published simultaneously a number of partly printed and partly lithographed pamphlets, in which we subjected the mixture of French-English Socialism, Communism and German philosophy which at that time represented the secret principles of the League to a merciless criticism; in place of this we tried to spread a scientific understanding of the economic structure of bourgeois society as the only firm theoretical basis, and finally we explained in a

popular manner that the question is not the establishment of some Utopian system, but the conscious participation in the historic process of change of society that takes place before our very eyes."

This positive criticism found a ready echo in the League. In January, 1847, its central bureau, in London, dispatched some representatives to Brussels to invite Marx and Engels to join the League. With the development of a more lucid understanding by the members and the clarification of the purpose of the League itself, the need for a unifying program became daily more obvious. Marx's indefatigable efforts in Brussels soon succeeded in transforming the Brussels organization into a proletarian revolutionary club. Engels, meanwhile, had gone to Paris, where old revolutionary illusions and new illusionary theories had created a most disastrous ideological chaos in the heads of the members of the League. Engels did his best to disentangle the prevailing confusion.

In an attempt to give the League of Communists a clear program, the London committee prepared a draft entitled, "Confession of Faith," and sent it to the affiliated clubs for discussion. This draft also reached Paris, where Moses Hess, a "philosophical" Socialist, made what he thought were improvements and prevailed upon the Paris Club to accept this document. But in a later meeting the decision was reversed. Engels writes about the incident in a letter to Marx, dated November, 10, 1847:

"I have played an infernal trick on Mose (Moses Hess). He had forced through a ludicrously improved 'Confession of Faith.' Last Friday I took it up in our circle and criticized question after question. Before I had gone through half of them our people declared themselves satisfied. Without opposition I then had a motion passed instructing me to draft a new one."

Meantime a congress had been called of the League

of the Communists to meet in London on November 30, 1847. The purposes of the gathering were to work out a constitution for the League and to adopt a program. In preparation for this, Marx who came to London for this congress from Brussels, and Engels, who represented the group of Paris, had written separate drafts of such a program. Engels evidently had used as a basis for this draft the one that he had prepared in compliance with the instructions given by the Paris League. On November 24, 1847, Engels wrote to Marx:

“You had better consider this ‘Confession of Faith’ somewhat. I think we had better drop that catechism form and call the thing ‘Communist Manifesto’; for inasmuch as it must deal more or less with history, the previously accepted style does not fit at all. I’ll bring with me the one that I made here. . . I begin: What is Communism? And then right after the proletariat, origin, difference from former workers, development of antagonisms between proletariat and bourgeoisie, crises, conclusions. In between a number of minor points and finally the policies of the Communists. This one from here has not yet been submitted for adoption; but I think nothing is contained in it against our views.”

This last sentence seems to indicate that Engels’ draft made for the London conference is the same one prepared by him for the Parisian League, while the first part of the letter suggests that there was an understanding between the two friends to make individual drafts for the London gathering and that the form of a catechism should be followed by both.

The “Principles of Communism” herewith published for the first time in English evidently represents the draft of Engels. The manuscript written in German was found among Engels’ posthumous papers.

We know now the final and classical form which the program of the Communists took when it was published ultimately as the “Communist Manifesto.” However,

the world fame that this document has achieved does not in the least lessen the value of the Engels' draft.

The Communist Manifesto is a carefully prepared document. Each one of its sentences stands out like a work of art hewn in granite. Although a document prepared for the political struggles of the hour of its publication and though dealing with problems characteristic of a period long past, the manifesto is not only an historic document, but also a timely source of inspiration for the struggles of today.

The draft of Engels is a manuscript written on the spur of the moment and was never put into final form for publication. Yet we find in it a clear outline of the ideas and gems of historical analysis in which the manifesto excels. The Engels' draft is proof that the Communist Manifesto is truly the result of the combined efforts of the great intellectual heroes of scientific Communism: Marx and Engels.

The draft, as contained in the discovered manuscript, is not complete. Question No. 9 is unanswered. Questions twenty-two and twenty-three are answered with a remark referring to an earlier manuscript, and as no such manuscript could be found, these questions remain unanswered. For the sake of completeness we will supply, in an appendix, answers to these questions based upon the writings of Frederick Engels or from the Communist Manifesto.

For the convenience of the readers, and to make possible a clear understanding, a number of explanatory notes have been prepared and printed in the appendix. Clarifying interjections in the text, set in parenthesis, are supplied by the translator.

Chicago, April, 1925.

Max Bedacht.

PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNISM

ENGELS' FIRST DRAFT OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

**Translation, Introduction and Appendix
By MAX BEDACHT**

1. Question: What is Communism?

A n s w e r : Communism is the science of the conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat,

2. Question: What is the proletariat?

A n s w e r : The proletariat is that class in society which derives its means of livelihood solely and exclusively from the sale of its labor (1.), and not from profit due to investment of capital; it is that class of people whose fate, whose life and death, whose very existence depends upon the presence of a demand for labor; it is dependent therefore, on the vicissitudes of prosperous or bad business periods, and on the fluctuations caused by unrestrained competition. In one word: the proletariat, or the class of the proletarians, is the working class of the nineteenth century (and today).

3. Question: Has there then not always been a proletariat?

A n s w e r : No. Poor and working classes have always been existent and the working classes were most always poor. But such poor, and such workers as live under the conditions just outlined—proletarians, have not always existed, just as competition was not always free and unrestricted.

