

*"The most widely read political pamphlet
in the history of the world."*

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

by Karl Marx



Introduction by William P. Fall

Additional copies of the *The Communist Manifesto* are available at the following prices: 1 to 99 copies, \$3.00 each; 100 to 999 copies, \$2.00 each; 1,000 copies or more, \$1.50 each. They may be purchased at any American Opinion Bookstore, or ordered directly from The John Birch Society, P.O. Box 8040, Appleton, WI 54913-8040.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

by Karl Marx

Preface by Frederick Engels

Introduction by William P. Fall

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY
Post Office Box 8040
Appleton, WI 54913-8040

Introduction by William P. Fall copyright ©1974
by American Opinion, P.O. Box 8040,
Appleton, Wisconsin 54913-8040.

All rights reserved. No part of this introduction may
be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any
means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy,
recording, or any information storage and retrieval
system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Manufactured in the United States of America.

First printing 20,000 — 12/74
Second Printing 10,000 — 6/76
Third Printing 10,000 — 6/78
Fourth Printing 10,000 — 3/80
Fifth Printing 10,000 — 10/81
Sixth Printing 10,000 — 8/84

Contents

An Introduction For All Americans	v
Preface	1
Manifesto of the Communist Party	5
I. Bourgeois and Proletarians	7
II. Proletarians and Communists	18
III. Socialist and Communist Literature	26
IV. Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Existing Opposition Parties	35
Suggested Reading	37

An Introduction For All Americans

by William P. Fall

Or rather we should say: An introduction for everyone, but especially college students.

For we are mindful that this discussion, and the writing that follows it, concern all responsible divisions of society. Current circumstances, however, place a much heavier moral and civic responsibility on college-age citizens than ever before. And since we frequently find public concern being expressed most vocally from the student levels, we particularly want to address this Introduction to them.

Now a question may arise in some minds as to why the *Communist Manifesto* should be of any importance to individuals who may have no interest in Communism. For that reason we would like to present a few observations which we hope will answer this question satisfactorily.

The globe today is divided essentially and realistically into two parts: the Communist world and the non-Communist world. This distinction is made more vivid by the Communists' view that outside of their world there exist only temporary nations, destined one day to be absorbed into their empire. For it is their creed that the "wave of the future" — the "New World Order" called Communism — is "inevitable" for all humanity. Already it has become a reality for more than a billion human beings, who are living out their lives under the "dictatorship of the proletariat." And anyone who will bother to read current statements and writings issued by the Communist hierarchy will have no difficulty discovering that, despite all talk about coexistence, they remain unwaveringly intent on imposing their "inevitable" system on the balance of the world's people, by any and all means necessary. This alone should be reason enough for everyone to examine the fundamental doctrine on which Communism was founded.

But an even stronger reason might be that Communism consists of ideologies which are completely contrary to those of our Christian civilization. Just such a principle as "The end justifies the means" is sufficient to illustrate the point. It is by this principle that the

Communists rationalize, without any qualms of conscience, every inhumane and perverse act of cruelty imaginable.

Religion, for example, is proclaimed as a major enemy of the New World Order. In Marx's words, it is "the opiate of the people," and so it must be destroyed. For this reason the Communists in Vietnam drove chopsticks into the ears of small boys, to prevent these youngsters from hearing the "evil words of the Lord's Prayer." In Angola, symbolically, they crucified women. In Spain, they herded congregations into churches where they were burned alive. Their vitriolic hatred of anything and everything religious was so intense, in fact, that they actually brought firing squads into Spanish Catholic churches to *execute* the Holy Eucharist.

Accounts of equally gruesome atrocities have been recorded in large numbers wherever the Communists have "liberated" the "oppressed" masses. All told, they have deliberately exterminated more than one hundred million human beings as expedient to the success, and for the overall gain, of the Communist system. In every instance, their excuse was that "the end justifies the means."

The questions that now arise are these: Will we suffer the same fate of becoming mere statistics in a systematic extermination? Is Communism inevitable, as every advocate since Marx has claimed? Or on the other hand, is it possible that modern Communists can be persuaded to accept coexistence with a free world?

Communism is a reality, as we know. Already it has had an immense impact on our lives, and it promises an even greater one to come. If that is to be the case, then we all had better know the answers to these questions. And unless we examine the *Communist Manifesto* we will not have the answers.

This is by no means to suggest that the *Manifesto* will equip the reader with complete knowledge about Communism. Far from it. Without the aid of some advance interpretation of Marx's frequently muddled rhetoric, one is more likely to find that short composition highly confusing. To comprehend fully the whole nature and scheme of the revolutionary Communist movement would require a much more thorough study than can be made of the *Manifesto* alone. But it is a major and indispensable key to such comprehension.

To understand the *Manifesto*, however, it is essential to understand its author. Now it is a commonly held belief that the work was co-authored by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. But essentially all the reader needs to know about Engels for the present is that he was totally subservient to Marx. He himself claimed no originality or creative ideas, but instead

credited all his knowledge to Marx's genius. While it is true that Engels roughed out what, for all intents and purposes, was the first draft of the *Manifesto*, under the title of *Foundations*, the points he outlined in that composition were merely an incomplete summary of concepts which he had absorbed from Marx. He then turned the project over to his mentor, who completely rewrote and greatly expanded what had been done. Engels, who was the better writer of the two, nonetheless offered little more than occasional editorial advice to his master, no doubt because he was thoroughly intimidated by the domineering Prussian. It can be said correctly, therefore, that the *Communist Manifesto* had but one author. So let's turn to the man who is called, although with gross exaggeration, the father of Communism.

I. Marx the Man

In this presentation we shall not attempt more than a scant biography. For we need concern ourselves with only the most important features of Marx's life as they bear on his codification of the Communist creed.

Karl Heinrich Marx was born in the Prussian city of Trier in 1818. He was the first son in a sizable family of children born to his Dutch-immigrant mother, whom he disliked, and his lawyer father, whom he used. It is a total myth that Marx grew up in poverty. Not only was he reared in a respectable middle-class family of more than sufficient means, but the seventeen years that he lived in the comfortable Trier environment never brought him into contact with the impoverished classes. The only poverty with which the Prussian "humanitarian" ever was to have contact was that which he brought on his own family. In fact, at least one of Marx's children died from neglect. But we are getting ahead of our story.

