

Anarchism
or
Socialism?

By Joseph Stalin



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS • New York

Michael
Hannon
1971

ANARCHISM
OR
SOCIALISM?

By
Joseph Stalin



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1953, BY
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.



PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

C O N T E N T S

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| EDITOR'S NOTE | 5 |
| ANARCHISM OR SOCIALISM | 7 |
| I. THE DIALECTICAL METHOD | 10 |
| II. THE MATERIALIST THEORY | 19 |
| III. PROLETARIAN SOCIALISM | 31 |
| EXPLANATORY NOTES | 59 |

EDITOR'S NOTE

IN THE winter of 1905-06, a group of anarchists in Georgia, in the Caucasus, followers of Prince Peter Kropotkin, conducted a fierce ideological campaign against the Marxists. This group published a number of newspapers in Tiflis, now Tbilisi. The anarchists had no support among the working class, but they achieved some success among declassed and petty-bourgeois groups.

Stalin wrote a series of articles in Georgian against the anarchists under the general title of "Anarchism or Socialism?" which comprises the present booklet.

The first four articles originally appeared in June and July, 1906, in *Akhali Tskhovreba (New Life)*, a daily Bolshevik newspaper published in Tiflis from June 20 to July 14, under the direction of Joseph Stalin. The series was discontinued, as the newspaper was suppressed by the authorities. These articles were reprinted, in a slightly revised form, in December 1906 and January 1907, in *Akhali Droyeba (New Times)*, a trade union weekly published in Tiflis from November 14, 1906, to January 8, 1907, when it was suppressed by order of the governor of Tiflis. An editorial comment explained:

"Recently, the Office Employees' Union wrote to us suggesting that we should publish articles on anarchism, socialism, and cognate questions. . . . The same wish was expressed by several other comrades. We gladly meet these wishes and publish these articles. As regards these articles, we deem it necessary to mention that some have already appeared in the Georgian press (but for reasons over which the author had no control they were not completed). Nevertheless, we considered it necessary to reprint all the articles in full and to request the author to rewrite them in more popular style, and this he gladly did."

The series was continued in the Bolshevik daily press of Tiflis: in February 1907, in *Chveni Tskhovreba (Our Life)* until its sup-

pression for its "extremist trend" on March 6, 1907; and then in April 1907, in *Dro (Time)*.

However, the series was never completed. In mid-1907, Stalin left Tiflis for Baku, where he was arrested several months later. His notes on the last chapters were lost when his lodgings were searched.

Anarchism or Socialism?

THE HUB of contemporary social life is the class struggle. In the course of this struggle each class is guided by its own ideology. The bourgeoisie has its own ideology, so-called *Liberalism*.¹ The proletariat also has its own ideology—this, as is well known, is *socialism*.

Liberalism must not be regarded as something whole and indivisible: it is subdivided into different trends, corresponding to the different strata of the bourgeoisie.

Nor is socialism whole and indivisible: In it there are also different trends.

We shall not here examine liberalism—that task had better be left for another time. We want to acquaint the reader only with socialism and its trends. We think that he will find this more interesting.

Socialism is divided into three main trends: *reformism*, *anarchism*, and *Marxism*.

Reformism (Bernstein² and others) regards socialism as a remote goal and nothing more, and actually repudiates the socialist revolution and aims at establishing socialism by peaceful means. Reformism advocates not class struggle but class collaboration. This reformism is decaying day after day, is day after day losing all resemblance to socialism and, in our opinion, it is totally unnecessary to examine it in these articles in defining socialism.

It is altogether different with Marxism and anarchism: both are at the present time recognized as socialist trends, both are waging a fierce struggle against each other, both are trying to present themselves to the proletariat as genuinely socialist doctrines, and, of course, a study and comparison of the two will be far more interesting for the reader.

We are not one of those who, when the word "anarchism" is mentioned, turn away contemptuously and say with a supercilious wave of the hand: "Why waste time on that? It's not worth talking

about!" We think that such cheap "criticism" is undignified and useless.

Nor are we one of those who console themselves with the thought that the anarchists "have no masses behind them and, therefore, are not so dangerous." It is not a matter of who has a larger or smaller "mass" following today; it is the essence of the doctrine that matters. If the "doctrine" of the anarchists expresses the truth, then it goes without saying that it will certainly hew a path for itself and will rally the masses around itself. If, however, it is unsound and built on a false foundation, it will not last long and will remain suspended in midair. But the unsoundness of anarchism must be proved.

Some people believe that Marxism and anarchism are based on the same principles and that the disagreements between them concern only tactics, so that, in the opinion of these people, it is quite wrong to set up one trend against the other.

This is a great mistake.

We believe that the anarchists are real enemies of Marxism. Consequently, we also hold that a real struggle must be waged against real enemies. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the "doctrine" of the anarchists from beginning to end and weigh it thoroughly in all aspects.

The point is that Marxism and anarchism are built up on entirely different principles, in spite of the fact that both come into the arena of struggle under the flag of socialism. The cornerstone of anarchism is the *individual*, whose emancipation, according to its tenets, is the principal condition for the emancipation of the masses, the collective body. According to the tenets of Anarchism, the emancipation of the masses is impossible until the individual is emancipated. Accordingly, its slogan is: "Everything for the individual." The cornerstone of Marxism, however, is the *masses*, whose emancipation, according to its tenets, is the principal condition for the emancipation of the individual. That is to say, according to the tenets of Marxism, the emancipation of the individual is impossible until the masses are emancipated. Accordingly, its slogan is: "Everything for the masses."

Clearly, we have here two principles, one negating the other, and not only disagreements on tactics.

The object of our articles is to juxtapose these two opposite principles, to compare Marxism with anarchism, and thereby throw

light on their respective virtues and defects. Right here we think it necessary to acquaint the reader with the plan of these articles.

We shall commence with a description of Marxism, deal, in passing, with the anarchists' views on Marxism, and then proceed to criticize anarchism itself. Namely, we shall explain the dialectical method, the anarchists' views on this method, and our criticism; the materialist theory, the anarchists' views and our criticism (here, too, we shall discuss the socialist revolution, the socialist dictatorship, the minimum program, and tactics generally); the philosophy of the anarchists and our criticism; the socialism of the anarchists and our criticism; anarchist tactics and organization—and, in conclusion, we shall give our deductions.

We shall try to prove that, as advocates of small community socialism, the anarchists are not genuine socialists.

We shall also try to prove that, in so far as they repudiate the dictatorship of the proletariat, the anarchists are also not genuine revolutionaries. . . .

And so, we shall proceed with our subject.

I THE DIALECTICAL METHOD

"Everything in the world is in motion. . . . Life changes, productive forces grow, old relations collapse." K. Marx

MARXISM IS not only the theory of socialism, it is an integral world outlook, a philosophical system, from which Marx's proletarian socialism logically follows. This philosophical system is called dialectical materialism.

Hence, to expound Marxism also means expounding dialectical materialism.

Why is this system called dialectical materialism?

Because its *method* is dialectical, and its *theory* is materialistic.

What is the dialectical method?

It is said that social life is in continual motion and development. This is true: Life must not be regarded as something immutable and static; it never remains at one level, it is in eternal motion, in an eternal process of destruction and creation. Therefore, life always contains the *new* and the *old*, the *growing* and the *dying*, the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary.

The dialectical method tells us that we must regard life as it actually is. We have seen that life is in continual motion; consequently, we must regard life in its motion and ask: Where is life going? We have seen that life presents a picture of constant destruction and creation; consequently, we must examine life in its process of destruction and creation and ask: What is being destroyed and what is being created in life?

That in life which is born and grows day after day is invincible, its progress cannot be checked. This means, for example, if the proletariat as a class is born and grows day after day, no matter how weak and small in numbers it may be *today*, in the long run it must conquer. Why? Because it is growing, gaining strength, and

marching forward. On the other hand, that in life which grows old and is advancing to its grave must inevitably sustain defeat, even if *today* it represents a titanic force. This means, for example, if the ground is gradually slipping from under the feet of the bourgeoisie, and the latter is slipping further and further back every day, no matter how strong and numerous it may be today, it must in the long run sustain defeat. Why? Because as a class it is decaying, growing feeble, growing old, and becoming a burden to life.

From this arose the well-known dialectical proposition: All that which really exists, *i.e.*, all that which grows day after day, is rational, and all that which decays day after day is irrational and, consequently, cannot avoid defeat.

For example: In the eighties of the last century a great controversy flared up among the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia. The Populists asserted, the main force that could undertake the task of "liberating Russia" was the petty bourgeoisie, rural and urban. Why? the Marxists asked them. Because, answered the Populists, the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie now constitute the majority and, moreover, they are poor, they live in poverty.

To this the Marxists replied: It is true that the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie now constitute the majority and are really poor, but is that the point? The petty bourgeoisie has long constituted the majority, but up to now it has displayed no initiative in the struggle for "freedom" without the assistance of the proletariat. Why? Because the petty bourgeoisie, as a class, is not growing; on the contrary, it is disintegrating day after day and breaking up into bourgeois and proletarians. Nor, on the other hand, is poverty of decisive importance here; of course, "tramps" are poorer than the petty bourgeoisie, but nobody will say that they can undertake the task of "liberating Russia."

As you see, the point is not which class today constitutes the majority, or which class is poorer, but which class is gaining strength and which is decaying.

And as the proletariat is the only class which is steadily growing and gaining strength, which is pushing social life forward and rallying all the revolutionary elements around itself, we must regard it as the main force in the present-day movement, join its ranks, and make its progressive strivings our strivings.

That is how the Marxists answered.

Obviously the Marxists looked at life dialectically, whereas the

Populists argued metaphysically—they pictured social life as something that remains static.

This is how the dialectical method views the development of life.

But there is movement and movement. There was movement in social life during the "December days,"³ when the proletariat, straightening its back, stormed arms depots and launched an attack upon reaction. But the movement of preceding years, when the proletariat, under the conditions of "peaceful" development, limited itself to individual strikes and the formation of small trade unions, must also be called social movement.

Clearly, movement assumes different forms.

And so the dialectical method says that movement has two forms: the evolutionary and the revolutionary.

Movement is evolutionary when the progressive elements spontaneously continue their daily activities and introduce minor, *quantitative* changes into the old order.

Movement is revolutionary when the same elements combine, become imbued with a single idea, and sweep down upon the enemy camp with the object of uprooting the old order and of introducing *qualitative* changes in life, of establishing a new order.

Evolution prepares for revolution and creates the ground for it; revolution consummates the process of evolution and facilitates its further activity.

Similar processes take place in nature. The history of science shows that the dialectical method is a truly scientific method. Beginning with astronomy and ending with sociology, in every field we find confirmation of the idea that nothing is eternal in the universe, everything changes, everything develops. Consequently, everything in nature must be regarded from the point of view of movement, development. And this means that the spirit of dialectics permeates the whole of present-day science.

As regards the forms of movement, as regards the fact that according to dialectics, minor, *quantitative* changes in the long run lead to major, *qualitative* changes—this law applies with equal force to the history of nature. Mendeleyev's "periodic table of the elements" clearly shows how very important in the history of nature is the rise of qualitative changes out of quantitative changes. The same thing is shown in biology by the theory of neo-Lamarckism,⁴ to which neo-Darwinism⁵ is yielding place.

We shall say nothing about other facts, on which Frederick Engels has thrown sufficiently full light in his *Anti-Dühring*.⁶

Such is the content of the dialectical method.

How do the anarchists look upon the dialectical method?

Everybody knows that Hegel⁷ was the father of the dialectical method. Marx purged and improved this method. The anarchists are aware of this, of course. They know that Hegel was a conservative, and so, taking advantage of this, they vehemently revile Hegel as an advocate of "restoration," they try with the utmost zeal to "prove" that "Hegel is the philosopher of restoration . . . that he eulogizes bureaucratic constitutionalism in its absolute form, that the general idea of his philosophy of history is subordinate to and serves the philosophical trend of the period of restoration," and so on and so forth.⁸

The well-known anarchist, Kropotkin,⁹ tries to "prove" the same things in his works (see, for example, his *Science and Anarchism*, in Russian).¹⁰

Our Kropotkinites from Cherkezishvili¹¹ right down to Sh. G.,¹² all in one voice echo Kropotkin.

True, nobody contests what they say on this point; on the contrary, everybody agrees that Hegel was not a revolutionary. Marx and Engels themselves proved before everybody else, in their *Critique of Critical Criticism*,¹³ that Hegel's views on history fundamentally contradict the idea of the sovereignty of the people. But in spite of this, the anarchists go on trying to "prove," and deem it necessary to go on day in and day out trying to "prove," that Hegel was an advocate of "restoration." Why do they do this? Probably, in order in this way to discredit Hegel and make their readers feel that the "reactionary" Hegel's method also cannot be other than "repugnant" and unscientific.

The anarchists think that they can refute the dialectical method by all this.

