

## 2 Communism

---

*Marcello Musto*

*Translated by Patrick Camiller*

### 2.1 Critical Theories of the Early Socialists

In the wake of the French Revolution, numerous theories began to circulate in Europe that sought both to respond to demands for social justice unanswered by the French Revolution and to correct the dramatic economic imbalances brought about by the spread of the Industrial Revolution. The democratic gains following the capture of the Bastille delivered a decisive blow to the aristocracy, but they left almost unchanged the inequality of wealth between the popular and the dominant classes. The decline of the monarchy and the establishment of the republic were not sufficient to reduce poverty in France.

This was the context in which the ‘critical-utopian’ theories of socialism,<sup>1</sup> as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (1820–1895) defined them in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848), rose to prominence. They considered them ‘utopian’<sup>2</sup> for two reasons: first, their exponents, in different ways, opposed the existing social order and furnished theories containing what they believed to be ‘the most valuable elements for the enlightenment of the working class’;<sup>3</sup> and, second, they claimed that an alternative form of social organization could be achieved simply through the theoretical identification of new ideas and principles, rather than through the concrete struggle of the working class. According to Marx and Engels, their socialist predecessors had believed that

<sup>1</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, MECW, vol. 6, p. 514.

<sup>2</sup> This term had been used by others before Marx and Engels. See, for example, J.-A. Blanqui, *History of Political Economy in Europe* (New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1885), pp. 520–33. M. L. Reybaud, *Études sur les Réformateurs contemporains ou socialistes modernes: Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen* (Paris: Guillaumin, 1840), pp. 322–41, was the first to group these three authors under the category of modern socialism. Reybaud’s text circulated widely and helped to spread the idea that they were ‘the entire sum of the eccentric thinkers whose birth our age has witnessed’, p. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, p. 515.

historical action [had] to yield to their personal inventive action, historically created conditions of emancipation to fantastic ones, and the gradual spontaneous class organization of the proletariat to an organization of society specially contrived by these inventors. Future history resolve[d] itself, in their eyes, into the propaganda and the practical carrying out of their social plans.<sup>4</sup>

In the most widely read political text in human history, Marx and Engels also took issue with many other forms of socialism both past and present, grouping them under the headings of ‘feudal’, ‘petty-bourgeois’, ‘bourgeois’, or – in disparagement of its ‘philosophical phraseology’ – ‘German’ socialism.<sup>5</sup> In general, these theories could be related to one another either in terms of an aspiration to ‘restore the old means of production and exchange, and with them the old property relations and the old society’ or in terms of an attempt to ‘cramp the modern means of production and exchange within the framework of the old property relations’ from which they had broken. For this reason, Marx saw in these conceptions a form of socialism that was both ‘reactionary and utopian’.<sup>6</sup>

The term ‘utopian’, as opposed to ‘scientific’ socialism, has often been used in a misleading and intentionally disparaging way. In fact, the ‘utopian socialists’ contested the social organization of the age in which they lived, contributing through their writings and actions to the critique of existing economic relations.<sup>7</sup> Marx had considerable respect for his precursors:<sup>8</sup> he stressed the huge gap separating Saint-Simon (1760–1825) from his cruder interpreters,<sup>9</sup> and, while he regarded some of Charles Fourier’s (1771–1858) ideas as extravagant ‘humorous sketches’,<sup>10</sup> he saw ‘great merit’ in the realization that the transformative aim for labour was to overcome not only the existing mode of distribution, but also the ‘mode of production’.<sup>11</sup> In Owen’s theories, he saw many elements that were

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.    <sup>5</sup> Ibid, pp. 507–13.    <sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 510.

<sup>7</sup> V. Geoghegan, *Utopianism and Marxism* (Berne: Peter Lang, 2008), pp. 23–38, where it is shown that the ‘utopian socialists saw themselves as social scientists’, p. 23. The Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy, for its part, employed the epithet ‘utopian’ in a purely derogatory sense. Cf. the interesting criticism, partly directed at Marx himself, in G. Claeys, ‘Early Socialism in Intellectual History’, *History of European Ideas* 40 (7): (2014), which finds in the definitions of ‘science’ and ‘scientific socialism’ an example of ‘epistemological authoritarianism’, p. 896.