The significant features of his youth are quickly summed up: He had a prodigious mind that drew to him the attention he quickly came to relish. As might have been expected, the excessive attention gave rise to undesirable characteristics. Karl Marx was known as a self-assertive, obstinate, and opinionated boy with no desire to make friends. And through his arrogance he managed to alienate anyone who sought to befriend him. It is known that his father was concerned about Karl's notably cold indifference and insensitivity to others, but apparently preferred to dismiss the matter for some time, in deference to his son's shining intellectual qualities, with the attitude that a gifted mind is naturally different.

And gifted it was. Young Marx was a top student through the lower grades of school. His rhetorical skill and dexterity in conversation, however, were observed to be his strongest points. In fact, these eventually came to overshadow greatly his scholastic achievements. When he left home to attend the University of Bonn he continued, as always, to devour quantities of books from which could be gleaned the food for his oratorical thought. But at the same time, his essential studies and attendance at lectures were being almost completely neglected. He narrowly escaped expulsion for “nocturnal drunkenness and riot” on at least one occasion.

Even while his father was suffering serious financial difficulties, as the result of what proved to be a terminal illness, Marx never ceased to squander all the generous allowances that he was able to wring out of the dying man by desperate pleas and glowing reports of his scholastic industriousness. The truth, of course, was that his grades were now miserable, as a result of his having lost all ambition to graduate. Marx had grown shamelessly content to live on his financially strained father or anyone else who would support him. The prodigy had become an aimless professional student. In short, he was a campus derelict – a college bum.

And once his character had been poured into that mold, the shape was retained for the rest of his life. With the exception of Engels, whose liberal pensions were dearly treasured, Karl Marx never had a lasting friend, never held any kind of stable employment, and yet was perennially successful at having his laziness subsidized by others – including his wife – who could be dazzled by his brilliant mental maneuvers.

Marx came to the university fully confident that he would become a world-famous poet. In his first year at Bonn, however, his ego suffered a severe assault. A professor, criticizing an essay which Marx submitted for his final exam, noted that the student fell “into his usual mistake – an exaggerated search after an unusual and metaphorical mode of expression. Therefore the whole presentation . . . lacks clarity, often even accuracy.” Rather than profiting from what was intended as constructive criticism, Marx became bitterly antagonistic towards the professor. His father, too, repeatedly censured the vain young man: “Unfortunately you are confirming all too well the opinion which I hold of you, that in spite of your many good qualities, egotism is your ruling passion.” Marx, like all egotists, was the last to admit any fault. But ultimately it began to dawn even on him that, at least as far as his poetic ambitions were concerned, he was anything but a genius. He came to confess of his own poetic writings: “The emotions are generalized and

formless . . . there is nothing natural . . . rhetorical reflections instead of poetic thoughts . . . everything is made out of thin air.”

It must be said that in this instance young Marx was being as candid about himself as was humanly possible for a person whose vanity had been fed and reinforced all his life by the flattering attentions of those few who entered his private world. Finally he was seeing himself as others, who had no reason to be partial to him, had been able to see him. He had been completely certain that he would become a famed poet. But even in the Europe of that era, when intellectual standards were being diluted with revolutionary thought, the qualities of sincere emotion and honest sentiment still were highly valued in poetry. And in that regard Karl Marx the “poet” stood stark naked before the world.

So he was clearly at a turning point in his life. Some new direction had to be chosen. Of course he might have sought to correct those flaws which hindered his literary ambitions, and which he now saw all too plainly. But instead he decided to become a theorist in philosophical abstractions.

II. Marx the Philosopher

There are many reasons why this course was a natural choice for Karl Marx. To begin with, the world in general was in a state of flux, as was only normal for a transitional period. The growth of free enterprise had given birth to the organic compound known as the industrial revolution, which at the time was becoming the strongest yet least harmful influence in civilized countries. Although social adjustment to the development of industry still had a lot of perfecting ahead of it, life-styles everywhere were, to a greater or lesser degree, changing for the better. The age of absolute monarchy already had begun to give way to a new age of individual freedom. Essentially, civilization was maturing, and its occasional growing pains were being felt in the form of temporary and minor dislocations.

Of course, other, less beneficial forces had long been at play. Among these was the wave of intellectual license rising throughout Europe — especially in Prussia — which took advantage of the confusion of this dawning new era. Philosophers seeking to “find for the multiplicity of things one single, total, all-inclusive explanation” had for many years been becoming more and more fashionable. And now a fleet of self-proclaimed philosophers came riding in on the crest of this wave of free thought. Each one was seeking a place in history, at least as the

inventor of some "system" that supposedly was needed to bring about order, and at best as the intellectual figure of power who would run such a system. To meddle, by means of an imposed system, with the natural process of socio-politico-economic maturation then under way was the worst thing that could have been done. But these sophomoric "philosophers," like modern-day bureaucrats, found the logic of a natural process much too simple. Besides, it would never thrust a great theorist into immortal history, much less serve as the means for establishing a personal powerhold.

Such were the times and the circumstances surrounding Karl Marx's metamorphosis from poet to philosopher. And there were also his own traits of character which so readily directed him to this new vocation. All of the weaknesses which he had described in himself as a poet now appeared as desirable attributes of a student of first principles. Weren't a philosopher's thoughts expected to be "generalized and formless"? Wasn't it common knowledge that in philosophy "there is nothing natural"? Weren't "rhetorical reflections instead of poetic thoughts" the philosopher's natural mode of expression? And in those times of intellectual license, who would become disturbed about philosophical ideas "made out of thin air"?

But certainly the principal motivation behind Marx's new pursuit was his notable ego. Like his fellow philosophers, he too was hungry for recognition — only perhaps more so. And he had better qualifications in this field for achieving it.

Marx left Bonn to attend the University of Berlin. While there he came into contact with a group of coffee-house "intellectuals" who met informally, under the name of the "Professors' Club," at any beer parlor where their lengthy daily sessions of loitering would be tolerated. Most of the young men who attended these gatherings held doctor's degrees, which in those times meant little more than that they had completed basic university studies. Though a mere student, Marx was accepted by the group and began to spend the bulk of his time at its long sessions, absorbing mental nutrition from the discourses.