We affirm that in this way they can prove nothing but their own ignorance. Pascal¹⁴ and Leibnitz¹⁵ were not revolutionaries, but the mathematical method they discovered is recognized today as a scientific method. Mayer¹⁶ and Helmholtz¹⁷ were not revolutionaries, but their discoveries in the field of physics became the basis of science. Nor were Lamarck and Darwin revolutionaries, but their evolutionary method put biological science on its feet. . . . Why,

then, should it not be admitted that, in spite of his conservatism, Hegel succeeded in working out a scientific method which is called the dialectical method?

No, *in this way* the anarchists can prove nothing but their own ignorance.

To proceed. In the opinion of the anarchists, "dialectics is metaphysics," and as they "want to free science from metaphysics, philosophy from theology," they repudiate the dialectical method.¹⁸

Oh those anarchists! As the saying goes, "Blame others for your own sins." Dialectics matured in the struggle against metaphysics and gained fame in this struggle; but according to the anarchists, dialectics is metaphysics!

Dialectics tells us that nothing in the world is eternal, everything in the world is transient and mutable; nature changes, society changes, habits and customs change, conceptions of justice change, truth itself changes—that is why dialectics regards everything critically; that is why it denies the existence of a truth established once and for all. Consequently, it also repudiates abstract "dogmatic statements, which once discovered had merely to be learned by heart."¹⁹

Metaphysics, however, tells us something altogether different. From its standpoint the world is something eternal and immutable,²⁰ it has been once and for all determined by someone or something—that is why the metaphysicians always have "eternal justice" or "immutable truth" on their lips.

Proudhon,²¹ the "father" of the anarchists, said that there existed in the world an *immutable justice determined once and for all*, which must serve as the basis of future society. That is why Proudhon was called a metaphysician. Marx fought Proudhon with the aid of the dialectical method and proved that since everything in the world changes, "justice" must also change, and that, consequently, "immutable justice" is just metaphysical nonsense.²² The Georgian disciples of the metaphysician Proudhon, however, keep reiterating that "Marx's dialectics is metaphysics"!

Metaphysics recognizes various nebulous dogmas, such as, for example, the "unknowable," the "thing in itself," and, in the long run, passes into vapid theology. In contrast to Proudhon and Spencer,²³ Engels combated these dogmas with the aid of the dialectical method,²⁴ but the anarchists—the disciples of Proudhon and Spencer—tell us that Proudhon and Spencer were scientists, whereas Marx and Engels were metaphysicians!

One of two things: Either the anarchists are deceiving themselves, or else they do not know what they are talking about.

At all events, it is beyond doubt that the anarchists are confusing Hegel's *metaphysical* system with his *dialectical* method.

Needless to say, Hegel's *philosophical system*, which rests on the immutable idea, is from beginning to end *metaphysical*. But it is also clear that Hegel's *dialectical method*, which repudiates all immutable ideas, is from beginning to end *scientific* and *revolutionary*.

That is why Karl Marx, who subjected Hegel's metaphysical system to devastating criticism, at the same time praised his dialectical method, which, as Marx said, "lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary."²⁵

That is why Engels sees a big difference between Hegel's method and his system. "Whoever placed the chief emphasis on the Hegelian *system* could be fairly conservative in both spheres; whoever regarded the dialectical *method* as the main thing could belong to the most extreme opposition, both in politics and religion."²⁶

The anarchists fail to see this difference and thoughtlessly assert that "dialectics is metaphysics."

To proceed. The anarchists say that the dialectical method is "crafty verbiage," "the method of sophistry," "logical somersaults,"²⁷ "with the aid of which both truth and falsehood are proved with equal facility."²⁸

Thus, in the opinion of the anarchists, the dialectical method proves both truth and falsehood.

At first sight it would seem that the accusation advanced by the anarchists has some foundation. Listen, for example, to what Engels says about the follower of the metaphysical method:

"His communication is: 'Yea, yea, Nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.' For him a thing either exists, or it does not exist; it is equally impossible for a thing to be itself and at the same time something else. Positive and negative absolutely exclude one another."²⁹

How is that? the anarchists cry heatedly. Is it possible for a thing to be good and bad at the same time? This is "sophistry," "juggling with words," it shows that "you want to prove truth and falsehood with equal facility"! . . .

Let us, however, go into the substance of the matter.

Today we are demanding a democratic republic. Can we say that a democratic republic is good in all respects, or bad in all

respects! No we cannot! Why? Because a democratic republic is good only on one side, when it destroys the feudal system; but it is bad on the other side, when it strengthens the bourgeois system. Hence we say: In so far as the democratic republic destroys the feudal system it is good—and we fight for it; but in so far as it strengthens the bourgeois system it is bad—and we fight against it.

So the same democratic republic can be “good” and “bad” at the same time—it is “yes” and “no.”

The same thing may be said about the eight-hour day, which is “good” in so far as it strengthens the proletariat, and “bad” in so far as it strengthens the wage system.

It was *facts* of this kind that Engels had in mind when he characterized the dialectical method in the words we quoted above.

The anarchists, however, fail to understand this, and an absolutely clear idea seems to them to be nebulous “sophistry.”

The anarchists are, of course, at liberty to note or ignore these *facts*, they may even ignore the sand on the sandy seashore—they have every right to do that. But why drag in the dialectical method, which, unlike anarchism, does not look at life with its eyes shut, which has its finger on the pulse of life and openly says: Since life changes and is in motion, every phenomenon of life has two trends—a positive and a negative; the first we must defend, the second we must reject.

To proceed further. In the opinion of our anarchists, “dialectical development is catastrophic development, by means of which, first the past is utterly destroyed, and then the future is established quite separately. . . . Cuvier’s³⁰ cataclysms were due to unknown causes, but Marx’s and Engels’ catastrophes are engendered by dialectics.”³¹

In another place the same author writes: “Marxism rests on Darwinism and treats it uncritically.”³²

Pay attention to this!

Cuvier rejects Darwin’s theory of evolution, he recognizes only cataclysms, and cataclysms are *unexpected* upheavals “due to *unknown* causes.” The anarchists say that the Marxists *adhere to Cuvier’s view* and therefore *repudiate Darwinism*.

Darwin rejects Cuvier’s cataclysms, he recognizes gradual evolution. But the same anarchists say that “Marxism rests on Darwinism and treats it uncritically,” *i.e.*, the Marxists repudiate *Cuvier’s cataclysms*.

In short, the anarchists accuse the Marxists of adhering to Cuvier’s view and at the same time reproach them for adhering to Darwin’s and not to Cuvier’s view.

This is anarchy if you like! As the saying goes, the Sergeant’s widow flogged herself! Clearly, Sh. G. of No. 8 of *Nobati*, forgot what Sh. G. of No. 6 said.

Which is right—No. 8 or No. 6?

Let us turn to the facts. Marx says: “At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations. . . . Then begins an epoch of social revolution.” But, “No social order ever perishes before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed.”³³

If this thesis of Marx is applied to contemporary social life, we shall find that between the present-day productive forces, which are *social* in character, and the form of appropriation of the product, which is *private* in character, there is a fundamental conflict which must culminate in the socialist revolution.³⁴

As you see, in the opinion of Marx and Engels, revolution is engendered not by Cuvier’s “unknown causes,” but by very definite and vital social causes called “the development of productive forces.”

As you see, in the opinion of Marx and Engels, revolution comes only when the productive forces have sufficiently matured, and not *unexpectedly*, as Cuvier thought.

Clearly, there is nothing in common between Cuvier’s cataclysms and Marx’s dialectical method.

On the other hand, Darwinism repudiates not only Cuvier’s cataclysms, but also dialectically understood development, which includes revolution; whereas, from the standpoint of the dialectical method, evolution and revolution, quantitative and qualitative changes, are two necessary forms of the same movement.

Obviously, it is wrong also to assert that “Marxism . . . treats Darwinism uncritically.”

It turns out therefore, that *Nobati* is wrong in both cases, in No. 6 as well as in No. 8.

Lastly, the anarchists, tell us reproachfully that “dialectics . . . provides no possibility of going, or jumping out of oneself, or of jumping over oneself.”³⁵

Now this is the downright truth, Messieurs Anarchists! Here you

are absolutely right, my dear sirs. The dialectical method does not, indeed, provide such a possibility. But why not? Because "jumping out of oneself, or jumping over oneself" is an exercise for wild goats; the dialectical method however was created for human beings.

This is the secret! . . .

Such, in general, are the anarchists' views on the dialectical method.

Clearly, the anarchists fail to understand the dialectical method of Marx and Engels; they have conjured up their own dialectics, and it is against these dialectics that they are fighting so ruthlessly.

All we can do is to laugh as we gaze at this spectacle, for one cannot help laughing when one sees a man fighting his own imagination, smashing his own inventions, while at the same time heatedly asserting that he is smashing his opponent.

II THE MATERIALIST THEORY

"It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness." K. Marx

WE ALREADY know what the dialectical method is.

What is the materialist theory?

Everything in the world changes, everything in life develops, but *how* do these changes take place, in *what form* does this development proceed?

We know, for example, that the earth was once an incandescent, fiery mass; then it gradually cooled, plants and animals appeared, the development of the animal kingdom was followed by the appearance of a definite species of ape, and all this was followed by the appearance of man.

This, broadly speaking, is the way nature developed.

We also know that social life did not remain static either. There was a time when men lived on a basis of primitive communism. At that time they gained their livelihood by primitive hunting; they roamed through the forests and procured their food in that way. There came a time when primitive communism was superseded by the matriarchate, when men satisfied their needs mainly by means of primitive agriculture. Later the matriarchate was superseded by the patriarchate, under which men gained their livelihood mainly by cattle breeding. The patriarchate was later superseded by the slave-owning system, when men gained their livelihood by means of relatively more developed agriculture. The slave-owning system was followed by feudalism, and then, after all this, came the bourgeois system.

This, broadly speaking, is the way social life developed.

Yes, all this is well known. . . . But *how* did this development

take place? Did consciousness call forth the development of "nature" and of "society," or, on the contrary, did the development of "nature" and "society" call forth the development of consciousness?

This is how the materialist theory presents the question.

Some people say that "nature" and "social life" were preceded by the universal idea, which later served as the basis of their development, so that the development of the phenomena of "nature" and of "social life" is, so to speak, the external form, merely the expression of the development of the universal idea.

Such, for example, was the doctrine of the *idealists*, who in the course of time split into several trends.

Others say that from the very beginning there have existed in the world two mutually negating forces—idea and matter, consciousness and being; and that, correspondingly, phenomena also divide into two categories—the ideal and the material, which negate each other, and contend against each other, so that the development of nature and society is a constant struggle between ideal and material phenomena.

Such, for example, was the doctrine of the *dualists*, who in the course of time, like the idealists, split into several trends.

The materialist theory utterly repudiates both dualism and idealism.

Of course, both ideal and material phenomena exist in the world, but this does not mean that they negate each other. On the contrary, the ideal and material sides are two different forms of the same nature or society. You cannot conceive of one without the other; they exist together, develop together, and consequently, we have no grounds for thinking that they negate each other.

Thus, so-called dualism proves to be unsound.

A single and indivisible nature expressed in two different forms—material and ideal; a single and indivisible social life expressed in two different forms—material and ideal: this is how we should regard the development of nature and social life.

Such is the monism of the materialist theory.

At the same time, the materialist theory also repudiates idealism.

It is wrong to think that in its development the ideal side, and consciousness in general, precede the development of the material side. So-called external "non-living" nature existed before there were any living beings. The first living being possessed no consciousness; it possessed only *irritability* and the first rudiments

of *sensation*. Later, animals gradually developed the power of sensation, which slowly passed into *consciousness*, in conformity with the development of the structure of their organisms and nervous systems. If the ape had always walked on all fours, if it had never stood upright, its descendant, man, would not have been able freely to exercise his lungs and vocal chords and, therefore, would not have been able to speak; and this would have fundamentally retarded the development of his consciousness. Or to put it another way, if the ape had not risen on its hind legs, its descendant, man, would have been compelled always to walk on all fours, to look downward and obtain his impressions only from below; he would have been unable to look up and around and, consequently, his brain would have obtained no more impressions than that of the quadrupeds. All this would have fundamentally retarded the development of human consciousness.

It follows, therefore, that the development of consciousness requires a particular structure of the organism and development of its nervous system.

It follows, therefore, that the development of the ideal side, the development of consciousness, is *preceded* by the development of the material side, the development of external conditions: First the external conditions change, first the material side changes, and *then* consciousness, the ideal side, changes accordingly.

Thus, the history of the development of nature utterly refutes so-called idealism.

The same thing must be said about the history of the development of human society.

History shows that if men were imbued at different times with different ideas and desires, the reason for this is that men fought nature at different times in different ways to satisfy their needs and, accordingly, their economic relations assumed different forms. There was a time when men fought nature collectively, on the basis of primitive communism; at that time their property was communist property and, therefore, at that time they drew scarcely any distinction between "mine" and "thine," their consciousness was communistic. There came a time when the distinction between "mine" and "thine" penetrated the process of production, and property assumed a private, individualist character. Therefore, the consciousness of men became imbued with the sense of private property. Then came a time, the present time, when production is again assuming

a social character and, consequently, property too will soon assume a social character—and this is precisely why the consciousness of men is gradually becoming imbued with socialism.