<sup>8</sup> See E. Hobsbawm, ‘Marx, Engels and Pre-Marxian Socialism’, in: E. Hobsbawm (ed.), *The History of Marxism. Volume One: Marxism in Marx’s Day* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), pp. 1–28.

<sup>9</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, MECW, vol. 5, pp. 493–510. Engels, who held Saint-Simon in high regard, in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* went so far as to assert that ‘almost all the ideas of later Socialists that are not strictly economic are found in him in embryo’, MECW, vol. 25, p. 292.

<sup>10</sup> K. Marx, *Capital*, volume I (London: Penguin, 1976), p. 403.

<sup>11</sup> K. Marx, ‘Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy [Grundrisse]. Second Instalment’, MECW, vol. 29, p. 97.

worthy of interest and anticipated the future. In *Value, Price and Profit* (1865), he noted that, already at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in *Observations on the Effect of the Manufacturing System* (1815), Owen had ‘proclaimed a general limitation of the working day as the first preparatory step to the emancipation of the working class’.<sup>12</sup> He had also argued, like no one else, in favour of cooperative production.

Nevertheless, while recognizing the positive influence of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen on the nascent workers’ movement, Marx’s overall assessment of their ideas was negative. He thought that they hoped to solve the social problems of the age with unrealizable fantasies, and he criticized them heavily for spending much of their time on the irrelevant theoretical exercise of building ‘castles in the air’.<sup>13</sup>

Marx did not take exception only to proposals that he considered wrong or impractical. Above all, he opposed the idea that social change could come about through *a priori* meta-historical models inspired by dogmatic precepts. The moralism of the early socialists also came in for criticism.<sup>14</sup> In his ‘Conspectus on Bakunin’s *Statism and Anarchy*’ (1874–1875), he reproached ‘utopian socialism’ with seeking ‘to foist new illusions onto the people instead of confining its scientific investigations to the social movement created by the people itself’.<sup>15</sup> In his view, the conditions for revolution could not be imported from outside.

## 2.2 Equality, Theoretical Systems, and Future Society: Errors of the Precursors

After 1789, many theorists contended with one another in outlining a new and more just social order, over and above the fundamental political changes that had come with the end of the *Ancien Régime*. One of the commonest positions assumed that all the ills of society would cease as soon as a system of government based on absolute equality among all its components had been established.

This idea of a primordial, and in many respects dictatorial, communism was the guiding principle of the Conspiracy of Equals that developed in 1796 to subvert the ruling French Directorate. In the *Manifesto of the Equals* (1795), Sylvain Maréchal (1750–1803) argued that ‘since all have the same faculties and the same wants’, there should be ‘the same education [and] the same nourishment’ for all. ‘Why’, he asked, ‘should not the like portion and the same quality of food suffice for each according

<sup>12</sup> K. Marx, *Value, Price and Profit*, MECW, vol. 20, p. 110.

<sup>13</sup> Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, p. 516.

<sup>14</sup> See D. Webb, *Marx, Marxism and Utopia* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), p. 30.

<sup>15</sup> K. Marx, ‘Conspectus on Bakunin’s *Statism and Anarchy*’, MECW, vol. 24, p. 520.

to their wants?’<sup>16</sup> The leading figure in the conspiracy of 1796, François-Noël Babeuf (1760–1797), held that application of ‘the great principle of equality’ would greatly extend the ‘circle of humanity’ so that ‘frontiers, customs barriers and evil governments’ would ‘gradually disappear’.<sup>17</sup>

The vision of a society based on strict economic equality re-emerged in French communist writing in the period after the revolution of July 1830. In *Travels in Icaria* (1840), a political manifesto written in the form of a novel, Étienne Cabet (1788–1856) depicted a model community in which there would no longer be ‘property, money, or buying and selling’, and human beings would be ‘equal in everything’.<sup>18</sup> In this ‘second promised land’,<sup>19</sup> the law would regulate almost every aspect of life: ‘every house [would have] four floors’<sup>20</sup> and ‘everyone [would be] dressed in the same way’.<sup>21</sup>

Relations of strict equality are also prefigured in the work of Théodore Dézamy (1808–1850). In the *Community Code* (1842), he spoke of a world ‘divided into communes, as equal, regular and united as possible’, in which there would be ‘a single kitchen’ and ‘one common dormitory’ for all children. The whole citizenry would live as ‘a family in one single household’.<sup>22</sup>