4. Question: How did the proletariat originate?

A n s w e r : The proletariat had its origin in the industrial revolution which occurred in the latter half of the past (18th) century in England, and which has since been repeated in all civilized countries of the world.

This industrial revolution was caused by the invention of the steam engine, the different spinning machines, the mechanical loom and a host of other mechanical contrivances. These machines, which because of their expensiveness could be installed only by the big capitalists, changed the hitherto prevailing mode of production. They replaced the workers, because the machines could produce products at a lower cost and with greater efficiency than the workers could produce them with their imperfect spinning wheels and weaving looms. The machines delivered the control of industry into the hands of the big capitalists and turned the little possessions of the workers, their tools, looms, etc., into just that much worthless junk. Thus the capitalists soon got possession of everything, while nothing was left for the worker. By this process the factory system was introduced in the production of clothing. After the first step was once taken in the introduction of machinery and the establishment of the factory system, the new methods of production were soon adopted in all other branches of industry, in calico printing, book production, in ceramic works, and in the making of metal products. Labor was more and more divided, so that the worker who formerly made and finished the complete product, now only worked on a part of it. This division of labor made possible an increase in speed and a consequent reduction in cost. It reduced the activity of the individual worker to a very simple, and incessantly repeated mechanical manipulation which could be done by a machine, not only just as well, but even better. In this way all these branches of industry gradually fell under the domination of steam-power, of machinery and the factory system, as had spinning and weaving before. At the same time they came completely under the control of the big capitalists, and in these industries also, the workers lost the last remnant of independence. Besides manufacture (2.), the crafts, too, gradually fell more and more under the domination of the factory system, for here, as well, the big

capitalists crowded out the little independent craftsman by the establishment of big shops where costs could be reduced and labor divided. Thus we finally reach a point where in the civilized countries almost all branches of production are carried on in factories, and where the individual craftsman with hand production is replaced by production in big industrial establishments. By this process the middle classes, and especially the small establishments, are more and more forced into ruin; the former position of the workers is completely changed and two new classes are created which gradually swallow all other classes.

1. The class of big capitalists, which in all civilized countries is at this moment in almost exclusive possession of the means of subsistence, of all raw materials and all tools (machines, factories). This is the class of the bourgeois, or the bourgeoisie.

2. The class of the completely propertyless, which depends for its necessary means of livelihood on the chance of selling its labor (labor power) to the bourgeois. This class is called the class of proletarians or the proletariat.

5. **Question:** Under what conditions does the sale of labor of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie take place?

Answer: Labor (labor power) is a commodity like every other commodity; its price is determined, therefore, by the very same laws as is the price of all other commodities. Price under the domination of big industry or free competition—which is one and the same thing as we will see later—is on the average always equal to the cost of production. The price of labor (labor power) therefore, is likewise equal to the cost of production of labor (labor power); the cost of the production of labor power is thus equal to just that amount of means of subsistence that is needed to enable the worker to toil and that prevents the class of workers from dying out. Therefore the worker receives for his labor not more than is needed for this purpose. The price of labor, or wages, therefore, is the lowest, the minimum needed to

live (3). Since business is sometimes better and sometimes worse, the worker gets a little more or a little less for his labor just as the factory owner gets a little more or less for his wares. But just as the factory owner gets on the average not any more nor any less than his cost of production whether business is good or bad, so the worker receives on the average not more nor less than this minimum. This economic law will be applied with continually increasing rigor as big industry takes hold of all lines of production.

6. Question: What kind of a working class existed before the industrial revolution?

A n s w e r : Always dependent upon the different stages of development of society, the laboring classes have lived under different conditions and under different relations to the propertied and ruling classes.

In ancient times the workers were the slaves of their owners, as they still are in some backward countries and even in the southern part of the United States up to this day (1847). In the middle ages the workers were the serfs of the landed aristocracy, as is still the case in Hungary, Poland and Russia (1847). Besides, during the middle ages and up to the industrial revolution there were the journeymen in the cities working for petty bourgeois artisans. Gradually with the development of manufacture (hand production on a larger scale) there came the hand workers, employed by the bigger capitalists.

7. Question: In what does the proletarian differ from the slave?

A n s w e r : The slave is sold once and for all—the proletarian must sell himself hourly and daily. The slave is the property of his master and no matter how miserable his existence may be, it is securely guaranteed by the interests of this master.

The individual proletarian, the property of the whole bourgeois class, so to speak, whose labor is bought only when needed, has no such secure existence. This exist-

ence is secure only for the working class as a whole. The slave stands outside of competition, the proletarian stands within it and feels all its fluctuations. The slave is a chattel and not a member of society while the proletarian—as a person—is recognized as a member of society. The slave may therefore have a better existence than the proletarian, yet the proletarian is part of a higher stage of social development and stands higher than the slave. The slave frees himself by abolishing, of all private property only chattel slavery, thus making himself a proletarian—the proletarian can free himself only by abolishing private property as a whole.

8. Question: In what does the proletarian differ from the serf?

A n s w e r : The serf is given ownership and use of a means of production, a quantity of land in return for part of the proceeds or in exchange for labor. The proletarian works with instruments of production belonging to someone else and works for the account of this someone else—in return for part of the proceeds. The serf gives—the proletarian receives. The serf has a secure existence; the proletarian has not. The serf stands outside of all competition; the proletarian stands within it. The serf frees himself either by running away into the cities where he becomes an artisan, or by changing tithe in products and labor into rent in money thus becoming a tenant, or by driving the feudal lord from his estate, making himself the proprietor; in short by entering, in one way or another, into the propertied class and into competition. The proletarian frees himself by abolishing competition, private property and all class differences.

