So what is the final stage *even beyond* communism, the final-final *Aufhebung*, the great transcendence, the ultimate negation? It is a world beyond all ownership and all possession, a world fully liberated for the spontaneous flowering of all faculties in all directions and for the unsullied, totally sensate appreciation of pure beauty. We may be pardoned for concluding that, wittingly or unwittingly – and with Marx it is difficult to know which – the final-final stage is the stage of the graveyard for the human race. After the turmoil and upheaval of all the *Aufhebungs* will come the 'peace' of a universal cemetery. For no possession, no use of resources, means rapid and universal starvation. Deprived of all labour for productive goals and of all possessions, mankind will have precious little time left for the appreciation of pure beauty.

Whether or not they saw the full horror of Marx's ultimate 'positive humanism', there is no doubt that the Soviets were always uneasy at the thought of this abyss. The Soviet editor of a Russian translation of Marx's manuscripts, published in 1956, on analysing the above passage, asserts that by 'communism as such' Marx meant raw communism of the initial stage. But this is almost a wilful misinterpretation of Marx's final words on beyond the ultimate stage. The Soviets had trouble enough with the 'withering away of the State' in the highest stage of communism, which to them meant at most a shift from official state ownership of all resources to ownership by 'social' or 'administrative' organizations, officially proclaimed as non-states.[29] The reason that Marx suppressed the publication of this essay in his lifetime seems similar to the Soviet's burying of their allegedly final-final goal. To say that even the Marxist public is 'not yet ready for it' is a rich understatement; one trusts that they never will be.

In socialist practice, of course, while communist countries never got to the 'highest stage', there seemed to be little evidence of either a notable appreciation of beauty or of great spontaneous or artistic creativity. Perhaps even the relative physical deprivation rather than the rapid and absolute starvation of 'beyond communism' of twentieth century socialist regimes was responsible for the grey and grim cast universally acknowledged to pervade these countries.

But of course all these problems are neatly buried by the pervasive but implicit premise underlying all of Marx's discussions of communism: the unsupported, unquestioned assumption that throughout all these changes, production remains happily abundant, if not superabundant. Hence the economic problem is simply and quietly assumed away.

Some might protest that, in our discussion of communism, we have not mentioned the feature that is generally considered the hallmark of that system: the slogan, 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'. This phrase seems to contradict our view that the essence of the

communist society is a secularized religion rather than economics. The *locus classicus*, however, of Marx's proclamation of this well-known slogan of French socialism, was in the course of his vitriolic *Critique of the Gotha Program* in 1875, in which Marx denounced the Lassallean deviationists who were forming the new German Social Democratic Party. And it is clear from the context of his discussion that this slogan is of minor and peripheral importance to Marx. In point 3 of his *Critique*, Marx is denouncing the clause of the programme calling for communization of property and 'equitable distribution of the proceeds of labour'. In the course of his discussion, Marx states that inequality of labour income is 'inevitable in the first stage of communist society,...when it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society. Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and the cultural development thereby determined'. On the other hand, Marx goes on,

> In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after...the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly – 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![30]

It should be evident from this passage and its context that Marx's final sentence, far from being the point and the culmination of his discussion, was stated briefly only to be dismissed. What Marx is saying is that the key to the communist world is not any such principle of the distribution of goods, but the eradication of the division of labour, the all-round development of individual faculties, and the resulting flow of superabundance. In such a world, the famous slogan becomes of only trivial importance. Indeed, Marx proceeds immediately after this passage to denounce talk among socialists of 'equal right' and 'equitable distribution' as 'ideological nonsense about "right" and other trash common among the democrats and French Socialists...'. He then quickly adds that 'it was in general incorrect to make a fuss about so-called "distribution" and put the principal stress on it'.[31,32]

The absolute misery and horror of the ultimate stage (and *a fortiori* of the beyond-ultimate stage) of communism should now be all too apparent. The eradication of the division of labour would quickly bring starvation and economic misery to all. The abolition of all structures of human interrelation would bring enormous social and spiritual deprivation to every person. And, even the alleged 'artistic' intellectual and creative development of all man's faculties in all directions would be totally crippled by the ban on all specialization. How can true intellectual development or creation come without

