

1 What is Communism?

Communism is the doctrine of the conditions of the liberation of the proletariat (*working class*).

2 What is the Proletariat?

The proletariat (*working class*) is that class in society which lives (*in dependence*) entirely from the sale of its labor and does NOT draw profit from any kind of capital (*or ownership of the property that is the means of mass production*);

whose weal (*or happiness*) and woe,
whose life and death,
whose sole existence depends

- on the demand for labor, hence,
- on the changing state of business,
- on the vagaries of unbridled competition.

The Proletariat, or the class of the proletarians, is, in a word, the working class of the 19th century.

3 Proletarians, then, have NOT always Existed?

No.

(Although) There have always been

- poor (*classes*)
- and working classes;

and the working class
have mostly been poor.

BUT there have NOT always been workers and poor people
living under **conditions** as they are **today**;

in other words,

there have NOT always been proletarians (*or working class*),
any more than there has always been

- free,
- (*rapacious, and*)
- unbridled

competitions.

4 How did the Proletariat Originate?

(FIRST quarter)

The Proletariat originated in the industrial revolution, which took place in England in the last half of the last (18th) century, and which has since then been repeated in all the (so called) civilized countries of the world.

This industrial revolution was precipitated by the discovery of

- the steam engine,
- various spinning machines,
- the mechanical loom,
- and a whole series of other mechanical devices.

These

- could be bought ONLY by big capitalists,
- altered the whole mode of production
- and displaced the former workers, because the machines turned out cheaper and better commodities than the workers could produce with their inefficient spinning wheels and hand looms.

(continued)

The machines delivered industry
wholly into the hands of the big capitalists
and rendered entirely worthless
the meagre property of the workers (tool, looms, etc.).

The result was that the capitalists
soon had everything in their hands
and nothing remained to the workers.

This marked the introduction of the factory system
into the textile industry.

4 How did the Proletariat Originate? (continued)**(SECOND quarter)**

Once the impulse to the introduction of

- machinery
- and the factory system

had been given,

this system spread quickly

to all other branches of industry,

especially

- cloth- (*dieing*) and book-printing,
- pottery,
- and the metal industries.

Labor was more and more divided
among the individual workers

so that the worker who previously had done a complete piece of work
now did ONLY a **part** of that piece.

This division of labor
made it possible
to produce things

- faster
- and cheaper.

(continued)

It reduced the activity of the individual worker to

- simple,
- endlessly repeated
- mechanical motions

which could be performed

NOT only as well (*by a machine*)

BUT much better by a machine.

In this way,

all the industries fell,

one after another,

under the dominance of

- steam,
- machinery,
- and the factory **system**,

just as spinning and waving

had already done.

4 **How did the Proletariat Originate?** (*continued*) (*THIRD quarter*)

But at the same time,
they also fell into the hands of big capitalists,
and their workers were deprived
of whatever independence remained to them.

Gradually,

- not only genuine manufacture
- but also handicrafts

came within the province of the factory system
as big capitalists increasingly displaced
the small master craftsman

by setting up huge workshops,
which saved many expenses
and permitted an elaborate division of labor.

4 **How did the Proletariat Originate?** *(continued)* *(FOURTH quarter)*

This is how it has come about
that in civilized countries
at the present time
nearly all kinds of labor
are performed in **factories**...

and, in nearly all branches of work,

- handicrafts
- and manufacture

have been superseded.

This process has,
to an ever-greater degree,
ruined the old middle class,
especial the small handicraftsmen;

it has entirely transformed
the condition of the workers;
and two new classes
have been created
which are gradually swallowing up
all the others.

(continued)

These are:

- (i) The class of big capitalists,
who, in all civilized countries,
are already in almost exclusive possession of all
 - the means of subsistence
 - and of the instruments (machines, factories)
 - and materials necessary for
the production of the means of subsistence.This is the bourgeois (*owning*) class, or the bourgeoisie.

- (ii) The class of the wholly propertyless,
who are obliged to sell their labor to the bourgeoisie (*owning class*)
in order to get, in exchange,
the means of subsistence for their support.
This is called the class of (*working*) proletarians, or the proletariat.

**5 Under what Conditions
does this Sale of the Labor
of the Proletarians
to the Bourgeoisie
Take Place?**

(FIRST third)

Labor is a commodity

like any other,
and its price
is therefore determined
by exactly the same laws
that apply to other commodities.

In a regime

- of big industry
- or of free competition

as we shall see,
the two (*labor and commodities*)
come to (*mean*) the same thing
the price of a commodity is,
on the average,
always equal to its cost of production.

Hence,
the price of labor
is also equal to the cost of production
of the labor.

**5 Under what Conditions
does this Sale of the Labor
of the Proletarians
to the Bourgeoisie
Take Place?**

(SECOND third)

BUT, the costs of production of labor consist of precisely the quantity of means of subsistence necessary to enable the worker to continue working, and to prevent the working class from dying out.

The worker will therefore get NO more for his labor than is necessary for this purpose; the price of labor, or the wage, will, in other words, be the lowest, the minimum, required for the maintenance of life.

