



IN MEMORY OF  
GREAT FREDRIK ENGELS

PROVASH GHOSH

---

Socialist Unity Centre of India (Communist)

# **In Memory of Great Fredrik Engels**

**PROVASH GHOSH**

**Socialist Unity Centre of India (Communist)**

In Memory of Great Fredrik Engels — Provas Ghosh  
[Speech on 28 November, 2020]

First Published : 7 February, 2021

Published by : Amitava Chatterjee  
*Member, Central Committee*  
Socialist Unity Centre of India (Communist)  
48 Lenin Sarani, Kolkata 700013  
Phone : 2265-3234, 2249-1828

Printed at : Ganadabi Printers and Publishers Pvt. Ltd.  
52B Indian Mirror Street, Kolkata 700013

Price : Rs. 15/-

## **Publisher's Note**

28 November, 2020 was the birth bicentenary of Great Fredrik Engels. To commemorate him Comrade Provas Ghosh, General Secretary of SUCI (Communist) addressed the party workers of the whole country through online. Now his discussion is being published as a booklet. Hope this book would help the readers to know the all round greatness of this pioneer of world communist movement.

7 February, 2021  
48, Lenin Sarani  
Kolkata-700013

**Amitava Chatterjee**  
*Member, Central Committee*  
**SUCI (Communist)**



# In Memory of Great Fredrik Engels

Comrade President, comrades and friends.

We are holding this meeting to pay homage to Fredrik Engels, a great pioneer of world communist movement, on his 200th birth anniversary. If we say Marxism or Marxism-Leninism, it is all right. But if you say only Marx it seems as though something is missing. So also, if you simply utter Engels, similarly something appears absent. But if you say “Marx-Engels” it becomes complete. It is like the name of one person. Although physically they were two, in essence they were like a single person in thinking, in ideological understanding, in perception, in practice and in emotional relationship. If I quote their worthy student comrade Lenin on this point, we can understand it. Lenin said,

“Ancient legends tell of various striking examples of friendship. The European proletariat may say that its science was created by two scholars and fighters, whose relations surpass all the most moving tales of the ancients concerning human friendship. Engels had always – placed himself behind Marx”. *(written soon after death of Engels, 1895).*

He wrote “With Marx, I always played second fiddle.” In-fact, this was the highest emotional expression of their comradeship when both of them were engaged in an intense struggle to find out the path of emancipation of the proletariat; educate and organise them accordingly. This emotional relationship is an extraordinary example for us to learn.”

We feel that entire mankind is and will always remain indebted to these Great leaders of the proletariat for their

historic contribution. Is it a tall claim on our part? Why are we remembering a man today who was born in 1820 and died in 1895? How is he related with our present-day life?

### **The present situation**

We know the ills confronting us today are most miserable and horrifying. I am not speaking only of India, but of the entire world. Economically, politically, culturally, morally - in all aspects - total human race seems to be fast heading towards ruination. For the people there is not even a ray of hope. There is not even a mirage for illusion let alone an oasis. We find an ever deepening endless recession is prevailing since few decades. Bourgeois economists are groping in the dark to find a solution, but there is no solution at all. Three fourths of the total wealth of the world is concentrated in the hands of only one percent of the population. Who are they? They are the big corporates, monopoly houses, in other words, imperialists-capitalists. Again 99% of the world population is the owner of only one-fourth of the wealth. If I divide this 99% people further, then among them if you leave out 10% to 15%, you will find the remaining more than 80% people are practically living like beggars or semi-beggars. There are millions of younger generation, who are unemployed, semi employed and retrenched. Everyday and in every hour, millions and millions are dying due to starvation and being denied medical treatment. Many are committing suicide. There are millions of children being born in the streets; many do not even know who their parents are; they collect food from the dustbins, from the leftovers of the rich people.

Politically what is the picture? In the name of democracy, fascist autocracy is reigning everywhere. Parliamentary democracy without political education of the people is hypocrisy without limitation. In the name of election, only selection is there. Monopolies and corporate sector select their servants to be placed in the governmental seat by

engineering mockery of elections. It is the money power and not people's power which decides the verdict in the election. Ruling capitalist class deploy money power, bureaucratic power, media power and muscle power to stage the farcical play of 'free and fair' election only to place its chosen party in power. Common people also feel that by election nothing will change in their lives, only there will be a change of government. They know that they will hear heaps of false promises by all the bourgeois leaders who are hypocrites, fraud and deceivers. Some of them are even debauch.

Recently we witnessed the farce of election in the land of so called greatest democracy, i.e., USA. What happened there? It has put to shame even a local club election. "*Sirf Kursiki Ladhai.*" It reflected simply fight for the chair. This thing happened there. This happens everywhere overtly or covertly. Political leaders know that people are starving; people are begging. Only by giving some false promises, offering some money, the leaders can buy their votes. People also think that in the elections they will get nothing other than some money, alcohol along with feasts for the local youth. This is going on. And there is bureaucracy with the executive power controlling everything in the interest of money power. Judges are promoted, selected, transferred and judgements are made according to the will of the ruling class and the ministerial power. These are very common talks now-a-days. Who controls media? It is the money power. Liberty of individual, freedom of speech, freedom to protest — these are all mere empty words. Voices of protests are muzzled shamelessly and suppressed ruthlessly, ferociously.

### **Mankind is made almost devoid of values**

Almost the entire mankind is now devoid of any values. Earlier there was a time when religious values worked in the society. Afterwards, when these values got exhausted historically, came the humanist values, which was witnessed

at the time of Renaissance followed by the democratic revolutions in the west and in the freedom struggle of the colonies including that of our country. Now-a-days when bourgeois humanism has become nearly exhausted and communist values have yet to prevail in the society, there is no semblance of any values in the society. Actually, a person is not born with any values, ethics or conscience. He or she acquires them from the social environment. If there are values in the society, if there is social conscience, one can acquire it gradually from early childhood. But capitalist rulers have almost destroyed it. Now we are witnessing dehumanized human beings. Physically they are human beings, but without any values. What a pathetic condition! Love, affection, tenderly feeling—these are almost absent in the society. Even in the family life, it is now a common thing that earning sons do not care for their elderly parents. Either they are being sent to old age homes which are like prison houses for the old people or they are driven out of homes only to beg at railway platforms or streets. Parents are even murdered for grabbing their property. Between husband and wife there is absence of love and affection. Distrust and disbelief are eating the sweetness of married life also. And worst is the raping, gang raping and murdering of girls which have become the order of the day. These were never witnessed in the human history like today. In the animal life also, you cannot find this type of raping and gang raping. Even an old lady of 90 years or a child of 3 years is not spared. These rapists are the product of this capitalist civilization. Can it be called civilization at all?

