

### **MARXISM**

Karl Marx and Engels redefined socialism on scientific bases in 19th century. Their Principles and Ideas are callaborately called as maxism on scientific socialism.

In order to make socialism a science of socialism, it had to be placed upon real basis. Marx was the founder of '**Scientific Socialism**' as opposed to 'Utopian Socialism'. This distinction of which Marx and Engels were very conscious may be explained in the first instance. The Utopian Socialists, as you already know, were Charles Fourier, Saint Simon, Robert Owen, Louis Blanc, etc. In the Communist Manifesto, the approach, directed against them is that they had no knowledge of the proletariat. As such, they made the appeal to the whole of society, by preference even to the ruling classes, they dreamed fanatstic pictures of a new society. To the Utopians, socialism was the expression of absolute truth. They appealed to morality, whereas from a scientific stand-point this appeal to morality and justice does not help us an inch further. The Utopians constructed the outline of a new society out of their own heads and looked round like Fourier, for a capitalist to launch it. In other words, they did not have a philosophy of history. The function of scientific socialism was to reveal socialism as 'a necessary product of historical development.' Given the knowledge of the laws according to which the human society unrolls itself, the scientific socialists could show that the existing capitalist society could not fail to give birth to a socialist order. The appeal to morality and justice, the vision and the dream was replaced by an understanding and acceptance of historical development.

The two great discoveries of this school are (i) the materialistic conception of history, and (ii) the revelation of the secret of capitalistic prouction through surplus value was discovered and scientifically interpreted by Marx. With these discoveries socialism became a science. The next thing was to work out all its detail. Many commentators have stressed the view that Marx can in no respect have claim to 'originality. It may be true, it is certainly immaterial. It may not be so in the world of science and scientific discovery, but in the realm of thought, there are few ideals which, with a little ingenuity, can be shown to have had a long history. The component parts of Marxian thought can be traced to a multitude of sources. He collected his bricks from many mason yards, but he used them to construct a building which was very much according to his own design.

The sources of Marx may be legacies at this moment. Firstly, there was Hegel who dominated his earlier years, for Marx belonged to a gneration when Hegelianism was very fashionable. From Hegel he learnt the principle of development by contrast

and conflict. Every state or condition calls forth for its negation which in turn provoked the negation of the negation, which contains in itself the original positive and the subsequent negation.

Every thesis reacts to its anti-thesis which leads to the synthesis combining both thesis and anti-thesis. Hegel had yoded his apparatus to the cart of idealism. It was Feuerback who made Marx a materialist. Thought Marx abandoned Hegel's idealism yet he continued throughout life to think in terms of Hegelian dialectic, sufficient to remember that dialectic process was learnt by Marx from Hegel. Secondly, from the earlier French socialist with whom he had contacts during the period of his residence in Paris, it is probable that Marx derived the phrase, if not precisely his conception, of the 'class war'. For indeed, the idea of class war, if one so chooses goes back to a famous phrase in Plato's Republic, but before Marx, the 'class war' has been conceived rather in terms of the conflict of interests between rich and poor. Thirdly, on the economic side, the affiliation and sources of Marx are clear beyond all shadow of doubt. He is merely the continuator of classical English Political Economy. On the question of value, Marx is substantially influenced by Ricardo. Partly, the conception of 'surplus value' was familiar to Gray, Hodgskin and other English socialists and was expressed by them with the utmost precision, though again doubtless, with Marxian timings.

### **5.1 Theoretical Basis of Scientific Socialism**

As distinct from utopian socialism and its unsubstantiated assumptions and wishful thinking, the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels was firmly based on the study of reality of capitalism and on a scientific understanding of the laws governing the development of society. One of the truly great services rendered by Marx and Engels was their establishment of the materialist conception of History whereas previously social scientists had adhered to the opinion that the march of history was determined by ideas, by the views held by people, **Marx and Engles** based themselves on the fact that before men engage in politics, philosophy and art, that is, in intellectual labours, they must have at their disposal the necessary minimum material things (food, clothing and shelter). But in order to obtain these things people must work and produce. And it is this labour activity of the people and their production of material things that provide the basis for social development. The discovery showed that history was a process of the replacing of one social system by another, by a higher and better system, and that this process rested on the advance of material production. Primitive society had given way to slave-owing society, slavery to feudalism and the latter to capitalism.