concentrated effort? In short, the terrible economic suffering of mankind under communism would be fully matched by its intellectual and spiritual deprivation. Considering the nature and consequences of communism, to call this horrific dystopia a noble and 'humanist' ideal can at best be considered a grisly joke, in questionable taste. The prevalent notion, for example, that Marxian communism is a glorious ideal for man perverted by the later Engels or by Lenin or Stalin, can now be put into proper perspective. None of the horrors committed by Lenin, Stalin, or other Marxist–Leninist regimes can match the monstrousness of Marx's communist 'ideal'. Perhaps the closest approximation was the short-lived communist regime of Pol Pot in Cambodia which, in attempting to abolish the division of labour, managed to enforce the outlawry of money – so that for their tiny rations the populace was totally dependent upon the niggardly largesse of the communist cadre. Moreover, they attempted to eliminate the 'contradictions between town and country', by following the Engels goal of destroying large cities, and by coercively depopulating the capital, Phnom Penh, overnight. In a few short years, the Pol Pot group managed to exterminate one-third of the Cambodian population, perhaps a record in genocide.[33]

Since under ideal communism everyone could and would have to do everything, it is clear that, even before universal starvation set in, very little could get done. To Marx himself, all differences among individuals were 'contradictions' to be eliminated under communism, so that presumably the mass of individuals would have to be uniform and interchangeable.[34] Whereas Marx apparently postulated normal intellectual capabilities even under communism, to later Marxists, it seems that difficulties could be alleviated by the emergence of superhuman beings. To Karl Kautsky (1854–1938), the German Marxist who assumed the mantle of the top leadership of Marxism upon the death of Engels in 1895, under communism 'a new type of man will arise...a superman...an exalted man'. Leon Trotsky waxed even more lyrical: 'Man will become incomparably stronger, wiser, finer. His body more harmonious, his movements more rhythmical, his voice more musical...The human average will rise to the level of an Aristotle, a Goethe, a Marx. Above these other heights new peaks will arise'. If the beyond ultimate stage of communism ever lasts long enough to breed a new super-race, we may safely leave it to the communist theoreticians of that future day to resolve the problem of whether the 'contradiction' of 'permitting' a super-Aristotle to tower over an Aristotle may be allowed to exist.[35]

Neither should libertarians be taken in by the Marxian goal of the 'withering away of the State' under communism, or in the use of the phrase, borrowed from the cherished aim of the French free market libertarians Charles Comte and Charles Dunoyer: a world where the 'government of persons is replaced by the administration of things'. There are two major flaws in this

formulation from the *laissez-faire* libertarian viewpoint. First, of course, as the Russian anarcho-communist Mikhail Bakunin (1814–76) insistently pointed out: it is absurd to try to reach statelessness via the absolute maximization of state power in a totalitarian dictatorship of the proletariat (or more realistically a select vanguard of the said proletariat). The result can only be maximum statism and hence maximum slavery. As perhaps the first of the 'new class' theorists, and anticipating the iron law of oligarchy of Michels and Mosca, Bakunin prophetically warned that a minority ruling class will once again, after the Marxian revolution, rule the majority:

> But the Marxists say, this minority will consist of the workers. Yes, no doubt...of former workers, who, as soon as they become governors or representatives of the people, cease to be workers and start looking down on the working masses from the heights of state authority, so that they represent not the people but themselves and their own claim to rule over others. Anyone who can doubt this knows nothing of human nature...The terms 'scientific socialist' and 'scientific socialism', which we meet incessantly in the works and speeches of the...Marxists, are sufficient to prove that the so-called people's state will be nothing but a despotism over the masses, exercised by a new and quite small aristocracy of real or bogus 'scientists'. ...They [the Marxists] claim that only dictatorship, their own of course, can bring the people freedom; we reply that a dictatorship can have no other aim than to perpetuate itself, and that it can engender and foster nothing but slavery in the people subjected to it. Freedom can be created only by freedom...[36]

Indeed, only a believer in the preposterous necromancy of the 'dialectic' could believe otherwise, that is, could believe that a totalitarian state can inevitably and virtually instantly be transformed into its opposite, and that therefore the way to get rid of the state is to work as hard as possible to maximize its power.

But the problem of the dialectic is not the only, indeed not even the main, problem with Marxian communism. For Marxism shares with the anarchists a grave problem of the higher stage of pure communism, assuming for a moment that it could ever be reached. The crucial point is that, both for anarchists and for Marxists, ideal communism is a world without private property, and that all property and resources will be owned and controlled in common. Indeed, the anarcho-communists' major complaint against the state is that it is allegedly the main enforcer and guarantor of private property and therefore that to abolish private property the state must also be eradicated. The truth, of course, is precisely the opposite: the state, through history, has been the main despoiler and plunderer of private property. With private property mysteriously abolished, then, the elimination of the state under communism (of either the Marxian or anarchist variety) would necessarily be a mere camouflage for a new state that would emerge to control and make decisions for communally owned resources. Except that the state would not

be called such, but rather renamed something like a 'people's statistical bureau', as has already been done in Khadafy's Libya, and armed with precisely the same powers. It will be small consolation to future victims, incarcerated or shot for committing 'capitalist acts between consenting adults' (to cite a phrase made popular by Robert Nozick), that their oppressors will no longer be the state but only a people's statistical bureau. The state under any other name will smell as acrid. Furthermore, it will be inevitable, under the iron law of oligarchy, that 'world communal decisions' will *have* to be undertaken by a specialized élite, so that the ruling class will inevitably reappear, under Bakuninite as well as any other form of communism.[37]