Similar views to those circulating in France also took root in Germany. In *Humanity as It Is and as It Should Be* (1838), Wilhelm Weitling (1808–1871) foresaw that the elimination of private property would automatically put an end to egoism, which he simplistically regarded as the main cause of all social problems. In his eyes, ‘the community of goods’ would be ‘the means to the redemption of humanity, transforming the earth into paradise’ and immediately bringing about ‘enormous abundance’.<sup>23</sup>

All the thinkers who projected such visions fell into the same dual error: they took it for granted that the adoption of a new social model based on strict equality could be the solution for all the problems of society; and they convinced themselves, in defiance of all economic laws, that all that was necessary to achieve it was the imposition of certain measures from on high, whose effects would not later be altered by the course of the economy.

<sup>16</sup> S. Maréchal, ‘Manifesto of the Equals or Equalitarians’, in: P. Buonarroti (ed.), *Buonarroti’s History of Babeuf’s Conspiracy for Equality* (London: H. Hetherington, 1836), p. 316.

<sup>17</sup> F.-N. Babeuf, ‘Gracchus Babeuf à Charles Germain’, in: C. Mazauric (ed.), *Babeuf Textes Choisis* (Paris: Éditions Sociales, 1965), p. 192.

<sup>18</sup> É. Cabet, *Travels in Icaria* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2003), p. 81.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4. <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54. <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>22</sup> T. Dézamy, ‘Laws of the Community’, in: P. E. Cocoran (ed.), *Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830–48* (London: The MacMillan Press Ltd, 1983), pp. 188–96.

<sup>23</sup> W. Weitling, *Die Menschheit, wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte* (Bern: Jenni, 1845), p. 50.

Alongside this naïve egalitarian ideology, based on an assurance that all social disparities among human beings could be eliminated with ease, was another conviction equally widespread among the early socialists: many believed that it was sufficient to theoretically devise a better system of social organization in order to change the world. Numerous reform projects were therefore elaborated in minute detail, setting out their authors' theses for the restructuring of society. The priority, in their eyes, was to find the correct formulation, which, once discovered, citizens would then willingly accept as a matter of common sense and gradually implement in reality.

Saint-Simon was one of those who clung to this conviction. In 1819, he wrote in the periodical *The Organizer* [*L'Organisateur*]: 'The old system will cease to operate when ideas about how to replace existing institutions with others . . . have been sufficiently clarified, pooled and harmonized, and when they have been approved by public opinion.'<sup>24</sup> However, Saint-Simon's views about the society of the future are surprising, and disarming, in their vagueness. In the unfinished *New Christianity* (1824), he stated that the 'political disease of the age' – which caused 'suffering to all workers useful to society' and allowed 'sovereigns to absorb a large part of the wages of the poor' – depended on the 'feeling of egoism'.<sup>25</sup> Since this had become 'dominant in all classes and all individuals',<sup>25</sup> he looked ahead to the birth of a new social organization based on a single guiding principle: 'all men must behave with one another as brothers'.<sup>26</sup>

Fourier declared that human existence was grounded upon universal laws, which, once activated, would guarantee joy and delight all over the earth. In his *Theory of the Four Movements* (1808), he set out what he unhesitatingly called the most 'important discovery [among] all the scientific work done since the human race began'.<sup>27</sup> Fourier opposed advocates of the 'commercial system' and maintained that society would be free only when all its components had returned to expressing their passions.<sup>28</sup> The main error of the political regime of his age was the repression of human nature.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> C. H. Saint-Simon, 'L'Organisateur: prospectus de l'auteur', in: C. H. de Saint-Simon, *Œuvres complètes*, vol. III (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2012), p. 2115.

<sup>25</sup> C. H. Saint-Simon, 'Le nouveau christianisme', in: C. H. de Saint-Simon, *Œuvres complètes*, vol. IV (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2012), p. 3222.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3216.

<sup>27</sup> C. Fourier, *The Theory of the Four Movements* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 4.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.