### **Why would we recall Marx and Engels even today?**

Then why we would commemorate Marx and Engels today? They were the thinkers who had foreseen this miserable state of capitalist civilization, had found out its causes and showed the path of salvation. Marx and Engels

conducted a very arduous struggle because of their boundless emotion for the oppressed people. That was a time when the impact of Renaissance had not yet ended in Europe. That was a time when battle between bourgeois democracy and feudal order was not yet settled. By this time some industries had also developed. Bourgeoisie as a class emerged with its anti-thesis, the working class. There were some protest movements of the working class against the bourgeoisie here and there. In brief this was the social backdrop of the emergence of Marx and Engels and their struggle.

Earlier, it was a firm belief among the thinkers, philosophers that class division, division between rich and poor, exploiter and exploited was eternal and permanent. They thought so because — for the thousands of years after the dissolution of the primitive society first came slave system with division between slave masters and slaves, then feudalism appeared with division between feudal lords and serfs and then came capitalism with bourgeoisie and working class as two antagonistic classes which is still continuing. This had led to the strong belief that this class division is eternal, unchangeable and absolute.

Another strong idea among the philosophers was that there was a supernatural power behind nature, there was a divine power and absolute idea prior to the creation of the world and which was controlling the world including its social life. Everything is pre-determined by that absolute power. According to that, class division and exploitation also is pre-determined and unchangeable. Exploited people also took this as absolute truth. Was it correct? Through an arduous struggle to study, examine and re-examine critically the different views particularly the philosophy of Hegel and Feuerbach, the political economy of Adam Smith and Ricardo and the “utopian socialism” of Saint Simon, Robert Owen and Charles Fourier — Marx along with Engels scientifically concluded that these views were wrong and boldly declared that the material world is the only objective

reality. There is no supernatural power behind nature. No divine power or absolute idea exists which controls and pre-determines the material world. Matter is in motion and in the process of continuous change. Always something coming into being and going out of being. Similarly, class division is also not eternal. Ancient society, in other words, primitive society had no classes. There was no private property and accordingly there was also no concept of private ownership of property. Class division came later on in the society following the development of production. Social systems also change. Class divided slave system, feudalism, capitalism all these social systems came into being one after another according to social laws and following the same law class division would be abolished and there would be classless society. They concluded that in nature, in the material world, starting from latest discovered smallest particle to till known greatest planet, everything is in the process of continuous change governed by certain laws. Similarly, human history also is in the process of change governed by certain laws. And there are some universal general laws governing both nature and human society. And, for these scientific, liberating ideologies these two great thinkers would be ever remembered in history, although they were not recognized in their time. Humanity would remain ever indebted to these great men for their historical contribution.

Today on this occasion of 200th birth anniversary of Fredrik Engels, I will confine mostly on his role in assisting Marx in this historic struggle.

### **Son of an industrialist turned into the guide of the proletariat**

What I have discussed up till now was according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh thought, as I have understood them. Now on I will mostly read and quote from Engels and Lenin. It may be a bit hard for you.

Some may feel bored too. But I am helpless. Due to shortage of time I cannot elaborate. I will request you to follow the discussion because these are very important lessons to guide our struggle. And if time permits, after this chapter is completed, I would like to discuss some more points.

Most of us may feel surprised by knowing that a son of an industrialist who was compelled to look after an industrial enterprise, turned into a pioneer in showing the path of revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Engels's father was an industrialist. At the age of 14, he was sent to high school which was called gymnasium in their country. Before completion of studies there, his father forced him to abandon his school and sent him to a nearby town to learn how to run business disallowing his ardent desire to continue study. But Engels had the mind to acquire knowledge. Already when he was a young school student, he learned many languages like Latin, Greek, German, and French. He studied French literature and German literature when he was a school boy. When he was sent for learning business, there also he continued studying on his own. He studied Socrates, Plato, Spinoza and Hegel. For one year he was sent to Berlin for a compulsory military training. In Berlin, he came in contact with Feuerbach's philosophy and there also he learned English and Spanish languages. He could easily read and write 12 languages and he could speak 20 languages. He used to study philosophy, economy, natural science, history and literature i.e almost all branches of knowledge. Such was his thirst for knowledge.

Ultimately, he was sent to Manchester in England. There his father had a partnership in an industry. He had serious differences with his father. Father was religious minded and Engels was opposed to religion. Father was very bureaucratic also. Engels wrote to Marx with much pain,

“Was it not for mother whom I dearly love, I would not have stood it even the few days which still remain

before my departure. You cannot imagine...It is particularly abominable to remain not only a bourgeois but even a manufacturer, i.e., a bourgeois who comes actively against the proletariat.”

Thus, writing to Marx he continues :

“I console myself by working on my book on the condition of the working class.”(*Marx-Engels Correspondence 1846-1895: A Selection, International Publishers.*)

In that book, ‘The condition of the working class in England’ which he wrote in 1845, he said —

“These workers have no property whatsoever of their own, live wholly upon their wages, which usually go from hand to mouth...Every working man, even the best is therefore constantly exposed to loss of work and food,.. that is to death by starvation...The dwellings of workers are so badly planned, badly built,.. badly ventilated, damp...at least one family usually sleeps in each room in smallest possible space....The bourgeoisie has gained a monopoly of all means of existence in the broadest sense of the word. The proletariat is, therefore, in law and in fact, the slave of the bourgeoisie which can decree his life and death...the farm hands have become day-labourers; are employed only when needed by farmers, and, therefore often have no work for weeks together, especially in winter, ...their food scanty and bad, their clothing ragged, their dwellings cramped and desolate,.... Moreover, they cannot combine to raise wages,....The workers must therefore strive to escape from this brutalizing condition to secure for themselves a better, more human position; and this they cannot do without attacking the interest of the bourgeoisie which consists in exploiting them. ...But the bourgeoisie defends its interests with all the power placed at its disposal by wealth and might of the state, ...the law...is enacted...for his benefit and protection ... the political movement of the working

class will inevitably lead the workers to realise that their only salvation lies in socialism.” Note that, this description of the lives of the workers and peasants are just like the situation of our country and of the world to-day.

Reading this book Marx evaluated ;

“He completely understood the nature of the mode of production.”