For some time he remained a silent attendant, leaving the older wonders to expound their marvelous theories. None were very original. The common practice was to parade before the group the ideas of such "free-thinking" intellectuals as Rousseau, Frederick II, Voltaire, d'Alambert, Strauss, Feuerbach, and above all, Hegel. Then the young "professors" would amateurishly compete at amplifying, improving, extending, and combining the ideas of these like-minded philosophers — each hoping that he would discover some new force in the universe,

devise some new system of order, and thereby attain greater fame than the heroes from whom he had pilfered his component thoughts.

Marx's method, when he finally emerged as a participant in these discourses, was no different. He merely employed it much more effectively. For he had sat on the sidelines long enough to ingest the fundamentals of the favored philosophies and to select carefully from these the best patches of theories which could be stitched together into a colorful quilt with his own threads of intellectual audacity. But what made Marx so distinguished in this approach was the way he had of making his thin threads of stitching more prominent than all the pieces of cloth in the incomplete quilt. And this he was able to do by eloquently and arrogantly defaming the weaknesses in the rejected remnants of the philosophies which he had used.

He was an instant success among his new associates, who lavished enthusiastic praise on him. Of course it was on such praise — something he had sorely missed as a “poet” — that his ego thrived. So he was emboldened to propound still more daring innovations, which earned him even greater attention.

Even the more prestigious visionaries connected with the group now began to take notice of Marx's talents, seeing in him many possibilities for advancing their own plans. It was these men, in fact, who prodded him into finally getting his doctor's degree in order to establish his own credentials of prestige. Realizing that he had grown lazy about studies, they recommended that he apply to the University of Jena, an institution notoriously so lax that a degree could be obtained by correspondence. So Marx simply mailed his dissertation to the school and his degree was promptly sent to him by return mail. And now *Doctor Marx* was ready to be introduced formally to some of the most important figures on Europe's revolutionary scene, who would guide him into the radical movement, teach him the philosophy of Communism, and support him as a promising apprentice.

It seems odd at first that someone as domineering, opinionated, and obstinate as Marx would allow himself to be led virtually by the nose into a part of the movement he had once found completely repulsive. But two facts explain this. First, the impresarios knew full well that Marx was an irrepressible egotist. In fact, they used his self-esteem to their advantage. By continually heaping flattery on the neophyte, they successfully kept him blind to the realization that his rise through the higher ranks actually was being guided by skilled masters. And second, Marx himself was seeing more and more how great were the opportunities for personal power in the radical movement.

III. Marx the Economist

Now it may appear that we have gone far astray from the subject of this Introduction by presenting so much biographical background. Be assured, however, that it is all highly pertinent to the discussion of the *Manifesto* in particular and of Communism in general. For just as Communism is better understood by examining the *Manifesto*, the document itself is better understood by examining the person who was its author.

And we can learn a great deal about the person from even so inadequate a biographical outline. We know, for example, that he had certain qualities which can properly be described as brilliant. But we also know that these were contrasted sharply with faults of character that stood out as vast chasms in the total makeup of his intellect and constituted the dominant factor in his pursuits.

When Marx fell into philosophy, more out of desperation than from inclination, he had no real ideological predisposition of his own making. He came into this realm bringing with him only a fair knowledge of those philosophies to which he had been most exposed, and which he tended to accept almost indifferently. The circumstances of time and place that shaped his early life had dictated that his greatest exposure be to Hegel's philosophy. Marx, therefore, became a Hegelian.

At first philosophy, for Marx, was no more than another road to the recognition he had been unable to reach through poetry. Later he saw it as offering an opportunity to achieve an even more desirable end — power. And he began to apply all the brilliant talents of his resourceful mind to the task of gaining that end.

Marx was not motivated by compassion for the “oppressed” workers whose cause his ideas were supposed to champion. He had never known any workers until he visited a meeting of the Communist League in London, where labor-class attendance was patronized and encouraged more as window dressing than anything else. And by then he already had long been involved with the movement. Workers, you see, were beneath the intellectual class of socialist philosophers like Marx. Despite his flaming orations on the principles of democracy, he fought tooth and nail against holding elections after the Paris uprising in 1848. Better to have Communist visionaries decide who should rule, rather than the ignorant masses. And once, when his wife naively beamed over his noble concern for the poor, he quickly corrected her by pointing out that his interest in socialism had nothing to do with

such silly, romantic, and sentimental notions. Marx detested sentimentality. All that was important was the thrilling intellectuality of his philosophy.

Nor was the philosophy itself any more sacred to Marx than a game in which all that mattered was winning out over his opponents — again, by any and all means necessary to achieve this end. His opponents, however, were not the faceless “bourgeois capitalists” whom he railed against publicly. Marx was determined to hold absolute rule over the movement by systematically discrediting, destroying, and banishing every socialist of established position who might stand in his way. For this reason he even was willing on many occasions to twist his philosophical arguments around completely backwards, just to humiliate some leading socialist who had espoused the same ideas.

In this connection, Engels in later years spent most of his time serving as Marx’s henchman, digging up or, if necessary, fabricating any bit of information that could be used to discredit these unsuspecting individuals. In fact, it was by such tactics that Engels managed to get the assignment of writing the *Manifesto*. An effort had been under way for two years to unite all the socialist factions of Europe behind one movement headed by the Communist League. At the League’s first congress, held in London in 1847, it was decided that a working program should be drawn up. So Moses Hess, a prominent socialist who had done much to help Marx’s rise, submitted a draft to the League’s Paris branch. Engels, when he learned of it, immediately went to work on undercutting and discrediting Hess, which he did so thoroughly that the League rejected Hess’s draft and assigned the job to Marx and himself.

This then was the real nature of events and causes behind the Marxian philosophy. Always the bold new idea was tailored to fit one privately envisioned end — the personal power and glorification of Karl Marx. And the more his power and glory increased within the developing revolutionary force, the more the philosophy had to be altered. For example, in the early days it was Marx the daring intellectual who, proclaiming the inevitability of socialism, snobbishly sneered at radical thugs for their distasteful and unnecessary use of violence. But later it was Marx the Communist who, nearing a position of power, agreed and even argued that militant force was essential. The only explanation for the difference in principles was the difference in how near the man thought he was to becoming the dominant figure in the revolutionary movement.