But that being so, and since the development of society is a law-governed process of the replacing of one socio-economic formation by another, it follows that capitalists society must, with the same inevitability make for the new socialist society.

Of great significance for Marx's scientific socialism was his discovery of surplus value as the sources of capitalist profits and of capitalist exploitation. A worker in

capitalist society, deprived of the basic means of production (factories, machinery and means of transport) owns only his labour power, his ability to work and procedure material values. In order to live and provide for his family, he is obliged to appear before the owner of the means of production, the capitalist and offer his labour which leads to the development of capitalism (detail examined in the following pages of this lesson).

After knowing the theoretical basis of scientific socialism now we proceed to discuss it in detail as worked out by Marx and Engels. Such a survey can be conveniently brought under four headings. Firstly, a background view of history which has acquired the little 'Materialistic class struggle' in which the negation of negation leads of every new negation. Secondly, there is applied to lay bare the secrets and procedure of capitalist exploitation. Thirdly, we find a body of prophecy, designed to show the future of development of the capitalistic system and its ultimate destination. Lastly, there is a view of the state with some hints as to the technique of revolution and far-off heaven, where the need of the state does not exist.

### **5.2 The Materialist Conception of History**

Before Marx, history was interpreted in several typical fashions (i) some interpreters considered 'Religion' as the key to understand human history and give religious interpretation of history, (ii) another approach to understand human history, and historical writings were largely the record of kings, parliaments, wars and peace treaties, (iii) there had also been 'hero interpretations of history' popularised by Carlyle. In world history, the heroes are chosen from great kings, generals, legislators, reformers, etc., (iv) the impact of idea was also provided of a key to understand history in pre-Marxist period. For example, Hegel conceived ideas as the principle cause of historical process and the material conditions (social, economic, technological, military) of society were thought of as essentially derived from and caused by the great motivating ideas. This emphasis on ideas often also implied that history was progressively involving towards the realization of key ideas, such as, freedom and democracy.

In Marxian period, the idealist view of history was predominant. Marx and Engels in their enunciation of Materialist concept of history were concerned to repudiate the "idealist" view of history that men are what they, by virtue of ideal influences, that they are fashioned by their religion, their laws, literature and their art. In what was supposed to be an epigrammatic summary of the theory, it is not religion that brings together the worker and the capitalist. With former selling his labour power and the later buying it, the worker works and the capitalist pays him wages. Penetrating into the essence of the bargain, Marx showed that it is far from being equal, as it would seem at first glance The point is that labour power is a commodity of a special kind, a commodity capable of producing material values. What is more the values it creates are greater than the wages paid to its seller by the capitalist. The latter pays only for a part of the values produced by the worker. He appropriates the remainder. In an

innocuous and generalised summary given by Engles, the essence of the theory is "to trace political events back to the effect of what are, in the 'Ist resort, economic causes.' The economic factor, above all the manner in which men earn their daily bread, provides the dynamic factor in history, in the light of which everything else—the structure of society, religion, law and art—must find their explanation.

Though **Materialist Conception of History** is, the most sound characteristic and original features of the Marxian system yet there is nowhere either a Marx or Engles an adequate or systematic account of it and its implications. Before outlining it, it is well to deal with an immediate difficulty. The name, though Marx used it, does not convey accurately, what is meant by it. It is, in fact, an economic interpretation of history, according to which all the mass phenomena of history are determined by economic condition. The theory begins with simple truth, which is the clue to the meaning of history, that "man must eat to live." His very survival depends upon the success with which he can produce what he wants from Nature. Production is, therefore, the most most important of all human activities. Men in association produce more than men in isolation and society is the result of an attempt to secure the necessities of life. But society has never accomplished that no satisfaction of all its members and has in consequence, always been subject to internal stress and strains. Hence, men not realising that unsatisfied needs are merely the result of defective modes of production, have always imagined another world in which those needs will be met. The production of the goods and services that support human life, and the exchange of those goods and services are the base of all social processes and institutions. Marx does not claim that the economic factor is the only one that goes into the making of history, he does claim that it is the most important one, the foundation upon which he erected the superstructure of culture, law and government, but stressed by corresponding political, social, religious and literary ideologies. In a general way, Marx describes the relations between men's material conditions of life and their ideas by saying that it is not the consciousness of men which determines their existence, but on the contrary, it is their social existence which determines their consciousness. In the 'German Ideology' Marx says :

"By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their material life what they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production."

Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life. Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and the corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development but men, developing their material production and their intercourse, alter alongwith this their real existence, their thinking and the product of their thinking. In the "Poverty of Philosophy", Marx observes :

"Social relations are closely bound up with productive forces. In acquiring new productive forces, men change their mode of production and in changing their mode of production is changed the way of earning their living. They change all their social relations. The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord, the steam mill society with the industrial capitalist."

Two snippets may be given from Engels, speaking alone, in order that he may make his special contribution to this anthology :

"The Materialist Conception of History starts from the principles of production, and with production the exchange of its products is the basis of every social order : that in every society which has appeared in history the distribution of the products, and with the division of society into classes or estates, is determined by what is produced and how it is produced, and how the product it exchanged. According to this conception, the ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolution are to be sought not in the minds of men, in their increasing insight into the eternal and justice, but in changes in the mode of production and exchange. They are to be sought not in the philosophy but in the economics of the period concerned."

The second is from the speech at the grave side of Marx. English then said that Marx had 'discovered the simple fact, hitherto concealed by an overgrowth of ideology, that mankind first of all eat and drink, have shelter and clothing, before it can pursue politics, science, religion, etc and that therefore, the production of material means of subsistence and consequently the degree of economic development attained by a given people or during a given epoch, from the foundation upon which the state institutions, the legal conceptions, the art and even the religious ideas of the people concerned have been evolved and in the light of which these things must therefore, be explained, instead of vice-versa as had hitherto been the case.

About the Materialist Conception of History we can say in summary form, as is clear from these statements that it is the economic factor (or conditions of productions) that ultimately determine all things. It governs the structure of the society in which men live. It fashions their religion, it determines all things. It governs the structure of the society in which men live. It fashions their religion, it determines their laws, it shapes their literature and their art. The spiritual is determined by the material.

Closely interwoven with the Materialistic Conception of History, is Marxism theory of the class struggle. The Materialist Conception of History, indeed, expresses itself in the through an everlasting struggle between classes. 'The Communist Manifesto' (1848) puts this in forefront :

"The history of all human society past and present, has been the history of class struggles. Free man and slave, patrician and slave, patrician and plebian, baron and serf, guild burges and journeyman — in a word, oppressor and oppressed — stood in sharp opposition to one another. They

carried on perpetual warfare, sometimes masked sometimes open; a warfare that invariably ended, either in a revolutionary change in the whole structure of society, or else in the common ruin of the contending classes."

There is no history apart from the record of class struggles, and' presumably what remains of history when the class-struggle is ignored, is but the record of insignificant trivialities. In the earlier epoch of history, we find almost everywhere a complete sub-division of society into different grades, a manifold gradations of social positions. In ancient Rome, we have politicians, knights, plebians, slaves. In the Middle Ages, we have feudal lords, vassals, guide burgesses, journeymen, serfs and within each of these classes here existed in almost every instance, further gradation.

Modern bourgeoisie society, rising out the ruins of feudal society, did not make an end of class antagonism. It merely setup new classes in the place of the old, new embodiment of struggle. In bourgeois age, the class antagonism has been simplified. More and more society is splitting into two great and directly opposed classes, Bourgeoisie and the proletariat in all these stages of history, and the basic structure of society. In a nomadic society, for example, horses might be considered the principal means of acquiring and accumulating wealth. From Marx's view point, those who are the owners of the greatest number of horses in such a society would also be the political chieftains who make and interpret the law. Even in religion, thier impact would not be missing. In a settled agricultural society, according to Marx, the landowning classes are the real ruler of state and society. In the modern industrial society, the ownership of the means of industrial production is the master key. The capitalist not only determine the economic destiny of society but also rule it politically and set its social standards and values. The ultimate purpose of the law, the education, and that perpetuates the particular ideology of capitalism which sustains the antagonism between the classes.