9. Question: In what does the proletarian differ from the craftsman? (The manuscript does not contain any answer) (4.).

10. Question: In what does the proletarian differ from the worker in manufacture? (see note).

A n s w e r : The worker, in the period of manufacture, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, was almost

everywhere in possession of his instruments of production, his loom, spinning wheels for his family, a little piece of land that he cultivated in his spare hours. The proletarian does not possess any of these things. The worker in the period of manufacture lived for the most part in the country and in a more or less patriarchal relation with his landlord or employer. The proletarian lives, as a rule, in the large cities and his relations to his employer are mere money relations. The worker in the period of manufacture, pulled out of his patriarchal conditions by big industry, was deprived of the property he still possessed and by that process was made a proletarian.

11. Question: What were the immediate results of the industrial revolution and of the division of society into bourgeois and proletarians?

A n s w e r : First: The continued diminishing of the prices of industrial products caused by machine production resulted in a complete destruction of the old industry based upon hand production. All half barbarian countries which have heretofore more or less withstood historical evolution, and whose industry was up to now dependent on hand labor, were thus forcibly taken out of their isolation. They bought the cheaper products of the Englishmen and condemned their own hand workers to ruin. In this way countries which have not progressed for thirty centuries, like India, are thoroughly revolutionized; even China is now approaching a revolution because of this process. It goes so far that a machine invented today in England within one year robs millions of workers in China of their bread. In this manner big industry has brought all nations of the earth into close connection, has thrown all little local markets together into one world market, has spread civilization and progress everywhere and has created a condition wherein everything that happens in civilized countries must have its effects in other countries, so that when now (1848) the workers of England or France free themselves it will cause revo-

lutions in other countries which must end sooner or later with the emancipation of the workers there.

Second: Everywhere where big industry has replaced hand labor, it has increased the riches and power of the bourgeoisie to the highest degree and has made it the dominating class in the land. The result of this has been that wherever this process has taken place the bourgeoisie has gotten the political power into its hands and has crowded out the hitherto ruling classes, the nobility and the guild masters and their representative, the absolute monarchy. The bourgeoisie destroyed the power of the aristocracy, the nobles, by abolishing the laws of primogeniture, by permitting division and sale of the landed estates and by abolishing all privileges of the nobles. It destroyed the power of the guild burghers by dissolving the guilds and abolishing craft monopolies. In place of both, it established free competition, that is to say, it established that condition of society wherein everyone has the right to take up any branch of production and wherein nothing can prevent him in this except the lack of necessary capital. The establishment of free competition therefore is a public declaration that from now on the members of society are merely unequal as far as their capital is unequal, that capital is the decisive power and that the bourgeoisie has become the first class in society. Free competition is necessary for the beginning of big industry because it is the only condition under which big industry can develop. The bourgeoisie, after it thus had destroyed the social power of nobility and the guild burghers, proceeded to the destruction of their political power. As it had elevated itself to the first class in society it proclaimed itself politically also as the first class. It did this by the establishment of a representative form of government which is based on civil equality before the law, and the recognition by law of free competition. This type of government was introduced into Europe in the form of the constitutional monarchy. In these constitutional monarchies only those

have the franchise who possess a certain amount of capital, only the bourgeois.(5). These bourgeois elect the deputies—and these bourgeois deputies establish a bourgeois government by virtue of their right of refusal to grant taxes (6).

Third: Everywhere it develops the proletariat in the same degree as it develops the bourgeoisie. To the same degree as the bourgeoisie grows richer the proletariat becomes more numerous. Inasmuch as the proletariat can be employed only by capital, and inasmuch as capital can increase only when it employs workers, the increase of the proletariat keeps pace with the increase of capital. At the same time it draws bourgeoisie and proletariat into big cities where industry can be carried on most advantageously. Thru this amassing of many proletarians at one point the latter are brought to a consciousness of their power. The more new machines are invented which replace hand work, the more industry develops and presses wages down to the minimum thus making the position of the proletariat more and more unbearable. In this way it prepares, on the one hand, by the growing dissatisfaction, on the other by the growing power of the proletariat, a revolutionization of society by the proletariat.

12. Question: What were the further results of the industrial revolution?

A n s w e r : Industry created in the steam engine the means by which it could increase industrial production within a short space of time infinitely. Free competition necessarily growing out of big industry soon took on a violent character as a result of the ease of production. Many capitalists took up the same industry and in a short time more was produced than was needed. The result was that the products could not be sold and a so-called commercial crisis appeared. Factories were shut down, factory owners were driven to bankruptcy and the workers lost their bread. Extensive misery prevailed everywhere. After a while the surplus products were

sold, the factories operated again, wages went up gradually and business was better than ever. But not for long. There were again too many products and a new crisis was at hand taking the same course as the previous one. Since the beginning of this century the industries thus continually moved back and forth between epochs of crises and epochs of prosperity. Such a crisis appears regularly every five to seven years accompanied every time by great misery for the workers and by general revolutionary excitement endangering society itself.

13. Question: What follows from these regularly appearing commercial crises?

Answer: First: Although in its first stage it created free competition, big industry has now outgrown this. Competition and control of industrial production by individuals has become a fetter which it must and shall break; big industry as long as it is continued on the present basis can maintain itself only by periodical disorders repeating themselves from every five to seven years, endangering the whole civilization and not only throwing the proletarians into misery, but also ruining a great number of bourgeois. Therefore, big industry has either to give up its existence—which is an absolute impossibility—or it needs an entirely new organization of society in which production is no longer controlled and directed by competing factory owners, but is carried on by society itself on the basis of a definite plan and in accordance with public needs.