Appreciating this work Lenin wrote,

“There were many even before Engels, who described the sufferings of the proletariat and showed the necessity of helping it. Engels was the first to say that the proletariat is not only a suffering class; that it is, in fact, the disgraceful economic condition of the proletariat that drives it irresistibly forward and compels it to fight for its ultimate emancipation...The political movement of the working class will inevitably lead the workers to realise that their only salvation lies in socialism. The book was a terrible indictment of capitalism and the bourgeoisie and created a profound impression. Engels’ book began to be quoted everywhere as presenting the best picture of the condition of the modern proletariat. And, in fact, neither before 1845 nor after has there appeared so striking and truthful a picture of the misery of the working class.”(*Frederick Engels: written soon after death of Engels, 1895*).

### **Beginning of the joint journey**

Engels had first met Marx when he had visited the office of ‘Rheinische Zeitung’ at Cologne in 1842 but they had no opportunity to discuss with each other.

In 1844, an article ‘Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy’ written by Engels was published in a journal Deutsch – Franzosische Jahrbucher (German French year book) jointly edited by Marx and Arnold Ruge, through which Marx came to know of Engels’ views for the first

time. When Engels visited Paris from England in 1844, he met Marx, and they had detailed exchange of views of which Engels wrote, “our complete agreement in all theoretical fields became evident and our joint work dates from that time.” This meeting was a historic event. Because from then on started a historic joint struggle by two great men to enunciate the path of the emancipation of oppressed class and end of class exploitation once and for all in human civilisation, which was considered hitherto quite absurd.

### **How ideological uniformity of the two great men developed**

Marx wrote in 1859 an introduction to his essay named “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.” In that introduction Marx wrote:

“Friedrich Engels, with whom I maintained a constant exchange of ideas by letters since the publication of his brilliant essay on the critique of economic categories arrived by another road at the same result as I (*Note this – ‘arrived by another road, at the same result as I’*) and when in the spring of 1845 he too came to live in Brussels, we decided to set forth together our conception as opposed to the ideological one of German philosophy, in fact to settle accounts with our former philosophical conscience.”

On this event Engels also wrote in 1888 on the ‘History of Communist League’ —

“While I was in Manchester, it was tangibly brought home to me that economic facts which have so far played no role or a contemplative one in the writing of history, are, at least in the modern world, a decisive historical force; that they form the basis of the origination of the present-day class antagonisms; these antagonisms are in their turn the basis of the formation of the political parties and party struggles, and thus of all political history. Marx had not only arrived at the

same view, but had already generalized it to the effect that, speaking generally, it is not the state which conditions and regulates the civil society (bourgeois society), but civil society which conditions and regulates the state, and, consequently, that policy and its history are to be explained from the economic relations and their development, and not vice versa. When I visited Marx in Paris in the summer of 1844, our complete agreement in all theoretical fields became evident and our joint work dates from that time. When, in the spring of 1845, we met again in Brussels, Marx had already fully developed his materialist theory of history in its main features from the above-mentioned basis and we now applied ourselves to the detailed elaboration of the newly-won mode of outlook in the most varied directions.... This discovery, which revolutionized the science of history and, as we have seen, is essentially the work of Marx — a discovery in which I can claim for myself only a very insignificant share — was, however, of immediate importance for the contemporary workers' movement.”

When Engels arrived in Paris, Marx had already been working on a polemical treatise, ‘The Holy Family’. Though Engels did not contribute much to it, on Marx’s insistence it was published under joint authorship in 1845. Then again in 1846, they jointly wrote ‘German Ideology’ where they fought against idealistic and utopian concepts and provided a scientific basis of socialism.

### **Lenin considered both Marx and Engels as the founders of modern socialism**

Now let me read Lenin on Marx-Engels, because it is more vivid and very educative which I cannot express in my own language. “The great worldwide historic service of Marx and Engels lies in the fact, that they proved by scientific analysis the inevitability of down fall of capitalism and its transition to communism under which there will be

no more exploitation of man by man.”

“The great worldwide historic service of Marx and Engels lies in this that they indeed indicated to the proletarians of all countries their role, their task, their calling: to be the first to rise in the revolutionary fight against capital and unite around themselves in this struggle all the toilers and the exploited. (*Speech at the unveiling of a Monument to Marx and Engels on November 7, 1918*).”

...In their scientific works, Marx and Engels were the first to explain that socialism is not the fancy of dreamers, but the final aim and inevitable result of the development of the productive forces in modern society. ...The names of Marx and Engels’ are justly placed side by side as names of founders of modern socialism.” (*Frederick Engels: written soon after the death of Engels in 1895*).

It is impossible to understand Marxism and to propound it fully without taking into account all the works of Engels’s ‘Ludwig Feuerbach, the end of German classical philosophy’ and ‘Anti Duhring’ which, like ‘Communist Manifesto’, are hand books for every class-conscious worker. Here, you have obviously noted that Lenin decisively mentioned both Marx and Engels as “founders of modern socialism”.

### **Marx was ahead but Engels also was his co-worker**

Why I am discussing in this way? When we say about Lenin and Stalin, we know Lenin was the teacher and Stalin was the worthy student of Lenin. But when we talk about Marx and Engels, we cannot say Engels was the worthy student of Marx. He was the co-worker and co-founder of ‘modern socialism’ as expressed by Lenin although Marx was ahead of him. Definitely Marx guided Engels. But Engels also by dialectical interaction helped Marx to advance. This point we should note.

## **Engels suggested to Marx to study Political Economy**

Another noteworthy point, which was unknown to many of us was mentioned by Lenin that “Contact with Engels was undoubtedly a factor in Marx’s decision to study political economy, the science in which his works have produced a veritable revolution.”

When Engels stayed in Manchester and Marx stayed in London, almost every-day they exchanged letters. Some days, even twice or thrice they exchanged letters. Referring to this Lenin wrote :

“In their letters Marx and Engels return again and again to the most diverse aspects of their doctrine, emphasizing and explaining — at times discussing and debating — what is newest (in relation to earlier views), most important and difficult. If one were to attempt to define in a single word the focus, so to speak, of the whole correspondence, the central point at which the whole body of ideas expressed and discussed converges — that word would be *dialectics*. The application of materialistic dialectics to the reshaping of all political economy from its foundation up, its application to history, natural science, philosophy and to the policy and tactics of the working class.”(*Marx Engels Correspondence, 1913*).