**5 Under what Conditions
does this Sale of the Labor
of the Proletarians
to the Bourgeoisie
Take Place?**

(*FINAL third*)

However, since business
is sometimes better and sometimes worse,
it follows that the worker sometimes gets more
and sometimes gets less
for his commodities (*of labor*).

But, again,
just as the industrialist, on the average of good times and bad,
gets NO more and NO less for his commodities
than what they cost,
similarly on the average
the worker gets NO more and NO less
than his **minimum** (*sustenance*).

This economic law of wages
operates the more strictly
the greater the degree
to which big industry has taken **possession**
of all branches of production

6 What Working Classes were there before the Industrial Revolution?

The working classes have always, according to the different stages of development of society, lived in different circumstances and had different relations

- to the owning
- and ruling classes.

In antiquity, the workers were the **slaves** of the owners, just as they still are in many backward countries and even in the southern part of the United States.

(**continued**)

In the Middle Ages,
they were the (*agricultural*) **serfs** of the land-owning nobility,
as they still are in Hungary, Poland, and Russia.

In the Middle Ages,
and indeed right up to the industrial revolution,
there were also (*trade*) **journey men** in the cities
who worked in the service of the petty bourgeois masters.

Gradually, as manufacture developed,
these journeymen became **manufacturing workers**
who were even then employed by larger capitalists.

**7. In what way
do Proletarians
Differ from Slaves?**

(FIRST half)

The slave is sold once and for all;
the proletarian must sell himself

- daily
- and hourly.

The individual slave,
property of one master,
is assured an existence,
however miserable it may be,
because of the master's interest.

The individual proletarian,
property as it were of the entire bourgeois class
which buys his labor only when someone has need of it,
has NO secure existence.
This existence is assured only to the class as a whole.

**7. In what way
do Proletarians
Differ from Slaves?**

(SECOND half)

The slave is outside competition;
the proletarian is in it
and experiences ALL its vagaries (*whims*).

The slave counts as a thing,
NOT as a member of society.

Thus, the slave can have a better existence
than the proletarian,
while the proletarian belongs to a higher stage of social development
and, himself, stands on a higher social level than the slave.

The slave frees himself when,
of ALL the relations of private property,
he abolishes only the relation of slavery
and thereby becomes a proletarian;

the proletarian can free himself
only by abolishing private property in general.

8. In what way do Proletarians Differ from Serfs

The serf **possesses** and uses an instrument of production, a piece of (*his feudal lord's*) land, in exchange for which

- he gives up a part of his product
- or part of the services of his labor.

The proletarian **works** with the instruments of production of another, for the account of this other, in exchange for a **part** of the product.

The serf **gives up**, the proletarian **receives**.

The serf has an **assured** existence, the proletarian has **NOT**.

The serf is **outside competition**, the proletarian is **in it** (*competition*).

(*continued*)

The serf liberates himself in one of three ways:

- either he runs away to the city and there becomes a handicraftsman;
- or, instead of products and services,
he gives money to his lord and thereby becomes a free tenant;
- or he overthrows his feudal lord and himself becomes a property owner.

In short, by one route or another,
he gets into the owning class
and enters into competition,

The proletarian liberates himself by abolishing

- competition,
- private property,
- and ALL class differences.

**9. In what way
do Proletarians
Differ from
Handicraftsmen?**

In contrast to the proletarian,
the so-called handicraftsman,
as he still existed almost everywhere in the **past** (eighteenth) century
and still exists here and there at present,
is a **proletarian** at most **temporarily**.

His **goal** is to acquire **capital** himself
wherewith to exploit other workers.

(continued)

He can often achieve this goal

- where guilds still exist
- or where freedom from guild restrictions has NOT yet led to the introduction of factory-style methods into the crafts NOR yet to fierce competition.

BUT

- as soon as the factory system has been introduced into the crafts
- and competition flourishes fully,

this perspective dwindles away

and the handicraftsman becomes more and more a **proletarian**.

The handicraftsman therefore frees himself by

- becoming either **bourgeois** or entering the middle class in general (*the petty bourgeois*),
- or becoming a proletarian because of competition (as is not more often the case).

In which case he can **free** himself
by joining the proletarian movement,
i.e., the more or less **communist** movement.

**10 In what way
Do Proletarians Differ
from Manufacturing Workers?**

The manufacturing worker of the 16th to the 18th centuries still had, with but few exception(s), an instrument of production in his own possession:

- his loom,
- the family spinning wheel,
- (or) a little plot of land

which he cultivated in his spare time.

The **proletarian** has **none** of these things.

The manufacturing worker almost always lives in the countryside and in a more or less **patriarchal** relation to his landlord or employer; the **proletarian** lives, for the most part, in the city and his relation to his employer is purely a **cash** relation.

The manufacturing worker

- is torn out of his patriarchal relation by big industry,
 - loses whatever property he still has,
- and in this way becomes a **proletarian**.

**11 What were the Immediate Consequences
of the Industrial Revolution
and of the Division of Society into Bourgeoisie and Proletariat?
(FIRST quarter)**

First, the lower and lower prices of industrial products
brought about by machine labor
totally destroyed, in ALL countries of the world,
the old system of manufacture or industry
based upon hand (or manual) labor.

