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A number of early followers of Hegel are known as the “young Hegelians.”

The leaders of the group included Bruno Bauer and David Strauss.

In their youth, Ludwig Feuerbach, Karl Marx, and Friedrich Engels were associates.

The young Hegelians were “leftist” radical opponents of despotic governments upheld by religious institutions.

A counter-movement was that of the conservative “right” Hegelians.

The right Hegelians held the power in the universities and kept the left Hegelians out.

They considered Hegel’s work to be the culmination of philosophy and existing institutions to be the culmination of society.
In Hegel’s system, the figure of Jesus represents the unity of the universal and the particular in a single individual.

Rationalist scholars claimed that Jesus was only an inspirational figure.

Schleiermacher held that the role of Jesus was to introduce a “God-consciousness” to humanity.

Strauss maintained that the unity of God and man is to be found not in the single individual Jesus, but in the life of the human species.

In *The Essence of Christianity* (1841), the young Feuerbach argued that God is the projection of human powers onto a fictitious objective being.
Human beings are in essence conscious beings. A being can be conscious only if its way of being (its “species”) is an object of its thought. The notions that humans have of themselves are identical to their notions of God. Initially, this fact is hidden, and the self-notion of humanity is sought in another being. This accounts for the anthropomorphically attributes assigned to God, as well as for the parade of spiritual beings such as devils, goblins, witches, ghosts, and angels. The exaltation of God implies a degradation of human beings. Religious progress is made when humans reclaim for themselves the properties they had projected onto God.
In 1888, Engels appended to one of his works a series of eleven theses on Feuerbach written by Marx in 1845.

Feuerbach called the piece “the brilliant germ of a new world view.”

Marx credited Feuerbach for recognizing that religious belief has a secular origin.

But Feuerbach did not recognize that the separation of the religious from the secular is based on “contradiction” in the secular basis.

The contradiction in secular society reveals the need for revolutionary action to resolve it, which would do away with any need for religion.

“The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is, to change it” (Thesis 11).
In 1844, Marx wrote three unpublished papers that are now known as the “Economic and Political Manuscripts.” These manuscripts, along with others written during the same period, are now known as the writings of the “young Marx” and are said to express Marx’s “humanism.”

The first two manuscripts are entitled “Alienated Labor,” and “Private Property and Communism.”

The third of the manuscripts was a “Critique of Hegelian Dialectic and Philosophy in General.”

This manuscript contains two elements:

- An exposition and criticism of Hegel’s dialectical method, particularly as used in the Phenomenology of Spirit and the Logic.
- The relation of the dialectical method to the modern philosophy, primarily that of Feuerbach, that is critical of Hegel.
The Fate of Hegel’s Dialectic

The early critics of Hegel were not critical of the dialectical method and remained entrapped in it.

- Some of their expressions “not only verbally agree with the Hegelian perspective but reproduce it literally.”

Later, Feuerbach “destroyed the inner principle of the old dialectic and philosophy.”

But the early critics, though proclaiming their superiority over Hegel, still did not come to grips with Hegel’s dialectic, or with Feuerbach’s.

Feuerbach achieved three great things.

- Proved that philosophy has served religion and as such must be condemned for alienating man from himself.
- Made interpersonal relations the basis of philosophy, rendering it materialistic and scientific.
- Opposed the Hegelian “negation of the negation” in favor of working out from the certainty of the senses.
Feuerbach’s Critique of Hegel’s Dialectic

- Feuerbach explained Hegel’s dialectic, and hence cleared the way for positive philosophy.
- Hegel’s dialectic contains three moves.
  - Hegel begins with the universal, infinite, abstract (in popular terms, traditional religion).
  - He then transcends this alienated other and posits the particular, finite, perceptible.
  - But the posited particular, finite, perceptible is itself transcended, and the universal, infinite, abstract is re-established (in popular terms, religion is re-established).
- Hegel thought that only the negation of the negation is the positive.
- But Feuerbach saw the negation of the negation to be a mere contradiction.
  - The last step is the re-affirmation of the first step, which itself is in opposition to the second step.
- As a result, the last step is not proved, because the second step has not been truly overcome.
Marx notes that Hegel’s system begins with logic and ends with absolute knowledge.

Absolute knowledge is the knowledge of a super-human, abstract mind knowing itself.