Marx’s theory of the inevitable rise of a New World Order had become

the philosophic keystone to the heightened spirit of his own socialist following. But unless the theory could be given more substance, that spirit would soon collapse into a disillusioned heap, and Marx would become just another in a long line of forgotten thirty-day socialist wonders. So he set about to prove the certainty of capitalism's demise by devoting long hours to the study of economics.

What was significant about this new ambition was that in all the time he had been preaching about the evils of capitalism and prophesying its inevitable doom, Marx had never so much as opened an economics book until now. For years he had been designing an economic system for the socialist paradise without ever having read even a primer on the science. And now he was feverishly studying economics, for the first time in his life, to find the missing key that would prove his already established economic philosophy.

Of course Marx was completely confident that he would do it. In fact, upon starting out on this voyage he characteristically began boasting that he soon would publish a revelation that would shake the world. He even accepted an advance fee from a publisher for the rights to his unwritten manuscript. The search, however, was long and fruitless. He could find nothing in his studies that would even seem to prove his philosophical theory, although he certainly wasn't willing to entertain any notion that his premises could not be substantiated.

Then at long last he came to the conclusion that the search was unnecessary. He had already made his great discovery without even realizing it. He mistakenly had been looking *in* economics for the hidden key, not *at* it. But now he realized what he had been searching for: The great, mysteriously elusive, all-powerful force which determined the inevitable downfall of the existing economic system was economics itself! In other words, Marx had "discovered" that economics makes the world go 'round — or, more precisely, that it is the central motivating factor in human behavior.

Earthshaking? Hardly. Rather, this only exposed Marxism for the pious fraud that it was. Marx's destination was fame and power, and he took whatever routes would get him there. Whenever convenient he took shortcuts that might save him the time and trouble of traveling the orthodox road. Marx was no more a true economist (which was the title he now claimed) than he was a true poet or a true philosopher. He was simply brilliantly clever at synthesizing selected ideas in such a way that they would produce the conclusion he desired. And with that much exploration of Karl Marx we now can proceed to examine the product of his designs.

IV. About the *Manifesto*

The *Manifesto of the Communist Party* had not been intended in the beginning to be a manifesto at all, but merely a program not unlike the platform of any political party. Once Engels had managed to get the commission for its writing from the Communist League, however, he and Marx saw that no mere political platform would suffice. These were Communists – the prophets of an inevitable New World Order – not common politicians. These were the intellectuals, the soldiers, the revolutionaries who would clear away the rubble of decaying capitalism to make way for the unencumbered rise of that New Order. Theirs must be a program – a manifesto – befitting so monumental a cause. And the League agreed.

The *Manifesto* is typically Marxian. In fact, as a summary of his muddled thinking, it *is* Marx. But this is not to say that the various theories on economics, sociology, and politics came from his own invention. On the contrary, there is not a single idea to be found in the *Manifesto* which had not been expressed at some earlier time. In reality, the *Manifesto* is a composite of the most successful revolutionary concepts produced by German philosophy, English political economics, and French socialism, before and during the nineteenth century. No one but Karl Marx, however, could have condensed and blended these concepts so ingeniously into one complete ideology, or tempered them so masterfully with powerful rhetoric.

It will be found that the wide variety of ideas which make up the whole *Communist Manifesto* have been highly compressed. As a result there are some areas where the reader who is unfamiliar with Marxist doctrine might become confused. Perhaps it will prove helpful, therefore, to discuss a few of the major concepts in advance.

First and foremost in the *Manifesto* is Marx's philosophy of the history of class struggle. The principal thread that is woven through the entire discussion is the Hegelian philosophy of the "dialectic." It was Hegel's theory that the development of humanity followed an irregular course of ascent, motivated by some transcendental force. The essence of the theory was that the irregularities in the upward path were governed by the dialectical process. That is, everything that comes into existence – thesis – is opposed by some negative entity – antithesis – and out of the inevitable clash between the two is produced a balanced, harmonious entity – synthesis.

This nebulous Hegelian philosophy captivated the revolutionary intellectuals of Europe in the early nineteenth century. But there were

many — including Marx — who rejected Hegel's spirituality. And so, borrowing from the ideas of Ludwig Feuerbach, D.F. Strauss, and Bruno Bauer, Marx introduced the atheistic concept of materialism into the philosophy as a substitute for spirituality. The product — or synthesis — was “dialectical materialism.”

In the application of this philosophy to the Communist program, the bourgeoisie — the body of “oppressive” middle-class property owners — becomes the thesis. The proletariat — the “oppressed” wage-labor working class — becomes the antithesis. And the predestined struggle between the two classes will produce as the synthesis a perfected New Order — the Communist society wherein all men will be equal and live in complete harmony. This theme is so central to Communism that it is immutable. Which is why today we hear from the Communists such statements as: “War to the hilt between Capitalism and Communism is inevitable.”

Marx goes further than Hegel in still another respect. He attempts to define the mysterious force which propels the dialectical process — that which Hegel attributed to the spiritual plane. The theoretical force motivating all human behavior is identified by Marx as “economic determinism” — in other words, the concept, briefly mentioned earlier, that all social and political activity is determined by the existing economic environment or conditions. In Marx's time, these conditions in many parts of Europe were poor, though gradually improving. But the concept of economic determinism was seized upon by radicals, since it freed them of any responsibility or guilt for their riotous rebellion. Of course, the idea was nothing new. It had been circulating since before the French Revolution.

Marx almost obscures his political economics in the *Manifesto* by superimposing sectional glimpses of it onto his philosophical narration. And so some of his phraseology should be explained before we leave this subject.

By his “labor theory of value,” which he derived from the classical economist David Ricardo, Marx means that the value of any given commodity is determined by the labor required to produce it. He adds onto this the notion that all human needs ideally should be filled by the direct exchange of labor. Profit, therefore, is “surplus value” in an economic system. That is, according to Marx, it is an unnecessary or even artificial increase in the value of goods that reduces labor's share of generated wealth to a bare subsistence level. Drawing on a theory of economist T.R. Malthus, he concludes that it is “scientifically” predictable that as the labor class grows in size, and the “exploitation” of

labor therefore increases, the conflict between the two classes – bourgeois and proletarian – will produce a New Order.