Here is a simple illustration. Let us take a shoemaker who owned a tiny workshop, but unable to withstand the competition of the big shoe manufacturers, he closed his workshop and took a job, say, at Adelkhanov's shoe factory in Tiflis. He went to work at Adelkhanov's factory not with the idea of becoming a permanent wage-worker, but with the object of saving some money, of accumulating a little capital to enable him to reopen his workshop. As you see, the position of this shoemaker is *already* proletarian, but his consciousness is *still* non-proletarian, it is thoroughly petty bourgeois. In other words, this shoemaker has *already* lost his petty-bourgeois position, it has gone; but his petty-bourgeois consciousness has not yet gone, it has lagged behind his actual position.

Clearly, here too, in social life, first the external conditions change, first the conditions of men change, and then their consciousness changes accordingly.

But let us return to our shoemaker. As we already know, he intends to save some money and then reopen his workshop. This proletarianized shoemaker goes on working, but finds that it is a very difficult matter to save money, because what he earns barely suffices to maintain his existence. Moreover, he realizes that the opening of a private workshop is after all not so alluring: The rent he will have to pay for the premises, the caprices of customers, shortage of money, the competition of the big shoe manufacturers, and similar worries—such are the troubles that torture the mind of the private artisan. On the other hand, the proletarian is relatively free from such cares; he is not troubled by customers, or by having to pay rent for premises. He goes to the factory every morning, “calmly” goes home in the evening, and as calmly pockets his “pay” on Saturdays. Here, for the first time, the wings of our shoemaker's petty-bourgeois dreams are clipped; here for the first time proletarian strivings awaken in his soul.

Time passes and our shoemaker sees that he has not enough money to satisfy his most essential needs, that what he needs very badly is a raise in wages. At the same time, he hears his fellow workers talking about unions and strikes. Here our shoemaker realizes that in order to improve his conditions he must fight the masters and not open a workshop of his own. He joins the union, enters the strike

movement, and soon becomes imbued with socialist ideas. . . .

Thus, *in the long run*, the change in the shoemaker's material conditions was followed by a change in his consciousness: First his material conditions changed, and then, after a time, his consciousness changed accordingly.

The same must be said about classes, and about society as a whole.

In social life, too, first the external conditions change, first the material conditions change, and then the thoughts of men, their habits, customs, and their world outlook change accordingly.

That is why Marx says: “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness.”³⁶

If we can call the material side, the external conditions, being, and other phenomena of the same kind, the *content*, then we can call the ideal side, consciousness, and other phenomena of the same kind, the *form*. Hence arose the well-known materialist proposition: In the process of development content precedes form, form lags behind content.

And as, in Marx's opinion, economic development is the “material foundation” of social life, its *content*, while legal-political and religious-philosophical development is the “ideological form” of this content, its “superstructure,” Marx draws the conclusion, “With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is *more or less rapidly* transformed.”³⁷

This, of course, does not mean that in Marx's opinion content is possible without form, as Sh. G. imagines.³⁸ Content is impossible without form, but the point is that a given form, since it lags behind its content, never *fully* corresponds to this content; and so the new content is “obliged” to clothe itself for a time in the old form, and this causes a conflict between them. At the present time, for example, the form of appropriation of the product, which is *private* in character, does not correspond to the *social* content of production, and this is the basis of the present-day social “conflict.”

On the other hand, the idea that consciousness is a form of being, does not mean that by its nature consciousness, too, is matter. That was the opinion held only by the vulgar materialists (for example, Büchner and Moleschott³⁹), whose theories fundamentally contradict Marx's materialism, and whom Engels rightly ridiculed in his *Ludwig Feuerbach*. According to Marx's materialism, conscious-

ness and being, idea and matter, are two different forms of the same phenomenon, which, broadly speaking, is called nature, or society. Consequently, they do not negate each other;* nor are they one and the same phenomenon. The only point is that, in the development of nature and society, consciousness, *i.e.*, what takes place in our heads, is preceded by a related material change, *i.e.*, what takes place outside of us. Any given material change is, sooner or later, inevitably followed by a corresponding ideal change.

Very well, we shall be told. Perhaps this is true as applied to the history of nature and society. But how do different conceptions and ideas arise in our heads at the same time? Do these so-called external conditions really exist, or is it only our conceptions of these external conditions that exist? And if external conditions exist, to what degree are they perceptible and cognizable?

On this point the materialist theory says that our conceptions, our "ego," exist only in so far as external conditions exist that create impressions upon our "ego." Whoever says unthinkingly that nothing exists but our conceptions, is compelled to deny the existence of all external conditions and, consequently, must deny the existence of other people and admit the existence only of his own "ego"—which is absurd and utterly contradicts the principles of science.

Obviously, external conditions do actually exist. These conditions existed before us, and will exist after us; and the more often and the more strongly they affect our consciousness, the more easily perceptible and cognizable they become.

As regards the question of how different conceptions and ideas arise in our heads *at the same time*, we must observe that here we have a brief repetition of what takes place in the history of nature and society. In this case too, the object outside of us preceded our conception of it; in this case too, our conception, the form, lags behind the object—behind its content. When I look at a tree and see it, this only shows that this tree existed even before the conception of a tree arose in my head; that it was this tree that roused the corresponding conception in my head. . . .

This, briefly, is the content of Marx's materialist theory.

* This does not contradict the idea that there is a conflict between form and content. The point is that the conflict is not between content and form in general, but between the *old* form and the *new* content, which is seeking a new form and striving toward it.

The importance of the materialist theory for the practical activities of mankind can be readily understood.

If the economic conditions change *first* and the consciousness of men undergoes a corresponding change *later*, it is clear that we must seek the grounds for a given ideal not in the minds of men, not in their imaginations, but in the development of their economic conditions. Only that ideal is good and acceptable which is based on a study of economic conditions. All those ideals which ignore economic conditions and are not based upon their development, are useless and unacceptable.

This is the first practical conclusion to be drawn from the materialist theory.

If the consciousness of men, their habits and customs, are determined by external conditions, if unsuitable legal and political forms rest on an economic content, it is clear that we must help to bring about a radical change in economic relations in order, with this change, to bring about a radical change in the habits and customs of the people, and in their political system.

This is what Karl Marx says on this score: "No great acumen is required to perceive the necessary interconnection of materialism with . . . socialism. . . . If man constructs all his knowledge, perceptions, etc., from the world of sense . . . then it follows that it is a question of so arranging the empirical world that he experiences the truly human in it, that he becomes accustomed to experiencing himself as a human being. . . . If man is unfree in the materialist sense—that is, is free not by reason of the negative force of being able to avoid this or that, but by reason of the positive power to assert his true individuality, then one should not punish individuals for crimes but rather destroy the anti-social breeding places of crime. . . . If man is formed by circumstances, then the circumstances must be formed humanly."⁴⁰

This is the second practical conclusion to be drawn from the materialist theory.

What is the anarchist view of the materialist theory of Marx and Engels?

While the dialectical method originated with Hegel, the materialist theory is a further development of the materialism of Feuerbach. The anarchists know this very well, and they try to take advantage of the flaws in the theories of Hegel and Feuerbach to dis-

credit the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels. We have already shown in reference to Hegel and the dialectical method that these tricks of the anarchists prove nothing but their own ignorance. The same thing must be said about their attack on Feuerbach and the materialist theory.

For example, the anarchists tell us with great aplomb that "Feuerbach was a pantheist . . ." that he "deified man . . ." that "in Feuerbach's opinion man is what he eats . . ." and that from this Marx drew the following conclusion: "Consequently, the main and primary thing is economic conditions."⁴²

True, nobody has any doubts about Feuerbach's pantheism, his deification of man, and his other fallacies of the same kind. On the contrary, Marx and Engels were the first to reveal Feuerbach's fallacies. Nevertheless, the anarchists deem it necessary once again to "expose" the already exposed fallacies. Why? Probably because, in reviling Feuerbach, they want indirectly to discredit the materialist theory of Marx and Engels. Of course, if we examine the subject impartially, we shall certainly find that in addition to erroneous ideas, Feuerbach gave utterance to correct ideas, as has been the case with many scholars. Nevertheless, anarchists go on "exposing."

We say again that by tricks of this kind they prove nothing but their own ignorance.

It is interesting to note (as we shall see later on) that the anarchists took it into their heads to criticize the materialist theory from hearsay, without being at all familiar with the subject themselves. As a consequence, they often contradict and refute each other, which, of course, makes our "critics" look ridiculous. If, for example, we listen to what Mr. Cherkezishvili has to say, it appears that Marx and Engels detested monistic materialism, that their materialism was vulgar and not monistic materialism.

"The great science of the naturalists, with its system of evolution, mutation, and monistic materialism, which *Engels so heartily detested* . . . avoided dialectics," etc.⁴³

It follows, therefore, that the natural science materialism, which Cherkezishvili approves of and which Engels "detested," was monistic materialism and, *therefore*, deserves approval, whereas the materialism of Marx and Engels is not monistic and, of course, does not deserve recognition.

Another anarchist says that the materialism of Marx and Engels is monistic and *therefore* should be rejected.

"Marx's conception of history is a throwback to Hegel. The monistic materialism of absolute objectivism in general, and Marx's economic monism in particular, are impossible in nature and fallacious in theory. . . . Monistic materialism is poorly disguised dualism and a compromise between metaphysics and science."⁴⁴

It follows, therefore, that monistic materialism is unacceptable, Marx and Engels do not detest it, on the contrary, they are monistic materialists themselves and, therefore, monistic materialism must be rejected.

Some run to the woods, others to the meadows. Try to make out which of them is right, the former or the latter! They have not yet agreed among themselves about the merits and demerits of Marx's materialism; they have not yet understood whether it is monistic or not, and have not yet made up their minds themselves as to which is the more acceptable, vulgar or monistic materialism, but they already deafen us with their boastful claims to have shattered Marxism!

Yes, yes, if Messieurs the Anarchists continue to shatter each other's views as zealously as they are doing now, needless to say, the future belongs to the anarchists. . . .

No less ridiculous is the fact that certain "celebrated" anarchists, notwithstanding their "celebrity," have not yet made themselves familiar with the different trends in science. It appears that they are ignorant of the fact that there are various kinds of materialism in science which differ a great deal from each other. There is, for example, vulgar materialism, which denies the importance of the ideal side and the effect it has upon the material side; but there is also so-called monistic materialism—the materialist theory of Marx—which scientifically examines the interrelation between the ideal and the material sides. But the anarchists *confuse* these different kinds of materialism, fail to see even the obvious differences between them, and at the same time affirm with great aplomb that they are regenerating science!

Kropotkin, for example, smugly asserts in his "philosophical" works that anarcho-communism rests on "contemporary materialist philosophy." But he does not utter a single word to explain on which "materialist philosophy" anarcho-communism rests: on vulgar, monistic, or some other. Evidently he is ignorant of the fact that there are fundamental contradictions between the different trends of materialism, and he fails to understand that to confuse

these trends means not "regenerating science," but displaying one's own downright ignorance.⁴⁵

The same thing must be said about Kropotkin's Georgian disciples. Listen to this:

"In the opinion of Engels, and also of Kautsky, Marx rendered mankind a great service in that he . . ." among other things, discovered the "materialist conception. Is this true? We do not think so, for we know . . . that all the historians, scientists and philosophers who adhere to the view that the social mechanism is set in motion by geographic, climatic and telluric, cosmic, anthropological and biological conditions, *are all materialists.*"⁴⁶

It follows, therefore, that there is no difference whatever between the "materialism" of Aristotle⁴⁷ and Holbach,⁴⁸ or between the "materialism" of Marx and Moleschott! This is criticism if you please! And people whose knowledge is on such a level have taken it into their heads to regenerate science! Indeed, it is an apt saying: "It's a bad omen when a cobbler begins to bake pies! . . ."

To proceed. Our "celebrated" anarchists heard somewhere that Marx's materialism is a "belly theory," and so they rebuke us Marxists, saying: "In the opinion of Feuerbach, man is what he eats. This formula had a magic effect upon Marx and Engels," and, as a consequence, Marx drew the conclusion that "the main and primary thing is economic conditions, relations of production. . . ." And then the anarchists proceed to admonish us in a philosophical tone: "It would be a mistake to say that the *sole* means of achieving this object [of social life] is *eating* and economic production. . . . If *ideology were determined* mainly monistically, by *eating* and economic conditions, some gluttons would be geniuses."⁴⁹

You see how easy it is to refute the materialism of Marx and Engels! It is sufficient to hear some gossip in the street from a young student about Marx and Engels, it is sufficient to repeat this street gossip with philosophical aplomb in the columns of a paper like *Nobati*, to leap into fame as a "critic" of Marxism!

But tell me, gentlemen, where, when, on which planet, and which Marx did you hear say that "*eating determines ideology*"? Why did you not cite a single sentence, a single word from the works of Marx to back your assertion? True, Marx said that the economic conditions of men determine their consciousness, their ideology, but who told you that eating and economic conditions are the same thing? Don't you really know that physiological phenomena, such

as *eating*, differ fundamentally from sociological phenomena, such as the *economic conditions* of men? One can forgive a young student, say, for confusing these two different things; but how is it that you, "vanquishers of Social-Democracy," "regenerators of science," so carelessly repeat the mistakes of a young student?