In this way, ALL ("semi-barbarian") countries,
which had hitherto been more or less strangers to historical development,
and whose industry had been based on manufacture (SEE previous question),
were violently forced out of their isolation.

They bought the cheaper commodities of the English
and allowed their own manufacturing workers to be ruined.

Countries which had known NO progress for thousands of years
(for example, India)
were thoroughly revolutionized,
and even China
is now on the way to revolution.

(continued)

We have come to the point
where a new machine invented (*manufactured, and used*) in England
deprives millions of Chinese workers of their livelihood
within a year's time.

In this way, big industry

- has **brought** ALL the people of the Earth into contact with each other,
- has **merged** ALL local markets into one world market,
- has **spread** ("civilization and progress") everywhere
- and has thus **ensured** that whatever happens in ("civilized") countries
will have repercussions in ALL other countries.

It follows that if the workers in England or France
now **liberate** themselves,
this must set off revolution in ALL other countries
(revolutions which, sooner or later,
must accomplish the **liberation**
of their respective working class).

**11 What were the Immediate Consequences
of the Industrial Revolution
and of the Division of Society into Bourgeoisie and Proletariat?
(SECOND quarter)**

Second, wherever big industries displaced manufacture (*SEE previous question*),
the bourgeoisie

- developed in wealth and power to the utmost
- and made itself the first class of the country.

The result
was that wherever this happened,
the bourgeoisie took political power into its own hands
and displaced the hitherto ruling classes,

- the aristocracy,
- the guild masters,
- and their representative, the absolute monarchy.

(continued)

The bourgeoisie annihilated the power of the aristocracy, the nobility, by abolishing the entailment of estates (in other words, by making landed property subject to purchase and sale, and by doing away with the special privileges of the nobility).

It destroyed the power of the guild masters by abolishing the guilds and handicraft privileges.

In their place
it put competition;

- that is, a state of society
- in which everyone has the right to enter into any branch of industry,
- the only obstacle being a lack of the necessary capital.

(continued)

The introduction of free competition
is thus public declaration that from now on

- the members of society are unequal
ONLY to the extent that their capitals are unequal,
- that capital is the decisive power,
- and that therefore the capitalists, the bourgeoisie,
have become the first class in society.

**11 What were the Immediate Consequences
of the Industrial Revolution
and of the Division of Society into Bourgeoisie and Proletariat?**
(THIRD quarter)

Free competition is necessary for the establishment of big industry,
because it is the ONLY condition of society
in which big industry can make its way.

Having destroyed the social power of

- the nobility
- and the guild masters,

the bourgeois also destroyed
their political power.

Having raised itself to the actual position of first class in society,
it proclaims itself to be also the dominant political class.

This it does through

- the introduction of the representative system
which rests on bourgeois equality before the law
- and the recognition of free competition,
- and in European countries takes the form of constitutional monarchy.

(continued)

In these constitutional monarchies,
ONLY those who possess a certain capital are voters:
that is to say, only members of the bourgeoisie.

These bourgeois voters choose the deputies,
and these bourgeois deputies,
by using their right to refuse to vote taxes,
choose a bourgeois government.

**11 What were the Immediate Consequences
of the Industrial Revolution
and of the Division of Society into Bourgeoisie and Proletariat?
(FOURTH quarter)**

Third, everywhere the proletariat
develops in step with the bourgeoisie.

In proportion,
as the bourgeoisie grows in wealth,
the proletariat grows in numbers.

For, since the proletarians can be employed ONLY by capital,
and since capital extends ONLY through employing labor,
it follows that the growth of the proletariat
proceeds at precisely the same pace as the growth of capital.

Simultaneously, this process
draws members of the bourgeoisie and proletarians together
into the great cities where industry can be carried on most profitably,
and by thus throwing great masses in one spot,
it gives to the proletarians a consciousness of their own strength.

(continued)

Moreover,

- the further this process advances,
- the more new labor-saving machines are invented,
- the greater is the pressure exercised by big industry on wages,
- which, as we have seen sink to their minimum
- and therewith render the condition of the proletariat increasingly unbearable.

The growing dissatisfaction of the proletariat
thus joins with its rising power
to prepare a proletarian social revolution.

12 What were the further Consequences of the Industrial Revolution?

Big industry created
in the steam engine, and other machines,
the means of endlessly

- expanding industrial production,
- speeding it up,
- and cutting its costs.

With production thus facilitated,
the free competition,
which is necessarily bound up with big industry,
assumed the most extreme forms;
a multitude of capitalists invaded industry,
and, in a short while,
more was produced than was needed.

(continued)

As a consequence,
finished commodities could NOT be sold,
and a so-called commercial crisis broke out.

- Factories had to be closed,
- their owners went bankrupt,
- and the workers were without bread (*no less shelter*).

Deepest misery reigned everywhere.

(continued)

After a time,

- the superfluous products were sold,
- the factories began to operate again,
- wages rose,
- and gradually business got better than ever.

But it was NOT long before

- too many commodities were again produced
- and a new crisis broke out,
- only to follow the same course as its predecessor.

Ever since the beginning of this (19th) century, the condition of industry has constantly fluctuated between periods of prosperity and periods of crisis; nearly every five to seven years, a fresh crisis has intervened, always with the greatest hardship for workers, and always accompanied by general revolutionary stirrings and the direct peril to the whole existing order of things.