And, as we have indicated, in the 'beyond-communism' stage, the stage of universal no-ownership and therefore of no action and no use of resources, death for the entire human race would swiftly ensue.

Marx and his followers have never demonstrated any awareness of the vital importance of the problem of allocation of scarce resources. Their vision of communism is that all such economic problems are trivial, requiring neither entrepreneurship nor a price system nor genuine economic calculation – that all problems could be quickly solved by mere accounting or recording. The classic absurdity on this matter was laid down by Lenin, who accurately expressed Marx's view in declaring that the functions of entrepreneurship and of allocation of resources have been '*simplified* by capitalism to the utmost' to mere matters of accounting and to 'the extraordinarily simple operations of watching, recording, and issuing receipts, within the reach of anybody who can read and write and knows the first four rules of arithmetic'. Ludwig von Mises wryly and justly comments that Marxists and other socialists have had 'no greater perception of the essentials of economic life than the errand boy, whose only idea of the work of the entrepreneur is that he covers pieces of paper with letters and figures'.[38]

It is perhaps all too fitting that we now find that the idea of communism as a simple problem of book-keeping and registration was perhaps originated by the French apocalyptic fantast and inspirer of Marx, Théodore Dézamy.[39]

10.4 Arriving at communism

Karl Marx had a crucial problem. He was not interested, as were the scorned 'Utopian' socialists, in merely exhorting everyone to adopt the communist path to a perfect society. He did not propose to leave the attainment of communism to the imperfect free wills of mankind. He demanded a certain, 'inevitable' path, a 'law of history' that would demonstrate the absolute inevitability of history's reaching its final glory in a communist society. But here he was at a disadvantage relative to the various Christian wings of messianic communism: for, unlike them, there was here no inevitable Messiah to arrive and usher in a Kingdom of God on earth. As in the case of the

post-mils, however, it was up to mankind, rather than the Messiah, to establish the Kingdom. Even without a Messiah, a vigilant and growing vanguard could establish the Kingdom; and the vanguard could even help in various pre-mil versions of millennialism. So that leadership by a dedicated vanguard was very much in the messianic tradition.

As Professor Tucker points out, Marx was not lacking a moral theory. He was definitely a moralist, but a highly curious one. In his 'mythic vision', the 'good', the 'moral', consists of participating in the inevitable triumph of the proletarian revolution, while the 'bad', or 'immoral', is trying to obstruct it.

> The answer to the question as to what should be done is given in the mythic vision itself, and can be summed up in a single word: 'Participate!'...So Marx...says that it is not a matter of bringing some utopian system or other into being (i.e. of defining a social goal and purposefully endeavoring to realize it) but simply of 'consciously participating in the historical revolutionary process of society which is taking place before our very eyes'.[40]

Thus, to be moral means to be 'progressive', to be in tune with the inevitable future workings of the laws of history, whereas the harshest condemnation is reserved for those who are 'reactionary', who dare to obstruct, even with partial success, such allegedly predestined turns of events. Thus Marxists are particularly vehement in denouncing revolutionary moments in which the existing rule of 'progressives' is replaced by 'reactionaries', and the clock is, miraculously, in the metaphor of historicist inevitability, 'turned back'. For example: the Franco revolution against the Spanish republic, and Pinochet's overthrow of Allende in Chile.

But if a certain change is truly inevitable, *why* is it important for human agency to lend a hand, indeed to struggle mightily on its behalf? Here we turn to the critical matter of *timing*. While a change may be inevitable, the intervention of man can and will speed up this most desired of happenings. Man can function, in one of Marx's favourite obstetrical metaphors, as a 'midwife' of history.[41] Man's intervention could give the inevitable a helpful push.