This knowledge is that of the philosopher, and it concerns only the mind itself, excluding nature and actual human beings.

Nature is something external to abstractly thinking mind.

When mind finds itself in absolute knowledge, what it finds is a merely logical existence, rather than the existence of actual human beings living in the natural world.

This can be seen in the *Phenomenology*, where consciousness is opposed only to an abstractly conceived other, and not real alienation.
Although Hegel’s use of the dialectic was defective, the dialectical method itself is necessary for the understanding of human existence.

“All the elements of criticism are implicit in [the Phenomenology], already prepared and elaborated in a manner far surpassing the Hegelian standpoint.”

Even though oppositions such as that of master and servant are conceived abstractly by Hegel, they are real relations through which humans are alienated from one another.

Hegel prepared the ground for understanding human nature.

- The self-development of man is a process.
- In the processes, man loses himself as a *species-being* in his alienation from his fellow man.
- Man overcomes this alienation through collective *work*, which uses man’s *species-powers*.
Absolute Knowledge

- The *Phenomenology* describes the ways in which consciousness appears.
- Since it presents abstract forms of consciousness, it presents only the way in which actual alienation appears.
- It culminates in “absolute knowledge,” in which self-consciousness overcomes its alienation and recognizes its “other” as itself.
- The alien “other” is itself merely a way in which self-consciousness thinks an other, and as such it is a mere thought-entity.
- Thus, in describing absolute knowledge, Hegel can claim to have incorporated all the thought-entities of the previous philosophers into his absolute self-knower.
- But his results apply only to the mental labor of the philosopher, and not to the labor of those whose object is the extra-mental world.
Self-consciousness is said to “externalize” itself insofar as it thinks of something as other than itself.

The externalized “other” can be called a “thing.”

But from the standpoint of phenomenology, there is only “thinghood,” or the thing as an object of consciousness.

Thinghood is “a mere artifice established by self-consciousness,” which can easily overcome its “otherness.”

The obvious description of what is “other” to self-consciousness (which Marx identifies with man) is “real, natural objects.”

A human being interacts with objects because the human being is a natural object just like the objects it works upon.
Marx adopts the standpoint of naturalism, which he distinguishes from idealism and materialism.

- Not idealistic because views thought as a product of nature, rather than nature as a product of thought.
- Not materialistic, because natural objects are objects for one another, rather than being independent entities.

Man as a natural being interacts with other natural beings in two ways.

- As an active being with vital powers that are capable of transforming other natural objects.
- As a passive being that suffers the activity of other natural objects.

Man is a special kind of natural object who takes himself as an object, and hence is a species-being.

The natural history of the species-being man consists of the transformations he undergoes in developing himself as species-being.
Hegel’s Transformations

- Hegel recognizes transformation, such as the following ascending series of social forms.
  - Private right.
  - Morality.
  - The family.
  - Civil society.
  - The state.
  - World history.

- But these are only ideal, and not real, transformations.
  - The thought of private right become the thought of morality.

- The thought-entities are confused with the real thing.

- So it is wrongly believed that actual transformations have been achieved.

- And it is believed by those who conform to these thought-entities that their way of living has been justified.
A positive feature of Hegel’s dialectic is his (abstract) recognition of transcendence of alienation and the consequent creation of new ways of thinking and acting.

Marx recognized two kinds of transcendence as being actual developments.

- Religion is transcended by atheism, giving rise to theoretical humanism.
- Private property is transcended by communism, giving rise to practical humanism.

The negative moments, atheism and communism, are quite real.

The new ways of thinking and acting are not simply returns to the original ways, which are really abolished.

Theoretical and practical humanism are consistent with atheism and communism, but not with religion and private property.
Hegel’s Inversion

- The end-product of Hegel’s dialectic is absolute spirit.
  - Natural man is only a predicate or symbol of the concealed absolute spirit.
- The relation of man as predicate to absolute spirit as subject is an inversion of the actual relation.
- Pure forms of thought are predicates, and actual living humans are subjects.
- The relation between thought and nature is likewise inverted.
- In an utterly arbitrary way, Hegel’s “absolute idea” is said to “decide” to let an other (nature) proceed from itself.
- This transition can be explained only by the *boredom* of thought having only itself as its content.
- But what is said to be known in this way is *abstract nature*, or nature as it is merely for thought, and “nature as nature” is nothing.
In 1846, Marx and Engels published *The German Ideology*.