How can eating determine social ideology? Ponder over what you yourselves have said. Eating, the form of eating, does not change; in ancient times people ate, masticated, and digested their food in the same way as they do now, but ideology changes all the time. Ancient, feudal, bourgeois, and proletarian—such are the forms of ideology. Is it conceivable that *that which does not change* can determine *that which is constantly changing*?

To proceed further. In the opinion of the anarchists, Marx's materialism "is parallelism. . . ." Or, "monistic materialism is poorly disguised dualism and a compromise between metaphysics and science. . . . Marx drops into dualism because he depicts relations of production as material, and human striving and will as *an illusion and a utopia*, which, even though it exists, *is of no importance.*"⁵⁰

First, Marx's monistic materialism has nothing in common with silly parallelism. From the standpoint of this materialism, the material side, content, necessarily *precedes* the ideal side, form. Parallelism, however, repudiates this view and emphatically affirms that neither the material nor the ideal *comes first*, that both develop together, side by side.

Second, even if Marx did "depict relations of production as material, and human striving and will as an illusion and a utopia . . . which is of no importance," does that show that Marx was a dualist? The dualist, as is well known, ascribes *equal* importance to both the ideal and material sides as two opposite principles. But if, as you say, Marx attaches higher importance to the material side and no importance to the ideal side because it is a "utopia," how do you make out that Marx was a dualist, Messieurs "Critics"?

Third, what connection can there be between materialist monism and dualism, when even a child knows that monism springs from *one principle*—nature, or being, which has a material and an ideal form, whereas dualism springs from *two principles*—the material and the ideal, which, according to dualism, negate each other?

Fourth, when did Marx depict "human striving and will as an illusion and a utopia"? True, Marx attributed "human striving and will" to economic development, and when the strivings of certain

armchair philosophers failed to harmonize with economic conditions, he called them utopia. But does this show that Marx believed that human striving in general is utopia? Does this too really need explanation? Have you really not read Marx's statement that "*mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve,*"⁵¹ i.e., that, generally speaking, mankind does not pursue utopian aims? Clearly, either our "critic" does not know what he is talking about, or he is deliberately distorting the facts.

Fifth, who told you that in the opinion of Marx and Engels "human striving and will are of no importance"? Why do you not point to the place where they say that? Does not Marx speak of the importance of "striving and will" in his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, in his *Class Struggles in France*, in his *Civil War in France*,⁵² and in other pamphlets of the same kind? Why then did Marx try to develop the "will and striving" of the proletarians in the socialist spirit, why did he carry on propaganda among them, if he attached no importance to "striving and will"? Or, what did Engels talk about in his well-known articles⁵³ of 1891-94 if not the "importance of will and striving"? True, in Marx's opinion human "will and striving" acquire their content from economic conditions, but does that mean that men themselves exert no influence on the development of economic relations? Is it really so difficult for the anarchists to understand such a simple idea?

Here is another "accusation" Messieurs the Anarchists make: "Form is inconceivable without content"; therefore, one cannot say that "form comes after content (lags behind content.—K⁵⁴.) . . . they 'co-exist.' . . . Otherwise, monism would be an absurdity."⁵⁵

Our "scholar" is somewhat confused again. It is quite true that content is inconceivable without form. But it is also true that the *existing form* never fully corresponds to the *existing content*: The former lags behind the latter; to a certain extent the new content is always clothed in the old form and, as a consequence, there is always a conflict between the old form and the new content. It is precisely on this basis that revolutions occur, and this, among other things, expresses the revolutionary spirit of Marx's materialism. The "celebrated" anarchists, however, have failed to understand this, and for this they themselves and not the materialist theory are to blame, of course.

Such are the views of the anarchists on the materialist theory of Marx and Engels—that is, if they can be called views.

III PROLETARIAN SOCIALISM

WE ARE now familiar with Marx's theoretical doctrine; we are familiar with his *method* and also with his *theory*.

What practical conclusions must we draw from this doctrine?

What is the connection between dialectical materialism and proletarian socialism?

The dialectical method affirms that only that class which is growing day after day, always marches forward, and fights unceasingly for a better future, can be progressive to the end, only that class can smash the yoke of slavery. We see that the only class that is steadily growing, always marches forward, and is fighting for the future is the urban and rural proletariat. Therefore, we must serve the proletariat and place our hopes on it.

Such is the first practical conclusion to be drawn from Marx's theoretical doctrine.

But there is service and service. Bernstein also "serves" the proletariat when he urges it to forget about socialism. Kropotkin also "serves" the proletariat when he offers it disintegrated community "socialism" without a broad industrial base. And Karl Marx serves the proletariat when he calls it to proletarian socialism, which will rest on the broad basis of modern large-scale industry.

What must we do in order that our activities may benefit the proletariat? How should we serve the proletariat?

The materialist theory affirms that a given ideal may be of direct service to the proletariat only if it does not run counter to the economic development of the country, if it fully answers the requirements of that development. The economic development of the capitalist system shows that present-day production is assuming a social character, that the social character of production fundamentally contradicts existing capitalist property. Consequently, our main task is to help to abolish capitalist property and to establish socialist property. And that means that the doctrine of Bernstein, who urges that socialism should be forgotten, fundamentally contradicts the

requirements of economic development; it is harmful to the proletariat.

Further, the economic development of the capitalist system shows that present-day production is expanding day after day. It is not confined within the limits of individual towns and provinces, but constantly overflows these limits and spreads over the whole country. Consequently, we must welcome the expansion of production and regard as the basis of future socialism not separate towns and communities, but the entire indivisible territory of the whole state which, in future, will, of course, expand more and more. And this means that the doctrine advocated by Kropotkin, which confines future socialism within the limits of separate towns and communities, is a hindrance to the powerful expansion of production; it is harmful to the proletariat.

Fight for a *broad* socialist life as the *principal* goal—this is how we should serve the proletariat.

Such is the second practical conclusion to be drawn from Marx's theoretical doctrine.

Clearly, proletarian socialism is the logical deduction from dialectical materialism.

What is proletarian socialism?

The present system is a capitalist system. This means that the world is divided into two antagonistic camps, the camp of a small handful of capitalists and the camp of the majority, the proletarians. The proletarians work day and night, nevertheless they remain poor. The capitalists do not work, nevertheless they are rich. This takes place not because the proletarians are unintelligent and the capitalists are geniuses, but because the capitalists appropriate the fruit of the labor of the proletarians, because the capitalists exploit the proletarians.

Why is the fruit of the labor of the proletarians appropriated by the capitalists and not by the proletarians? Why do the capitalists exploit the proletarians and not *vice versa*?

Because the capitalist system is based on commodity production. Here everything assumes the form of a commodity, everywhere the principle of buying and selling prevails. Here you can buy not only articles of consumption, not only food products, but also the labor power of men, their blood and their consciences. The capitalists know all this and purchase the labor power of the proletarians, they hire them. This means that the capitalists become the owners

of the labor power they buy. The proletarians, however, lose their right to the labor power which they have sold. That is to say, what is produced by that labor power no longer belongs to the proletarians, it belongs only to the capitalists and goes into their pockets. The labor power which you have sold may produce in the course of a day goods to the value of 100 rubles, but that is not your business, those goods do not belong to you. It is the business only of the capitalists, and the goods belong to them. All that you must receive is your daily wage which, perhaps, may be sufficient to satisfy your essential needs if, of course, you live frugally. Briefly, the capitalists buy the labor power of the proletarians, they hire the proletarians, and this is precisely why the capitalists appropriate the fruit of the labor of the proletarians, this is precisely why the capitalists exploit the proletarians and not *vice versa*.

But why is it precisely the capitalists who buy the labor power of the proletarians? Why do the capitalists hire the proletarians and not *vice versa*?

Because the principal basis of the capitalist system is the private ownership of the instruments and means of production. Because the factories, mills, the land and minerals, the forests, the railways, machines, and other means of production have become the private property of a small handful of capitalists. Because the proletarians lack all this. That is why the capitalists hire proletarians to keep the factories and mills going; if they did not do that, the instruments and means of production would yield no profit. That is why the proletarians sell their labor power to the capitalists; if they did not, they would die of starvation.

All this throws light on the general character of capitalist production. First, it is self-evident that capitalist production cannot be united and organized; it is all split up among the private enterprises of individual capitalists. Second, it is also clear that the quantity of goods and, as a result, the market is soon glutted, prices needs of the people, but to produce goods for sale in order to increase the profits of the capitalists. But as every capitalist strives to increase his profits, each one tries to produce the largest possible quantity of goods and, as a result, the market is soon glutted, prices fall, and—a general crisis sets in.

Thus, crises, unemployment, suspension of production, anarchy of production, and the like are the direct results of present-day unorganized capitalist production.

If this unorganized social system still remains standing, if it still firmly withstands the attacks of the proletariat, it is primarily because it is protected by the capitalist state, by the capitalist government.

Such is the basis of present-day capitalist society.

There can be no doubt that future society will be built on an entirely different basis.

Future society will be socialist society. This means, primarily, that there will be no classes in that society. There will be neither capitalists nor proletarians and, consequently, there will be no exploitation. In that society there will be only workers engaged in collective labor.

Future society will be socialist society. This also means that with the abolition of exploitation, commodity production and buying and selling will also be abolished and, therefore, there will be no room for buyers and sellers of labor power, for employers and employed—there will be only free workers.

Future society will be socialist society. This means, finally, that in that society the abolition of wage labor will be accomplished by the complete abolition of the private ownership of the instruments and means of production. There will be neither poor proletarians nor rich capitalists; there will be only workers who collectively own all the land and minerals, all the forests, all the factories and mills, all the railways, etc.

As you see, the main object of production in the future will be to satisfy directly the needs of society and not to produce goods for sale to increase the profits of the capitalists. Here there will be no room for commodity production, struggle for profits, etc.

It is also clear that future production will be organized on a socialist basis and highly developed; it will take into account the needs of society and will produce as much as society needs. Here there will be no room either for disintegrated production, competition, crises, or unemployment.

Where there are no classes, where there are neither rich nor poor, there is no need for a state, there is no need either for political power, which oppresses the poor and protects the rich. Consequently, in socialist society there will be no need for the existence of political power.

That is why Karl Marx said as far back as 1846: "The working

class, in the course of its development, will substitute for the old bourgeois society an association which will exclude classes and their antagonism, and there will be *no more political power properly so-called.*"⁵⁶

That is why Engels said in 1884: "The state, therefore, has not existed from all eternity. There have been societies which have managed without it, which had no notion of state or state power. At a definite stage of economic development, which necessarily involved the cleavage of society into classes, the state became a necessity. . . . We are now rapidly approaching a stage in the development of production at which the existence of these classes has not only ceased to be a necessity, but becomes a positive hindrance to production. They will fall as inevitably as they once arose. *The state inevitably falls with them.* The society which organizes production anew on the basis of free and equal association of the producers will put the whole state machinery where it will then belong—into the museum of antiquities, next to the spinning wheel and the bronze ax." [Italics added.]⁵⁷

At the same time, it is self-evident that for the purpose of administering public affairs there will have to be in socialist society, in addition to local offices which will collect all sorts of information, a central statistical bureau, which will collect information about the needs of the whole of society, and then distribute the various kinds of work among the working people accordingly. It will also be necessary to hold conferences and particularly congresses, the decisions of which will certainly be binding upon the comrades who are in the minority until the next congress is held.

Finally, it is obvious that free and comradely labor should result in an equally comradely, and complete, satisfaction of all needs in the future socialist society. This means that if future society demands from each of its members as much labor as he can perform, it, in its turn, must provide each member with as many products as he needs. From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!—such is the basis upon which the future collective system must be created. It goes without saying that in the *initial* stage of socialism, when those who have not yet grown accustomed to work are being drawn into the new way of life, when the productive forces also have not yet been sufficiently developed and there is still "dirty" and "clean" work to do, the application of the principle, "to each according to his needs," will undoubtedly be greatly

hindered and, as a consequence, society will be obliged *temporarily* to take some other path, a middle path. But it is also clear that when future society has been established, when the survivals of capitalism have been eradicated, the only principle that will conform to socialist society will be the one we have pointed to above.

That is why Marx said in 1875: "In a higher phase of communist [*i.e.*, socialist] society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual under division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual . . . only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."⁵⁸

Such, in general, is the picture of future socialist society according to Marx's theory.

This is all very well. But is the achievement of socialism conceivable? Can we assume man will rid himself of "savage habits"?

Or again: if everybody receives according to his needs, can we assume that the level of the productive forces of socialist society will be adequate for this?

Socialist society presupposes an adequate development of productive forces and socialist consciousness among men, their socialist enlightenment. At the present time the development of productive forces is hindered by the existence of capitalist property, but if we bear in mind that this capitalist property will not exist in future society, it is self-evident that the productive forces will increase tenfold. Nor must it be forgotten that in future society the hundreds of thousands of present-day parasites, and also the unemployed, will set to work and augment the ranks of the working people; and this will greatly stimulate the development of the productive forces. As regards men's "savage" sentiments and opinions, these are not as eternal as some people imagine; there was a time, under primitive communism, when man did not recognize private property; there came a time, the time of individual production, when private property dominated the hearts and minds of men. A new time is coming, the time of socialist production—will it be surprising if the hearts and minds of men become imbued with socialist strivings? Does not being determine the "sentiments" and opinions of men?