**5.3 The theory of class struggle :-** as found in Marxism, is of course, merely a somewhat mechanical application of the Hegelian formula. Hegelianism requires that the negation having asserted itself, should proceed to struggle with its opposite and rise to a higher synthesis, the negation of negation, and accordingly, classes must behave accordingly; whether they like or not. It is, however, by no means obvious as is implicit in Marxism, why the struggle between capitalism and proletariat should conduct us to the final synthesis and the disappearance of all classes. But since this dialectic of class struggle is original with the institution of private property, it is sure to end with its fall.

1. We see material conception of history with skepticism, it is obvious, that it falls short at many points. History cannot be explained solely in terms of the economic factor. Other factors like religion and patriotism, country's law and tradition cannot be ignored. Marx's economic interpretation as the master key to history is an excessive generalisation and simplification. No single factor has been predominant through history and which factor is the most important in particular situations is a question of

empirical inquiry. The most obvious difficulty of the materialist conception of history is seen in its helplessness when confronted with the problem of the influence of mind over them. It is easy enough to persuade ourselves that any of the leaders of humanity could have appeared only when he did appear. It is absurd to assume that any great men bound to appear at the appropriate structure. Any way Marx only visualizes economic factors in the ultimate analysis.

It is also doubtful whether one can eliminate from history the mighty repercussions springing from non-economic causes. In a similar way, the Marxian economic explanation of war is either wholly false, and can account for only part of the historical reality, for example, the Greeks who fought the Persians twenty five hundred years ago did so not primarily to protect Athenian investment and trade interests in Asia minor, but because they knew that the victory of Persia would mean the end of Greek civilization. To take more recent illustration, the core of conflict in the two world wars was not the protection of British investment in Africa or of America loans to British and France, but the more fundamental issue of either totalitarian militarism is to rule the world. What the Marxist interpretation missed in the analysis of major conflict is first the element of power and second, the clash of value system which are frequently more important of people than economic interests. But then value system and power can only be understood in economic and material terms. Therefore, such criticism of Marx is superfluous.

**5.4 Doctrine of Surplus Value :-** After a survey of the materialistic concept of history and the doctrine of class war we have reached the stage where the position of bourgeoisie or capitalists, is challenged by the rising proletariat. It becomes necessary, therefore, to consider the hidden springs of this antagonism and to reveal how the worker is inevitably exploited by his employer. This leads us to Marx's economic analysis—the doctrine of surplus value and the development of Capitalism.

In its broad shape, Marx's famous theory is that the value of a commodity is nothing more than the labour embodied in it. Accumulation and exploitation are possible because there happens to be in the market for sale of a commodity possessing quite peculiar properties. This is 'labour power' which in the Marxian view is quite distinct from labour. Labour power, not labour is the commodity which the capitalist purchases. Now labour power also has its value. The natural price to pay for labour is that which enables the worker to subsist and continue his race, in fact, it is the cost of production of labour. This is the value quite properly paid for labour power, but when labour power is used, it gives off more value than its cost. The worker may make enough for his maintenance in six hours; but he has sold labour power work ten or twelve hours each day. The difference (in their case the work of 4 hours or 6 hours) represents the value, it is unpaid value appropriated by the capitalist.

Marx's theory of surplus value is not merely the introduction to something that interested him for an examination not of capitalism as it is, but the capitalism as it was developing or becoming. Using nature in Aristotelian sense of what a thing will

become when fully developed, so we may say that it is, with the nature is self destruction. The end of capitalism will be brought about, Marx argues, not by "subversive conspiracies" of professional revolutionaries but by the same inexorable laws of social development and change that destroyed systems. Capitalism will dig its own grave. Capitalism, according to him, is doubly doomed by the general law of capital accumulation and centralisation which begins to operate automatically as soon as capitalist appropriate surplus value; and secondly it is doomed also by its own internal contradictions. According to the law of capital accumulation, there occurs "the concentration of already formed capitals, the destruction of the individual independence, the expropriation of capital by capitalist, the transformation of many small capitalists into a few large ones." This is unavoidable, not because the capitalist 'shares with the miser the passion wealth' as wealth but because, "What is the miser is a mere idiosyncrasy in the capitalist, it is the effect of the social mechanism of which he is but one of the wheels." "To accumulate", Marx says, "is to conquer the worlds of social wealth to increase the mass of human being exploited by him, and thus to extend both the direct and the indirect way of the capitalist. To fail to accumulate is itself to be thrust into the ranks of the exploited masses. Competition, the growth of credit, the development of a joint stock system, technical improvement all speed up the accumulation of capital." Technical improvement which keeps down wages, and lot of the workers become harder to bear until "they have nothing to loose but their chains". Moreover, the development of capitalism simplified the class struggle since it leaves only two classes—the property owners and the wage earners, embattled against each other. Thus by increasing the poverty of the great majority and by simplifying the class struggle since it leaves only two classes the property owners and the wage earners, embattled against each other. Thus by increasing the poverty of the great majority and by simplifying the class struggle, the law of capitalist accumulation leads capitalist to the final and inevitable class struggle with the proletariat that can have no other ending than the triumph of the oppressed.