It should not be necessary for humanity to endure all the prolonged misery which would follow this working of the natural law of economic determinism, Marx reasoned. Since the outcome of a Communist order is inevitable anyway, it is the moral duty and creative role of Communists to institute a less painful process that will spare the world such hardships. And he summed up this process in a single phrase, “abolition of private property.”

With this step taken, all property would come into common ownership under the control and protection of the State. Wages and the surplus value of profit would be abolished in the process. Theoretically, everyone would be equally prosperous because everyone would be equal. This would eliminate all greed, all exploitation, all oppression, and therefore peace and harmony would reign.

But the condition would have to be universal throughout the world before dangers to its blissful permanence would cease. Hence Marx prescribed ten steps that make up the Communist program for the elimination of all capitalism in all the world's countries, and for the establishment of a Communist New World Order.

V. A Final Thought

It will be observed that we have not attempted to disprove the Marxian theories outlined in the previous section. Of course, this is not because we are hesitant to meet any such challenge, but rather because there already are scores of scholarly books which amply fill the need of the interested student. And there is really nothing we could add on that level. Our main purpose in presenting the *Communist Manifesto* is to acquaint the reader sufficiently with Communist doctrine and aims so that he will be able to recognize them under their many disguises.

In the all-out struggle against Communism, there is little point in arguing against its intellectual, philosophical, economic, political, or sociological positions. To do so would be to assume that the theories embodied in the *Manifesto* were arrived at through an honest search for truth. And it would presuppose that an honest demonstration of the fallacies of these theories would be enough to dissuade the Communists from their avowed aims. But nobody knows more certainly than the Communist Masters themselves that neither of these assumptions is true.

We have shown that Marx invariably would establish his conclusions

first, and then would develop the concepts of “scientific” processes by which he claimed to have reached the conclusions. In other words, he painted his house before it was built. Right away this fact rules out any possibility of intellectual honesty on Marx’s part. The truth is that his single objective was to devise a philosophy, a system of political economics, and a program for revolution that would serve as the means for establishing a power base for Communism, with a pinnacle of prestige and power for himself. And the *Manifesto* was the remarkably clever summary of those means.

But we have also pointed out that all of the revolutionary ideas of philosophy, political economics, and socialism known today as Marxism already had been in wide currency for some time before Marx so brilliantly interwove them for his own battle flag. Which immediately indicates that there were others before him who sought the same end of personal power by means of the same revolutionary concepts.

This probability takes on greater weight from the fact that Marx did not write the Communist program on his own initiative, but instead was commissioned to do so by the Communist League. The League itself could be traced back many years, under various names, as a secret and subversive society. There is also the fact that on January 26, 1848, the League sternly insisted that Marx have his manuscript completed and turned in by the first of February. There is the further fact that the Paris uprising erupted in that same month of February, and that a series of other revolutionary shock waves, in Italy, Austria, and Germany, all struck at about the same time. And against the presumption that it was Marx’s personal prestige and magnetic leadership in the revolutionary movement that motivated this contagion of Communist terror, there is the fact that his name did not begin to appear on the *Manifesto* until after twenty-four years of publication. All of these and other facts are far too conspicuous to be without any bearing on, or relation to, one another.

Consider, for example, that mob riots — particularly of the proportions of those which occurred in 1848 — do not simply happen. And they certainly do not burst into full bloom, spontaneously and simultaneously, in several separate countries. Riots have to be incited. Moreover, revolution spanning the breadth of an entire continent is highly unlikely without thorough planning, exact timing, skillful execution, and close coordination. So it hardly could be by sheer coincidence that certain revolutionary figures had been flitting from one European hot spot to another at this time. Nor can the fact be discounted that predictions of violent uprisings in almost every country

in Europe were being heard prior to the Paris outbreak. Without any question, this whole series of Communist insurrections in 1848 had been orchestrated.

And there are other facts to be considered. Marx's having been ordered to complete the *Manifesto* just in time for the uprisings makes it obvious that the Communist League at least knew full well what was to occur, if in fact it was not itself the force directing these events. It is also obvious that Marx himself was not the leader of this force, though he certainly was aiming for such a position.

These observations completely rule out any humane and noble purpose, any natural outgrowth from economic and social conditions, or any misguided but sincere philosophy, as the cause of the revolutions of 1848. Each of those revolutions was conspiratorially planned and led, as had been the French Revolution of 1789, by the *same continuing force*.

Nor is it merely conjecture that the characters who directed the revolutionary turbulence of 1848 were part of a single, powerfully organized, self-perpetuating conspiracy. On the contrary, so much hard evidence concerning this conspiracy had come to light in earlier years as to leave absolutely no doubt about its continuing unity of purpose. And before the mid-nineteenth century there had been enough authoritative books written about this evil league to provide us today with an accurate knowledge of its workings.

We know, for example, that the conspiracy was founded formally in Bavaria, in 1776, by Adam Weishaupt. We know that its aims were to abolish all religion and destroy all existing forms of government; to tear asunder all traditional institutions of society; and to erect on top of the ruins a *Novus Ordo Seclorum* — a New World Order — over which the princes of the conspiracy, then called the Order of the Illuminati, would hold absolute rule. We know that, as a means to this end, the conspiracy sought to replace Divinity with reason (intellectualism) and religion with the worship of nature (materialism). We know that it devised a philosophy whereby the New World Order would seem inevitable. And we know that it promised universal equality under this Order as the foundation for an eternally peaceful and prosperous society.

The striking similarity between the doctrines of Communism and Illuminism is conspicuously obvious to anyone. And the similarity does not end there. One need only read Professor John Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy* (Western Islands, 1967) to see quite plainly that the *Communist Manifesto* is a direct extension of the diabolical scheme set into motion by Weishaupt in 1776. In fact, by examining the Illuminati's secret documents, which were uncovered by the Bavarian authorities,

and which have been quoted extensively in Robison's book, the reader will recognize Karl Marx as being exactly the type of character prescribed by Weishaupt for use by, and even possible acceptance into, the inner circle of this great conspiracy.