<sup>29</sup> This is the exact opposite of the theory developed by Sigmund Freud, who, in 'Civilization and Its Discontents', in: S. Freud (ed.), *Complete Psychological Works*, vol. 21 (London: Hogarth Press, 1964), pp. 59–148, argued that a non-repressive

Alongside radical egalitarianism and a quest for the best possible social model, a final element common to many early socialists was their dedication to promoting the birth of small alternative communities. For those who organized them, the liberation of these communes from the economic inequalities existing at the time would provide a decisive impetus for the spread of socialist principles and make it easier to argue in their favour.

In *The New Industrial and Societal World* (1829), Fourier envisaged a novel community structure in which villages would be ‘replaced with industrial phalanxes of roughly 1800 persons each’.<sup>30</sup> Individuals would live in phalansteries, that is, in large buildings with communal areas where they could enjoy all the services they needed. According to the method invented by Fourier, human beings would ‘flutter from pleasure to pleasure and avoid excesses’; they would have brief spells of employment, ‘two hours at the most’, so that each would be able to exercise ‘seven to eight attractive kinds of work in the course of the day’.<sup>31</sup>

The search for better ways of organizing society also spurred on Owen, who, over the course of his life, founded important experiments in workers’ cooperation. First at New Lanark, Scotland from 1800 to 1825, then at New Harmony in the United States from 1826 to 1828, he tried to demonstrate in actual practice how to realize a more just social order. In *The Book of the New Moral World* (1836–1844), however, Owen proposed the division of society into eight classes, the last of which ‘will consist of those from forty to sixty years complete’, who would have the ‘final decision’. What he envisaged, rather naïvely, was that in this gerontocratic system everyone would be able and willing to assume their due role in the governance of society ‘without contest, his fair, full share of the government of society’.<sup>32</sup>

In 1849, Cabet, too, founded a colony in the United States, at Nauvoo, Illinois, but his authoritarianism gave rise to numerous internal conflicts. In the laws of the ‘Icarian Constitution’, he proposed as a condition for the birth of community that, ‘in order to increase all the prospects of success’, he should be appointed ‘sole and absolute Director for a period of ten years, with the power to run it on the basis of his doctrine and ideas’.<sup>33</sup>

organization of society would involve a dangerous regression from the level of civilization attained within human relations.

<sup>30</sup> C. Fourier, *Le nouveau monde industriel et sociétaire*, in C. Fourier, *Œuvres complètes*, vol. VI (Paris: Éditions Anthropos, 1845), p. 15.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 67–69.

<sup>32</sup> R. Owen, *The Book of the New Moral World* (New York: G. Vale, 1845), p. 185.

<sup>33</sup> É. Cabet, *Colonie icarienne aux États-Unis d’Amérique: sa constitution, ses lois, sa situation matérielle et morale après le premier semestre 1855* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1971), p. 43.

The experiments of the early socialists – whether the lovingly devised phalansteries, the sporadic cooperatives, or the eccentric communist colonies – proved so inadequate that their implementation on a wider scale could not be seriously contemplated. They involved a derisory number of workers and often very limited participation of the collective in policy decisions. Moreover, many of the revolutionaries (non-English ones, in particular) who devoted their efforts to building such communities did not understand the fundamental changes in production that were taking place in their age. Many of the early socialists failed to see the connection between the development of capitalism and the potential for social progress for the working class. Such progress depended on the workers' capacity to appropriate the wealth they generated in the new mode of production.<sup>34</sup>

### 2.3 Where and Why Marx Wrote about Communism

Marx set himself a completely different task from that of previous socialists; his absolute priority was to 'reveal the economic law of motion of modern society'.<sup>35</sup> His aim was to develop a comprehensive critique of the capitalist mode of production, which would serve the proletariat, the principal revolutionary subject, in the overthrow of the existing social-economic system.

Moreover, having no wish to inculcate a new religion, Marx refrained from promoting an idea which he considered theoretically pointless and politically counterproductive: a universal model of communist society. For this reason, in the 'Postface to the Second Edition' (1873) of *Capital*, volume I (1867), he made it clear that he had no interest in 'writing recipes for the cook-shops of the future'.<sup>36</sup> He also outlined what he meant by this well-known assertion in the 'Notes on Wagner's *Treatise*

<sup>34</sup> According to R. Rosdolsky in *The Making of Marx's 'Capital'* (London: Pluto Press, 1977), the Romantic socialists, unlike Marx, 'were totally incapable of grasping the "course of modern history", i.e., the necessity and historical progressiveness of the bourgeois social order which they criticized, and confin[ed] themselves to moralistic rejection of it instead', p. 422.