But what proof is there that the establishment of the socialist system is inevitable? Must the development of modern capitalism inevitably be followed by socialism? Or, in other words, how do we know that Marx's proletarian socialism is not merely a sentimental dream, a fantasy? Where is the scientific proof that it is not?

History shows that the form of property is directly determined by the form of production, and, as a consequence, a change in the form of production is sooner or later inevitably followed by a change in the form of property. There was a time when property bore a communistic character, when the forests and fields in which primitive men roamed belonged to all and not to individuals. Why did communist property exist at that time? Because production was communistic, labor was performed in common, collectively; all worked together and could not dispense with each other. A different period set in, the period of petty-bourgeois production, when property assumed an individualistic (private) character, when everything that man needed (with the exception, of course, of air, sunlight, etc.) was regarded as private property. What brought about this change? The fact that production became individualistic; each one began to work for himself, separated from all the rest. Finally came the time of large-scale capitalist production, when hundreds and thousands of workers gather under one roof, in one factory, and engage in collective labor. Here you do not see the old method of working individually, each pulling his own way; here every worker is closely associated in his work with his comrades in his own shop, and all of them are associated with the other shops. It is sufficient for one shop to stop work for the workers in the entire plant to become idle. As you see, the process of production, labor, has already assumed a social character, has acquired a socialist hue. And this takes place not only in individual factories, but in entire branches of industry, and between branches of industry. It is sufficient for the railwaymen to go on strike to put the whole of industry in difficulties, it is sufficient for the oil and coal industries to come to a standstill for whole factories and mills to close down after a time. Clearly, here the process of production has assumed a social, collective character. However, as the private character of appropriation contradicts the social character of production, as present-day collective labor must inevitably lead to collective property, it is self-evident that the socialist system will follow capitalism as day follows night.

That is how history proves the inevitability of Marx's proletarian socialism.

History teaches us that the class or social group which plays the principal role in social production and performs the main functions in production must, in the course of time, inevitably take control of that production. There was a time, under the matriarchate, when women were regarded as the controllers of production. Why was this? Because under the kind of production then prevailing, primitive agriculture, women played the principal role in production, they performed the main functions, while the men roamed the forests in quest of game. Then came the time, under the patriarchate, when the predominant position in production passed to men. Why did this change take place? Because under the kind of production prevailing at that time, stock breeding, in which the principal instruments of production were the spear, the lasso, and the bow and arrow, the principal role was played by men. . . . There came the time of large-scale capitalist production, in which the proletarians begin to play the principal role in production, when all the principal functions in production pass to them, when without them production cannot go on for a single day (let us remember general strikes), and when the capitalists, far from being needed for production, are actually a hindrance to it. What does this signify? It signifies either that all social life must collapse entirely, or that the proletariat, sooner or later, but inevitably, must take control of modern production, must become its sole owner, its socialist owner.

Modern industrial crises, which represent the death throes of capitalist property and bluntly put the question—capitalism or socialism?—make this conclusion absolutely obvious. They vividly demonstrate the parasitism of the capitalists and the inevitability of the victory of socialism.

This is further proof, provided by history, of the inevitability of Marx's proletarian socialism.

Proletarian socialism is based not on sentiment, not on abstract "justice," not on love for the proletariat, but on the scientific grounds cited above.

That is why proletarian socialism is also called "scientific socialism."

Engels said as far back as 1877: "If for the imminent overthrow of the present mode of distribution of the products of labor . . . we

had no better guarantee than the consciousness that this mode of distribution is unjust, and that justice must eventually triumph, we should be in a pretty bad way, and we might have a long time to wait." The most important thing in this is that "the productive forces created by the modern capitalist mode of production and also the system of distribution of goods established by it have come into burning contradiction with that mode of production itself, and in fact to such a degree that, if the whole of modern society is not to perish, a revolution of the mode of production and distribution must take place, a revolution which will put an end to all class divisions. On this tangible, material fact . . . and not on the conceptions of justice and injustice held by any armchair philosopher, is modern socialism's confidence of victory founded."⁵⁹

This does not mean, of course, that since capitalism is decaying, the socialist system can be established any time we like. Only anarchists and other petty-bourgeois ideologists can think that. The socialist ideal is not the ideal of all classes. It is the ideal only of the proletariat; not all classes are directly interested in its establishment, the proletariat alone is so interested. This means that as long as the proletariat constitutes a small section of society, the establishment of the socialist system is impossible. The decay of the old form of production, the further concentration of capitalist production, and the proletarianization of the majority in society—such are the conditions needed for the achievement of socialism.* But this is not all. The majority in society may already be proletarianized, but it may still be impossible to achieve socialism. This

* In the introduction to the first volume of his collected writings, published in 1946, Stalin refers to this treatment of the problem of achieving the victory of socialism as follows:

" . . . At that time the author adhered to the thesis, current among Marxists, that one of the major conditions for the victory of the socialist revolution is that the proletariat must become the majority of the population, that, consequently, in those countries where the proletariat does not yet constitute the majority of the population owing to the inadequate development of capitalism, the victory of socialism is impossible.

"This thesis was taken as generally accepted among Russian Marxists, including the Bolsheviks, as well as among the Social-Democratic parties of other countries. The subsequent development of capitalism in Europe and America, however, the transition from pre-imperialist capitalism to imperialist capitalism and, finally, Lenin's discovery of the law of the uneven economic and political development of different countries, showed that this thesis no longer corresponded to the new conditions of development, that

is because, in addition to all this, the achievement of socialism calls for class consciousness, the unity of the proletariat and the ability of the proletariat to manage its own affairs. For all this to be acquired, what is called political freedom is needed, *i.e.*, freedom of speech, press, strikes, and association, in short, freedom to wage the class struggle. But political freedom is not equally insured everywhere. Therefore, the conditions under which it is obliged to wage the struggle—under a feudal autocracy (Russia), a constitutional monarchy (Germany), a big-bourgeois republic (France), or under a democratic republic (which Russian Social-Democracy is demanding)—are not a matter of indifference to the proletariat. Political freedom is best and most fully insured in a democratic republic, that is, of course, in so far as it can be insured under capitalism at all. Therefore, all advocates of proletarian socialism necessarily strive for the establishment of a democratic republic as the best type of “bridge” to socialism.

That is why, under present conditions, the Marxist program is divided into two parts: the *maximum program*, the goal of which is socialism, and the *minimum program*, the object of which is to lay the road to socialism through the democratic republic.

What must the proletariat do, what path must it take, in order consciously to carry out its program, to overthrow capitalism and to build socialism?

The answer is clear. The proletariat cannot achieve socialism by making peace with the bourgeoisie—it must unflinchingly take the path of struggle, and this struggle must be a class struggle, a struggle of the entire proletariat against the entire bourgeoisie. Either the bourgeoisie and its capitalism, or the proletariat and its socialism! This must be the basis of the proletariat’s actions, of its class struggle.

the victory of socialism was quite possible in individual countries where capitalism had not yet reached the highest point of development and the proletariat did not yet constitute the majority of the population, but where the capitalist front was sufficiently weak to be breached by the proletariat. The Leninist theory of the socialist revolution thus arose in 1915-16. As is well known, the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution proceeds from the thesis that the socialist revolution will be victorious not necessarily in those countries where capitalism is most developed, but primarily in those countries where the capitalist front is weak, where it is easier for the proletariat to breach that front, where capitalism has reached, say, only the medium stage of development.”—*Ed.*

But the proletarian class struggle assumes numerous forms. A strike, for example, partial or general, is class struggle. Boycott and sabotage are undoubtedly class struggle. Meetings, demonstrations, representation in public representative bodies, etc.—whether national parliaments or local government bodies makes no difference—are also class struggle. All are different forms of the same class struggle. We shall not here examine which form of struggle is more important for the proletariat in its class struggle, we shall merely observe that, each in its proper time and place, all are undoubtedly needed by the proletariat as essential means for developing its class consciousness and organization; and the proletariat needs class consciousness and organization as much as it needs air. It must also be observed, however, that for the proletariat, all these forms of struggle are merely *preparatory* means, that not one of them, taken separately, constitutes the *decisive* means by which the proletariat can smash capitalism. Capitalism cannot be smashed by the general strike alone; the general strike can only create some of the conditions that are necessary for the smashing of capitalism. It is inconceivable that the proletariat should be able to overthrow capitalism merely by being represented in parliament; parliamentarism can only prepare some of the conditions that are necessary for overthrowing capitalism.

What, then, is the *decisive* means by which the proletariat will overthrow the capitalist system? The *socialist revolution* is this means.

Strikes, the boycott, parliamentarism, meetings, and demonstrations are all good forms of struggle as means for preparing and organizing the proletariat. But not one of these means is capable of abolishing existing inequality. All these means must be concentrated in one principal and decisive means; the proletariat must rise and launch a determined attack upon the bourgeoisie in order to destroy capitalism to its foundations. This principal and decisive means is the socialist revolution.

The socialist revolution must not be conceived as a sudden, short blow; it is a prolonged struggle waged by the proletarian masses, who inflict defeat upon the bourgeoisie and capture its positions. And as the victory of the proletariat will at the same time establish domination over the vanquished bourgeoisie, as, *in class conflicts*, the defeat of one class signifies the domination of the other, the first stage of the socialist revolution will be the political domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie.

The socialist *dictatorship of the proletariat*, capture of power by the proletariat—this is what the socialist revolution must start with.

This means that *until the bourgeoisie is completely vanquished*, until its wealth has been confiscated, the proletariat must without fail possess a military force, it must without fail have its “proletarian guard,” with the aid of which it will repel the counter-revolutionary attacks of the dying bourgeoisie, exactly as the Paris proletariat during the Commune.

The socialist dictatorship of the proletariat is needed to enable the proletariat to expropriate the bourgeoisie, to enable it to confiscate the land, forests, factories, and mills, machines, railways, etc., from the entire bourgeoisie.

The expropriation of the bourgeoisie—this is what the socialist revolution must lead to.

This, then, is the principal and decisive means by which the proletariat will overthrow the present capitalist system.

That is why Karl Marx said as far back as 1847: “The first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class. . . . 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 proletariat organized as the ruling class.”⁶⁰

This is how the proletariat must proceed if it wants to bring about socialism.

From this general principle emerge all the other views on tactics. Strikes, boycott, demonstrations, and parliamentarism are important only in so far as they help to organize the proletariat and to strengthen and enlarge its organizations for the purpose of bringing about the socialist revolution.

Thus, to bring about socialism, the socialist revolution is needed. The socialist revolution must begin with the dictatorship of the proletariat, *i.e.*, the proletariat must capture political power as a means with which to expropriate the bourgeoisie.

But to achieve all this, the proletariat must be organized, the proletarian ranks must be united and solid, strong proletarian organizations must be formed, and these must grow steadily.

What forms must the proletarian organization assume?

The most widespread, mass organizations are trade unions and workers’ co-operative societies (mainly producers’ and consumers’

societies). The object of the trade unions is to fight (mainly) against industrial capital to improve the conditions of the workers under the present capitalist system. The object of the co-operative societies is to fight (mainly) against merchant capital to secure an increase of consumption among the workers by reducing the prices of articles of primary necessity, also under the capitalist system, of course. The proletariat undoubtedly needs both trade unions and co-operative societies as means of organizing the proletarian masses. Hence, from the point of view of the proletarian socialism of Marx and Engels, the proletariat must utilize both these forms of organization and reinforce and strengthen them, as far as this is possible under present political conditions, of course.

But trade unions and co-operative societies alone cannot satisfy the organizational needs of the militant proletariat. This is because the organizations mentioned cannot go beyond the limits of capitalism, for their object is to improve the conditions of the workers under the capitalist system. The workers, however, want to free themselves entirely from capitalist slavery, they want to smash these limits, and not only revolve within the limits of capitalism. Hence, in addition, an organization is needed that will rally around itself the class-conscious elements of the workers of *all* trades, that will transform the proletariat into a conscious class and take as its chief aim to smash the capitalist system, to prepare for the socialist revolution.

Such an organization is the Social-Democratic Party of the proletariat.

This party must be a class party, and it must be quite independent of all other parties—this is because it is the party of the proletarian class, the emancipation of which can be brought about only by this class itself.

This party must be a revolutionary party—this is because the workers can be emancipated only by revolutionary means, by means of the socialist revolution.

This party must be an international party, the doors of the party must be open to all class-conscious proletarians—this is because the emancipation of the workers is not a national but a social question, equally important for the Georgian proletarians, for the Russian proletarians, and for the proletarians of other nations.

Hence, it is clear, that the more closely the proletarians of the different nations are united, the more thoroughly the national

barriers which have been raised between them are demolished, the stronger will be the party of the proletariat, and the more will the organization of the proletariat in one indivisible class be facilitated.

Hence, it is necessary, as far as possible, to introduce the principle of centralism in the proletarian organizations as against the loose federal principle—irrespective of whether these organizations are party, trade union, or co-operative.