- Volume I was a critique of modern German philosophy in the person of the “Young Hegelians” Feuerbach, Bauer and Stirner.
- Volume II criticized German socialist movements of the time.

The point of departure of the “young heroes” was “the putrescence of the absolute spirit.”

This gave rise to various new philosophical possibilities, which were trumpeted for their dangerous and revolutionary character.

However, far from being revolutionaries, these philosophers merely reflected the values of the German middle class.

The wretched social conditions in Germany were in no way improved as the result of their writings.
Ideology consists in systems of ideas that humans have produced from their consciousness alone.

- Morality.
- Religion.
- Metaphysics.

The starting point of ideology is in the *conception* of what a human being is.

This conception is supposed to be independent of the material conditions of human beings.

Those material conditions are then supposed to be explained through this conception.

Ideology’s view of the human inverts reality.

Ideology’s conception of man is itself a product of the material conditions of the human being.
The critics of Hegel did not escape his ideological standpoint.

Each merely emphasized one side of Hegel’s system at the expense of another side of it.

Whereas Hegel claimed that when something is reduced to a logical category it is understood, the Young Hegelians criticized things by claiming them to be religious in nature.

Thus, they held that the problems of mankind are due to the influence of religious ideas on human life.

Since the ideas are the products of consciousness, changes in reality could be brought about by changes in consciousness.

But all that results from the change in consciousness is the re-interpretation of reality.
The correct starting-point of philosophy is the real activities of real human beings in real material conditions.

There are two kinds of conditions.

- Pre-existing natural conditions (physical organization of humans and their relation to nature).
- Conditions produced by human activity.

The ability to produce the means of their own subsistence is the basis of human development.

This ability distinguishes us from animals.

The manner in which people produce their means of subsistence determines their mode of life.

Thus, the nature of individuals is dependent on the material conditions which determine the way in which they produce what they do.
There are three factors whose development is brought about by the productive activity of human beings.

- Development of productive forces.
- Division of labor.
- Social relations among people.

The way these factors are developed determines the internal structure of a nation.

Every new productive force brings about a new division of labor.

So, the way in which labor is divided is the measure of the productive force of a nation, and hence of its structure.

The division of labor are forms of ownership of the material, instruments and products of labor.
Early Types of Ownership

- The initial phase of ownership is tribal, where the means of subsistence are hunting, gathering and agriculture.
  - The division of labor is only a natural extension of the division of labor in a family.
- The second phase is ownership occurs when cities arise from the unification of tribes.
- There is communal ownership, but with private property beginning to exist.
- As private property becomes more widespread, communal ownership decays.
- There develop antagonisms between town and country, and within the town, between industry and commerce.
- There is also fully established the class relation between citizens and slaves.
The thesis here is that the forms of ownership determine the internal structure of a nation.

It might be thought that the structure of nations is determined violently through conquest.

- Rome was conquered by the barbarians.

In fact, a nation becomes ripe for conquest as a consequence of the way its labor is divided.

- For the barbarians, war was a form of life, and with population expansion, there was a drive for more land.
- In Italy, land was concentrated in a few hands, and the plebeian class between the landowners and slaves was a mere proletarian rabble.

These concentration of wealth and elimination of the middle class were to be repeated in modern industrialized nations.
The Feudal System

- The barbarian invasions had thinned out the population and reduced the means of production, which in turn gave rise to new ways of life.
- In the countryside, there is a hierarchical class of nobility ruling communally over serfs.
- In the towns, there are small craftsmen with limited capital with apprentices working under them.
- There was no division of labor of any importance.
- It was necessary that the towns and land-holdings be united into feudal kingdoms.
- Due to the hierarchical organization of the nobility, the form of government was monarchy.
- This and the other two forms of organization are explained by considering the real activities of real people in real material conditions.
The first of the three “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844” is an unfinished paper entitled “Alienated Labor.”

The thesis of the manuscript is that “private property” is the consequence of “externalized labor.”

The starting-point of the investigation are the presuppositions of political economy (the study of production in the context of the state).

The primary fact is that society is divided into proprietors and workers without property.

The misery of the workers is proportional to their productivity.