About this part of economic analysis and development of capitalism, we can say that Marx's predictions have been erroneous. Marx's main objection to capitalism was its inefficiency as well as injustice. Experience has contradicted his forecasts. Per capital consumption in West Europe is more than double than in the Soviet Union and in the United States it is three times greater. As to the technological innovation the capitalist countries still are in most cases the creators, and the Communist countries, except in space science and technology, the borrowers and imitators. Marx believed that there will be more unemployment under capitalism. But the growth welfare state policies in the major capitalist countries led to the recognition of full employment as a primary social objective. Oddly and contrary to Marx's prediction, Communist states like Poland and Yugoslavia suffered from unemployment. However, per capital consumption did not reflect the quality of life, which in the case of other states was definitely better in socialist countries.

After examining Materialist Conception of History, economic analysis and the development of capitalism, now we proceed to examine Marxian view of the state. The nature of coming revolution or what may be therefore the Marxian view of the state is a corollary of the Materialist Conception of History. According to Marx, the state is a class organisation, representing the interests and reflecting the ideas of the dominant class. Moreover, bring the expression of the dominance of the class struggle, the essence of state power lies in its purely repressive character. More precisely, if we invite Engels to his customary role in singing in unison. 'The state is nothing more than a machine for the oppression of one class by another. As Marx expressed it in Das Capital "After every revolution making a progressive phase in class struggle, the purely representative character of the state stand out in bolder relief." As the conditions of production change the existing state ceases to meet the requirements of the new exploiting class. The feudal state, based on status is not an effective instrument for capitalistic and is, therefore, replaced by the capitalist state based on contract. The collapse of the old order and arrival of the new state, "with its moral and political beliefs and is property relations suitable to the interest of the new dominant class, is inevitable, but it will not happen automatically is that a revolutionary situation, the struggle between the new challenging and the old challenged class, will take place. The history of society is the history of class war. This class war at last reaches its final phase when the capitalist is face to face with the proletariat. Capitalism, the thesis calls into being its anti-thesis, organised labour and from the resultant clash, the final synthesis of the classless society will result, when "pre-history ends and history begins."

Before achieving this form of state, there will be transitional period known as Socialism, where there will dictatorship of the proletariat. The machinery of the state will socialise the natural resources and the remnants of capitalism will be stamped out. In this period, goods will be distributed, not according to need but according to work performed. The state continues to be the repressive organ. But instead of minority oppressed the majority will oppress the small group of former exploiters. The workers state will thus, be far more democratic than the bourgeois democratic. They, indeed, were a sham and contradictory in terms, since democracy cannot exist in any society which is divided as under capitalism, into two irreconcilably antagonistic groups. Engels also said democracy would be 'the specific from the dictatorship of the proletariat.'

In the regime of dictatorship of the Proletariat, socialism will blossom in Communism. Marx and Engels tell us very little about the future society. However, two things may be noted about the new order : (a) society will be organised and things will be distributed on the principle "from each according to his ability to each according to his need. (b) The state will 'wither away' and in the long march through history the class oppression will have come to an end. No more classes and no more state.

About "withering away" of state, Marx and Engels are specific. The doctrine of

"withering away" of state is elaborated by Engels from Marx's tentative expression. In 1874, Engels declared that the state 'as a result of social revolution of the future, would vanish.' What this implies is not clear. In 1877, he writes that by converting the means of production into state property the proletariat would abolish the State as State. In 1891, he spoke of the victorious proletariat "Parting down the worst aspects of the State, until a new generation grown up in the new, free social conditions, is capable of putting aside the whole paraphernalia of state." About the future society, in Marx, said Lenin, "You will find the trace of utopia in the sense of inventing the 'new' society and constructing it out of fancies."