Yet, Marx's obstetrical analogies are only a feeble attempt to evade the self-contradiction between the idea of inevitability and action to achieve the inevitable. For according to Marx, the timing as well as the nature of events is determined by the material dialectic of history. Socialism is brought about, wrote Marx in *Capital*, by the 'operation of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself'. As von Mises points out, to Marx

> Ideas, political parties, and revolutionary actions are merely superstructural; they can neither delay nor accelerate the march of history. Socialism will come when the material conditions for its appearance will have matured in the womb [obstetrics again!] of capitalist society, neither sooner or later. If Marx had been consist-

> ent, he would not have embarked upon any political activity. He would have waited quietly for the day on which 'the knell of private capitalist property sounds'.[42]

Marx might not have been logical or consistent, but his attitude was squarely in the millennialist tradition. As Professor Tuveson points out:

> Several characteristics of historical Communist movements recall millenarian agitations. There is, for one, the well-known fanaticism of millenarian believers...The firm conviction that a sequence of events, leading to universal redemption, is ordained (or 'determined') would seem to lead to passivity on the part of an individual...But, characteristically, there is a vitally important qualification. Although the series of events is prophesied, their *timing* may be retarded by the failure of mankind. To delay the coming of redemption, then, is a great sin, against one's fellow beings, against posterity, against the power that has ordained events. But whole-hearted, zealous participation in the historically determined duties, doing what the old millenarians would call 'doing God's will', gives special *éclat*. In most millenarian groups there is something corresponding to the 'Communist Party'. In Revelation itself there are the hundred and forty-four thousand, 'the first fruits unto God and to the Lamb', who are without guile, for they are 'without fault before the throne of God'. (Revelation XIV:4–5). Thus, the whole proletariat, like the whole body of the saved, is without damning fault, but the specially distinguished group...are chosen from the chosen.[43]

But there was still a remaining problem: *whence* comes the inevitability in the Marxian schema? The proof that his cherished communist ideal would inevitably, 'scientifically' arrive, would occupy Marx for the rest of his life. Certainly, he found the outlines of such proof in the mysterious workings of the Hegelian dialectic, which he bent to his use.

10.5 Marx's character and his path to communism

Karl Marx, as the world knows, was born in Trier, a venerable city in Rhineland Prussia, in 1818, son of a distinguished jurist, and grandson of a rabbi. Indeed, both of Marx's parents were descended from rabbis. Marx's father Heinrich was a liberal rationalist who felt no great qualms about his forced conversion to official Lutheranism in 1816. What is little known is that, in his early years, the baptized Karl was a dedicated Christian. In his graduation essays from the Trier *gymnasium* in 1835, the very young Marx prefigured his later development. His essay on an assigned topic, 'On the Union of the Faithful with Christ' was orthodox evangelical Christian, but it also contained hints of the fundamental 'alienation' theme that he would later find in Hegel. Marx's discussion of the 'necessity for union' with Christ stressed that this union would put an end to the tragedy of God's alleged rejection of man. In a companion essay, 'Reflections of a Young Man on the Choice of a Profession', Marx expressed a worry about his own 'demon of

ambition', of the great temptation he felt to 'inveigh against the Deity and curse mankind'.

Going first to the University of Bonn and then off to the prestigious new University of Berlin to study law, Marx soon converted to militant atheism, shifted his major to philosophy, and joined a *Doktorklub* of young (or Left) Hegelians, of which he soon became a leader and general secretary.

The shift to atheism quickly gave Marx's demon of ambition full rein. Particularly revelatory of Marx's adult as well as youthful character are volumes of poems, most of them lost until a few were recovered in recent years.[44] Historians, when they discuss these poems, tend to dismiss them as inchoate romantic yearnings, but they are too congruent with the adult Marx's social and revolutionary doctrines to be casually dismissed. Surely, here seems to be a case where a unified (early plus late) Marx is vividly revealed. Thus in his poem 'Feelings', dedicated to his childhood sweetheart and later wife Jenny von Westphalen, Marx expressed both his megalomania and his enormous thirst for destruction:

> Heaven I would comprehend
> I would draw the world to me;
> Living, hating, I intend
> That my star shine brilliantly...

and

> ...Worlds I would destroy forever,
> Since I can create no world;
> Since my call they notice never...

Here is a classical expression of Satan's supposed reason for hating, and rebelling against, God.

In another poem, Marx writes of his triumph after he shall have destroyed God's created world:

> Then I will be able to walk triumphantly,
> Like a god, through the ruins of their kingdom.
> Every word of mine is fire and action.
> My breast is equal to that of the Creator.

And in his poem, 'Invocation of One in Despair', Marx writes:

> I shall build my throne high overhead
> Cold, tremendous shall its summit be.