It is also clear that all these organizations must be built on a democratic basis, in so far as this is not hindered by political or other conditions, of course.

What should be the relations between the party on the one hand and the co-operative societies and trade unions on the other? Should the latter be party or non-party? The answer to this question depends upon where and under what conditions the proletariat has to fight. At all events, there can be no doubt that the friendlier the trade unions and co-operative societies are toward the Socialist Party of the proletariat, the more fully will both develop. And this is because both these economic organizations, if they are not closely connected with a strong Socialist Party, often become petty, allow narrow craft interests to obscure general class interests and thereby cause great harm to the proletariat. It is therefore necessary, in all cases, to insure that the trade unions and co-operative societies are under the ideological and political influence of the party. Only if this is done will the organizations mentioned be transformed into a socialist school that will organize the proletariat, at present split up into separate groups, into a conscious class.

Such, in general, are the characteristic features of the proletarian socialism of Marx and Engels.

How do the anarchists look upon proletarian socialism?

First of all, we must know that proletarian socialism is not simply a philosophical doctrine. It is the doctrine of the proletarian masses, their banner; it is revered and “worshiped” by the proletarians all over the world. Consequently, Marx and Engels are not simply the founders of a philosophical “school”; they are the living leaders of the living proletarian movement, which is growing and gaining strength every day. Whoever fight against their doctrines, whoever wants to “overthrow” them, must keep all this well in mind so as to avoid having his head cracked in an unequal struggle. Messieurs

the anarchists are well aware of this. That is why, in fighting Marx and Engels, they resort to a most unusual and, in its way, a new weapon.

What is this new weapon? A new investigation of capitalist production? A refutation of Marx's *Capital*? Of course not! Or perhaps, having armed themselves with “new facts” and the “inductive” method, they “scientifically” refute the “Bible” of Social-Democracy—the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels? Again no! Then what is this extraordinary weapon?

It is the accusation that Marx and Engels indulged in “plagiarism”! Would you believe it? It appears that Marx and Engels wrote nothing original, that scientific socialism is a pure fiction, because the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels was, from the beginning to end, “stolen from the *Manifesto* of Victor Considérant.”⁶¹ This is utterly ridiculous, of course, but V. Cherkeshishvili, the “incomparable leader” of the anarchists, relates this amusing story with such aplomb, and a certain Pierre Ramus, Cherkeshishvili's foolish “apostle,” and our home-grown anarchists repeat this “discovery” with such fervor, that it is worth while dealing at least briefly with this “story.”

Listen to Cherkeshishvili: “The entire theoretical part of the *Communist Manifesto*, namely, the first and second chapters . . . are taken from V. Considérant. Consequently, the *Manifesto* of Marx and Engels—that Bible of legal revolutionary democracy—is nothing more than a clumsy paraphrasing of V. Considérant's *Manifesto*. Marx and Engels not only appropriated the contents of Considérant's *Manifesto* but even . . . borrowed some of its chapter headings.”⁶²

This story is repeated by another anarchist, Pierre Ramus: “It can be emphatically asserted that their (Marx and Engels) major work (the *Communist Manifesto*) is simply theft (a plagiarism); shameless theft; they did not, however, copy it word for word as ordinary thieves do, but stole only the ideas and theories.”⁶³

This is repeated by our anarchists in *Nobati*, *Musha*,⁶⁴ *Khma*,⁶⁵ and other papers.

Thus it appears that scientific socialism and its theoretical principles were “stolen” from Considérant's *Manifesto*.

Are there any grounds for this assertion?

Who is Victor Considérant?

Who is Karl Marx?

Considérant, who died in 1893, was a disciple of the utopian Fourier⁶⁶ and remained an incorrigible *utopian*, who placed his hopes for the "salvation of France" on the *conciliation* of classes.

Karl Marx, who died in 1883, was a materialist, *an enemy of the utopians*. He regarded the development of the productive forces and the *struggle* between classes as the guarantee of the liberation of mankind.

Is there anything in common between them?

The *theoretical* basis of scientific socialism is the materialist theory of Marx and Engels. From the standpoint of this theory the development of social life is wholly determined by the development of the productive forces. If the feudal-landlord system was superseded by the bourgeois system, the "blame" for this rests upon the development of the productive forces, which made the rise of the bourgeois system inevitable. Or again, if the present bourgeois system will inevitably be superseded by the socialist system, it is because this is demanded by the development of modern productive forces. Hence the historical necessity for the destruction of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. Hence the Marxist proposition that we must seek our ideals in the history of the development of the productive forces and not in the minds of men.

Such is the *theoretical* basis of the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels.⁶⁷

Did Considérant's *Democratic Manifesto* say anything of the kind? Did Considérant accept the materialist point of view?

We assert that neither Cherkezishvili, nor Ramus, nor our *Nobatis* quote a *single* statement, or a *single* word from Considérant's *Democratic Manifesto* which proves that Considérant was a materialist and based the evolution of social life upon the development of the productive forces. On the contrary, we know very well that Considérant is known in the history of Socialism as an idealist utopian.⁶⁸

What, then, induced these queer "critics" to indulge in this idle chatter? Why do they undertake to criticize Marx and Engels when they are even unable to distinguish idealism from materialism? Was it only to amuse people? . . .

The *tactical* basis of scientific socialism is the doctrine of uncompromising class struggle, for this is the *best* weapon the proletariat possesses. The proletarian class struggle is the weapon by means of which the proletariat will capture political power and then appropriate the bourgeoisie in order to establish socialism.

Such is the *tactical* basis of scientific Socialism as expounded in the *Manifesto* of Marx and Engels.

Is anything like this said in Considérant's *Democratic Manifesto*? Did Considérant regard the class struggle as the best weapon the proletariat possesses?

As is evident from the articles of Cherkezishvili and Ramus (see above-mentioned symposium), there is not a word about this in Considérant's *Manifesto*. It merely notes the class struggle as a deplorable fact. As regards the class struggle as a means of smashing capitalism, Considérant spoke of it in his *Manifesto* as follows:

"Capital, labor, and talent—such are the three basic elements of production, the three sources of wealth, the three cogs in the industrial machine." The three classes which represent them have "common interests"; their function is "to make the machines work for the capitalists and for the people." Before them . . . is the great goal of "organizing the association of classes within the united nation."⁶⁹

All classes, unite! This is the slogan that Considérant proclaimed in his *Democratic Manifesto*.

What is there in common between these tactics of class *conciliation* and the tactics of uncompromising class *struggle* advocated by Marx and Engels, whose resolute call was: *Proletarians of all countries, unite against all anti-proletarian classes?*

There is nothing in common between them, of course!

Why, then, do Messieurs Cherkezishvili and their foolish followers talk this rubbish? Do they think we are corpses? Do they think we shall not drag them into the light of day?

And finally, there is one other interesting point. Considérant lived right up to 1893. He published his *Democratic Manifesto* in 1843. At the end of 1847 Marx and Engels wrote their *Communist Manifesto*. After that the *Manifesto* of Marx and Engels was published over and over again in all the European languages. Everybody knows that the *Manifesto* of Marx and Engels was an epoch-making document. Nevertheless, *nowhere* did Considérant or his friends *ever* state during the lifetime of Marx and Engels that the latter had stolen "socialism" from Considérant's *Manifesto*. Is this not strange, reader?

What, then, induces the "inductive" upstarts—I beg your pardon, "scholars"—to talk this rubbish? In whose name are they speaking? Are they more familiar with Considérant's *Manifesto* than Consi-

dérant himself? Or perhaps they think that Considérant and his supporters had not read the *Communist Manifesto*?

But enough. . . . Enough because the anarchists themselves do not take seriously the Quixotic crusade launched by Ramus and Cherkezishvili. The inglorious end of this ridiculous crusade is too obvious to make it worthy of much attention. . . .

Let us proceed to the actual criticism.

The anarchists suffer from a certain ailment: They are very fond of "criticizing" the parties of their opponents, but they do not take the trouble to make themselves the least bit familiar with these parties. We have seen the anarchists behave in precisely this way when "criticizing" the dialectical method and the materialist theory of the Social-Democrats (see Chapters I and II). They behave in the same way when they deal with the theory of scientific socialism that is advocated by the Social-Democrats.

Let us, for example, take the following fact. Who does not know that fundamental disagreements exist between the Socialist-Revolutionaries⁷⁰ and the Social-Democrats?⁷¹ Who does not know that the former repudiate Marxism, the materialist theory of Marxism, its dialectical method, its program, and the class struggle; whereas the Social-Democrats take their stand entirely on Marxism? These fundamental disagreements must be self-evident to anybody who has heard anything, if only a whisper, about the controversy between *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya*⁷² (the organ of the Socialist-Revolutionaries) and *Iskra*⁷³ (the organ of the Social-Democrats). But what will you say about those "critics" who fail to see this difference between the two and shout that both the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Social-Democrats are Marxists? Thus, for example, the anarchists assert that both *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* and *Iskra* are *Marxist organs*.⁷⁴

This shows how "familiar" the anarchists are with the principles of Social-Democracy!

After this, the soundness of their "scientific criticism" will be self-evident. . . .

Let us examine this "criticism."

The anarchists' principal "accusation" is that they do not regard the Social-Democrats as genuine *socialists*—you are not socialists, you are enemies of socialism, they keep on repeating.

This is what Kropotkin writes on this score: "We arrive at conclusions different from those arrived at by the majority of the

economists . . . of the Social-Democratic school. . . . We . . . arrive at free communism, whereas the majority of Socialists (meaning Social-Democrats too—*The author*) arrive at state capitalism and collectivism."⁷⁵

What is this "state capitalism" and "collectivism" of the Social-Democrats?

This is what Kropotkin writes about it: "The German Socialists say that all accumulated wealth must be concentrated in the hands of the state, which will place it at the disposal of workers' associations, organize production and exchange, and control the life and labor of society."⁷⁶

And further: "In their schemes . . . the collectivists are guilty . . . of a twofold error. They want to abolish the capitalist system, but they preserve the two institutions which constitute the foundations of this system: representative government and wage labor."⁷⁷ "Collectivism, as is well known . . . preserves . . . wage labor. Only . . . representative government . . . takes the place of the master." The representatives of this government "retain the right to utilize in the interests of all the surplus value obtained from production. Moreover, in this system a distinction is made . . . between the labor of the common laborer and that of the skilled craftsman: the labor of the unskilled worker, in the opinion of the collectivists, is *simple* labor, whereas the skilled craftsman, engineer, scientists and so forth perform what Marx calls *complex* labor and have the right to higher wages."⁷⁸ Thus, the workers will receive their necessary products not according to their needs, but "in proportion to the services they render society."⁷⁹

The Georgian anarchists say the same thing, only with greater aplomb. Particularly outstanding among them for the recklessness of his statements is Mr. Bâton. He writes:

"What is the collectivism of the Social-Democrats? Collectivism, or more correctly, state capitalism, is based on the following principle: each must work as much as he likes, or as much as the state determines, and receives in reward the value of his labor in the shape of goods." Consequently, here "there is needed a legislative assembly . . . there is needed (also) an executive power, *i.e.*, ministers, all sorts of administrators, gendarmes and spies and, perhaps, also troops, if there are too many discontented."⁸⁰

Such is the first "accusation" Messieurs the anarchists hurl at Social-Democracy.

Thus, from the arguments of the anarchists it follows that:

(1) In the opinion of the Social-Democrats, socialist society is impossible without a government which, in the capacity of principal master, will hire workers and will certainly have "ministers . . . gendarmes and spies."

(2) In socialist society, in the opinion of the Social-Democrats, the distinction between "dirty" and "clean" work will be retained, the principle "to each according to his needs," will be rejected, and another principle will prevail, *viz.*, "to each according to his services."

These are the two points on which the anarchists' "accusation" against Social-Democracy is based.

Has this "accusation" advanced by Messieurs the Anarchists any foundation?

We assert that everything the anarchists say on this subject is either the result of stupidity, or despicable slander.

Here are the facts.

As far back as 1846 Karl Marx said: "The working class, in the course of its development, will substitute for the old bourgeois society an *association* which will exclude classes and their antagonism, and there will be *no more political power properly so-called.*"⁸¹

A year later Marx and Engels expressed the same idea in *The Communist Manifesto.*⁸²

In 1877 Engels wrote: "The first act in which the state really comes forward as the representative of society as a whole—the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—is at the same time its last independent act as a state. The interference of the state power in social relations becomes superfluous in one sphere after another, and then ceases of itself. . . . The state is not 'abolished,' *its withers away.*"⁸³

In 1884 the same Engels wrote: "The state, therefore, has not existed from all eternity. There have been societies which have managed without it, which had no notion of state. . . . At a definite stage of economic development, which necessarily involved the cleavage of society into classes, the state became a necessity. . . . We are now rapidly approaching a stage in the development of production at which the existence of these classes has not only ceased to be a necessity, but becomes a positive hindrance to production. They will fall as inevitably as they once arose. *The state inevitably falls with them.* The society which organizes production

anew on the basis of free and equal association of the producers will put the whole state machinery where it will then belong—into the museum of antiquities, next to the spinning wheel and the bronze ax." [Italics added.]⁸⁴

Engels said the same thing again in 1891.⁸⁵

As you see, in the opinion of the Social-Democrats, socialist society is a society in which there will be no room for the so-called state, political power, with its ministers, governors, gendarmes, police, and soldiers. The last stage in the existence of the state will be the period of the socialist revolution, when the proletariat will capture political power and set up its own government (dictatorship) for the final abolition of the bourgeoisie. But when the bourgeoisie is abolished, when classes are abolished, when socialism becomes firmly established, there will be no need for any political power, and the so-called state will retire into the sphere of history.