**13 What Follows
from these Periodic
Commercial Crises?**

(FIRST half)

First:

That, though big industry in its earliest stage
created FREE competition,
it has **NOW** outgrown free competition;

that, for big industry, competition
and generally the individualistic organization of production
have become a FETTER
which it must and will shatter;

that, so long as big industry remains on its present footing,
it can be maintained ONLY at the cost of general **chaos** every seven years,
each time threatening the whole of civilization
and NOT only plunging the proletarians into **misery**
BUT also **ruining** large sections of the bourgeoisie;

(continued)

hence, either that big industry must itself be given up,
which is an absolute impossibility,
or that it makes unavoidably necessary
an entirely **new organization** of society
in which production is NO longer **directed**
by mutually competing **individual** industrialists
BUT rather (*directed*) by the **whole** society
operating according to a definite (*central*) plan
and talking account of **the needs of ALL**.

13 What Follows from these Periodic Commercial Crises?

(SECOND half)

Second:

That big industry,
and the limitless expansion of production which it makes possible,
bring within the range of feasibility
a **social order** in which so much is produced
that EVERY member of society will be in a position
to exercise and develop
ALL his (*or her*) powers and faculties in complete freedom.

It thus appears
that the very qualities of big industry
which, in our present-day society,
produce misery and crises
are those which,
in a different form of society,
will **abolish**

- this misery
- and these catastrophic depressions.

(continued)

We see with the greatest clarity:

- (i) that ALL these evils are from now on
to be ascribed solely
to a **social order** which **NO** longer corresponds
to the requirements of the real situation; and
- (ii) that it is possible,
through a **new** social order,
to do away with (*ALL*) these evils altogether.

14 What will this New Social Order have to be like?

Above ALL, it will have to take the control

- of industry
- and of all branches of production

out of the hands of mutually competing individuals,
and instead institute a system
in which all these branches of production
are **operated by society as a whole**;
that is, for

- the common account,
- according to a common (*central*) plan,
- and with the participation of all members of society.

It will,
in other words,

- abolish competition
- and replace it with association (*or cooperation*).

(*continued*)

Moreover,

- since the management of industry by individuals necessarily implies private property,
- and since competition is in reality merely the manner and form in which the control of industry by private property-owners expresses itself,

it follows that private property cannot be separated from

- competition
- and the individual management of industry.

Private property MUST, therefore,
be abolished
and in its place must come the common utilization
of all instruments of production
and the distribution of ALL products
according to common agreement;
in a word, what is called
the communal ownership of goods.

(continued)

In fact,
the abolition of private property is, doubtless,
the shortest and most significant way
to characterize the revolution in the whole social order
which has been made necessary
by the development of industry;
and for this reason it is rightly advanced by communists
as their main demand.

**15 Was NOT the Abolition of Private Property
Possible at an Earlier Time?**

(FIRST half)

No.

- Every change in the social order,
- every revolution in property relations,

is the necessary consequence
of the creation of **NEW** forces of production
which **NO longer fit into**
the old property relations.

Private property (*or the means of mass production*)
has **NOT** always existed.

(continued)

When, towards the end of the Middle Ages,
there arose a **NEW mode of production**
which could NOT be carried on
under the then existing

- feudal and
- guild forms of property,

this manufacture,
which had outgrown the old property relations,
created a new property form, private property (*or means of mass production*).

And for

- manufacture
- and the earliest stage of development of big industry,

private property (*or means of mass production*)
was (*or became*) the **ONLY** possible property form;
the social order based on it
was the **ONLY** possible social order.

(continued)

So long as it is **NOT** possible

- to produce so much that there is enough for ALL,
- with more left over for expanding the social capital
- and extending the forces of production;

so long as this is NOT possible,

there **MUST** always be

- a ruling class directing the use of society's productive forces,
- and a poor, oppressed class.

15 Was NOT the Abolition of Private Property Possible at an Earlier Time?

(SECOND half)

How these classes are constituted depend on the stage of development.

The agrarian Middle Ages give us

- the baron
- and the serf;

the cities of the later Middle Ages show us

- the guild master
- and the journeyman
- and the day laborer;

the 17th century

- has its (*home*) manufacturing workers;

the 19th (*century*) has

- big factory owners
- and proletarians.

(continued)

It is clear that, up to now,

- the forces of production have **never** been developed to the point where enough could be developed for ALL,
- and that private (*control of*) property (*or the means of mass production*) **has** become a fetter and a barrier in relation to the further development of the forces of production.

(continued)

Now, however, the development of big industry has ushered in a **NEW** period.

Capital and the forces of production have been expanded to an unprecedented extent, and the means are at hand to multiply them without limit in the near future.

Moreover, the **forces** of production have been **concentrated** in the hands of a few bourgeois, **while** the great mass of the people are more and more falling into the proletariat, their situation becoming more wretched and intolerable in **proportion** to the increase of wealth of the bourgeoisie.

and finally, these mighty and easily extended forces of production have so far **outgrown**

- private property
- and the bourgeoisie,

that they threaten at any moment to unleash the most violent disturbances of the social order.