## **After Marx’s death, Engels devoted all his time to complete Marx’s unfinished work — ‘Capital’**

As early as 1873, in a letter to Marx, Engels expressed his plan to write a large work on dialectics in nature. He said, working out of these ideas ‘required much time’. On November 23, 1882, he wrote to Marx that he expected shortly to finish his ‘Dialectics of Nature’. Marx’s death (March 14, 1883), however compelled Engels to suspend this work and as he mentioned in the preface to the Second

Edition of ‘Anti Duhring’, to busy himself with ‘more urgent duties’. He wrote,

“I am under the obligation to prepare for the press the manuscript which Marx has left, and this is much more important than anything else.” Thus he engaged himself fully for the publication of other volumes of ‘Capital’, as he considered” ‘Das Capital’, often called, on the continent, ‘the Bible of the working class’ to be of utmost importance. That the conclusions arrived at in this work are daily more and more becoming the fundamental principles of the great working-class movement.”

On his service in preparing 2nd and 3rd volumes of ‘Capital’ let me quote Lenin. He said,

“Marx died before completing his great work ‘Capital’. However, there were rough drafts. And Engels after the death of his friend undertook the heavy labour of working up and publishing the second and third volume of ‘capital’. In 1885, he published the second and in 1894 he published the third volume. He died in 1895 and could not publish the fourth volume. A great deal of work was required on these two volumes. An Austrian social democrat rightly remarked that ‘by the publication of volume II and III of ‘Capital’, Engels erected in memory of the genius that has been as his friend, a majestic monument on which he without intending it indelibly carved his own name’. These two volumes of ‘Capital’ are, indeed the work of both Marx and Engels. ... His love for Marx when the latter was alive and his reverence for Marx’s memory after the latter’s death were infinite.”

Marx desired to publish ‘Capital’ as a complete work with all the volumes together. Engels advised him not to do so. Actually, it was not completed yet. ‘So, publish the first volume’ — advised Engels. It was a very good advice. Otherwise, humanity would have missed the publication of this first volume of ‘Capital’ in Marx’s life time. According

to Engels' advice, Marx published his first volume. And to popularize it Engels wrote articles after articles in different newspapers — sometimes appreciating, sometimes criticizing it in a clever way so that people began to feel attraction to read it.

### **Engels' works greatly enriched the treasure house of Marxism**

Lenin advised that Engels works “Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy”, “Anti-Duhring” along with “The communist manifesto” are the handbooks of every class-conscious worker. Here I want to add some more of his works like “Dialectics of Nature”, a chapter from Anti-Duhring, that is, “socialism: utopian and scientific”, “The part played by labour in the transition from ape to man” which is a chapter in “Dialectics of Nature” and then “Origin of family, private property and the state”. These also should be considered as unique contributions of Engels. Engels wrote many important books. If time permits, I will read few important portions from some of his celebrated books.

### **Basic difference between Hegel and Marx**

Let me mention that Engels wrote in 1859, in his work “Karl Marx, A contribution to the Critique of Political Economy” thus:

“Marx was and is the only one who could undertake the work of extracting from the Hegelian logic the kernel containing Hegel's real discoveries in this field, and of establishing the dialectical method, divested of its idealist wrappings, in the simple form in which it becomes the only correct mode of conceptual evolution.”

It is known that Hegel's philosophy was dialectical idealism; Marx developed a completely opposite one, in

other words, dialectical materialism. Regarding this, Marx wrote in 1873, in the introduction of the first volume of *Capital* :

“My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but it is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life process of the human brain, in other words, the process of thinking, which, under the name of “Idea,” he even transforms it into an independent subject, is the ‘demiurgos’ (creator) of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of ‘the Idea’. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the mind, and translated into forms of thought.”

Further Marx said,

“The mystifying side of Hegelian dialectics, I had criticized nearly 30 years ago.”

That meant Marx had criticized Hegel’s idealism in 1843.

This was the basic difference between Hegel and Marx as pointed out by both Marx and Engels.

### **Engels explains why Dialectical Materialism is named after Marx**

In 1888, there is a note written by Engels in his celebrated book ‘Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy’, to clarify why the philosophy was named as Marxism without mentioning his name. He had written,

“I hope, I may be permitted here to make a remark by way of personal explanation. Reference has been frequently made in recent days to my share in the formation of this theory, (i.e., dialectical materialism — Marxism) and I can therefore hardly avoid the necessity of here making, in a few words, a final statement on this subject.

I cannot deny that I had an independent share before

as well as during my forty years of work with Marx, in laying down as well as — more particularly — in the elaboration of the theory. But the overwhelming part of the basic and leading ideas, especially in the domains of history and economics, as well as the final and the keen statements of them belongs to Marx. What I have contributed, Marx could have easily filled in without my aid, with the exception perhaps of two or three special branches of knowledge. But what Marx did, I could have never done. Marx stood higher, saw farther, had a wider, more comprehensive and swifter view than all of us. Marx was a genius; we were at best talented. Without him our theory would have been far from what it is now. It is therefore justly called by his name.”

Now I like to read another instance. In 1893, Franz Mehring wrote a book on historical materialism. He sent it to Engels for comments. Engels first appreciated the work and then commented :

“If I find anything to object to it is that you give me more credit than I deserve. Even if I count in everything which I might possibly have found out for myself eventually but which Marx with his more rapid *coup d’oeil* (*quick glance*) and wider vision discovered much more quickly. When one had the good fortune to work for forty years with a man like Marx, one usually does not during his lifetime get the recognition one thinks one deserves. Then, when the greater man dies, the lesser easily gets overrated and this seems to me to be just my case at present; history will set all this right in the end and by that time one will manage to kick the bucket and not know anything anymore about anything.”

See what great culture and ethics he had. This is to be learned by all of us. There is no attempt for self-projection or to usurp credit, not a grain of attempt for name or fame. People are appreciating him and he is criticizing them saying “You are overrating me”, appreciating and highlighting

always the great contribution of Marx. This is the character of Engels. A great character, a very rare if not rarest in history.

### **Engels had saved Marx's life from starvation**

Marx and his family were almost in a starving condition for a few decades. And it was Engels who used to send money to save Marx and his family from starvation. Engels looked after a company where his father had a share. Against his will he joined there. After a period of break, again he joined there only to help Marx. When his father died Engels sold the entire inherited share. Whatever money he got, with that he aided Marx.

It is to be noted that Engels was the first man who recognised the great role of Marx as a pioneer to show the path of emancipation of the proletariat and thereby end class division and exploitation once and for all. So, he felt the imperative duty to save this precious life at any cost.