As you see, the above-mentioned "accusation" of the anarchists is mere tittle-tattle devoid of all foundation.

As regards the second point in the "accusation," Karl Marx says the following about it: "In a higher phase of communist [*i.e.*, socialist] society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual under the division of labor, and therewith also the *antithesis* between *mental* and *physical labor*, has vanished; after labor has become . . . the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with all-round development of the individual . . . only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully behind and society inscribe on its banners: *from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.*"⁸⁶

As you see, in Marx's opinion, the higher phase of communist (*i.e.*, *socialist*) society will be a system under which the division of work into "dirty" and "clean," and the distinction between mental and physical labor will be completely abolished, labor be equal, and in society the genuine communist principle will prevail: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. Here there is no room for wage labor.

Clearly this "accusation" is also devoid of all foundation.

One of two things: Either Messieurs the Anarchists have never seen the above-mentioned works of Marx and Engels and indulge in "criticism" on the basis of hearsay, or they are familiar with these works of Marx and Engels and are deliberately lying.

Such is the fate of the first "accusation."

The second "accusation" of the anarchists is that they deny that Social-Democracy is *revolutionary*. You are not revolutionaries, you repudiate violent revolution, you want to establish socialism only by means of ballot papers, Messieurs the Anarchists tell us.

Listen to this: "Social-Democrats . . . are fond of declaiming on the theme of 'revolution,' 'revolutionary struggle,' 'fighting with arms in hand.' . . . But if you, in the simplicity of your heart, ask them for arms, they will solemnly hand you a ballot paper to vote in elections." They affirm that "the only suitable tactics that befit revolutionaries are peaceful and legal parliamentarism, with the oath of allegiance to capitalism, to established power, and to the entire existing bourgeois system."⁸⁷

The Georgian anarchists say the same thing, with even greater aplomb, of course. Take, for example, Bâton,⁸⁸ who writes as follows:

"The whole of Social-Democracy . . . openly asserts that fighting with the aid of rifles and weapons is a bourgeois method of revolution, and that only by means of ballot papers, only by means of general elections, can parties capture power, and then, by means of parliamentary majority and legislation, reorganize society."⁸⁹

This is what Messieurs the Anarchists say about the Marxists.

Has this "accusation" any foundation?

We affirm that here, too, the anarchists betray their ignorance and their passion for slander.

Here are the facts.

As far back as the end of 1847, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote: "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!*" [Italics added.]⁹⁰

In 1850, in anticipation of another outbreak in Germany, Karl Marx wrote to the German comrades of that time as follows: "Weapons and munitions must not be surrendered on any pretext . . . the workers must . . . *organize themselves independently as a proletarian guard with a commander . . . and with a general staff. . . .*" And this you "must keep in view during and after the coming insurrection." [Italics added.]⁹¹

In 1851-52 Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote: "The insurrectionary career once entered upon, *act with the greatest deter-*

mination, and on the offensive. The defensive is the death of every armed rising. . . . Surprise your antagonists while their forces are scattering, prepare new successes, however small, but daily . . . force your enemies to a retreat before they can collect their strength against you; in the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary policy yet known: *de l'audace, de l'audace, encore de l'audace!*"⁹²

We think that something more besides "ballots" is meant here.

Finally, recall the history of the Paris Commune, recall how peacefully the Commune acted, when it was content with the victory in Paris and refrained from attacking Versailles, that hotbed of counter-revolution. What do you think Marx said at that time? Did he call upon the Parisians to go to the ballot box? Did he express approval of the compacency of the Paris workers (the whole of Paris was in the hands of the workers), did he approve of the good nature they displayed toward the vanquished Versailles? Listen to what Marx said:

"What elasticity, what historical initiative, what a capacity for sacrifice in these Parisians! After six months of hunger . . . they rise, beneath Prussian bayonets. . . . History has no like example of a like greatness. If they are defeated only their 'good nature' will be to blame. *They should have marched at once on Versailles* [italics added], after first Vinoy and then the reactionary section of the Paris National Guard had themselves retreated. The right moment was missed because of conscientious scruples. They did not want to *start the civil war*, as if that mischievous *abortion* Thiers had not already started the civil war with his attempt to disarm Paris."⁹³

This is how Karl Marx and Frederick Engels thought and acted.

This is how the Social-Democrats think and act.

But the anarchists go on repeating: Marx and Engels and their followers are interested only in ballots—they repudiate violent revolutionary action!

As you see, this "accusation" is also slander, which exposed the anarchists' ignorance about the essence of Marxism.

Such is the fate of the second "accusation."

The third "accusation" of the anarchists is that they deny Social-Democracy is a popular movement, describe the Social-Democrats as bureaucrats, and affirm that the Social-Democratic plan for the dictatorship of the proletariat spells death to the revolution, and

since the Social-Democrats stand for such a dictatorship, they actually want to establish not the dictatorship of the proletariat, but their own dictatorship over the proletariat.

Listen to Mr. Kropotkin: "We Anarchists have pronounced final sentence upon dictatorship. . . . We know that every dictatorship, no matter how honest its intentions, will lead to the death of the revolution. We know . . . that the idea of dictatorship is nothing more nor less than the pernicious product of governmental fetishism which . . . has always striven to perpetuate slavery."⁹⁴ The Social-Democrats not only recognize revolutionary dictatorship, they also "advocate dictatorship over the proletariat. . . . The workers are of interest to them only in so far as they are a disciplined army under their control. . . . Social-Democracy strives through the medium of the proletariat to capture the state machine."⁹⁵

The Georgian anarchists say the same thing: "The dictatorship of the proletariat in the direct sense of the term is utterly impossible, because the advocates of dictatorship are state men, and their dictatorship will be not the free activities of the entire proletariat, but the establishment at the head of society of the same representative government that exists today."⁹⁶ The Social-Democrats stand for dictatorship not in order to facilitate the emancipation of the proletariat, but in order . . . "by their own rule to establish a new slavery."⁹⁷

Such is the third "accusation" of Messieurs the Anarchists.

It requires no great effort to expose this, one of the regular slanders uttered by the anarchists in order to deceive their readers.

We shall not analyze here the utterly fallacious view of Kropotkin, according to whom every dictatorship spells death to revolution. We shall discuss this later when we discuss the anarchists' tactics. At present we shall touch only upon the "accusation" itself.

As far back as the end of 1847 Karl Marx and Frederick Engels said that to establish socialism the proletariat must achieve political dictatorship in order, with the aid of this dictatorship, to repel the counter-revolutionary attacks of the bourgeoisie and to deprive it of the means of production; that this dictatorship must be not the dictatorship of a few individuals, but the dictatorship of the entire proletariat as a class: "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 proletariat organized as the ruling class."⁹⁸

That is to say, the dictatorship of the proletariat will be a dictatorship of the entire proletariat as a class over the bourgeoisie and not the domination of a few individuals over the proletariat.

Later they repeated this very same idea in nearly all their other works, such as, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, *The Class Struggles in France*, *The Civil War in France, Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, *Anti-Dühring*, and others.

But this is not all. To ascertain how Marx and Engels conceived of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to ascertain to what extent they regarded this dictatorship as possible, it is very interesting to see what their attitude was toward the Paris Commune. The point is that the dictatorship of the proletariat is denounced not only by anarchists, but also by the urban petty bourgeoisie including butchers and tavern keepers, by all those whom Marx and Engels called philistines. This is what Engels said about the dictatorship of the proletariat, addressing such philistines:

"Of late, the German philistine has once more been filled with wholesome terror at the words: *Dictatorship of the Proletariat*. Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."⁹⁹

As you see, Engels conceived of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the shape of the Paris Commune.

Clearly, everybody who wants to know what the dictatorship of the proletariat is as conceived by Marxists must study the Paris Commune. Let us then turn to the Paris Commune. If it turns out that the Paris Commune was indeed the dictatorship of a few individuals over the proletariat, then—down with Marxism, down with the dictatorship of the proletariat! But if we find that the Paris Commune was indeed the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, then—we shall laugh heartily at the anarchist slanderers who in their struggle against Marxists have no alternative but to invent slander.

The history of the Paris Commune can be divided into two periods: the first period, when affairs in Paris were controlled by the well-known Central Committee, and the second period, when, after the authority of the Central Committee had expired, control of affairs was transferred to the recently elected Commune. What was this Central Committee, what was its composition? Before us lies Arthur Arnould's *Popular History of the Paris Commune* which,

according to Arnould, briefly answers this question. The struggle had only just commenced when about 300,000 Paris workers organized in companies and battalions and elected delegates from their ranks. In this way the Central Committee was formed.

"All these citizens [members of the Central Committee] elected during partial elections by their companies or battalions," says Arnould, "were known only to the small groups whose delegates they were. Who were these people, what kind of people were they, and what did they want to do?" This was "an anonymous government consisting almost exclusively of common workers and minor office employees, the names of three-fourths of whom were unknown outside their streets or offices. . . . Tradition was upset. Something unexpected had happened in the world. There was not a single member of the ruling classes among them. A revolution had broken out which was not represented by a single *lawyer, deputy, journalist, or general*. Instead, there was a *miner* from Creusot, a *bookbinder*, a *cook*, and so forth."¹⁰⁰

Arthur Arnould goes on to say: "The members of the Central Committee said: 'We are obscure bodies, humble tools of the attacked people. . . . Instruments of the people's will, we are here to be its echo, to achieve its triumph. The people want a Commune, and we shall remain in order to proceed to the election of the Commune.' Neither more nor less. These dictators do not put themselves above nor stand aloof from the masses. One feels that they are living with the masses, in the masses, by means of the masses, that they consult with them every second, that they listen and convey all they hear, striving only, in a concise form . . . to convey the opinion of three hundred thousand men."¹⁰¹

This is how the Paris Commune behaved in the first period of its existence.

Such was the Paris Commune.

Such is the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Let us now pass to the second period of the Commune, when the Commune functioned in place of the Central Committee. Speaking of these two periods, which lasted two months, Arnould exclaims with enthusiasm that this was a real dictatorship of the people. Listen:

"The magnificent spectacle which this people presented during those two months imbues us with strength and hope . . . to look into the face of the future. During those two months there was a real

dictatorship in Paris, a most complete and uncontested dictatorship not of one man, *but of the entire people*—the sole master of the situation. . . . This dictatorship lasted uninterruptedly for over two months, from March 18 to May 22 [1871]." In itself "The Commune was only a moral power and possessed no other material strength than the universal sympathy . . . of the citizens, *the people were the rulers*, the only rulers, they themselves set up their police and magistracy."¹⁰²

This is how the Paris Commune is described by Arthur Arnould, a member of the Commune and an active participant in its hand-to-hand fighting.

The Paris Commune is described in the same way by Lissagaray, another of its members and equally active participant.¹⁰³

The people as the "only rulers," "not the dictatorship of one man, but of the whole people"—this is what the Paris Commune was.

"Look at the Paris Commune. That was the dictatorship of the proletariat," exclaimed Engels for the information of philistines.

So this is the dictatorship of the proletariat as conceived by Marx and Engels.

As you see, Messieurs the Anarchists understand the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Paris Commune, and Marxism, which they so often "criticize," as much as you and I, dear reader, understand Chinese.

Clearly, there are two kinds of dictatorship. There is the dictatorship of the minority, the dictatorship of a small group, the dictatorship of the Trepovs¹⁰⁴ and Ignatyevs¹⁰⁵ which is directed against the people. This kind of dictatorship is usually headed by a camarilla which adopts secret decisions and tightens the noose around the neck of the majority of the people.

Marxists are the enemies of such a dictatorship, and they fight such a dictatorship far more stubbornly and self-sacrificingly than do our noisy anarchists.

There is another kind of dictatorship, the dictatorship of the proletarian majority, the dictatorship of the masses, which is directed against the bourgeoisie, against the minority. At the head of this dictatorship stand the masses. Here there is no room either for a camarilla or for secret decisions, here everything is done openly, in the streets, at meetings—because it is the dictatorship of the street, of the masses, a dictatorship directed against all oppressors.

Marxists support this kind of dictatorship "with both hands," and that is because such a dictatorship is the magnificent beginning of the great socialist revolution.

Messieurs the Anarchists confused these two mutually negating dictatorships and thereby put themselves in a ridiculous position. They are fighting not Marxism but the figments of their own imagination, they are fighting not Marx and Engels but windmills, as Don Quixote of blessed memory did in his day. . . .

Such is the fate of the third "accusation."

(TO BE CONTINUED)*

* See Editor's Note, p. 5.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

All unsigned notes are by Stalin. Insertions in square brackets and notes so designated are by the editor.