For its bulwark – superstitious dread
For its marshal – blackest agony.[45]

The Satan theme is most explicitly set forth in Marx's 'The Fiddler', dedicated to his father:

See this sword?
the prince of darkness
Sold it to me.

And:

With Satan I have struck my deal,
He chalks the signs, beats time for me
I play the death march fast and free.

Particularly instructive is Marx's lengthy, unfinished poetic drama of this youthful period, *Oulanem, A Tragedy*. In the course of this drama his hero Oulanem, delivers a remarkable soliloquy, pouring out sustained invective, a hatred of the world and of mankind, a hatred of creation and a threat and vision of total world destruction.

Thus Oulanem pours out his vials of wrath:

...I shall howl gigantic curses on mankind:
Ha! Eternity! She is an eternal grief...
Ourselves being clockwork, blindly mechanical,
Made to be the foul-calendars of Time and Space,
Having no purpose save to happen, to be ruined,
So that there shall be something to ruin...
If there is a something which devours,
I'll leap within it, though I bring the world to ruins–
The world which bulks between me and the Abyss
I will smash to pieces with my enduring curses.
I'll throw my arms around its harsh reality:
Embracing me, the world will dumbly pass away,
And then sink down to utter nothingness,
Perished, with no existence – that would be really living!

And

...the leaden world holds us fast,
And we are chained, shattered, empty, frightened,

> Eternally chained to this marble block of Being...
> and we –
> We are the apes of a cold God.[46]

All this reveals a spirit that often seems to animate militant atheism. In contrast to the non-militant variety, which expresses a simple disbelief in God's existence, militant atheism seems to believe implicitly in God's existence, but to hate Him and to wage war for His destruction. Such a spirit was all too clearly revealed in the retort of the militant atheist Bakunin to the famous pro-theist remark of the deist Voltaire: 'If God did not exist, it would be necessary to create Him." To which the demented Bakunin retorted: 'If God did exist, it would be necessary to destroy Him." It was this hatred of God as a creator greater than himself that apparently inspired Karl Marx.

Also prefiguring the man was a trait that Marx developed early in his youth and never relinquished: a shameless sponging on friends and relatives. Already in early 1837, Heinrich Marx, castigating his son Karl's wanton spending of the money of others, wrote to him that 'on one point... you have wisely found fit to observe an aristocratic silence; I am referring to the paltry matter of money'. Indeed, Marx took money from any source available: his father, mother, and throughout his adult life, his long-suffering friend and abject disciple, Friedrich Engels, all of whom fuelled Marx's capacity for spending money like water.[47]

An insatiable spender of other people's money, Marx continually complained about a shortage of financial means. While sponging on Engels, Marx perpetually complained to his friend that his largess was never enough. Thus, in 1868, Marx insisted that he could not make do on an annual income of less than £400–£500, a phenomenal sum considering that the *upper tenth* of Englishmen in that period were earning an average income of only £72 a year. Indeed, so profligate was Marx that he quickly ran through an inheritance from a German follower of £824 in 1864, as well as a gift of £350 from Engels in the same year.

In short, Marx was able to run through the munificent sum of almost £1200 in two years, and two years later accept another gift of £210 from Engels to pay off his newly accumulated debts. Finally, in 1868, Engels sold his share of the family cotton mill and settled upon Marx an annual 'pension' of £350 from then on. Yet Marx's continual complaints about money did not abate.[48]

As in the case of many other spongers and cadgers throughout history, Karl Marx affected a hatred and contempt for the very material resource he was so anxious to cadge and use so recklessly. The difference is that Marx created an entire philosophy around his own corrupt attitudes toward money. Man, he thundered, was in the grip of the 'fetishism' of money. The problem was the existence of this evil thing, not the voluntarily adopted attitudes of some

people toward it. Money Marx reviled as 'the pander between...human life and the means of sustenance', the 'universal whore'. The utopia of communism was a society where this scourge, money, would be abolished.