Now, under these conditions, the abolition of private (*control of*) property (*or the means of mass production*) has become NOT only possible BUT absolutely necessary.

**16 Will the Peaceful Abolition
of (the) Private (control of the) Property (that is the means of mass production)
be Possible?**

It would be desirable
if this could happen,
and the communists
would certainly be the LAST to opposed it.

Communists know only too well
that all conspiracies are NOT only useless,
BUT even harmful.

They know all too well
that revolutions are NOT made intentionally and arbitrarily,
BUT that, everywhere and always,
they have been the **necessary consequence of conditions**
which were wholly independent
of the will and direction
of individual parties and entire classes.

(continued)

BUT they also see
that the development of the **proletariat**
in nearly ALL (*so called*) civilized countries
has been **violently suppressed**,
and that in this way
the **opponents** of communism
have (*ironically*) been working toward a revolution
with ALL their strength.

IF the oppressed proletariat
is finally driven to revolution
THEN we communists
will defend the interests of the proletarians with **deeds**
as we now defend them with **words**.

**17 Will it be Possible
for (the) Private (control
of the) Property (that is the means of mass production)
to be Abolished at One Stroke?**

NO, no more than **existing** forces of production
can at **one stroke** be multiplied
to the extent necessary
for the creation of a communal society.

In ALL probability,
the proletarian revolution will transform existing society **gradually**
and will be able to abolish
(the) private (control of the) property (that is the means of mass production)
only when the means of production
are available in sufficient quantity.

18 What will be the Course of this Revolution?

(FIRST fifth)

Above all, it will establish a democratic constitution,
and through this,
the direct **or** indirect dominance of the proletariat (*or working class*).

Direct in England,
where the proletarians (*or working class*)
are already a majority of the people.

Indirect in France and Germany,
where the majority of the people
consists NOT only of proletarians (*or the working class*), but also of

- small peasants (*or agricultural workers*)
- and petty bourgeois (*or owning class*)

who are in the process of **falling**
into the proletariat (*or working class*),
who are more and more **dependent**
in ALL their political interests on the proletariat (*or working class*),
and who must, therefore,
soon **adapt** to the demands of the proletariat (*or working class*).

Perhaps this will cost a second struggle,
but the (*ultimate*) outcome can only be
the victory of the proletariat (*or working class*).

18 What will be the Course of this Revolution?

(SECOND fifth)

Democracy would be wholly value**less** to the proletariat (*or working class*)
if it were NOT immediately used as a means

- for putting through measures directed **against**
(*the*) private (*control of the*) property (*that is the means of mass production*)
- and **ensuring** the livelihood of the proletariat (*or working class*).

The main measures,
emerging as the necessary result
of existing relations,
are the following:

continued

- (i) **Limitation of (the) private (control of the) property (that is the means of mass production)** through
- progressive taxation,
 - heavy inheritance taxes,
 - abolition of **inheritance** through **collateral** lines (brothers, nephews, etc.)
 - (and) forced loans, etc.
- (ii) **Gradual expropriation** (or seizure of the private control of the property that is the means of mass production) of (the)
- landowners,
 - industrialists,
 - railroad magnates and
 - shipowners,
- partly through competition by state industry,
partly directly through compensation in the form of bonds.
- (iii) **Confiscation of the possessions of ALL**
- **emigrants** (the owning class who choose to leave the country)
 - **and** (the owning class who act as) **rebels** against the majority of people (who are the working class).

18 What will be the Course of this Revolution?

(THIRD fifth)

(The main measures, emerging as the necessary result of existing relations, are the following):

- (iv) **Organization** of labor or employment of proletarians (*or the working class*)
 - on publicly owned land,
 - in factories
 - and workshops
 - with **competition among** the **workers** being abolished
 - and with the factory owners,
 - in so far as they still exist,
 - being obliged to pay the **same** high wages
 - as those paid by the state.

- (v) An **equal** obligation on ALL (*able bodied*) members of society to work until such time as (*the*) private (*control of the*) property (*that is the means of mass production*) has been completely abolished.
 (*as well as the*) **Formation** of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

- (vi) **Centralization** of money and credit in the hands of the state through a national bank with state capital, and the **suppression** of ALL private
 - banks and
 - bankers.

18 What will be the Course of this Revolution?

(FOURTH fifth)

(The main measures, emerging as the necessary result of existing relations, are the following):

(vii) **Increase** in the number of national

- factories,
- workshops,
- railroads,
- (and) ships;

bringing new lands into cultivation

and **improvement** of land already under cultivation

(ALL in proportion to the growth of the capital and labor force
at the disposal of the nation).

(viii) **Education** of ALL children,

- from the moment they can leave their mother's (or guardian's) care,
- in national establishments
- at national cost.

Education and production together.

continued...

- (ix) Construction, on public lands,
of great palaces as **communal dwellings**
for **associated** groups of citizens
engaged in both industry and agriculture
and **combining** in their way of life
the **advantages** of urban and rural conditions
while avoiding the
- one-sidedness and
 - drawbacks
- of each.