Second: Big industry by the chances it created for an indefinite extension of production makes possible a condition in society in which so much of all necessities of life can be produced that every member of society will be put into a position where he can develop and apply all his abilities and talents freely, so that just those qualities of big industry which in present society cause all the misery and commercial crises will be the ones that in a new social order will destroy this misery and these disastrous oscillations (changes from prosperity

to crisis). It is clear therefore:

1. That from now on all these evils can be accounted for only by a social order no longer adapted to conditions, and

2. That the forces are at hand to eliminate all these evils through a new social order. (7.)

14. Question: Of what kind will be this new order?

A n s w e r : It will first of all take the direction and control of industry and of all branches of production out of the hands of competing individuals and manage them by society itself, that is, for society as a whole, according to a common plan and by participation of all the members of society. Thus it will discontinue competition and replace it by co-operation. Inasmuch as the direction of industries by individuals necessarily provides private property and inasmuch as competition is nothing more than the form that the direction of industry takes under private ownership therefore private ownership of industries and competition are inseparable. Private property therefore must also be abolished and in its place must be put common use of all means of production and distribution of all products according to mutual agreement, so-called common ownership. Abolition of private property, in fact, is the shortest and most precise circumscription of the social change necessitated by the development of industry. It is therefore truthfully the chief demand of the Communists.

15. Question: So abolition of private property was not possible before now?

A n s w e r : No. Every change in the social order, every fundamental change in the forms of property was the necessary result of the creation of new productive forces which could no longer be controlled by the old forms of property. Thus private property itself originated. Private property (in the present form) has not always existed. When toward the end of the middle ages a new mode of production was created in manufacture, a mode which did not permit of itself to be adapted to the

existing forms of feudal property and guild monopolies, then this new form of production which had outgrown old forms of property, created for itself a new form: (modern) private property. For manufacture and for the first stage of development of big industry no other form of property was possible than private property and no other form of society than one based on private property. As long as production is not plentiful enough to supply not only all needs, but also to amass a surplus for the increase of social capital and for the further development of the productive forces, so long must there exist on the one hand a class controlling these productive forces and on the other a poor and exploited class.

The character of these classes depends upon the stage of development of production. The middle ages dependent on agriculture, presented to us the baron and the serf; the cities of the later middle ages showed us the guild master with the journeyman and the day laborer; the seventeenth century had the manufacturer and the hand worker; the nineteenth century has the big factory owner and the proletarian. It is clear that previous to this time the productive forces had not been developed to the point that enough for all could be produced and that private property had become a fetter for the productive forces. But now, when firstly capitalist and productive forces are created as never before and when means are at hand to increase these productive forces within a short time indefinitely, and when, secondly, these productive forces are gathered into the hands of a few bourgeois while the big mass of the people are ever more driven into the class of the proletariat, while their position grows more miserable and unbearable, as wealth of the bourgeois constantly increases, and when, thirdly, these gigantic and easily increasing productive forces have outgrown private property and the bourgeoisie in such a degree that every moment they cause the most violent disturbances in the social order through this development of big industry the abolition of private prop-

erty has become not only possible but absolutely necessary.

16. Question. Will the abolition of private property be possible by peaceful means?

A n s w e r : It is desirable that the abolition of private property be brought peacefully, and the Communists surely are the last ones who would object to this method. The Communists know too well that all conspiracies are not only useless but even harmful. They know too well that revolutions are not made intentionally and willfully, but that they are everywhere and at all times the necessary results of circumstances which are entirely independent of the will and direction of individual parties and whole classes. But at the same time the Communists see that the development of the proletariat in almost all civilized countries is violently suppressed and that thus the opponents of the Communists are working with all power toward making a (violent) revolution necessary. When the suppressed proletariat is finally driven into a (violent) revolution then the Communists shall defend the cause of the proletariat with their deeds as well as with words (8).

17. Question: Will the abolition of private property be possible with one stroke?

A n s w e r : No. Just as little is this possible as it is to multiply sufficiently the existing productive forces at one stroke as would be necessary for the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth. The proletarian revolution will therefore only gradually transform present society and will abolish private property only after it has created the necessary amount of means of production.

18. Question. Along what lines will this revolution develop?

A n s w e r : It will first of all establish a democratic constitution and thus either directly or indirectly establish the political rule of the proletariat. Directly, mainly where the proletariat even at this moment makes up a

majority of the people; indirectly, in France and in Germany where the majority of the people are composed not only of proletarians, but also of small peasants and petty bourgeois. These peasants and petty bourgeois are still in a transitory period toward the proletariat and are dependent in their political interests more and more on the workers and therefore will have to submit to the demands of that class. This probably will necessitate a second struggle which, however, can end only with the victory of the proletariat.

The democracy would be utterly useless for the proletariat if it could not be used immediately as a means for the application of measures which attack private property and secure the existence of the proletariat. The most important of these measures which at this time already result from the existing conditions are the following:

1. Limitation of private property by progressive taxes, heavy inheritance taxes, abolition of inheritance for relatives not lineal descendents—such as brothers, nephews, etc.—forced loans, etc.

2. Gradual expropriation of land owners, factory owners, railroad owners, ship owners, partly through competition with state industry and partly by direct compensation in form of assignates (paper money).