Karl Marx, the self-proclaimed enemy of the exploitation of man by man, not only exploited his devoted friend Friedrich Engels financially, but also psychologically. Thus, only three months after Marx's wife, Jenny von Westphalen, gave birth to his daughter Franziska in March 1851, their live-in maid, Helene ('Lenchen') Demuth, whom Marx had 'inherited' from Jenny's aristocratic family, also gave birth to Marx's illegitimate son, Henry Frederick. Desperately anxious to keep up *haute bourgeois* conventions and to hold his marriage together, Karl never acknowledged his son, and, instead, persuaded Engels, a notorious womanizer, to proclaim the baby as his own. Both Marx and Engels treated the hapless Freddy extremely badly, Engels's presumed resentment at being so used providing him a rather better excuse. Marx boarded Freddy out continually, and never allowed him to visit his mother. As Fritz Raddatz, a biographer of Marx, declared, 'if Henry Frederick Demuth was Karl Marx's son, the new mankind's Preacher lived an almost lifelong lie, and scorned, humiliated, and disowned his only surviving son'.[49] Engels, of course, picked up the tab for Freddy's education. Freddy was trained, however, to take his place in the working class, far from the lifestyle of his natural father, the quasi-aristocratic leader of the world's downtrodden revolutionary proletariat.[50,51]

Marx's personal taste for the aristocracy was lifelong. As a young man, he attached himself to his neighbour, Jenny's father Baron Ludwig von Westphalen, and dedicated his doctoral thesis to the baron. Indeed, the snobbish proletarian communist always insisted that Jenny imprint 'née von Westphalen' on her calling card.

10.6 Notes

1. Ernest L. Tuveson, 'The Millenarian Structure of *The Communist Manifesto*', in C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich (eds), *The Apocalypse: in English Renaissance Thought and Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), pp. 326–7. Tuveson speculates that Marx and Engels may have been influenced by the outburst of millenarianism in England during the 1840s. On this phenomenon, particularly the flare-up in England and the US of the Millerites, who predicted the end of the world on 22 October 1844, see the classic work on modern millenarianism, Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800–1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970). See Tuveson, ibid., p. 340, n. 5.
2. Jean B. Quandt, 'Religion and Social Thought: The Secularization of Postmillennialism', *American Quarterly*, 25 (Oct. 1973), pp. 402–3. Actually, Ely, in common with many other post-mils, was not all *that* gradual, as he spoke of the New Jerusalem, 'which we are all eagerly awaiting'.
3. Quoted in S.V. Utechin, 'Philosophy and Society: Alexander Bogdanov', in Leopold Labedz (ed.), *Revisionism: Essays on the History of Marxist Ideas* (New York: Praeger, 1962), p. 122.
4. J.P. Stern, 'Marxism on Stilts: Review of Ernst Bloch, *The Principle of Hope*', *The New*

Republic, 196 (9 March 1987), pp. 40, 42; Leszek Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), III, pp. 423–4.

5. G.K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy* (New York: 1927), pp. 244–5. Quoted in Thomas Molnar, *Utopia: the Perennial Heresy* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1964), p. 123.
6. 'The C.P.S.U. [Communist Party of the Soviet Union], being a party of scientific communism, advances and solves the problems of communist construction as the material and spiritual prerequisites for them become ready and mature, being guided by the fact that necessary stages of development must not be skipped over...'. *Fundamentals of Marxism—Leninism* (2nd rev. ed., Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1963), p. 662. Also see ibid., pp. 645–6, 666–7, 674–5.
7. On alienation and the dialectic, see Chapter 11.
8. Stein treated French socialism and communism as ideologies of the propertyless proletariat, aiming to destroy the historical foundations of European society based on the principles of individual personality and private property. The difference of course, is that Marx, in contrast to the other 'classless' socialists and communists, embraced this connection to the proletariat, whereas Stein condemned and warned against it. See the excellent and illuminating work by Robert C. Tucker, *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), pp. 114–7. Stein's book, Lorenz von Stein, *Der Socialismus und Communismus des Heutigen Frankreichs* (Leipzig: 1842), remains untranslated. (Later editions were entitled *Geschichte des socialen Bewegung in Frankreich*, 1850, 1921). Stein spent his mature years as professor of public finance and public administration at the University of Vienna, 1855–88.
9. Quoted in Tucker, op. cit., note 8, pp. 155. Italics are Marx's.
10. Indeed, it is no accident that Marxian historians, from Engels to Ernst Bloch, have been great admirers of these regimes and movements, first, because of their communism, and second, because they were certainly 'people's movements', bubbling up from the lower classes.
11. Tucker, op. cit., note 8, pp. 155–6.
12. *Anti-Dühring* became the common name for Engels's *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*, which came out in 1878, five years before Marx's death. Three general chapters, not focused on Dühring, came out in French in 1880, as *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, which became second to the *Communist Manifesto* as a popular presentation of Marxism in the late nineteenth century. The English translation, authorized by Engels, was published in 1892, and therefore Engels must be held responsible for such a clumsy locution as the verb 'environ'. See R.C. Tucker (ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader* (2nd ed., New York: W.W. Norton, 1972), pp. 715–6.
13. Tucker, op. cit., note 8, pp. 196–7.
14. Ibid., p. 198.
15. Tucker, op. cit., note 12, p. 160. Similarly, in his *Anti-Dühring*, Engels heaped scorn upon the sort of 'Prussian socialism' which would preserve the division of labour as 'inevitable in the nature of things'. In contrast, Engels proclaimed that in the future communism, 'In time to come there will no longer be any professional porters or architects, and that the man who for half an hour gives instructions as an architect will also push a barrow for a period, until his activity as an architect is once again required'. Ibid., p. 718. In this spirit, Maoist China, during the Cultural Revolution, randomly substituted surgeons and janitors for each other in hospitals.

