

From Engel's Critique of the S-D program of 1891, Neue Zeit, Jahrg. 20, Vol. 1, 1901.

"That the masters appropriate those things as 'exclusive possession' is already said in 1 and would only be repetitious if you platterings brings in the word 'Monopolist'."

Engels makes point also about feudal remnants, landowners, ~~serf~~ peasants and p-b.

"The planlessness based on the essence of capitalist private production' requires strong correction. I know a capitalist production as a form of society, as economic phase; a capitalist private production as an appearance occurring within this phase so, or so. What then does 'capitalist private production' mean? Production by private entrepreneurs ~~of~~ which is more and more the exception. Capitalist production by Artien societies is already not private production any more but production for the associated reckoning of many. And when we go over from the A-S to the trusts, which monopolize and rule whole branches of industry, then not only private production but also planlessness ceases. Strike out private and the sentence can pass.

Where the SD said "common property of society and transformation of cap. prod. into socialist prod. -- FE proposes transformation of the present capit. prod. for the interests of the indiv. or corps. into socialist prod. for the interests of the whole society and according to a predetermined plan."

The SD program said: The SD has nothing in common with the so-called state socialism, the system of statification or for fiscal private which puts the state in the place of the private entrepreneur and thereby unites in one hand the power of the state exploitation and the political exploitation oppression of the workers." FE takes out 'of the workers.'

You put abstract political questions in the foreground and hide thereby the most immediate concrete questions, the question which with the first great events, the first political crisis places itself on the order of the day.

....If something is sure, it is that our party and the work. cl. can only come to power under the form of the dem. repl. This is even the specific form for the dict. of the prol. as the great Fr. Rev. has already shown. It is nevertheless unthinkable that our best people could be ministers under a Kaiser, like Miquel. But if you can't put into the program the demand for a republic, you can and should demand the concentration of all political power in the hands of the peoples' representatives. And that would suffice for now, if you can't go farther.

Secondly, the reconstitution of Germany, petty states and Prussia. "In my opinion the prol. can only use the form of the one and indiv. republic.... But not in the sense of the French which today is nothing more than the empire of 1798 without the emperor. (Kaiser)

From 1792 to 1798 every Fr. Dept. every community had complete self-administration according to the American model and that is what we must have. Now self-administration is going to be instituted without any America and the first French Rep. show us, and today Australia, Canada and the other English colonies.

14533