3. Confiscation of the estates, of all emigrants and rebels who are against the majority of the people.

4. Organization of labor or employment of the proletariat on national estates, factories, and workshops by which method, competition between the workers is abolished and factory owners, as long as there are any, have to pay the same high wages as the state.

5. Compulsion for work applicable to all members of society until the time of the abolition of private property. Formation of industrial armies especially for agriculture.

6. Centralization of the credit system and money movements in the hands of the state through a national bank with state capital, and suppression of all private

banks and bankers.

7. Increase of all national factories, workshops, railroads, ships; reclamation of all lands not yet under cultivation and improvement of all cultivated lands in the same ratio in which the capital, and the workers at the disposal of the nation, increase.

8. Raising of all children in national institutes and at national expense beginning at the time the child has outgrown the first care of the mother.

9. Erection of large palaces on the national estates as common shelter for communes of citizens working in the industry and agriculture and which combine the advantages of urban and rural life without at the same time suffering from onesidedness and disadvantages of both.

10. Destruction of all unhealthy and badly built houses and sections of the cities.

11. Equal rights of inheritance for legitimate and illegitimate children.

12. Concentration of all means of transportation in the hands of the state.

All these measures cannot, of course, be carried out at once. But the accomplishment of one will always create the basis for the accomplishment of the next. After the first radical attack against private property is made the proletariat will be forced to go further and further, and to concentrate in the hands of the state, all capital, all agriculture, all industry, all transport and all exchange. In driving toward the accomplishment of concentration, all these measures will be feasible and develop their centralizing consequences, in exactly the same ratio as the productive forces of the country are increased by the work of the proletariat. Finally when all capital, all production and all exchange is concentrated in the hands of the nation, then private property is abolished, money is superfluous, production is increased, and man is changed so much that even the last remnants of the old form of

19. Question: Will this revolution be accomplished in one country alone?

society can disappear (9).

A n s w e r : No. Big industry, by creating a world market has all the peoples of the earth, especially the civilized ones, brought into such close connection with each other that each nation is dependent upon what happens in the other. Furthermore, it has advanced social development in all civilized countries to a degree that in all these countries a bourgeoisie and a proletariat are the most important classes of society and the struggle between them has become the all-dominating struggle of the day. The Communist revolution therefore will not be a national one only, but will be carried on simultaneously in all civilized countries, at least as far as England, America, Germany and France are concerned. In each of these countries it will develop either faster or slower, depending upon whether one country or the other has better developed industries, bigger wealth or a greater mass of productive forces. Thus it will be slowest and most difficult in Germany and quickest and easiest in England. A Communist revolution in one country will cause considerable reaction in the other countries of the world and will decisively change and hasten the development there. It will be a universal revolution and, therefore, will claim universal territory.

20. Question. What will be the results of the final abolishment of private property?

A n s w e r : By taking the use of all productive forces, of all means of transportation and of all exchange and distribution of the products out of the hands of private capital by society itself, and by managing them according to a plan based on the needs of society as a whole, the abolishment of private property will first of all eliminate all the bad results which at present are connected with the running of big industry. The crises disappear. Extensive production, which in the present order of society, causes over-production and terrible misery, will then be insufficient and will have to be extended. In stead of causing misery, production over the immediate

needs of society will then assure the satisfying of all needs and at the same time will provide the means to create and to satisfy new desires. It will be the condition and also the cause of new progress and it will accomplish this progress without occasioning a disturbance as is the case now in the present society. Big industry, freed of the fetters of private property will then develop to a degree which will make modern industry look just as small as manufacture looks in comparison with present day industry. The development of industry will supply society with a sufficient mass of products to satisfy the needs of all. So will agriculture, which is now hindered by the pressure of private property and division in small allotments, exploit all the improvements and scientific achievements and will take a new upward swing enabling it to supply society with a sufficient quantity of products. In this way society will get enough products and will be able to organize the distribution of them in such a manner that the needs of all its members can be satisfied. Division of society into classes antagonistic to each other becomes superfluous. But not only will it become superfluous but also incompatible with the new social order. The existence of classes grew out of the division of labor, but the division of labor in the form hitherto practical will be completely eliminated. Because to increase industrial and agricultural production in the form outlined the mechanical and chemical expedients are not sufficient. The abilities of the humans who have to apply these expedients must be developed accordingly. Just as the peasants and the manufacturing workers of the past century had to change their whole mode of living, had to become entirely different men when they were pulled into big industry, so will the common administration of production by society as a whole and the resulting new development of production need and produce different men. The common administration of production cannot be carried on by men as they live today where every one is subordinated to one branch of production, is

chained to it, is exploited by it; everyone has only one of his abilities developed at the expense of all others, knows only one simple manipulation in the production of a part of a part of his particular branch of production. Even industry of today has less and less use for men of this sort. Industry carried on by society in common and systematically, needs men whose abilities are developed in all directions and who are able to view the whole system of production. The hitherto existing division of labor, which makes one into a farmer, another one into a shoemaker, a third one into a factory hand, and a fourth into a stock speculator which has been undermined even now by the machine process, will disappear completely. Education will lead the young people quickly through the whole system of production and will put them into a position to permit them to enter successively one branch of production after the other always in accordance with either the needs of society or with their individual preference. It will therefore take from them their one-sided character which is forced upon them by the present division of labor. In this way a Communistically organized society will give its members a chance to apply their versatile abilities and talents. By this process the different classes must necessarily disappear. The Communistically organized society on the one hand is incompatible with the existence of classes, and on the other, itself creates the means by which class differences will be eliminated.