    Finally, in his *Woman and Socialism* (1883), the faithful German Marxist and working-class organizer, August Bebel (1840–1913), paraphrased Marx's passage for the role of women under communism: 'At one moment a practical worker in some industry she is in the next hour educator, teacher, and nurse: in the third part of the day she exercises some art or cultivates a science; and in the fourth part she fulfills some administrative function'. Quoted in Ludwig von Mises, *Socialism: An Economic and Sociological Analysis* (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981), p. 168n.
16. Alexander Gray, *The Socialist Tradition* (London: Longmans, Green, 1946), p. 328.
17. Tucker, op. cit., note 12, p. 723.
18. Tucker, op. cit., note 8, p. 197n.

19. On the debate within the Soviet Union on this issue, see Herman Akhminov, 'The Prospects for the Division of Labor', *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the USSR* (July 1964), pp. 3–18.
20. Friedrich Engels, 'On Authority', written in 1872 and first published in an Italian collection in 1874. Tucker, op. cit., note 12, p. 731.
21. English translation by William O. Henderson, *The Life of Friedrich Engels* (London: Frank Cass, 1976) I, pp. 369–76. Cited in T.W. Hutchison, *The Politics and Philosophy of Economics: Marxians, Keynesians and Austrians* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), pp. 9–12, 14.
22. On Ricardian socialists, and on Rodbertus's business cycle theory, see Chapter 13 below. Rodbertus was an independently wealthy Prussian politician and civil servant, who lived most of his life as a leisured and erudite Prussian country squire. (He purchased an estate near the town of Jagetzow in East Prussia, and promptly renamed himself Rodbertus von Jagetzow.) His basic thrust was that labour is bound down by the iron or brazen law of wages (so named by Lassalle, as we shall see below), but that justice can be imposed by socialism run by the state, a literally divine, self-creative living organism, best headed by the king (in short, a monarchical socialism). Rodbertus sternly warned, however, that people are not yet moral enough for such socialism – and would not be for another five hundred years. See Gray, op. cit., note 16, pp. 343–51.
23. Hutchison, op. cit., note 21, p. 15. Hutchison points out that 'Engels's warning regarding imbalances in the supply of trousers and trouser buttons has recently acquired embarrassing relevance' in Soviet Russia. In 1980, *Pravda* (Moscow) had complained that, in regard to priority of supply, 'in the clothing industry trousers are on the list of the "most important", but zip-fasteners are not'. Ibid., p. 20n.
24. Ibid., pp. 15–16.
25. 'Private Property and Communism', in Tucker, op. cit., note 12, p. 85.
26. As Tucker puts it, 'Socialized humanity is not only a classless but also a stateless, lawless, family-less, religion-less and generally structure-less collectivity of complete individuals who live in harmony with themselves, with each other, and with the anthropological nature outside them. It hardly needs pointing out that this society without social structure is not a social order in any meaningful sense of that term. Speaking in the younger Marx's vein, it is an un-society'. Tucker, op cit., note 8, p. 201.
27. Ibid., pp. 158–61.
28. Tucker, op. cit., note 12, p. 93.
29. The Soviet version of ultimate communism hardly differed from the first stage, of Soviet life itself. All the central, new, disturbing messianic or bizarre features of communism are played down or buried. Thus, to the Soviets, higher or true communism was *not* the end of history, but merely a society that 'will change and improve continuously'. Communist abundance will emphatically *not* be fabulous lands flowing with milk and honey'. There will simply be 'rapid and continuous advance' of 'socialist science and technology'. *Fundamentals of Marxism - Leninism*, op. cit., note 6, pp. 698–9, and pp. 698–717.
30. Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (New York: International Publishers, 1938), p. 10. The critique was first published by Engels in 1891, after Marx's death. The Lassalleans were followers of the late Ferdinand Lasalle (1825–64) a blowhard and dandy who was extremely popular in Germany, especially beloved by the working class, and the pre-eminent organizer of the proletariat. Typically, Lassalle died early in a most unproletarian and aristocratic way – in a duel over a lady. One of Lasalle's two major deviations from Marxism was his ultra-Malthusian devotion to the Malthus–Ricardo subsistence theory of wages as determined by population growth, which he popularized in the most rigid form, and allegedly named the 'iron law of wages', in which form it won widespread fame. In reality, Lassalle dubbed it the 'brazen law of wages' (in the sense of 'made of brass'), and his most common locution was 'the brazen and gruesome law of wages' (*das eherne und grausame Gesetz*).