18 What will be the Course of this Revolution?

(FINAL fifth)

(The main measures, emerging as the necessary result of existing relations, are the following):

- (x) **Destruction** of ALL
 - unhealthy and
 - jerry-built dwellingsin urban districts.
- (xi) Equal **inheritance rights**
for children born in and out of wedlock.
- (xii) Concentration of ALL means of **transportation**
in the hands of the nation.

continued...

It is impossible, of course,
to carry out ALL these measures
(ALL) at once.

BUT one (*measure*)
will always bring other (*measure*)s
in its wake.

Once the first radical attack
on (*the*) private (*control of the*) property (*that is the means of mass production*)
has been launched,
the proletariat (*or working class*) will find itself forced to go ever further,
to concentrate increasingly in the hands of the state

- ALL capital,
- ALL agriculture,
- ALL transport,
- (*and*) ALL trade.

continued...

ALL the foregoing (*or aforementioned*) measures
are directed to this end;
and they will become

- practicable and
- feasible,
- (*and*) capable of producing their centralizing effects

to precisely the degree
that the proletariat (*or working class*),
through its labor,
multiplies the country's productive forces.

continued...

Finally, when

- ALL capital,
- ALL production,
- (*and*) ALL exchange

have been brought together
in the hands of the nation,

- (*the*) private (*control of the*) property (*that is the means of mass production*)
will disappear of its own accord,
- money will become superfluous,
- and production will so expand
- and man so change
that society will be able to slough off
whatever of its old economic (*bad*) habits may remain.

**19 Will it be Possible
for this Revolution to Take Place
in One Country Alone?**

No. By creating the world market,
big industry has already brought
ALL the peoples of the Earth,
and especially the (*so called*) civilized peoples,
into such close relation with one another
that none is independent
of what happens to the others.

(continued)

Further, it has co-ordinated the social development of the (*so called*) civilized countries to such an extent that, in ALL of them,

- bourgeoisie (*owning class*)
- and proletariat (*working class*)

have become the decisive classes, and the struggle between them (*has become*) the great struggle of the day.

It follows that the communist revolution will NOT merely be a national phenomenon BUT must take place simultaneously in ALL (*so called*) civilized countries (that is to say) at least

- England,
- America,
- France,
- and Germany.

(*continued*)

It will develop in each of these countries more or less rapidly, according as one country or the other has:

- a more developed industry,
- greater wealth,
- (*and*) a more significant mass of productive forces.

Hence,

- it will go slowest and will meet (*the*) most obstacles in Germany,
- (*and*) most rapidly and with the fewest difficulties in England.

It will have a powerful impact on the other countries of the world, and will radically alter the course of development which they have followed up to now, while greatly stepping up its pace.

It is a universal revolution and will, accordingly, have a universal range.

**20 What will be the Consequences
of the Ultimate disappearance
of (the) private (control of the) property
(that is the means of mass production)?**

(FIRST of five)

Society will take ALL

- forces of production and
- means of commerce, as well as
- the exchange and distribution of products,

out of the hands of private capitalists
and will manage them in accordance
with a plan based on

- the availability of resources and
- the needs of the whole society.

In this way,
most important of all,
the evil consequences
which are now associated
with the conduct of (*rapacious*) big industry
will be abolished.

(continued)

There will be NO more crises;
the expanded production,
which for the present order of society is

- overproduction and hence
- a prevailing cause of misery,

will then be insufficient
and in need of being expanded much further.

Instead of generating misery,
overproduction will reach beyond
the elementary requirements of society
to assure the satisfaction of the needs of all;
it will create

- new needs
and, at the same time,
- the means of satisfying them.

It will become the condition of,
and the stimulus to,
new progress,
which will NO longer
throw the whole social order into confusion,
as progress has always done in the past.

**20 What will be the Consequences
of the Ultimate disappearance
of (the) private (control of the) property
(that is the means of mass production)?**

(SECOND of five)

Big industry,
freed from the pressure
of (the) private (control of the) property (that is the means of mass production),
will undergo such an expansion
that what we now see
will seem as petty in comparison
as (small scale, home) manufacture seems
when put beside the big industry of our own day.

This development of industry
will make available to society
a sufficient mass of products
to satisfy the needs of everyone.

The same will be true of agriculture,
which also

- suffers from the pressure
of (the) private (control of the) property (that is the means of mass production) and
- is held back by the division of privately owned land
into small parcels.

(continued)

Here, existing improvements and scientific procedures
will be put into practice,
with a resulting leap forward
which will assure to society
ALL the products it needs.

In this way,
such an abundance of goods
will be able to satisfy the needs
of ALL its (*society's*) members.

**20 What will be the Consequences
of the Ultimate disappearance
of (the) private (control of the) property
(that is the means of mass production)?**

(THIRD of five)

The division of society into

- different,
- mutually hostile classes

will then become unnecessary.

Indeed, it will be

- NOT only unnecessary
- BUT intolerable

in the new social order.

The existence of classes
originated in the division of labor,
and the division of labor (*between owning class and working class*),
as it has been known up to the present,
will completely disappear.

For mechanical and chemical processes
are NOT enough to bring industrial and agricultural production
up to the level we have described;
the capacities of the men (*and women*) who make use of these processes
must undergo a corresponding development.