It follows from this, that the contrast between city and country will likewise disappear. Very material reasons will necessitate the operation of agriculture and industry by the same individuals instead of by two different classes. The scattering of the agricultural population in the rural districts aside from the crowding of the industrial population in the big cities is a condition characteristic of the low stage of development of agriculture and industry and is a handicap to all further development, a handicap felt even at this moment.

The general association of all members of society for common and systematic exploitation of the productive forces; the extension of production to a degree that all needs are satisfied; the discontinuance of a condition in which the needs of one are satisfied at the expense of the other; the complete destruction of classes and class antagonisms; the many sided development of the abilities and talents of all members of society by the elimination of the hitherto dominating division of labor, by industrial education, by constant change of activity, by participation of all in the enjoyment of the good and necessary things of life produced by common effort; amalgamation of city and country; those are the main results of the abolition of private property-

21. Question. What influence will Communist society have on the family?

A n s w e r : It will make the relation of the two sexes to each other a purely private affair which will interest only those concerned and in which society as a whole has no reason to interfere. It can do that because it eliminates private property and educates children in common and thus destroys the two bases of the hitherto prevailing marriage, namely, the dependency of woman on man and of the children on the parents by reason of private property. In this there also lies the answer to the cries of the highly moral petty bourgeois against the "Communist community of women." Common property of women is a condition characteristic of bourgeois society and which today finds its clear expression in prostitution. Prostitution is based entirely on private property and will fall with it. A Communist organization therefore instead of introducing the community of women, in reality eliminates that condition.

22. Question: What relations will the Communist organization have to the presently existing nationalities? (10).

A n s w e r : (The manuscript does not give any answer.)

23. Question: What will be its relation to existing religions? (11.)

(The manuscript does not contain any answer.)

24. Question: In what do the Communists differ from the socialists?

A n s w e r: The Socialists are divided into three classes. The first class consists of adherents of the feudal and patriarchal society which was beaten down and is being daily destroyed by its own creation—bourgeois society. This class draws from the evils of present day society the conclusions that the feudal and patriarchal society must be re-established because the latter did not suffer from these evils. All their proposals follow either in straight or crooked lines to this goal. This class of reactionary socialists, in spite of its alleged sympathy and its hot tears for the misery of the proletariat will always be energetically attacked by the Communists, because

1. It aims at something absolutely impossible.

2. It tries to re-establish the rule of the nobility, of the guild masters, and the manufacturers with all their retinue of kings, officers, soldiers and priests, a society which, though free from the evils of present day society, was weighed down at least by as many other evils without the prospect of emancipation of the oppressed workers through a Communist organization.

3. It shows its real intentions every time, when the proletariat becomes revolutionary and Communist, and when these socialists immediately unite with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

The second class consists of adherents of present society in whom the evils necessarily resulting from it, have created a fear for the continuation of this social form. They therefore try to retain this present form of society, and at the same time eliminate the evils connected with it. With this end in view, some propose large charity measures, others, gigantic reform systems, which, under the pretense of reorganizing society, try to

retain the basis of present day society and thus this society itself. These bourgeois socialists also shall be fought continuously by the Communists because they work for the enemies of the Communists and defend the very society which the Communists want to overthrow.

The third class, finally, consists of democratic socialists who want to realize part of the measures mentioned in question eighteen by the same means that the Communists want to realize them, but they do want these achievements as transitory measures for the establishment of Communism, but only as measures to alleviate the misery and to eliminate the evils of present day society. These democratic socialists are either proletarians which are not yet sufficiently educated to the conditions of their emancipation or they are representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, a class, which, up to the achievement of democracy and those measures resulting from it, have in many ways the same interests as the proletarians. The Communists shall, therefore, in moments of action, create an understanding with these democratic socialists and shall, in general, follow a common policy with them adapted to the needs of the moment providing these socialists do not enter the services of the bourgeoisie and attack the Communists. That this common action will not exclude discussion of the differences with them is clear.

25. Question: What is the relation of the Communists to the other political parties of our time? (1847) (12).

A n s w e r : This relation is different in the different countries. In England, France and Belgium where the bourgeoisie rules, the Communists still have, for the time being, some common interests with the various democratic parties, interests which are greater the more the democrats approach, in the socialist measures proposed by them, the aims of the Communists, and the clearer and the more decisive they represent the interests of the proletariat, and the more they base their action upon the proletariat. In England for instance, the

Chartists composed mostly of workers, are indefinitely nearer to the Communists than the democratic petty bourgeois or so-called radicals.

In America where a democratic constitution is established, the Communists will have to side with that party which wants to use this constitution against the bourgeoisie and in the interests of the proletariat, that is, with the Agrarian National Reformers.

Though themselves, still in a very mixed party, the radicals in Switzerland are the only ones with whom the Communists can have any dealings, and of these radicals it is the ones in the Cantons of Vaud and Geneva who are furthest advanced.

