

Draft
re Erfahrt Program by Kautsky

by FE

Engels' Critique of the S-D Program of 1891, Neues 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 platitudinarily bring in the word 'Monopolist'."

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

The planlessness based on the essence of capitalist private production requires strong correction. I know capitalist production as a form of society, as economic phase; a capitalist private production as an appearance occurring within this phase or so. What then does capitalist private production mean? Production by private entrepreneurs of which is more and more the exception. Capitalist production by Aktien societies is already not private production any more, but production for the associated reckoning of many, and when we go over from the trusts, which monopolize and rule whole branches of industry, when not only private production but also planlessness ~~is~~ 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 cap. 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 ~~is~~ for fiscal purposes, which puts the state in the place of the private entrepreneurs and thereby unites in one hand the power of the eco. exploitation and the political ~~suppression~~ oppression of the workers." FE takes out 'of the workers.'

92
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 workers can only come to power under the form of the dem. republ. 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 Miguel. 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.

12498