These facts must be explained, but political economy is not able to provide an explanation through its categories of greed and competition.
The Fruit of Labor

- Labor produces commodities, but it also produces itself as a commodity.
- In the production of commodities, the greater the volume of production, the cheaper the product becomes.
- Analogously, the greater the productivity of the worker, the lesser the value of the worker becomes.
- There are three relations in which the worker stands to the product.
  - Realization: labor produces a product.
  - Objectification: the efforts of the worker are embodied in an object.
  - Appropriation: the object is converted from its natural state and placed into human service.
- These relations will be the basis of the explanations of labor given in the manuscript.
Political economy shows that the apparently positive outcome of labor in fact diminishes to the worker. The more products are realized, the more the worker is driven toward starvation. The production of objects leads to the loss of objects, and even of work itself, by the worker. The appropriation of objects does not benefit the worker, but on the contrary makes the worker a slave to the object, and ultimately to the capital that pays for his labor. In this way, the labor of the worker produces an object that is alien and external to the worker. The labor of the worker is thus “alienated.”
The Externalization of the Worker

- The product of the labor of the worker is related to him as an alien object.
- The more the worker labors, the greater the power of the alien object.
- As a consequence, the inner world of the worker becomes proportionally impoverished.
- This is the same phenomenon as in the case of religion, as was pointed out by Feuerbach (who is not cited here).
  - “The more man attributes to God, the less he retains in himself.”
- The life of the worker has become externalized in his product.
- The object itself exists externally to him as a hostile, alien, independent power.
Nature, the sensuous material world, supplies objects for labor and also provides the means of the physical subsistence of the worker.

By appropriating the external world through his labor, the worker deprives himself of both.
- The raw materials of nature are used up in being converted to objects.
- The depleted nature is less capable of supporting physical subsistence.

The worker becomes slave to the objects on which he labors.
- The object is necessary in order for the worker to have labor at all.
- By providing labor to the worker, the object provides to the worker his means of subsistence.

As nature becomes depleted, the condition of the worker becomes worse.
Political economy reveals the inverse relation between the richness of the products of labor and the poverty of the life of the worker.

For example, the more objects that are produced by the worker, the less the worker has to consume.

But by taking the point of view of the wealthy, political economy does not recognize the basis of these inversions in the relation between the worker and the objects of production.

But the relation to the objects of labor is not the only factor in alienation or externalization.

There is also externalization in the process of production.

The externalization in the object is a by-product of the externalization in the process of production.
One cause of the alien, external character of the labor of the worker is that the work is not part of his nature. The worker would rather be at home tending to his own concerns.

Thus, the labor of the worker is coerced, forced labor. It does not satisfy the needs of the worker, but only the needs of others. If it is not necessary for the worker’s subsistence, it is avoided like the plague.

In forced labor, the person acts for the benefit of another person, just as when one is possessed by religious feeling.

The worker feels that he is acting freely only when attending to animal functions such as eating, drinking, and procreating, or at most, tending to his home and wardrobe.

As opposed to the alienation of the object, the alienation of working is self-alienation.
The Reversal of Man’s Species-Being

- In part, the life of an individual is the life of the species.
- The whole of nature is the inorganic body of man, the arena of his free activity.
  - It is the direct means whereby life is possible.
  - It is the “matter, object, and instrument of his life activity.”
- The conscious life-activity of man is the species-being of man.
- In making over nature, man finds himself in it.
- But in alienated labor, the relation is reversed, and life-activity becomes only a means for man’s existence.
- In this way, man is alienated from his own nature as species-being.
- The alienation of man from his species-being is “realized and expressed” by the alienation of one person from another.
If the labor of the worker is an alien and forced activity, it is for the benefit of beings other than the worker himself.

Perhaps in ancient societies labor was directed toward their gods, but gods alone are not those who enslave the workers.

Work is not in the service of nature, since nature is transformed through work in a way which would seem to benefit the worker.

The only remaining candidate is men other than the worker.

The torment of the worker results in the enjoyment of the alien master.

The alienation of the worker’s activity then is due to the fact that it is performed in the service of someone else.
In alienated labor, the object produced by the worker is not his own, but rather is owned by the lord of labor.

The relation of the worker to labor produces the relation of the lord of labor (the capitalist) to labor.