Marx had acknowledged this in a letter to Engels,

“Amidst all the terrible miseries I have lived through in these days the thought of you and your friendship always kept me going on with the hope that we still have something worth doing together in the world.”

Again in 1862 Marx wrote,

“Could you not come here for few days? I have set aside so many old things in my critique that there are several points on which I would like to consult you before I go on.”

See, how Marx used to count on the opinion of Engels.

Marx sent the proofs of his work “capital” to Engels and wrote,

“your satisfaction until now is more important to me than anything the rest of the world may say of it.”

See, how much Marx valued the friendship and opinion of Engels.

## **Engels on the historic contribution of Marx**

In 1877, Engels wrote an article on the historic contribution of Marx, where he said,

“Karl Marx, the man who was the first to give socialism and thereby the whole labour movement of our day, a scientific foundation. The whole previous view of history was based on the conception that the ultimate causes of all historical changes are to be looked for in the changing ideas of human beings and that of all historical and political changes are the most important and dominate the whole of history. But the questions were not asked as to whence the ideas come into men’s minds and what the driving causes of the political changes are.... Marx has proved that the whole of previous history (excepting primitive history) is a history of class struggles, that in all the manifold and complicated political struggles the only thing at issues has been the social and political role of social classes, the maintenance of domination by older classes and conquest of domination by newly arising classes. To what, however, do these classes owe their origin and their continued existence? They owe it to the particular material, physically sensible conditions in which society at a given period produces and exchanges its means of subsistence. ...This new conception of history, however, was of supreme significance for the socialist outlook. It showed that all previous history moved in class antagonisms and class struggles, that there have always existed ruling and ruled, exploiting and exploited classes, and that the great majority of the mankind has always been condemned to arduous labour and little enjoyment. ... the ruling big bourgeoisie has fulfilled its historic mission, that it is no longer capable of the leadership of the society and has even become a hindrance to the development of production, ...that historical leadership has passed to the proletariat, a class which, owing to its whole position in society can only free itself by abolishing altogether all class rule, all servitude, all exploitation. ...

The second discovery of Marx is the final elucidation of the relation between capital and labour, in other words, the demonstration of how, within present society and under the existing capitalist mode of production, the exploitation of the workers by the capitalist takes place.

Modern scientific socialism is based on these two parts.”

### **Engels after the demise of Marx**

Now I will read some portions from Engels’ speech after the death of Marx .

“On the 14th of March at quarter to 3 in the afternoon the greatest living thinker ceased to think. Just as Darwin discovered the law of development of organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of development of human history, but that is not all. Marx also discovered special law of motion governing the present day capitalist mode of production and the bourgeois society that this mode of production has created. The discovery of surplus value suddenly threw light on the problem in time to solve which all previous investigations of both bourgeois economists and socialist critics had been groping in dark. Two such discoveries would be enough for one lifetime. Happy the man to whom it is granted to make even one such discovery. But in every single field which Marx investigated — and he investigated very many fields, none of them superficially — in every field, even in that of mathematics, he made independent discoveries. Such was the man of science. But this was not even half the man. Science was for Marx a historically dynamic, revolutionary force. However great the joy with which he welcomed a new discovery in some theoretical science whose practical application perhaps it was as yet quite impossible to envisage. For example, he followed closely the development of the discoveries made in the field of electricity.. For Marx

was before all else a revolutionist. His real mission in life was to contribute, in one way or another, to the overthrow of the capitalist society and of the state institutions which it had brought into being, to contribute to the liberation of the modern proletariat, which he was the first to make conscious of its own position and its needs, conscious of the conditions of its emancipation.... His name will endure through the ages and so also his works.”

In brief, I have read the evaluation of Marx by Engels after his death.

In 1885, see how Engels highlighted Marx’s contribution in the preface to *Anti-Duhring* where he wrote,

“I must note in passing that in as much as the mode of outlook expounded in this book was founded and developed in far greater measure by Marx, and only to an insignificant degree by myself, it was self-understood between us that this exposition of mine should not be issued without his knowledge. I read the whole manuscript to him before it was printed, and the tenth chapter of the part on economics was written by Marx”.

In *Anti-Duhring*, Engels dealt on science also. Part of it was published in 1880 separately in a book titled “*Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*”, where he fought Utopian Socialist school. Actually, the book *Anti-Duhring* was one of the renowned writings of Engels. But see how he has placed the leading role of Marx in writing this book.

In the 1888 edition of “*Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German Philosophy*” Engels acknowledging the role of Marx wrote:

“In the preface to ‘*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*’, published in Berlin, 1859, Karl Marx relates how the two of us in Brussels in the year 1845 set about: ‘to work out in common the opposition of our view’ — the materialist conception of history which was elaborated mainly by Marx — to the

ideological view of German philosophy, in fact, to settle accounts with our erstwhile philosophical conscience. The resolve was carried out in the form of a criticism of post-Hegelian philosophy.” But it was not printed. Engels continued, “Since then 40 years have elapsed and Marx died without either of us having had an opportunity of returning to the subject. We have expressed ourselves in various places regarding our relation to Hegel, but nowhere in a comprehensive, connected account. To Feuerbach, who after all in many respects forms an intermediate link between Hegelian philosophy and our conception, we never returned,” Thus reasons for writing this book was explained by Engels. Engels also said: “Before writing it, I got notes hurriedly scribbled down by Marx for later elaboration, absolutely not intended for publication, but invaluable as the first document in which is deposited the brilliant germ of the new world outlook.”

Again in the book “Origin of family private property and state” Engels wrote in the preface:

“The following chapters constitute in a sense, the fulfilment of a bequest. It was no less a person than Karl Marx who had planned to present the results of Morgan’s researches in the light of conclusions of his own — within certain limits, I must say our own— materialistic investigation of history, and thus to make clear for the first time their whole significance... My work can offer only a meagre substitute for what my departed friend who no longer had the time to accomplish. But I have before me the critical notes which he made with his extensive extracts from Morgan, and as far as possible I reproduce them here.”

### **The Communist Manifesto — A milestone**

Let me speak regarding the background of “The Communist Manifesto” which was written in 1848. At that time both Marx and Engels were in Communist League. It was an organization in which they joined. That organization

suggested, rather entrusted them with the responsibility to draft “The Communist Manifesto”. Before drafting this communist manifesto, Engels drafted “Principles of Communism”, which served as the basis for writing Communist Manifesto.