Though for later generation, Marx has become so exclusively the exponent of scientific socialism, especially if Marx is to be taken as a convenient abbreviation for the Marx-Engels partnership yet, there are two other names which cannot be passed over in silence. These are : Lassalle and Rodbertus.

Lassalle carried the gospel of Marx to those for whom it was designed. He made socialism a political movement. He established the general union of German workers. Lassalle's position may be said to be based theoretically on a straight forward Marxian foundation; but he differs from Marx with regard to the programme for the immediate future. About his conception of what the state is, and of what can be done by and through the state, Lassalle differs from Marx.

Lassalle believed that is of the essence of 'Scientific Socialism' which seeks to prove that coming of socialism is part of the incalculable march of events, that it must be based on a philosophy of history.. Lassalle's philosophy of history is simple. He views all history as divided into three periods by the revolutions of 1789 and 1848. In a sweeping generalisation he holds that revolution that has already taken place in the actual relationship existing in a society. In short, a revolution is an acknowledgement and endorsement of what has already taken place."

Lassalle's economic theories were essentially Marxist. He accepted the labour theory of value and Ricardo's "Iron Law" that labour wages remain theory of 'surplus value. To remedy this situation workers must establish producers cooperative with credit from the state. Addressing the German workers Lassalle tells them that the state belongs to them and to the needy classes, and that they and their associations are the state. He regarded the state as the engine for the moral uplift and regeneration of mankind. It exists to develop the freedom of banking and its purpose is to enable the individual to attain heights to which he could have never reached by his own unaided efforts. Lassalle's version of the state is more in line with the workshop of the state as something divine and hence least Marxian.

Lassalle's socialism rested firmly on the foundation of political democracy; he pressed for universal suffrage of independent action by the workers to bring about the state in which each worker was to receive the full product of his labour. He urged direct political action peacefully and legally for the revision of economic inequalities. Labour, he said, must strike out on its own and remain disassociated from other groups to

attain universal, equal and direct suffrage as a tool for reaching its goals. Nothing less would suffice.

Robertus, in his general theoretical position is not far removed from Marx. Robertus and Marx are not in the main as theoretical analysis of the world and of Capital. However, Robertus was mostly interested in social problems. The social problem according to him, consists exclusively in prevalent increasing poverty and commercial crisis. Robertus throughout is concerned, directly or indirectly, with these two questions alone.

Robertus accepted Ricardian Law of Wages, unquestioningly. Wages, he asserts, have never, for any, length of time, been above the necessary subsistence level. Wages the reward of working class, is always and perpetually shrinking share of the nation's wealth. For Robertus, the law of Diminishing Wage Share must be abrogated if the world is to be healed. Moreover, the commercial crisis, further accentuates the poverty and the misery already prevalent. For Robertus, all commodities are the product of labour only, putting it otherwise all wealth is the creation of labourers who do not receive what they produce nor on the basis of what they produce. He believes that the ultimate cause of poverty of the working class is found in the private ownership of land and the means of production. He is an emphatic voice of protest against Laissez faire and all its ways. He believed that while the eighteenth century had given workers legal freedom, the accompanying economic system had stripped this freedom of any meaning. It was necessary, if social justice was to be achieved, for the state to bring about a better system of distribution of production.

**5.5 Conclusion :-** Thus, we can conclude our discussion about Scientific Socialism that it is associated with Marx and Engels' thought and exposition. However, the study of Scientific Socialism remains incomplete without a reference to Lassalle and Robertus.

#### 5.6 SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Ebenstein : *Today's Isms*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey
2. Wayper, C.L. : *Political Thought, Teach Yourself Books*, St. Paul's House, London
3. Maxey, C.C. : *Political Philosophy*
4. Misra, B.N. : *Capitalism, Socialism & Planning*, Oxford & I.B.H. Publishing Co., New Delhi
5. Gray Alexander : *The Socialist Tradition*, Longmans Green & Co. Ltd., London
6. Lancaster : *Master of Political Thought*, Vol. III
7. Engels : *Socialism : Utopian and Scientific*, Progress Publishers, Moscow