The relation of the objects that are produced by the worker to the lord of labor is that of being private property.

Although it appears to be the cause, private property is rather the consequence of externalized labor.

Analogously, God is not the creator of minds, but is instead the creation of minds.

Private property is the product of externalized labor.

But it is also the means by which labor is externalized, or the realization of the externalization of labor.
Private property seems to be in conflict with labor, a conflict decided by Proudhon in favor of labor.

But the conflict is really between \textit{alienated} labor and private property.

If higher wages were required, the result would not be the enhanced freedom and dignity of the worker, but only a higher slave-wage.

Proudhon advocated equality of wages as the way to eliminate private property in favor of labor.

But wages are a product of alienated labor, and no manipulation of wages eliminates the alienation, and so no manipulation of wages abolishes private property.

The emancipation of workers from private property would be the emancipation of human servitude in general.
The concept of private property has emerged from the analysis of the concept of alienated labor.

The other concepts of political economy can be developed from the concepts of private property and alienated labor.

- Barter.
- Competition.
- Capital.
- Money.

This development is not carried out in the manuscript, which ends abruptly in the course of giving a general description of the nature of private property.

Another unfinished piece of business is to show how it happens that the labor of man becomes externalized.
The second essay in the 1844 manuscripts is entitled “Private Property and Communism.”

In the essay “Alienated Labor,” Marx had noted the possibility of emancipating workers through the abolition of private property.

Emancipation would resolve the “contradiction” between labor and capital, which is embodied in private property.

The contradiction is “a dynamic relation driving toward resolution.”

The outcome of the emancipation would be communism.

The present essay describes the various forms of communism and how communism is related to human nature and society.
Some other political economists grasped incompletely the need to overcome the contradiction between labor and capital.

- Proudhon stated that capitalism is to be overcome “as such.”
- Fourier (a “physiocrat” who held that land is the ultimate source of wealth) held that agricultural labor sets an example for other forms.
- Saint-Simon, holding that the essence of labor is industrial labor, sought the improvement of working conditions.

Communism is the only means of overcoming private property.

Communism can exist in various forms.

- A crude, immediate form, in which private property is made public property.
- An intermediate form, which is still influenced by private property.
- A developed form, in which private property is overcome.
Crude communism is the universalization of private property.

It would abolish anything, such as talent, that could not become public.

Everyone would be in the position of the laborer.

The basis for this leveling is envy of what the capitalist possesses.

This envy is really a disguised form of the greed of the capitalist.

The leveling activity of crude communism is not an appropriation of the objects of labor.

It would result in the undoing of all the effects of labor and would return man to a poor and unnaturally simple state.
A Test of the Outcome of Crude Communism

- Crude communism fails as a way of overcoming alienation.
- This can be seen by analogy with the relation between man and woman.
- The relation of marriage is like that between capitalist (the husband) and the laborer (the wife).
- In crude communism, private property is outlawed, and so the women would then be shared by all the men (as described in Plato’s *Republic*).
- This degraded state cannot be a model for how humans should behave as a species.
- If the style of relation of man to women cannot be generalized to all of society, then the system that supports this style of relation does not embody the way humans should relate to one another.
Marx describes an intermediate phase of communism in which understands itself as trying to overcome alienation, but without a grasp of the essential role of private property.

The final phase of communism finally succeeds in overcoming private property.

This kind of communism restores man as a social being, and hence as a human being.

It resolves all conflicts between nature and man, and between men.

As such, it is completed naturalism and completed humanism.

It also truly resolves all other conflicts, including those between:

- Existence and essence.
- Objectification and self-affirmation.
- Freedom and necessity.
- Individual and species.
Completed communism, both in its existence and in its comprehension of its existence, is the outcome of the entire movement of history.

Uncompleted forms of communism looks to history for instances of opposition to private property. It then uses the historical existence of these economies to confirm the adequacy of its attempt to overcome private property.

This attempt at validation cannot be successful.

The fact that there are many other ways of dealing with private property is evidence that no historical economy is the essential way of overcoming private property.
In a completed communist society, private property is overcome, and with it is overcome all forms of human alienation.

The immediate sensuous form of private property is material property.

But there are other forms of production that result in alienation.

- Religion.
- Family.
- State.
- Law.
- Morality.