Regarding the German edition of the Communist Manifesto, Engels wrote with pain because in the same year of its publication in 1883, Marx died:

“The preface to the present edition I must, alas, sign alone. Marx, the man to whom the whole working class of Europe and America owes more than to anyone else, rests at Highgate Cemetery and over his grave the first grass is already growing. Since his death, there can be even less thought of revising or supplementing the Manifesto. All the more do I consider it necessary again to state here the following expressly :

The basic thought running through the Manifesto — that economic production and the structure of society of every historical epoch necessarily arising therefrom constitute the foundation for the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently all history (excepting primitive society) has been a history of class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social development; that this struggle, however, has now reached a stage where the exploited and oppressed class can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it, without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression and class struggles — this basic thought belongs solely and exclusively to Marx.”

Regarding Marx, in a letter to Bernstein, Engels wrote in 1881, that,

“By theoretical and practical achievements Marx has gained for himself such a position that the best people

in all the working-class movements throughout the world have full confidence in him. At critical junctures they turn to him for advice, then usually find his counsel is best,... It is therefore not a case of Marx forcing his opinion, and still less his will, on people. And it is upon this that Marx's peculiar influence, so extremely important for the movement, reposes."

### **Paul Lafarge on Engels**

Now I will quote few words of Paul Lafarge, son-in-law of Marx on Engels after his demise. He wrote,

"I made the acquaintance of Engels in 1867 — the year in which the first volume of 'Capital' was published. 'I must introduce you to Engels', said Marx to me, 'as you are engaged to my daughter,'...It is impossible to speak about Engels without referring at the same to Marx. The web of their lives was so closely interwoven that it was as if, were only one life,...(p-483, *Social Democrat*, vol-9, no.-8, 15 August 1905)

Engels, who had lived in England and studied there the theories of political economy, the conditions of the workers, the rise of industry and the Chartist movement, exercised an undaunted influence on the mind of Marx, who, up till then, had been mainly interested with philosophy, history, law and mathematics. It was Engels who first advised him to turn his attention to political economy.. Soon it became clear to Marx that in the study of economics was to be found the key to the history of society and of ideas. Engels told me that Marx in 1848, in Paris.. had first sketched out to him the outlines of his theory of the materialist conception of history.

Engels and Marx had acquired the habit of working together. Engels in this way often acted as a stimulus on Marx, who did not like to begin his work till he had got anything well in hand and was at times too

diffident to begin....

Marx was never weary of expressing astonishment at the universality of the knowledge of Engels, as well as the wonderful keenness of his mind, which enabled him to see things with lightning rapidity; and Engels was always ready to recognise the powers of Marx's analysis and synthesis. When they were not together they used to study the same subjects in order to communicate to each other the results of their researches. They had the highest opinion of each other...each one was always thinking how he could serve the other, and each was proud of the other. ...after Marx's death it was his duty to look through manuscripts and to prepare for the press his (Marx's) unpublished works. Engels put on one side all that he had prepared relating to his universal philosophy of knowledge, at which he had been working for more than ten years, and for which he had made a survey of all sciences and their latest progress, in order to devote himself to the preparation of the two last volumes of 'Capital'."

### **Engels' contribution in the development of Marx**

What I can say now is that in the struggle of Marx there is also the contribution of Engels. Everything develops in dialectical contradiction. Between Marx and Engels the emotional bond was based on dialectical interaction. Rightly Marx was ahead of Engels, as Engels himself stated. Engels could not develop without Marx's guidance and help. And to a considerable extent, Engels also contributed to the development of Marx as stated by Lenin who identified Engels as "Co-worker" or "Co-founder" of scientific socialism. So, in spite of Engels's admission regarding Marx, "I always played second fiddle", it cannot be accepted in that way. Other than his own contribution in applying dialectics in some subjects particularly in science; in the subjects where he interpreted and elaborated Marx's

views, there also one will find his brilliant creativeness and those are invaluable assets in the treasure house of Marxism. I will read now for your knowledge the list of books that were written jointly by them and also singly by Engels.

In 1845: “The Condition of the Working Class In England” by Engels

In 1846: jointly they wrote “German Ideology”

In 1847: Engels wrote “Principles of Communism”

In 1847-48: jointly they wrote “Manifesto of The Communist Party”

In 1851-53: Engels wrote “Revolution and Counter Revolution In Germany”

In 1859: Engels wrote “Karl Marx: A Contribution To The Critique of Political Economy”

In 1875: Engels wrote on “Social Relations in Russia”

In 1875-76: Engels wrote “Introduction to The Dialectics of Nature”

In 1876: Engels wrote “The Part Played by Labour In The Transition From Ape To Man”

In 1877: Engels wrote “Socialism: Utopian And Scientific”

In 1877: Engels wrote on “Karl Marx”

In 1884: Engels wrote “Origin of Family, Private Property And State”

In 1885: Engels wrote on the “History of Communist League”

In 1886: Engels wrote “Ludwig Feuerbach and The End of Classical German Philosophy”

In 1874: Engels wrote “The Peasant Question In France and Germany”

In 1873-86: Engels wrote “Dialectics Of Nature”

In 1878: Engels wrote “Old Preface To Anti-Duhring”

In 1878: Engels wrote “Anti-Duhring”

I am not sure if this list is complete.

Engels wrote a good number of books with the sole purpose of popularizing Marx and Marxism and

strengthening international working-class movements.

Now let me read a few portions from some of his books. My selections may not satisfy all of you.

### **Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of Classical German Philosophy**

Let me discuss the backdrop of the invaluable contribution of Engels in his 'Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy', written in 1888. Engels sets the aim and object of the book in the preface as:

“...A short connected account of our relation to the Hegelian philosophy of how we proceeded from as well as of how we separated from it, appeared to me to be required more and more.

...To Feuerbach, who after all in many respects forms an intermediate link between Hegelian philosophy and our conception, we never returned.”(p-324-325; *Marx Engels: vol-II, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1949*)

The decision to write a book was taken by both Marx and Engels in the year 1845. They prepared a manuscript, which could not be published at that time. After forty three years, he had written with enriched knowledge to explain the views of Hegel and Feuerbach and their differences with Marxian philosophy. He had shown that the concept of morality expressed by Feuerbach was nothing but humanism serving the interest of bourgeoisie.