    Lassalle's other and more important deviation was his embrace and worship of the state. Marx saw the state as a tyrannical instrument of mass exploitation which required a violent revolution to overthrow. Lassalle, in Hegelian fashion, on the other hand, wor-

shipped the state as a guide and developer of freedom, as the fusion of man into a spiritual whole, and as an eternal instrument for moral regeneration. The only problem with the state, for Lassalle, was the fact that it was not yet controlled by the workers, but this could be rectified simply by enacting universal suffrage, after which the state would be run by a workers' party and the workers would then *become* the state and all would be well. The state would promptly transfer the control of production to workers' associations which would thus circumvent the brazen law by appropriating to themselves the surplus profits now extracted by the capitalists. See Gray, op. cit., note 16, pp. 332–43.

31. Actually, Marx goes on to make a useful point: that distribution always flows from the 'conditions of production' and cannot be separated from it. One would like to think that this was not only an argument against the 'vulgar socialists' but also an implicit slap at J.S. Mill, who thought that while production was bound by economic law, 'distribution' could be separated from production and reformed by state action.
32. See the excellent discussion of this point in Tucker, op. cit., note 8, p. 200.
33. The Soviet people were spared the full cataclysm of communism when Lenin, a master pragmatist, drew back from the early Soviet attempt (1918–21) to abolish money and leap into communism (later deliberately mislabelled 'war communism'), and went back to the largely capitalist economy of the New Economic Policy. Mao tried to bring about communism in two disastrous surges: the Great Leap Forward, which attempted to eliminate private property and to eliminate the 'contradictions' between town and country by building a steel plant in every backyard; and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which tried to eliminate the 'contradiction' between intellectual and manual labour by shipping an entire generation of students to forced labour in the wilds of Sinkiang. On the myth of 'war communism', see the illuminating discussion in Paul Craig Roberts, *Alienation and the Soviet Economy* (Alburquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971), pp. 20–47.
34. In an amusing note, during the New Left period of the late 1960s, the *Liberated Guardian* broke off from the quasi-Maoist journal, *The Guardian*, in New York City, on the ground that the latter functioned in the same way as any 'bourgeois' periodical, with specialized editors, typists, copy-readers, business staff, etc. The *Liberated Guardian* was run by a 'collective' in which, assertedly, every person performed every task without specialization. The same criticism, followed by the same solution, was applied by the women's caucus which confiscated the property of the New Left weekly, *Rat*. Both periodicals, as one would expect, died a mercifully swift death. See Murray N. Rothbard, *Freedom, Inequality, Primitivism, and the Division of Labor* (Menlo Park, Calif. Institute for Humane Studies, 1971), pp. 15n, 20.
35. See von Mises, op. cit., note 15, p. 143. Also see Rothbard, op. cit., note 34, pp. 8–15.
36. Bakunin, *Statehood and Anarchy*: quoted in Leszek Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism: Its Origins, Growth and Dissolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), I, pp. 251–2. See also Abram L. Harris, *Economics and Social Reform* (New York: Harper & Bros, 1958), pp. 149–50.
37. On self-ownership and on the impossibility of communal ownership, see Murray N. Rothbard, *The Ethics of Liberty* (2nd ed., Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1983), pp. 45–50.
38. Italics are Lenin's. V.I. Lenin, *State and Revolution* (New York: International Publishers, 1932), pp. 83–4; von Mises, op. cit., note 15, p. 189. Also see Harris, op. cit., note 36, pp. 152–3n.
39. See the standard biography of Marx by David McLellan, *Karl Marx: His Life and Thought* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 118.
40. Tucker, op. cit., note 8, p. 229.
41. On obstetrical metaphors in Marxism, see Gray, op. cit., note 16, p. 299 and 299n.
42. Ludwig von Mises, *Theory and History*, (1957, Auburn, Ala.: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 1985), p. 81.
43. Tuveson, op. cit., note 1, pp. 339–40.
44. The poems were largely written in 1836 and 1837, in his first months in Berlin. Two of the