Insofar as these are overcome, man leads a social, human existence.

Overcoming any one of these forms (e.g., religion by atheism) is not sufficient for communism, which overcomes alienation universally.
Once private property is overcome, genuine social interactions become possible.

The object of human activity becomes one’s existence for all other humans.

Because human nature is a social nature, human beings for the first time realize their essence in this environment.

The social activity of man can take place in different ways.

- Communally.
- When working in private (as in theoretical or scientific work).

The material condition for theoretical work is a language that is common to society.

My own existence is social activity, and I am conscious of this, so that all my creations are for the benefit of society.
Like Hegel, Marx asserts that thinking and being are different, yet at the same time are a unity. The distinction is between one’s consciousness that thinks through general representations and one’s active social life. We can call the activity of the “general consciousness” an activity of a generic life. Thinking through general consciousness has as its object the social life of man. But “society” is not some abstraction which is distinct from the individuals standing in social relations. The particular thinker thinks the totality of social relations. The particular person acts an an expression of the totality of life.
The Emancipation of the Senses

- When private property exists, the relation between the person and the object is one of possessing or having.
- With the abolition of private property, objects are “appropriated,” in the sense that they are made to satisfy social ends.
- Previously, human capacities viewed objects only as possible possessions.
  - Thinking.
  - Sensing.
  - Acting.
  With their new orientation toward objects, humans relate to them in a social way.
    - I see an object as satisfying a social need.
- There is even the development of “social organs,” or “a human sense.”
A society that is “fully constituted” will produce “the rich, deep, and entirely sensitive man as its enduring actuality.

The practical activities of this society allow the resolution of theoretical antitheses.

- Subjectism and objectivism.
- Spiritualism and materialism.
- Activity and passivity.

Marx does not tell us how these oppositions are only overcome, but only that they cannot be overcome theoretically.

More generally, the essential powers of human beings are discovered only in the history of human labor.

But psychology abstracts from this history by subsuming it all under the concept “common need.”
The significance of current natural science is that it is the basis for the technological developments that make industrialization possible.

Given that we understand human psychology through the study of the history of industry, natural science is relevant to the study of man.

Natural science begins with sense-perception, as Feuerbach has noted.

The objects of sense-perception are natural objects.

The powers of man are developed only through work upon natural objects, and so the powers of man are proper objects of natural science.
Social man is a product of his own activities, which make up world-history.
Thus, social man is self-created.
The question of where the process ultimately began depends on a theoretical abstraction and makes no sense.
The self-creation of social man makes him self-sufficient.
There is no need for an alien creator, such as God.
Atheism negates God, but socialism need not do so, since it begins positively with sense-perception of man and nature.
Communism negates the negation of private property and so is a starting-point for the establishment of truly human society.
The “Manifesto of the Communist Party” (also known as the “Communist Manifesto”) was written in 1848 as the outcome of an assembly of communists from various nationalities.

Its goal is to debunk the claim that communism is “a spectre [that] is haunting Europe.”

Many diverse forces have united in an alliance to stop the spread of communism.

The label “communist” is used to discredit opposing parties.

This establishes that communism is acknowledged as a power.

It also calls for a response on the part of communists.
Recent historical research has shown that societies in the era before written history were communistic in structure. Since that time, societies have become differentiated into social classes, which are naturally antagonistic to one another.

- Patrician, knights, plebeians, slaves in ancient Rome.
- Lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs in the Middle Ages.

The result of the class-struggles has been either the transformation of society or the ruin of the warring classes. From the ruins of feudal society has sprung modern bourgeoise society.

The stratification of classes has been simplified into two layers:
- Bourgeoisie (capitalists, owners of means of social production).
- Proletariat (laborers who sell their labor in order to live).
The Bourgeoisie and Proletariat

The bourgeoisie has its origins in the early cities of the middle ages.

With the discovery of new lands, commerce developed, and with it developed giant industries, owned by industrial millionaires.

The increasing wealth of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by the collapsing of all working people into a single class—the proletariat.

The source of these developments were transformations in modes of production and exchange of goods.

The bourgeoisie have come to political power in the modern representative state.

“The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.”
The bourseoisie has brought about more change in society than any other social class in history.

It has replaced all previous social relations with a bond of cash-payment in the service of naked self-interest.