Here he pointed out the basic difference between idealism and materialism. He said :

“Thus the question of the relation of thinking to being, the relation of the spirit to nature — the paramount question of the whole of philosophy...”(p-334)

“The answers which the philosophers gave to this question split them into two great camps. Those who

asserted the primacy of spirit to nature and, therefore, in the last instance, assumed world creation in some form or other ... comprised the camp of idealism. The others, who regarded nature as primary, belong to the various schools of materialism.”(p-335)

Then he explained the views of Hegel as follows:

“According to Hegel, dialectics is the self-development of the concept. The absolute concept does not only exist — unknown where — from eternity, it is also the actual living soul of the whole existing world. ... Then it “alienates” itself by changing into nature, where, without unconscious of itself, disguised as the necessity of nature, it goes through a new development and finally comes again to self-consciousness in man. This self-consciousness then elaborates itself again in history from the crude form until finally the absolute concept again comes to itself completely in the Hegelian philosophy.”... (p-350)

“While materialism conceives nature as the sole reality, nature in the Hegelian system represents merely the “alienation” of the absolute idea, so to say, a degradation of the idea. At all events, thinking and its thought-product, the idea, is here the primary, nature the derivative, which only exists at all by the condescension of the idea. ... According to him, nature, as a mere ‘alienation’ of the idea, is incapable of development in time — capable only of extending its manifoldness in space, so that it displays simultaneously and alongside of one another all the stages of development comprised in it, and is condemned to an eternal repetition of the same process.”(p-332)

Engels pointed out how Feuerbach breaking with Hegel began as materialist but ‘remained bound by the traditional idealist fetters :

“Matter is not a product of mind, but mind itself is merely the highest product of matter. This is, of course, pure materialism. But, having got so far,

Feuerbach stops short. He cannot overcome the customary philosophical prejudice, prejudice not against the thing but against the name materialism. He says: ‘To me materialism is the foundation of the edifice of human essence and knowledge; but to me it is not what it is to the physiologist, to the natural scientists in the narrower sense, for example, to Moleschott, and necessarily is from their standpoint and profession, namely, the edifice itself. Backwards I fully agree with the materialists; but not forwards.’”(p:337)

“In spite of the ‘foundation’, he remained here bound by the traditional idealist fetters, a fact which he recognizes in these words: ‘Backwards I agree with the materialists, but not forwards!’ But, it was Feuerbach himself who did not go ‘forwards’ here;...”(p:340)”

Then Engels exposed the idealism of Feuerbach in his philosophy of religion and ethics and his misconception that secular humanist morality enunciated by him was applicable for all periods and all classes.

“The real idealism of Feuerbach becomes evident as soon as we come to his philosophy of religion and ethics. He by no means wishes to abolish religion; he wants to perfect it. Philosophy itself must be absorbed in religion.”(p-342)

“Rational self-restraint with regard to ourselves and love — again and again love — in our intercourse with others — these are the basic laws of Feuerbach’s morality; from them, all others are derived.”(p-346)

“...the Feuerbachian theory of morals fares like all its predecessors. It is designed to suit all periods, all peoples and all conditions, and precisely for that reason it is never and nowhere applicable.”(p-348)

Here he mentioned how Marx refuted Feuerbach’s standpoint.

“But the step which Feuerbach did not take had

nevertheless to be taken. The cult of abstract man, which formed the kernel of Feuerbach's new religion, had to be replaced by the science of real men and of their historical development. This further development of Feuerbach's standpoint beyond Feuerbach was inaugurated by Marx in 1845 in *The Holy Family*."(p-348)

In an old note book of Marx, eleven theses on Feuerbach was found by Engels on which he commented with much appreciation that, "in which is deposited the brilliant germ of the new world outlook." Those were printed as an appendix of his book. Here I like to mention some of the points of Marx's historic thesis.

1. "Feuerbach starts out from the fact of religious self-alienation, the duplication of the world into a religious, imaginary world and a real one. His work consists in the dissolution of the religious world into its secular basis. He overlooks the fact that after completing this work, the chief thing still remains to be done. For the fact that the secular foundation detaches itself from itself and establishes itself in the clouds as an independent realm is really only to be explained by the self cleavage and self-contradictoriness of this secular basis."...(p:403, *Karl Marx, Theses on Feuerbach; Marx Engels Selected Works, vol-II*)
2. "Feuerbach resolves the religious essence into the human essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations. Feuerbach who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence, is consequently compelled :
  - a) To abstract from the historical process and to fix the religious sentiment (Gemut) as something by itself and to presuppose an abstract — isolated-human individual.
  - b) The human essence, therefore, can with him be comprehended only as 'genus', as an internal, dumb generality which merely naturally unites the

many individuals.”(p:403-404)

3. “Feuerbach, consequently, does not see that the ‘religious sentiment’ is itself a social product, and that the abstract individual whom he analyzes belongs in reality to a particular form of society.”(p:404)
4. “The highest point attained by contemplative materialism, that is, materialism which does not understand sensuousness as practical activity, is the contemplation of single individuals in ‘civil society’.”(p:404)
5. “The standpoint of the old materialism is ‘civil’ society; the standpoint of the new is human society, or socialized humanity.”(p:404)
6. “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it.” (p:404)

### **Against the theses of Duhring**

Eugene Duhring, philosophically an idealist, came out with the claim of a radical revolution in philosophy, political economy and socialism to counter Marxism by creating confusion and Engels was compelled to expose him through his famous book ‘Anti-Duhring’ in 1894. Let me quote from the book:

“...Mankind therefore finds itself faced with a contradiction: on the one hand, it has to gain an exhaustive knowledge of the world system in all its interrelations; and on the other hand, because of the nature both of men and of the world system, this task can never be completely fulfilled. But this contradiction lies not only in the nature of the two factors — the world, and man — it is also the main lever of all intellectual advance, and finds its solution continuously, day by day, in the endless progressive evolution of humanity, just as for example mathematical problems find their solution in an infinite series or continued fractions. Each mental image of the

world system is and remains in actual fact limited, objectively by the historical conditions and subjectively by the physical and mental constitution of its originator.”(p-57, *Anti Duhring: Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954*)

On mathematics, its origin from the need of mankind and its connections with the real world, he said—

“Pure mathematics deals with the space forms and quantity relations of the real world — that is, with material which is very real indeed. The fact that this material appears in an extremely abstract form can only superficially conceal its origin from the external world.”(p-58)

“Like all other sciences, mathematics arose out of the *needs* of men: from the measurement of land and the content of vessels, from the computation of time and from mechanics.”(p-59)

“Eternity in time, infinity in space, signify from the start and in the simple meaning of the words that there is no end in *any* direction neither forwards nor backwards, upwards or downwards, to the right or to the left.”(p-73)