Germany is still faced with the decisive struggle between the bourgeoisie and the absolute monarchy. Since the Communists cannot carry on a decisive struggle between themselves and the bourgeoisie as long as the bourgeoisie itself is not the ruling class, it is in the interests of the Communists to see to it that the bourgeoisie attains power as quickly as possible so that it may be overthrown again as quickly as possible. The Communists, therefore, must always take the side of the liberal bourgeoisie against the government, but it must take every care not to fall victims to the self-deceptions of the bourgeoisie or to the deceptive assurances about the wonderful results of the victory of the bourgeoisie for the proletariat. The only advantages which the victory of the bourgeoisie will give to the Communists are: first, various concessions which will make it easier for the Communists to take up the defense, the discussion, and the spreading of their principles which will facilitate the unification of the proletariat into a closely knit militant organized class, and secondly, in the certainty that from the day when the absolute government falls, the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is the order of the day. From this day on, the policies of the parties of the Communists will be the same as in those countries where the bourgeoisie already rules.

APPENDIX

The "Principles of Communism" is an historic document. It was born out of the historic situation preceding the revolutionary upheavals of 1848 in Europe. It deals in its immediate program with problems of its day, but while we understand this document only when we consider it together with the time in which it was written, it also helps us to understand that time.

The lasting value of the document is the keenness with which it sketches the future of social development. Engels' draft shares this quality with the Communist Manifesto. It is true that the eyes of the authors see this development take place with a rapidity that did not compare with the slow process of reality. But the revolutionary leader, who, with his keen intellect could construct theoretically the social development of coming generations in correct forms, cannot be reproached because he could not see that the process he could describe in minutes would take decades in history.

Engels' manuscript is even more optimistic in this respect than the Manifesto.

The Engels' draft, like the Manifesto in its final form, builds on existing movements and tendencies. But no matter what concessions it is willing to make to these movements and tendencies it insists on raising the banner of an independent proletarian revolt. Though the revolution of its day appears as a bourgeois nationalist revolution, as for instance in Germany, and although it urges alliance of the proletariat with this revolutionary element, yet it primarily raises the slogan of revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. It looks upon the impending nationalist and bourgeois upheavals only as necessary prerequisites for the proletarian revolution. It proposes to help the bourgeoisie into power because only then can the second and last act of the revolution

take place, the dethronement of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a proletarian power.

The notes here appended will assist the reader in obtaining a clearer understanding of the document and of its value for the proletarian struggles of today.

(1) Engels is applying here, the word labor in its old usage in place of labor power. In later years Engels and Marx always put labor power in places where labor was used in this sense before.

"In order to be able to extract value from the consumption of a commodity, our friend, Moneybags, must be so lucky as to find, within the sphere of circulation, in the market, a commodity, whose use-value possesses the peculiar property of being a source of value, whose actual consumption, therefore, is itself an embodiment of labor, and, consequently, a creation of value. The possessor of money does find on the market such a special commodity in **capacity for labor or labor power.**" Marx: Capital, Vol. I, p. 186.

(2) Manufacture is used here in a now obsolete sense meaning production by hand (Latin: manus—hand and facio—make.) Manufacture was the first form of industrialization of production in the pre-machine age, the organization of production by hand on a large scale as against individual production under the guild system. Manufacture was the forerunner of modern machine industry. Wherever used in this document the word has this meaning.

(3) The indispensable minimum of subsistence mentioned here is not the absolute minimum on which a worker can keep alive. The minimum cited here as the determining factor of the value of labor power includes also such things as would be considered luxuries in a backward country but are self-understood necessities in a highly developed country. Thus the value of the commodity, labor power, varies in the different countries.

Marx says about this in "Capital" Vol. 1, Chapter VI:

"If the owner of labor-power works today, tomorrow he must again be able to repeat the same process in the same conditions as regards health and strength. His means of subsistence must therefore be sufficient to maintain him in his normal state as a laboring individual. His natural wants, such as food, clothing, fuel, and housing, vary according to the climate and other physical conditions of his country. On the other hand, the number and extent of his so-called necessary wants, as also the modes of satisfying them, are themselves the product of historical development, and depend therefore to a great extent on the conditions under which, and consequently on the habits and degree of comfort in which, the class of free laborers has been formed. In contra-distinction therefore to the case of other commodities, **there enters into the determination of the value of labor-power, a historical and moral element.**"

(4) Answer to question 9.

The journeyman of the guildmaster was, as a rule, the apprentice of yesterday and the master of tomorrow, while the modern proletarian is, as a rule, a wage worker for life. The journeyman of the artisan lived as a part of the family of the latter and was part of the same social strata, while the proletarian is divided from his employer by a social chasm which removes him, in education, in mode of living, etc. a whole world from the capitalist. The journeyman of the artisan worked with tools that were his property, or, at least, easily became his property; the proletarian manipulates a machine, not his own and beyond his power to buy—firstly, because he lacks the necessary means, and, secondly, the machine is practically useless except as a part of a whole system of machines that make up the factory and permit the production of a commodity only by their common or successive use. The journeyman of the independent artisan was an artisan himself; the quality of his product dependent on his skill; the modern proletarian is a machine hand; the quality of his product depends mostly on the machine while he is responsible for the quantity. The journeyman and his master, the guild burgher, were protected against competition by monopolistic guild charters; the proletarian of today is a plaything of competition. The journeyman and his guildmaster were reactionary and resisted economic progress because it destroyed their idyllic monopolist existence; the proletarian of today welcomes and assists economic progress because his final emancipation is dependent on the furthest possible development of all the productive forces of society.

(5) Bourgeois democracy made its bow to society with a very limited suffrage. Voting was a privilege of the propertied classes. A change has taken place slowly. Since Engels wrote this manuscript, bourgeois democracy has undergone a gradual change in outward form. With education, the press and pulpit under its absolute control, capitalism could entrust the masses with the right to vote. Occasional interference in the calculations of the ruling groups by uncontrollable moods of the voters is met with little correctives such as graft and corruption. A system of checks and balances is a protection against any undesirable sudden political changes. And against any danger of a serious political revolt there always remains, for a corrective, the police and military power of the state. Thus it is not only the limitation of the suffrage to the bourgeoisie which assures unrestricted and unqualified political control to that class.