(continued)

Just as

- the (*agricultural workers or*) peasants and
- (*home*) manufacturing workers

of the last century

changed their whole way of life

and became quite different people

when they were drawn (*or coerced*) into big industry,

in the same way, communal control over production by society as a whole,

and the resulting new development,

will require an entirely different kind of human material.

People will NO longer be,

as they are today,

subordinated to a single branch of production,

- bound to it,
- exploited by it;

they will NO longer develop *one* of their faculties

at the expense of ALL others;

they will NO longer know only *one* branch,

or one branch of a single branch,

of production as a whole.

(*For*) Even industry as it is today

is finding such people

less and less useful.

**20 What will be the Consequences
of the Ultimate disappearance
of (the) private (control of the) property
(that is the means of mass production)?**

(FOURTH of five)

Industry

- controlled by society as a **whole**, and
- operated according to a plan,

presupposes well-rounded human beings,
their faculties

- developed in a balanced fashion,
- able to see the system of production in its entirety.

The form of the division of labor which makes

- one a peasant,
- another a cobbler,
- a third a factory worker,
- a fourth a stock-market operator,

has already been undermined by machinery
and will completely disappear.

(continued)

Education will enable young people quickly to

- familiarize themselves with the whole system of production and
- to pass from one branch of production to another

in response to

- the needs of society or
- their own inclinations.

It will, therefore, free them
from the one-sided character
which the present-day division of labor
impresses upon every individual.

Communist society will, in this way,
make it possible for its members
to put their comprehensively developed faculties
to full use.

BUT, when this happens,
classes will necessarily disappear.

(continued)

It follows that society organized on a communist basis is incompatible with the **existence** of classes on one hand, and that the very building of such a society provides the means of **abolishing** class differences on the other.

**20 What will be the Consequences
of the Ultimate disappearance
of (the) private (control of the) property
(that is the means of mass production)?**

(FINAL fifth)

A corollary of this
is that the **difference** between city and country
is destined to **disappear**.

The management of agriculture **and** industry
by the **same** people
rather than by two different classes of people is,
if only for purely material reasons,
a **necessary** condition of communist association.

The dispersal of

- the agricultural population on the land,
- alongside the crowding of the industrial population into the great cities,

is a condition which corresponds
to an **undeveloped** state of both agriculture and industry
and can already be felt as an **obstacle** to further development.

(continued)

The general cooperation of ALL members of society
for the purpose of

- planned exploitation of the forces of production,
- the expansion of production to the point where it will satisfy the needs of ALL,
- the abolition of a situation in which the needs of some are satisfied at the expense of the needs of others,
- the complete liquidation of classes and their conflicts,
- the rounded development of the capacities of ALL members of society through the elimination of the present division of labor, through industrial education,
- through engaging in varying activities,
- through the participation by ALL in the enjoyments produced by all,
- through the combination of city and country;

these are the main consequences

of the abolition of *(the)* private *(control of the)* property *(that is the means of mass production)*.

21 What will be the Influence of Communist Society on the Family?

It will transform the relations between the sexes
into a purely private matter
which concerns ONLY the persons involved
and into which society has NO occasion to intervene.

It can do this since it

- does away with *(the) private (control of the) property (that is the means of mass production)* and
 - educates children on a communal basis,
- and in this way removes the two bases of traditional marriage;
the dependence rooted in *(the) private (control of the) property (that is the means of survival)*,
- of the **women** on the man,
 - and of the **children** on the parents.

(continued)

And here is the answer
to the outcry of the highly moral philistines
against the *(so called)* "community of women."

Community of women is a condition
which belongs entirely to bourgeois *(owning-class)* society
and which today finds its complete expression in **prostitution**.

But prostitution is based
on *(the)* private *(control of the)* property *(that is the means of survival)*
and falls with it.

Thus, communist society,
instead of introducing *(a so called)* community of women,
in fact abolishes it.

22 What will be the Attitude of Communism to Existing Nationalities?

The nationalities of the peoples associating themselves in accordance with the principle of **community** will (*eventually*) be compelled to mingle with each other as a result of this association

and thereby to dissolve themselves, just as the various estate and class distinctions must disappear through the abolition of their **basis**, (*the*) private (*control of the*) property (*that is the means of mass production*).

**23 What will be its Attitude
to Existing Religions?**

All religions so far
have been the expression of historical stages of development

- of individual peoples
- or groups of peoples.

But communism is the state of historical development
which makes ALL existing religions superfluous
and brings about their disappearance.

24 How do communists Differ from socialists?

The so-called socialists are divided
into **three** categories.

(FIRST of three)

[Reactionary Socialists]

The first category consists of adherents of a

- feudal and
- patriarchal

society which has already been destroyed,
and is still daily being destroyed, by

- big industry and
- world trade and their creation,
- bourgeois (*owning class*) society.

This category concludes,
FROM the evils of existing society,
THAT feudal and patriarchal society
must be **restored**
because it was free of such evils.

In one way or another,
ALL their proposals
are directed to this end.