<sup>35</sup> K. Marx, *Capital*, volume I (London: Penguin, 1976), p. 92.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99. Marx made this point in reply to a review of his work in *Positive Philosophy (La Philosophie Positive)*, in which the Comtean sociologist Eugène de Roberty (1843–1915) had criticized him for not having indicated the 'necessary conditions for a healthy production and just distribution of wealth', see K. Marx, *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Erster Band, Hamburg 1872*, MEGA<sup>2</sup>, vol. II/6, pp. 1622–3. A partial translation of de Roberty's review is contained in S. Moore, *Marx on the Choice between Socialism and Communism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), pp. 84–7, although Moore wrongly claimed that the purpose of *Capital* was 'to find in the present the basis for predicting the future', p. 86.



on *Political Economy*' (1879–80), where, in response to criticism from the German economist Adolph Wagner (1835–1917), he categorically stated that he had 'never established a "socialist system"'.<sup>37</sup>

Marx made similar declarations in his political writings. In *The Civil War in France* (1871), he wrote of the Paris Commune, the first seizure of power by the subaltern classes: 'The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce by a decree of the people.' Rather, the emancipation of the proletariat had 'to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men'. The point was not to 'realize ideals', but 'to set free elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant'.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, Marx said much the same in his correspondence with leaders of the European workers' movement. In 1881, for instance, when Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis (1846–1919), the leading representative of the Social Democratic League in the Netherlands, asked him what measures a revolutionary government would have to take after assuming power in order to establish a socialist society, Marx replied that he had always regarded such questions as 'fallacious', arguing instead that 'what is to be done . . . at any particular moment depends, of course, wholly and entirely on the actual historical circumstances in which action is to be taken'. He contended that it was impossible 'to solve an equation that does not comprise within its terms the elements of its solution'; 'a doctrinaire and of necessity fantastic anticipation of a future revolution's programme of action only serves to distract from the present struggle'.<sup>39</sup>

Nevertheless, contrary to what many commentators have wrongly claimed, Marx did develop, in both published and unpublished form, a number of discussions about communist society which appear in three kinds of text. First, there are those in which Marx criticized ideas that he regarded as theoretically mistaken and liable to mislead socialists of his time. Some parts of the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and *The German Ideology*; the chapter on 'Socialist and Communist Literature' in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*; the criticisms of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon in the *Grundrisse*, the *Urtext*, and the *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*; the texts of the early

<sup>37</sup> K. Marx, 'Marx's Notes (1879–80) on Wagner', in T. Carver (ed.), *Texts on Method* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), pp. 182–3.

<sup>38</sup> K. Marx, *The Civil War in France*, MECW, vol. 22, p. 335.

<sup>39</sup> K. Marx to F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, 22 February 1881, MECW, vol. 46, p. 66. The vast correspondence with Engels is the best evidence of his consistency in this regard. In the course of forty years of collaboration, the two friends exchanged views on every imaginable topic, but Marx did not spend the least time discussing how the society of the future should be organized.



1870s directed against anarchism; and the theses critical of Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–1864) in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (1875) belong to this category. To these should be added the critical remarks on Proudhon, Lassalle, and the anarchist component of the International Working Men's Association scattered throughout Marx's vast correspondence.

The second kind of text is the militant writings and political propaganda written for working-class organizations. In these, Marx tried to provide more concrete indications about the society for which they were fighting and the instruments necessary to construct it. This group comprises the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, the resolutions, reports, and addresses for the International Working Men's Association – including *Value, Price and Profit* and *The Civil War in France* – and various journalistic articles, public lectures, speeches, letters to militants, and other short documents such as the *Programme of the French Workers' Party*.