However, at the time when Engels wrote this document the question of extension of suffrage was a revolutionary demand of large masses in France and England. It was for this reason that the author of the "Principles" emphasized the importance of limited suffrage for bourgeois control of the state.

(6) The right of parliaments to grant taxes is the foundation of tremendous power, even in a pseudo constitutional monarchy, such as Germany was before the world war. The dependency of the government on parliament for its only

steadily yielding source of income, taxes and tariffs, etc., forces even the semi-feudal monarchy into the role of a servant to the bourgeoisie. The monarch claiming to rule by the grace of God sinks into the position of a lackey of capitalism, reigning by the 'grace of the bourgeoisie.

Capitalism, however, at the same time, changes the economic basis of the old nobility and thus turns it into a subdivision of the modern capitalist class representing mostly agrarian capital.

(7) Engels wrote this manuscript on the eve of a revolutionary upheaval, the shadow of which was visible to his keen eyes even then. His enthusiastic welcome for the coming event was caused in the main by his conviction that a new revolution, in France for instance, could make its appearance only as a proletarian revolution. Even in backward Germany the national revolution then due, could, in his eyes, only complete its task of creating a democratic national state. With this accomplished, the bourgeois revolution would have dug its own grave into which it would be pushed unceremoniously by its energetic successor, the proletarian revolution. Marx shared these expectations.

This optimistic hope was not well founded. Engels himself wrote about this view a half century later:

"History proved us and all those that thought like we did to have been incorrect. It has made clear that the stage of economic development on the continent was by far, not ripe at that time for the elimination of capitalist production. It has proven this by the economic revolution which since 1848, has taken hold of the whole continent and has only since then granted real citizenship to big industry in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland and lately also Russia, and which has made Germany absolutely an industrial country of the first order—all on a capitalist basis which in 1848 surely was still able to expand very much. It is just this industrial revolution that has brought clarity into the relation of the classes; which has eliminated a great number of intermediary groups that have come over from the manufacturing period and, in Eastern Europe, even from the artisans; which has created a real bourgeoisie and a real proletariat and has pushed these classes into the foreground of the stage of social development. It is by this process that the struggles between these two great classes, which in 1848 existed, outside of England, only in Paris, and at best in a few big industrial centers, has been spread all over Europe and has taken on an intensity which was unthinkable in 1848. Then, the many sectarian 'gospels' with their panaceas—today, the generally accepted, transparently clear, and its last aim clearly defining theory of Marx. Then, the masses divided into, and differing by, localities and nationalities, thrown back and forth between enthusiasm and despair—today, a great international army of Communists,—marching onward irresistibly growing daily in numbers, in organization, in discipline, in understanding and in its conviction of victory."

(8) Engels never entertained any illusions about the

possibilities of a peaceful revolution. In the foreword to "Civil Wars in France," Engels says: "The working class cannot confine itself to taking possession of a ready made governmental state machinery and setting it going for its own ends." Or as Marx puts it: "The proletarian revolution has not to transmit the military and bureaucratic machinery from one hand to another as has been done up to the present, but must break it."

If in spite of that, Engels does not deny categorically all chances of a peaceful revolution it is because he did not want to frighten unnecessarily his newly won adherents of the Paris club. Although they had dethroned their leaders, who were moved by illusions rather than by knowledge, they had not yet dethroned their own illusions. Engels therefore presents armed conflicts as an historic probability declaring the Communists to meet the emergency when it arises. Thus he did justice to his convictions and yet did not frighten his new friends beyond the boundary lines of his influence.

In the Manifesto the two friends did no longer make such concessions. There they say:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. 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 Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

"Working men of all countries, unite!"

(9) Comparing the draft of Engels with the final form of the Manifesto, it will be noted that the Manifesto proposes more radical measures than the draft. The draft suggests limitation of inheritance, the Manifesto demands abolition: the draft proposes expropriation of land gradually and for compensation, the Manifesto demands immediate and complete expropriation without compensation. Public organization of work and erection of palaces of labor has been dropped entirely by the Manifesto.

Engels was influenced in some of his immediate demands by existing tendencies in France, by Louis Blanc and others.

For Engels, the demand for a democratic constitution did not express the form of proletarian rule but a condition permitting the organization of the proletariat for political struggle for the setting up of a proletarian dictatorship. Criticizing the name Social-Democrats in 1894, Engels said: "Social-Democrat . . . is inexact as a name for a party whose economic program is not simply a general socialist one, but definitely Communist—for a party whose final political aim is the suppression of the state and, therefore, also democracy."

(10) The Communist Manifesto answers this question as follows:

"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 civilized 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."

(11) About religion and Communism we read in the Communist Manifesto:

"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 in character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class. . . .

"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. . . .

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

(12) At the time when the "Principles" were written, there existed practically no proletarian parties anywhere. The political action of the incomparably small groups of Communists had to connect up with the activities of existing progressive political groups. Altho all these groups were more or less dominated by bourgeois ideology, even the most proletarian—the Chartist movement in England, yet these groups were revolutionary. Engels made it clear, however, that the Communists carry on independent politics from these movements and accompany them only so long as their roads may lay together.

THE END