(continued)

This category of reactionary socialist,
for ALL their **seeming** partisanship
and their scalding tears
for the misery of the proletariat (*working class*),
is nevertheless energetically opposed
by the communists for the **following** reasons:

- (i) It (*reactionary socialism*) **strives** for something
which is entirely **impossible**.
- (ii) It (*reactionary socialism*) seeks to establish the rule of
 - the aristocracy,
 - the guild masters,
 - the small producers, and
 - their retinue of absolute or feudal
 - monarchs,
 - officials,
 - soldiers, and
 - priests;
 a society which was,
to be sure,
free of the evils of present-day society
BUT which brought it **at least as** many evils
without even offering to the oppressed workers
the prospect of liberation
through a communist revolution.

(continued)

- (iii) As soon as the proletariat (*working class*) becomes **revolutionary** and **communist**, these reactionary socialists show their true colors by immediately making common cause **with** the bourgeoisie (*owning class*) **against** the proletarians (*or working class*).

24 How do communists Differ from socialists?

*The so-called socialists are divided
into **three** categories...*

(SECOND of three)

[Bourgeois Socialists:]

The second category consists of adherents of present-day society who have been frightened for its future by the evils to which it necessarily gives rise
(*such as the consequences of rewarding short-sighted sociopathy*).

What they want, therefore, is to maintain this society while getting rid of the evils which are an inherent part of it.

To this end, some propose **mere** welfare measures; while others come forward with grandiose systems of **reform** which, under the **pretense** of re-organizing society, are in fact intended to **preserve** the foundations, and hence the life, of **existing** society.

(continued)

Communists must unremittingly (*and persistently*) struggle **against** these bourgeois (*owning-class*) socialists because they work for the enemies of communists and **protect** the society which communists aim to **overthrow**.

24 How do communists Differ from socialists?

*The so-called socialists are divided
into **three** categories...*

(THIRD of three)

[Democratic Socialists]

Finally, the third category consists of democratic socialists who favor **some** of the same measures the communists advocate, as described in Question 18, **NOT** as part of the **transition** to communism, however, **BUT** as measures which they believe will be sufficient to **abolish** the misery and evils of present-day society.

These (*so called*) democratic socialists are either proletarians (*or working class*) who are NOT yet sufficiently clear about the conditions of the liberation of their class, **or** they are representatives of the petty bourgeoisie (*or owning class*), a class which, **prior** to the achievement of democracy and the socialist measures to which it gives rise, has many interests **in common** with the proletariat (*working class*).

(continued)

It follows that,
in moments of **action**,
the communists will have to **come** to an understanding
with these democratic socialists,
and in general to follow as far as possible
a common policy **with** them;
provided that these socialists do **NOT**
enter into the service of the ruling bourgeoisie (*owning class*)
and **attack** the communists.

It is clear that this form of cooperation in action
does NOT exclude
the (*mere*) discussion of differences.

25 What is the Attitude of the Communists to the Other Political Parties of our Time?

(FIRST half)

This attitude is different in the different countries.

In England, France, and Belgium, where the bourgeoisie (*owning class*) rules, the communists still **have** a common interest with the various democratic parties, an interest which is all the greater the more closely the socialistic measures they champion **approach** the aims of the communists; that is, the more clearly and definitely

- they **represent** the interests of the proletariat (*working class*)
- and the more they **depend** on the proletariat (*working class*) for support.

In England, for example, the working-class Chartists are infinitely closer to the communists than

- the democratic petty bourgeoisie (*owning class*)
- or the so-called Radicals.

(continued)

In America,
where a (*so called*) democratic constitution has already been established,
the communists must make the common cause with the party

- which will turn this constitution **against** the bourgeoisie (*owning class*)
- and use it in the **interests** of the proletariat (*working class*);
that is, with the agrarian National Reformers.

In Switzerland, the Radicals,
though a very mixed party,
are the only group with which the communists can co-operate,
and among these Radicals,

- the Vaudois
- and Genevese

are the most advanced.

25 What is the Attitude of the Communists to the Other Political Parties of our Time?

(SECOND half)

In Germany, finally, the decisive struggle now on the order of the day is that between

- the bourgeoisie (*owning class*)
- and the absolute monarchy (*aristocracy*).

Since the communists **cannot** enter upon the decisive struggle between themselves and the bourgeoisie (*owning class*) **until** the bourgeoisie (*owning class*) is in power, it follows that it is in the interest of the communists to **help** the bourgeoisie to power as soon as possible in order the **sooner** to be able to **overthrow** it.

Against the governments, therefore, the communists must continually support the radical liberal party, taking care to **avoid** the self-deceptions of the bourgeoisie (*owning class*) and **NOT** fall for the enticing promise of benefits which a victory for the bourgeoisie (*owning class*) would **allegedly** bring to the proletariat (*working class*).

The sole advantages which the proletariat (*working class*) would derive from a bourgeois (*owning class*) victory would consist

- (i) in various concessions which would facilitate the **unification** of the proletariat (*working class*) into a closely knit, battle-worthy, and organized class; and
- (ii) in the **certainly** that, on the very day the absolute monarchies fall, the **struggle** between bourgeoisie (*owning class*) and proletariat (*working class*) will (*at last*) **start**.

From that day on, the policy of the communists will be the same as it now is in the countries where the bourgeoisie (*owning class*) is already in power.