We hope that the serious student will go on to read *Proofs of a Conspiracy* in order to comprehend better the origins of Communism. But the first essential need is to understand the conspiratorial nature and aims of Communism itself as a determined worldwide menace. And to aid this understanding we now give you, our thoughtful reader, the *Communist Manifesto*.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

Manifest

der

Kommunistischen Partei.

Veröffentlicht im Februar 1848.

Proletarier aller Länder vereinigt euch.

London.

Gedruckt in der Office der „Bildungs- Gesellschaft für Arbeiter“

von F. C. Burghard

46, LIVERPOOL STREET, BISHOPS-GATE.

Preface

by Frederick Engels

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

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

When the European working class had recovered sufficient strength for another attack on the ruling classes, the International Working Men's Association sprang up. But this association, formed with the express aim of welding into one body the whole militant proletariat of Europe and America, could not at once proclaim the principles laid down in the "Manifesto." The International was bound to have a program broad

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

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

international production of all Socialist literature, the common platform acknowledged by millions of working men from Siberia to California.

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

The “Manifesto” being our joint production, I consider myself bound to state that the fundamental proposition which forms its nucleus belongs to Marx. That proposition is: that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class – the proletariat – cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class – the bourgeoisie – without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles.

This proposition, which, in my opinion, is destined to do for history

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

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

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

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

The present translation is by Mr. Samuel Moore, the translator of the greater portion of Marx's *Capital*.

London, 30th January, 1888

Manifesto of the Communist Party

by Karl Marx

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

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

Two things result from this fact.

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European Powers to be itself a Power.

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

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

Bourgeois and Proletarians

THE HISTORY of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

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

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

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

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

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonization of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the

means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, under which industrial production was monopolized by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guildmasters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle class; division of labor between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labor in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand, ever rising. Even manufacturing no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern 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 turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

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

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune, here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France), afterwards, in the period of manufacturing proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and in fact, cornerstone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world-market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

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

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left 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 fervor, 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 infeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom — Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored 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-laborers.

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

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation, distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all newly-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses, his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

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

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of 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 civilized nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal 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 literatures there arises a world-literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. 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 civilization into their midst, *i.e.*, to become bourgeois themselves. In a 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 civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralized means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralization. Independent or but loosely connected

provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments, and systems of taxation, became lumped together in one nation with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier and one customs-tariff.

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

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

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

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the power of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the condition for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put on trial, each time more threateningly, the existence of the entire bourgeois society. In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, is periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity — the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation, had

cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endangering the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

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

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

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

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labor, 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 also of labor, 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 labor increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work enacted 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 laborers, crowded into the factory, are organized 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 the slaves of the bourgeois 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 openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.

The less the skill and exertion or strength implied in manual labor, in other words, the more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labor 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 labor, more or less expensive to use, according to their age and sex.

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

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

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual laborers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves, they destroy imported wares that compete with their labor, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage the laborers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the

consequence of their own active union, but of the union of bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial 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 great masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalized, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinction of labor, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeoisie, and the resulting commercial crisis, make the wages of the worker ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious, the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collision between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (Trades 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 these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruits of their battles lie, 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 centralize the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletarians, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organization 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-hour bill in England was carried.

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

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

Finally, in times when the class-struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact, within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movements 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 lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are, therefore, not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay, more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat, they thus defend not their present, but their future interests, they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.

The "dangerous class," the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, may, here and there, be

swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.

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

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

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the 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, ranging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeois, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois.

The modern laborer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an overriding law. It is unfit to rule, because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

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

II

Proletarians and Communists

IN WHAT RELATION do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The French Revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favor of bourgeois property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products that is based on class antagonism, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

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

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

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

Or do you mean modern bourgeois private property?

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

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

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

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

Let us now take wage-labor.

The average price of wage-labor is the minimum wage, *i.e.*, that quantum of the means of subsistence, which is absolutely requisite to keep the laborer in bare existence as a laborer. What, therefore, the wage-laborer appropriates by means of his labor, merely suffices to prolong and reproduce a bare existence. We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labor, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labor of others. All that we want to do away with is the miserable character of this appropriation, under which the laborer 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, living labor is but a means to increase accumulated labor. In Communist society, accumulated labor is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the laborer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

From the moment when labor can no longer be converted into capital,

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

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

Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society: all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labor 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-labor when there is no longer any capital.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

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

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

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

The bourgeois claptrap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of Modern Industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor.

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

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

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

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

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

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and thus,

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

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

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

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

The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading 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.

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

Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views, and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the condition 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 the ruling class.

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

When the ancient world was in its last throes, the ancient religions

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

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philosophical and juridical ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality, philosophy, political science, and law constantly survived this change.

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

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

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

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

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 centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, *i.e.*, of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

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

These measures will of course be different in different countries. Nevertheless, in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

1. *Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.*
2. *A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.*
3. *Abolition of all right of inheritance.*
4. *Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.*
5. *Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.*
6. *Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.*
7. *Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.*
8. *Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.*
9. *Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of population over the country.*
10. *Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc.*

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

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

III

Socialist and Communist Literature

1. REACTIONARY SOCIALISM

a. Feudal Socialism

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

In order to arouse sympathy, the aristocracy were obliged to lose 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 revenge by singing lampoons on their new master, 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, through total incapacity to comprehend the march of modern history.

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

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

In pointing out that their mode of exploitation was different from that of the bourgeoisie, the feudalists forgot 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, root and branch, the old order of society.

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

In political practice, therefore, they join in all coercive measures against the working class; and in ordinary life, despite their highfalutin phrases, they stoop to pick up the golden apples dropped from the tree of industry, and to barter truth, love, and honor for traffic in wool, beet-root sugar, and potato spirit.

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

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

b. Petty Bourgeois Socialism

The feudal aristocracy was not the only class that was ruined by the bourgeoisie, not the only class whose conditions of existence pined and perished in the atmosphere of modern bourgeois society. The medieval burgesses and the small peasant bourgeoisie 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 civilization has become fully developed, a new class of petty bourgeois has been formed, fluctuating between proletariat and bourgeoisie, and ever renewing itself as a supplementary part of the 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 can see the moment approaching when they will completely disappear as an independent section of modern society, to be replaced, in manufacture, agriculture, and commerce, by overlookers, bailiffs, and shopmen.