1. Liberalism as here used refers to the position of the Russian bourgeoisie in 1905-06 in relation to the big landlords and tsarism, with which it sought conciliation in the form of a constitutional monarchy. Its political expression was the Constitutional-Democratic Party.—*Ed.*
2. BERNSTEIN, EDUARD (1850-1932). German Social-Democrat; in the 1890's attacked the basic doctrines of Marxism and became a leader of the revisionists and reformists.—*Ed.*
3. DECEMBER DAYS. The armed insurrection of the Moscow workers in December 1905, which marked the peak of the Revolution of 1905-07.—*Ed.*
4. NEO-LAMARCKISM. The later development of the theories of the great French biologist, Jean Baptiste Lamarck (1744-1829), the forerunner of the theory of evolution as formulated by Darwin. Lamarckism assigns primary influence to the external environment.—*Ed.*
5. NEO-DARWINISM. The theories developed by followers of Charles Darwin (1809-1882), the father of the modern science of evolution. The neo-Darwinists stressed the all-sufficiency of natural selection, although Darwin himself did not treat it as an exclusive factor in organic evolution.—*Ed.*
6. Frederick Engels, *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science (Anti-Dühring)*, New York, 1939.—*Ed.*
7. HEGEL, GEORG WILHELM FRIEDRICH (1770-1831). Great German philosopher, idealist.—*Ed.*
8. *Nobati*, No 6. Article by V. Cherkezishvili. [*Nobati (The Call)*, a weekly newspaper published by the Georgian anarchists in Tiflis in 1906.]
9. KROPOTKIN, PETER A. (1842-1921). Russian geographer and theoretician of anarchism; lived in exile in London and, after the Revolution of 1917, returned to Russia, where he died.—*Ed.*
10. This book also appeared in English under the title, *Modern Science and Anarchism*, London, 1903; a revised edition in 1912.—*Ed.*
11. CHERKEZISHVILI, v. Follower of Kropotkin and the leader of the anarchist group in Georgia—*Ed.*
12. SH. C. Initials of Shalva Gogelia, a Georgian anarchist.—*Ed.*

13. *Critique of Critical Criticism*. The reference here is to *The Holy Family: or, a Review of the Critical Critique Against Bruno Bauer and His Followers*, published in 1845, the first work of collaboration between Marx and Engels, in which the founders of scientific socialism undertook their initial systematic critique of Hegeliansm.—*Ed.*
14. PASCAL, BLAISE (1623-1662). Distinguished French philosopher, mathematician, and physicist; a forerunner of Leibnitz and Newton in their invention of differential and integral calculus.—*Ed.*
15. LEIRNITZ, GOTTFRIED WILHELM (1646-1716). Outstanding German philosopher and mathematician; in philosophy, he may be considered a forerunner of classic German idealism; in mathematics, his outstanding contribution was the discovery of calculus, independently of Newton.—*Ed.*
16. MAYER, JULIUS ROBERT VON (1814-1878). German physicist; formulated principle underlying the theory of the conservation of energy.—*Ed.*
17. HELMHOLTZ, HERMANN L. F. VON (1821-1894). Distinguished German physicist and physiologist, who made many contributions in fields of accoustics, theory of color, and motion.—*Ed.*
18. *Nobati*, Nos. 3 and 9. Sh. G. See also Kropotkin's *Science and Anarchism*.
19. Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach*, [Frederick Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the Outcome of Classical German Philosophy*, New York, 1941, p. 11.]
20. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*. [See Note 6.]
21. PROUDHON, PIERRE JOSEPH (1809-1865). Petty-bourgeois French anarchist, who tried to find a middle course between socialist theories and the classical economists.—*Ed.*
22. Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*. [New York. Marx wrote this book in the winter of 1846-47 as a polemic against Proudhon's *Système des Contradictions économiques ou Philosophie de la Misère (System of Economic Contradictions or Philosophy of Poverty)*.]
23. SPENCER, HERBERT (1820-1903). English philosopher and sociologist; positivist and apologist for capitalism. He extended Darwin's theory of the struggle for existence in natural evolution to people in society, attempting to show the inevitability of such a struggle and the impossibility of socialism.—*Ed.*
24. *Ludwig Feuerbach*.
25. *Capital*, Vol. I, Preface. [Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, New York, 1947, p. xxi.]
26. *Ludwig Feuerbach* [pp. 15-16].
27. *Nobati*, No. 8. Sh. G.
28. *Nobati*, No. 4. Article by V. Cherkezishvili.
29. *Anti-Dühring*, Introduction [p. 28].
30. CUVIER, GEORGES LEOPOLD, BARON DE (1769-1832). French naturalist, founder of science of comparative anatomy. Developed the theory of the

- sudden general extinction and creation of species (cataclysms), in opposition to the evolutionary theory.—*Ed.*
31. *Nobati*, No. 8. Sh. G.
 32. *Nobati*, No. 6.
 33. Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Preface. [Chicago, 1904, p. 11.]
 34. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Part III, Chapter II [pp. 292-310].
 35. *Nobati*, No. 8. Sh. G.
 36. Marx, *Critique of Political Economy*, p. 11.—*Ed.*
 37. *Ibid.*, p. 12.—*Ed.*
 38. *Nobati*, No. 1, "A Critique of Monism."
 39. BÜCHNER, LUDWIG (1824-99) and MOLESCHOTT, JACOB (1822-93). German "vulgar" materialist philosophers, predominantly mechanistic, non-historical, and anti-dialectical.—*Ed.*
 40. *Ludwig Feuerbach*, Appendix, "Karl Marx on the History of French Materialism of the XVIII Century" [pp. 92-93].
 41. *Nobati*, No. 7, D. Delendi.
 42. *Nobati*, No. 6, Sh. G.
 43. *Nobati*, No. 4, V. Cherkezishvili.
 44. *Nobati*, No. 6. Sh. G.
 45. Kropotkin, *Science and Anarchism*, and also *Anarchy and its Philosophy*.
 46. *Nobati*, No. 2.
 47. ARISTOTLE (384-322 B.C.). Greek philosopher, founder of formal logic, and a scholar of encyclopedic genius, whom Marx characterized as the "greatest thinker of antiquity." Basically an idealist, despite many materialist elements and tendencies in his thinking.—*Ed.*
 48. HOLBACH, PAUL-HENRI (1723-1789). Outstanding French philosopher, materialist and atheist; a leading representative of the Enlightenment and a philosophical forerunner of the French Revolution.—*Ed.*
 49. *Nobati*, No. 6. Sh. G.
 50. *Ibid.*
 51. Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* [p. 12].
 52. Karl Marx. *The Class Struggles in France, 1840-50*, New York; *The Civil War in France*, New York, 1940.—*Ed.*
 53. During these years, in addition to his editorial work on Vols. II and III of *Capital*, Engels wrote a series of articles and introductions to new editions in various languages to the writing of Marx and his own, some of which were published in the current Marxist press.—*Ed.*

54. The words in parentheses are Stalin's. These articles were signed with the initial K.—*Ed.*
55. *Nobati*, No. 1. Sh. G.
56. *Poverty of Philosophy* [p. 147].
57. Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* [New York, 1942, p. 158].
58. Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme* [New York, 1938, p. 10].
59. *Anti-Dühring* [pp. 173-75].
60. *Communist Manifesto*. [Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, New York, 1948, p. 30.]
61. CONSIDÉRANT, VICTOR PROSPER (1808-93). French utopian Socialist, follower of Fourier (see Note 66). In 1854, he founded a utopian colony in Texas, but the effort failed and he returned to France in 1869.—*Ed.*
62. See collection of articles by Cherkezishvili, Ramus and Labriola, published in German under the title, *The Origin of the "Communist Manifesto,"* p. 10.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
64. *Musha (The Worker)*, a daily newspaper published by the Georgian anarchists in Tiflis in 1906.—*Ed.*
65. *Khma (The Voice)*, another daily published in Tiflis by the anarchists in 1906.
66. FOURIER, CHARLES (1772-1837). French utopian Socialist, who had a great influence upon the development of scientific socialist ideas. Engels called him one of the "patriarchs of socialism." He emphasized the creative function of labor in a future social system based on the "phalanx," consisting of various sets of economic enterprises. Among the many Fourier colonies formed in the United States during the 1840's, Brook Farm in Massachusetts was the most famous. Albert Brisbane was Fourier's chief disciple in this country.—*Ed.*
67. *Communist Manifesto*, Chapters I and II.
68. Paul Louis, *The History of Socialism in France*.
69. Karl Kautsky's pamphlet, *The Communist Manifesto—A Plagiarist*, p. 14, where this passage from Considérant's *Manifesto* is quoted.
70. SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARY PARTY. Formed in 1901 by a number of Populist (Narodnik) groups; based on kulaks and village petty-bourgeoisie and opposed to the Social-Democrats and Marxists. It favored individual terroristic methods, which were repudiated by the Marxists.—*Ed.*
71. SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS. Members of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party founded in 1898. At the Second Congress in 1903, it split into two factions: the majority (Bolshevik) orthodox Marxist faction, and the minority (Menshevik) opportunist faction. See *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, New York, 1939.—*Ed.*

72. *Revolutionnaya Rossiya (Revolutionary Russia)*. Official organ of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party (See Note 70).—*Ed.*
73. *Iskra (Spark)*. Began publication in December 1900 and remained principally under the editorial guidance of Lenin until 1903 when, as a result of the split in the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, it passed into the hands of the Mensheviks. At that time, it also became the official organ of the party.—*Ed.*
74. See the anarchists' symposium, *Bread and Freedom*, p. 202.
75. Kropotkin, *Modern Science and Anarchism*, pp. 74-75.
76. Kropotkin, *The Speeches of a Rebel*, p. 64.
77. *The Conquest of Bread*, p. 148.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
80. *Nobati*, No. 5, pp. 68-69.
81. *Poverty of Philosophy* [pp. 146-47].
82. *Communist Manifesto*, Chapter II.
83. *Anti-Dühring* [p. 307].
84. *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* [p. 158].
85. See his Introduction to *The Civil War in France*.
86. *Critique of the Gotha Programme* [p. 10].
87. See the symposium, *Bread and Freedom*, pp. 21, 22-23.
88. BATON. Pseudonym of Mikhako Tsereteli, Georgian anarchist.—*Ed.*
89. *The Capture of Political Power*, pp. 3-4.
90. *Manifesto of the Communist Party* [p. 44]. In some of the legal editions [permitted by the tsarist censorship] several words have been omitted in the translation.
91. *The Cologne Trial. Marx's Address to the Communists*. [In Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, New York, "Address of the Central Council to the Communist League," pp. 164-65.]
92. *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany*. [Frederick Engels, *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, New York, 1933, p. 135.]
93. *Letters to Kugelmann*. [Karl Marx, *Letters to Kugelmann*, New York, 1934, p. 123.]
94. Kropotkin, *The Speeches of a Rebel*, p. 131.
95. *Bread and Freedom*, pp. 62, 63.
96. Bâton, *The Capture of Political Power*, p. 45.
97. *Nobati*, No. 1, p. 5. Bâton.

98. *Communist Manifesto* [p. 30]. ..
99. *The Civil War in France*, Introduction by Engels [p. 22].
100. *A Popular History of the Paris Commune*, p. 107.
101. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
102. *Ibid.*, pp. 242, 244.
103. *History of the Paris Commune*.
104. TREPOV, DMITRY F. (1855-1906). As chief of police in Moscow, later Governor-General of St. Petersburg, and then as Assistant Minister of the Interior, notorious for his police brutality against workers and students.—*Ed.*
105. IGNATYEV, NIKOLAI P., COUNT (1832-1908). Tsarist general and notorious persecutor of the Jews. His brother, ALEXEI P. (1842-1906), Governor-General of Kiev and then of Odessa in 1905, also a notorious reactionary, was assassinated in 1906.—*Ed.*

ON THE INTERNATIONAL LIST

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R. Joseph Stalin

The last major work, on problems of political economy and perspectives of the capitalist and socialist world. Cloth, \$1.25; Paper, \$0.25

MARXISM AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION Joseph Stalin

Includes the basic essay on the nation, and other theoretical essays on problems of the national movement. \$2.00

DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM Joseph Stalin

A succinct presentation of the philosophic foundations of Marxism. Cloth, \$1.00; Paper, 25¢

THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION V. I. Lenin

Lenin's most important historical and theoretical studies on the national question and its relationship to the class struggle.

Cloth, \$1.50; Paper, 90¢

ON CONTRADICTION Mao Tse-tung

A philosophical essay on dialectics. Cloth, \$1.00; Paper, \$0.35

THEORIES OF SURPLUS VALUE Karl Marx

The authoritative English edition of sections dealing with classic economic theories, and such questions as crises and productivity. \$4.00

LUDWIG FEUERBACH Frederick Engels

The philosophy of Hegel and Feuerbach. Includes Marx's famous "Theses." Cloth, \$1.50; Paper, \$0.50

THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND THE STATE Frederick Engels

The celebrated classic on the evolution of society and the development of the family from primitive times. Trade, \$2.00; Pop., \$1.65

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 16, N. Y.