The third and final group of texts, which are centred around capitalism, contain Marx's lengthiest and most detailed discussions of the features of communist society. Important chapters of *Capital* and the numerous preparatory manuscripts, particularly the highly valuable *Grundrisse*, contain some of his most salient ideas on socialism. It was precisely his critical observations on aspects of the existing mode of production that prompted reflections on communist society, and it is no accident that in some cases successive pages of his work alternate between these two themes.<sup>40</sup>

A close study of Marx's discussions of communism allow us to distinguish his own conception from that of twentieth-century regimes, who, while claiming to act in his name, perpetrated a series of crimes and atrocities. In this way, it is possible to relocate the Marxian political project within the horizon that corresponds to it: the struggle for the emancipation of what Saint-Simon called 'the poorest and most numerous class'.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Rosdolsky argued in *The Making of Marx's 'Capital'* that, while it is true that Marx rejected the idea of the 'construction of completed socialist systems', this does not mean that Marx and Engels developed 'no conception of the socialist economic and social order (a view often attributed to them by opportunists), or that they simply left the entire matter to [their] grandchildren . . . On the contrary, such conceptions played a part in Marx's theoretical system . . . We therefore constantly encounter discussions and remarks in *Capital*, and the works preparatory to it, which are concerned with the problems of a socialist society', pp. 413–14.

<sup>41</sup> C. H. Saint-Simon and B.-P. Enfantin, 'Religion Saint-Simonienne: Procès', in: C. de Saint Simon and B.-P. Enfantin, *Oeuvres de Saint-Simon & D'Enfantin*, vol. XLVII (Paris: Leroux, 1878), p. 378. In other parts of their work, the two French proto-socialists use the expression 'the poorest and most laborious class'. See, for example, idem, 'Notre politique est religieuse', *ibid.*, vol. XLV, p. 28.

Marx's notes on communism should not be thought of as a model to be adhered to dogmatically,<sup>42</sup> still less as solutions to be indiscriminately applied in diverse times and places. Yet these sketches constitute a priceless theoretical treasure, still useful today for the critique of capitalism.

#### 2.4 The Limits of the Initial Formulations

Contrary to the claims made by a certain type of Marxist-Leninist propaganda, Marx's theories were the result not of some innate wisdom, but of a long process of conceptual and political refinement. Intense study of economics and many other disciplines, together with observation of actual historical events, particularly the Paris Commune, was extremely important for the development of his thoughts on communist society.

Some of Marx's early writings – many of which he never completed or published – are often surprisingly regarded as syntheses of his most significant ideas,<sup>43</sup> but, in fact, they display all the limits of his initial conception of post-capitalist society.

<sup>42</sup> An example of this genre is the anthology K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. Lenin, *On Communist Society* (Moscow: Progress, 1974), which presents the texts of the three authors as if they constituted a homogenous opus of the Holy Trinity of communism. As in many other collections of this type, Marx's presence is altogether marginal: even if his name appears on the cover, as the supreme guarantor of the faith of 'scientific socialism', the actual extracts from his writings (19 pages out of 157) are considerably shorter than those of Engels and Lenin (1870–1924). All we find here of Marx the theorist of communist society comes from the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* and the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, plus a mere half-page from *The Holy Family* and a few lines on the dictatorship of the proletariat from the letter of 5 March 1852 to Joseph Weydemeyer (1818–1866). The picture is the same in the diffuse anthology edited by the Finnish communist O. W. Kuusinen, *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism: Manual*, second rev. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1963). In part 5, on 'Socialism and Communism', Marx is quoted only eleven times, compared with twelve references to the work of Nikita Khrushchev (1894–1971) and the documents of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and fifty quotations from the works of Lenin.

<sup>43</sup> See R. Aron, *Marxismes imaginaires. D'une sainte famille à l'autre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970) which pokes fun at the 'Parisian para-Marxists', p. 210, who 'subordinated *Capital* to the early writings, especially the economic-philosophical manuscripts of 1844, the obscurity, incompleteness and contradictions of which fascinated the reader', p. 177. In his view, these authors failed to understand that 'if Marx had not had the ambition and hope to ground the advent of communism with scientific rigour, he would not have needed to work for thirty years on *Capital* (without managing to complete it). A few pages and a few weeks would have sufficed', p. 210. See also, M. Musto, 'The Myth of the "Young Marx" in the Interpretations of the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*', *Critique*, 43 (2) (2015), pp. 233–60. For a description of the fragmentary character of the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and the incompleteness of the theses contained in them, see M. Musto, *Another Marx: Early Manuscripts to the International* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), pp. 42–45.