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

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

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

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

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

c. German or "True" Socialism

The Socialist and Communist literature of France, a literature that originated under the pressure of a bourgeoisie in power, and that was the

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

The work of the German literati consisted solely in bringing the new French ideas into harmony with their ancient philosophical conscience, or rather, in annexing the French ideas without deserting their own 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 classical works of ancient heathendom had been written. The German literati reversed this process with the profane French literature. They wrote their philosophical nonsense beneath the French original. For instance, beneath the French criticism of the economic functions of money, they wrote "Alienation of Humanity," and beneath the French criticism of the bourgeois State they wrote, "Dethronement of the Category of the General," and so forth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It proclaimed the German nation to be the model nation, and the German petty Philistine to be the typical man. To every villainous meanness of this model man it gave a hidden, higher socialistic interpretation, the exact contrary of its true character. It went to the extreme length of directly opposing the "brutally destructive" tendency of Communism, and of proclaiming its supreme and impartial contempt of all class struggles. With very few exceptions, all the so-called Socialist and Communist publications that now (1847) circulate in Germany belong to the domain of this foul and enervating literature.

2. CONSERVATIVE OR BOURGEOIS SOCIALISM

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

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

We may cite Proudhon's *Philosophie de la Misère* as an example of this form.

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

A second and more practical, but less systematic, form of this socialism sought to depreciate every revolutionary movement in the eyes of the working class, by showing that no mere political reform, but only a change in the material conditions of existence, in economical relations,

could be of any advantage to them. By changes in the material conditions of existence, this form of socialism, however, by no means understands abolition of the bourgeois relations of production, an abolition that can be effected only by a revolution, but administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations; reforms, therefore, that in no respect affect the relations between capital and labor, but at the best lessen the cost, and simplify the administrative work, of bourgeois government.

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

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

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

3. CRITICAL-UTOPIAN SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

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

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

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

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

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

Historical action is to yield to their personal inventive action, historically created conditions of emancipation to fantastic ones, and the gradual, spontaneous class-organization of the proletariat to an organization of society specially contrived by these inventors. Future history resolves itself, in their eyes, into the propaganda and the practical carrying out of their social plans.

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

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

Hence, they reject all political, and especially all revolutionary action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavor, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by the force of example, to 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 very undeveloped state, and has but a fantastic concept of its own position, correspond with the first instinctive yearnings of that class for a general reconstruction of society.

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

publications, are recognized under their earliest indistinct and undefined forms only. These proposals, therefore, are of a purely Utopian character.

The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, this fantastic standing apart from the contest, these fantastic attacks on it, lose all practical value and all theoretical justification. Therefore, although the originators of these systems were, in many respects, revolutionary, their disciples have, in every case, formed mere reactionary sects. They hold fast by the original views of their masters, in opposition to the progressive historical development of the proletariat. They therefore endeavor, and that consistently, to deaden the class struggle and to reconcile the class antagonisms. They still dream of experimental relations of their social Utopias, of founding isolated *phalanstères*, of establishing "Home Colonies," of setting up a "Little Icaria" — duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem; and to realize all these castles in the air, they are compelled to appeal to the feelings and purses of the bourgeois. By degrees they sink into the category of the reactionary conservative Socialists depicted above, differing from these only by more systematic pedantry, and by their fanatical and superstitious belief in the miraculous effects of their social science.

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

The Owenites in England, and the Fourierists in France, respectively, oppose the Chartists and the "Reformists."

IV

Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Existing Opposition Parties

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

The 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 ally themselves with the Social-Democrats against the conservatives and radical bourgeoisie, reserving, however, the right to take up a critical position in regard to phrases and illusions traditionally handed down from the great Revolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

Working men of all countries, unite!

Suggested Reading

Much has been written about International Communism, yet there is more to this revolutionary movement than meets the eye. As an imperialistic force for the destruction of human freedom, it has no equal in recorded history. Unfortunately, scholars who yearly produce voluminous critiques of communism consistently fail to discover, or deliberately avoid revealing, the murky origins of the movement or the source of its power.

It is our belief that the communist movement has never been capable of self-perpetuation, but has always been dependent upon outside aid and guidance. In short, we believe that International Communism is nothing more than an arm of a larger and more encompassing conspiratorial force which is seeking the subjugation of mankind.

Although the following reading list is by no means exhaustive, it should give the serious student of history several reliable sources of information about the central role of conspiratorial movements in shaping the history of the world during the last two centuries.

Available from The John Birch Society

Books listed in this section are available from your local American Opinion Bookstore or may be ordered directly from The John Birch Society, Post Office Box 8040, Appleton, WI 54913-8040.

America's Secret Establishment: An Introduction To The Order Of Skull & Bones by Antony C. Sutton. Exposes the 'Order' — a secret, senior-year society at Yale University, whose members have attained positions of power far beyond imagination. \$19.95 paperbound.

The Anglo-American Establishment by Carroll Quigley. Evidence of a conspiracy is circumstantial unless a conspirator lets something slip. Then came Carroll Quigley, Georgetown professor, historian, and leftist who was close enough to the Conspiracy to know its leaders and their goals. He put it all on paper in 1949 but found no publisher. Only after his death did this incriminating manuscript surface. \$10.00 paperbound.

Betrayal By Rulers by Prince Michael Sturdza. Traces the deterioration of the West and especially the United States since World War II, finding a pattern of action that cannot be explained by folly, stupidity, or accident - only by betrayal. \$4.95 paperbound.

Conspiracy Against God and Man by Reverend Clarence Kelly. The author has assembled information from two continents into a highly readable exposition of the Illuminati's origin, tactics, and goals, revealing a striking parallel between it and the communist movement. \$7.95 paperbound.

Fabian Freeway by Rose L. Martin. As the result of ten years of research, Rose L. Martin has compiled a detailed and alarming report on the Fabian Society of England and its inroads into American political life. Under the guise of a harmless reform movement, the Fabians have become a powerful force for socialism in America. \$8.95 hardbound.