It has replaced the various forms of freedom of individuals with the single freedom of trade.

In order to achieve its unprecedented success, the bourgeoisie must continually revolutionize the modes of production.

It must also expand its reach until it becomes global and overturns all local modes of production.

Moreover, it replaces the “old wants” of every society with “new wants” which can be met only with imported goods.

Even the intellectual sphere has become globalized, with the creation of a world literature.
Through its destruction of feudal society, the bourgeoisie has unleashed the most powerful productive forces in history.

Yet this very success contains within it the seeds of the destruction of the capitalist system.

The problem is that the system is unable to control its productive output, resulting in massive over-production.

Over-production gives rise to economic crises, which threaten the existence of the system itself.

Attempts to cope with the crises, such as opening new markets, only create the conditions for larger crises down the road.

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

- The means of the destruction of the capitalist system is one of its essential components: the proletariat.
- The increase in productive power is proportional to the development of laborers who are a commodity, and thus whose value fluctuates with the market.
- Their wages and working conditions decrease as their productivity rises.
- As commodities, proletarians are interchangeable, so that differences in age and gender are no longer of any importance.
- Those in the middle class (small businessmen, peasants, etc.) are gradually forced into the proletariat.
  - Their small capital cannot compete with large capital.
  - Their specialized skills are not needed because their products can be mass-produced.
The Revolt of the Proletariat

- The conditions of the proletariat are intolerable, which leads to various forms of revolt against the bourgeoisie.
- Initially, they consisted in the destruction of the physical components of industry.
- When the size and homogenization of the proletariat is sufficiently great, they band together to form trade-unions, concerned with such issues as wages.
- The improvement in communications allows large-scale centralization, which in turn leads to greater political power.
- The proletariat are aided by the bourgeoisie, who empower them to help in their own struggle against its enemies.
  - At first, the aristocracy.
  - Later, other bourgeoisie who stand in the way of industrial progress.
  - Always, the bourgeoisie of foreign countries.
Some members of the bourgeoisie fall into the proletariat, victims of industrial progress.

Others, particularly those who understand the social dynamics at work, voluntarily join the bourgeoisie.

Only the proletariat is the revolutionary class.

The middle class is reactionary, in that its fight to preserve itself is a fight to preserve a pre-industrial way of life.

The lower class that lives beyond the rule of law and society (Lumpenproletariat) may take part in a proletarian revolution, but are more likely to be co-opted into the service of the bourgeoisie.

The proletariat lacks property and finds traditional institutions of law, morality, and religion as bourgeois prejudices that work in the interests of the bourgeoisie.
The Victory of the Proletariat

- Because the proletariat has nothing to lose, it can overcome its situation only by the abolition of the bourgeoisie.
- It is in a position to do so because the proletariat comprises the vast majority of people.
- Any mass uprising of the proletariat would crush anything in its path.
- Because the proletariat necessarily becomes impoverished in proportion to the wealth of the bourgeoisie, the latter are unfit to rule.
- The inherent flaw of the capitalist system is that it overcomes the isolation of laborer and drives them into revolutionary association.
- The bourgeoisie digs its own grave, for it necessarily unleashes forces that will inevitably overthrow it.
Although the program of the Communist Party must be adapted to local condition, there are some items for action that should apply generally to advanced countries, including the following.

- Abolition of private ownership of land.
- A heavily progressive income tax.
- Abolition of right of inheritance.
- Centralization of credit in a monopolistic state bank.
- State ownership of the means of communication and transport.
- The expansion of state-owned industry and promotion of growth in agriculture.
- Obliging everyone equally to work.
- Merging agriculture and industry, and re-distributing the population more equally.
- Free education and the abolition of child-labor.
How to Bring About the Revolution

- Every local or national force that opposes the existing social and political order should be supported by the Communists.
- In so doing, they should bring to the consciousness of their allies that the fundamental problem is private property.
- The most important venue for revolution is Germany.
  - Its proletariat is more developed than in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
  - The bourgeoisie itself is in the midst of a revolution against the remnants of the old feudal order.
  - The bourgeois revolution will be followed by a proletarian revolution.
- The Communist Party freely admits that its “ends can be attained only by a violent overthrow of all existing social conditions.”
- The working people of the world should unite in revolution, because all they have to lose is their chains.