The French Revolution by Nesta Webster. An excellent discussion of the subversive influences which fomented the French Revolution. \$6.00 paperbound.

The Invisible Government by Dan Smoot. Today's *Illuminati* may well be the snobbish group of intellectual socialists who run the Council on Foreign Relations. In 1962, former FBI official Dan Smoot dragged this secret organization out of its hiding place and into the spotlight. \$4.95 paperbound.

The Law by Frederic Bastiat. Originally published in 1850, this book explains the fundamental principles involved in determining the proper scope of government. \$2.00 paperbound.

Marx and Satan by Reverend Richard Wurmbrand. By examining Marx's poetry, plays, correspondence, and biographical accounts, Richard Wurmbrand builds a convincing case for Marx's Satanic preferences. \$5.95 paperbound.

The New Americanism by Robert Welch. This is a valued collection of major speeches and essays written by Mr. Welch that reach back into history to the founding of the Illuminati and move forward to show the links with the Communist Conspiracy and the socialist intellectuals of today. \$4.95 paperbound.

Our Enemy, The State by Albert Jay Nock. Written by a master of English prose, this is a classic critique distinguishing "government" from "the State" and exposing the dangers of statism. Originally published in 1935. \$9.95 paperbound.

Philip Dru: Administrator by Colonel E.M. House. A fictionalized account of how socialism/communism can be fastened onto the American Republic, this book was written in 1912 by the man who served in the White House as the *alterego* of President Woodrow Wilson. \$4.00 paperbound.

The Politician by Robert Welch. This book details the career of Dwight David Eisenhower, a Republican president who was a favorite of the leftist ADA and the destroyer of anti-communists. A startling example of how false an image can be. \$4.95 paperbound.

Proofs of a Conspiracy by John Robison. First published in 1798, this remains one of the most accurate studies of the Order of the Illuminati, a secret society founded in 1776 by Adam Weishaupt. Although 20th century historians have all but ignored the influence of the Illuminati, it is significant that this conspiracy embodied all of the characteristics of the movement we now call communism. \$4.95 paperbound.

The Rise of the House of Rothschild by Count Egon Caesar Corti. The fascinating story of the founding and early years of one of the greatest financial empires in modern history. \$4.95 paperbound.

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta Webster. The author traces the growth of such secret societies as the Templars, the Assassins, the Illuminati, and the Carbonari. \$6.00 paperbound.

The Selling of Gorbachev by Marlin Maddoux. An excellent response to "Gorbymania" and the pervasive campaign to improve the image of communism. The author exposes the roles played in this sinister game by the media, politicians, and many Red-trading American businessmen. \$3.00 paperbound.

The Shadows of Power by James Perloff. For those who have long followed the conspiratorial designs of the Council on Foreign Relations, this 1988 clarification about familiar episodes in history supplies missing links and makes the picture whole. \$10.95 paperbound.

Socialist Network by Nesta Webster. In her introduction, the author states: "The object of this book is not to provide a history of socialism, but merely an account of the socialist organizations of modern times." \$6.00 paperbound.

Surrender of an Empire by Nesta Webster. The systematic destruction of the British Empire is the subject of this fascinating book. \$6.00 paperbound.

Tragedy and Hope: A History Of The World In Our Time by Carroll Quigley. Boasting of having been permitted "to examine its papers and secret records," Carroll Quigley confirms the existence of a conspiracy above communism without ever using such a term. He details the origin and eventual power of the CFR and allied groups in this 1300 page book. \$25.00 hardbound.

The United Nations Conspiracy by Robert W. Lee. The author goes straight to the heart of the matter. The "last, best hope for peace" has connections with the socialistic CFR, is used as a base for Soviet espionage in the U.S., is run by Secretaries General with Marxist backgrounds, gives money to terrorists, and hides violence behind the skirts of its "children's fund." \$10.00 hardbound.

Valley of Decision by Dr. Sterling Lacy. An introduction to the conspiracy theory, this book will be especially appealing to church-going Americans who ought to make their presence felt in the political arena. \$4.00 paperbound.

Wall Street And The Rise Of Hitler by Antony C. Sutton. The author establishes a definite financial link between a select group of financial insiders and the national socialists of Nazi Germany. \$8.95 paperbound.

World Revolution by Nesta Webster. Since the 18th century, the world has been continuously embroiled in wars and revolutions directly attributable to secret societies and subversive movements. This book gives an excellent overview of the actions of revolutionaries during the past two centuries. \$6.00 paperbound.

Also Recommended

The New American is a biweekly magazine that dares to identify America's enemy as a conspiracy, adheres completely to the great heritage of liberty earned for us by our nation's founders, and warns continuously about the horrifying trend toward the creation of a Marxist state here in the United States. The perspective given in the pages of this publication is at the same time remarkably different and desperately needed.

A sample copy will be sent upon receipt of a written request. Or, subscriptions at \$39.00 for a full 26-issue year, or \$22.00 for six months, will be entered promptly. Send check and complete mailing address to:

The New American
Post Office Box 8040
Appleton, WI 54913-8040

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

The history of the human race has repeatedly been marked by the domination of the many by the few. At its core, control by the state or by a ruling clique claiming to personify the state has resulted in the denial of God-given rights — especially property rights.

During recent centuries, most would-be rulers who have gained favor with the people by promising them other men's property have been called socialists. Since the middle of the nineteenth century and the publication of *The Communist Manifesto*, however, those socialists who advocate revolution and terror to speed their acquisition of power have been known as communists.

While the generic term for these forms of collectivism is "socialist," those who admit to being communists seek power through *revolutionary* means, and those who call themselves socialists seek the same power through an *evolutionary* process.

With the publication of *The Communist Manifesto*, all socialists looked to Karl Marx as their ideological leader and his *Manifesto* as their guide. Millions more who have no idea whose program they are following have also embraced this Marxist program.

As nation after nation — certainly including the United States — plunges toward a socialistic new world order, wisdom dictates that those who would remain free should understand the strategy and tactics of those who would enslave. These are given in the *Manifesto*. What Karl Marx outlined in this small booklet — as a program to be implemented knowingly by socialists and communists, or unknowingly by democrats and republicans — will indeed destroy freedom and bring about the rule of the many by the few.

— The John Birch Society