In respect to matter in motion Engels writes:

“*Motion is the mode of existence of matter.* Never anywhere has there been matter without motion, nor can there be.” (p-86)

“Matter without motion is just as inconceivable as motion without matter. Motion is therefore as uncreatable and indestructible as matter itself...”(p-86)

Regarding the class division of the society and its influence on ethics and morality, he said:

“...as society has hitherto moved in class antagonisms, morality has always been class morality; it has either justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or ever since the oppressed class became

powerful enough, it has represented its indignation against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed. That in this process there has on the whole been progress in morality, as in all other branches of human knowledge, no one will doubt. But we have not yet passed beyond class morality. A really human morality which stands above class antagonisms and above any recollection of them becomes possible only at a stage of society which has not only overcome class antagonisms but has even forgotten them in practical life.” (p-132-133)

### **Socialism : Utopian and Scientific**

In the ‘Special Introduction to The English Edition of 1892’, Engels laid down the background of this book and why he was compelled to write it. Here, while paying due respect to the utopian socialists, eminent men like Saint Simon, Fourier and Robert Owen, he fought their ideas and proved that scientific socialism, as evolved from the materialist conception of history by Marx, is the only road to a socialist society, where there will be no more exploitation of man by man. Here he proved why Utopian Socialist concepts are wrong but scientific ideas are correct. I will read out a few excerpts from the book:

“The Socialism of earlier days certainly criticized the existing capitalistic mode of production and its consequences. But it could not explain them, and, therefore, could not get the mastery of them. It could only simply reject them as bad. The more strongly this earlier Socialism denounced the exploitations of the working-class, inevitable under Capitalism, the less able was it clearly to show in what this exploitation consisted and how it arose, but for this it was necessary —(1) to present the capitalistic mode of production in its historical connection and its inevitableness during a particular historical period, and therefore, also, to present its inevitable downfall; and

(2) to lay bare its essential character, which was still a secret. This was done by the discovery of *surplus-value.*” (p:135; Marx Engels Selected Works. Vol-II)

“The materialist conception of history starts from the proposition that the production of the means to support human life and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure; ... the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in man’s brains, not in man’s better insights into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the *philosophy*, but in the *economics* of each particular epoch.”(p:136)

“Nature is the proof of dialectics, and it must be said for modern science that it has furnished this proof with very rich materials increasingly daily, and thus has shown that, in the last resort, Nature works dialectically and not metaphysically; that she does not move in the eternal oneness of a perpetually recurring circle, but goes through a real historical evolution. In this connection, Darwin must be named before all others. He dealt the metaphysical conception of Nature the heaviest blow by his proof that all organic beings, plants, animals, and man himself, are the products of a process of evolution going on through millions of years.”(p:131-132)

### **Dialectics of Nature**

...In 1873 Engels informed Marx that he decided to write a large work on dialectics in nature. He began its preliminary outlines in 1875-76, but could not complete it as shortly afterwards he had to switch over to a most important task, that is, in the interest of revolutionary proletarian movement to criticise Duhringism, and for this he utilised also his materials on the ‘Dialectics of Nature’. After that in 1882 he wrote to Marx that he expected

shortly to finish ‘Dialectics of Nature’. But he could not as after the death of Marx in 1883, Engels fully engaged himself to edit and publish Marx’s remaining volumes of capital. So ‘Dialectics of Nature’ remained incomplete. Still then it helped tremendously in the Marxist understanding of the natural world. In the ‘introduction’ to his work, Engels gave a brilliant sketch of the evolution of natural science from the epoch of the Renaissance to Darwin. With the help of giant strides especially owing to three discoveries of natural science : the discovery of the animal and plant cell, law of the conservation and transformation of energy and Darwin’s theory of evolution of animal and plant organism, Engels expounded the natural-scientific foundation of the dialectical materialistic outlook. He had shown that in nature everything happens dialectically, universe is infinite in time and space, in a process of constant motion and change, matter and motion are indestructible, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively. Some of his valuable observations from this book I present below:

“...this modern research into nature dates, like all more recent history, from that mighty epoch which we Germans term the Reformation, from the misfortune that overtook us at that time, and which the French term the Renaissance and the Italians the Cinquecento, although it is not fully expressed by any of these names. It is the epoch which had its rise in the latter half of the fifteenth century. Royalty, with the support of the burghers of the towns, broke the power of the feudal nobility and established the great monarchies, based essentially on nationality, within which the modern European nations and modern bourgeois society came to development.”(p:62, *Marx Engels Selected Works, vol-II; Published by Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955*)

“It was the greatest progressive revolution that mankind has so far experienced, a time which called for giants and produced giants – giants in power of

thought, passion, and character, in universality and learning. The men who founded the modern rule of the bourgeoisie had anything but bourgeois limitations. On the contrary, the adventurous character of the time inspired them to a greater or less degree. There was hardly any man of importance then living who had not travelled extensively, who did not speak four or five languages, who did not shine in a number of fields.”(p:63)

He further said,

“But what is especially characteristic of them is that they almost all live and pursue their activities in the midst of the contemporary movements, in the practical struggle; they take sides and join in the fight, one by speaking and writing, another with the sword, many with both. Hence the fullness and force of character that makes them complete men.”(p:63-64)

On liberation of science from religion and the church and its incredible progress in this period he wrote:

“The emancipation of natural science from theology dates from this, although the fighting out of particular mutual claims has dragged on down to our day and in many minds is still far from completion.”(p:64)

“Modern natural science has had to take over from philosophy the principle of the indestructibility of motion; it cannot any longer exist without this principle. But the motion of matter is not merely crude mechanical motion, mere change of place, it is heat and light, electric and magnetic tension, chemical combination and dissociation, life and finally, consciousness.” (p:77)

“The indestructibility of motion cannot be conceived merely quantitatively, it must also be conceived qualitatively; matter whose purely mechanical change of place includes indeed the possibility under favourable conditions of being transformed into heat, electricity, chemical action, life,...” (p:77)

In respect to the infinite universe without beginning or end and which is not made up by indivisible atoms, as propounded by the then philosophers and scientists, he wrote - “The universe is infinite in space and time. It is in a process of incessant motion and change. ...matter and motion are indestructible,...” (p:10, *Dialectics of Nature, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954*)

At that time scientists concluded that atoms are the smallest particles of the universe and refuting them Engels observed that “Atoms are in no wise regarded as simple, or in general as the smallest known particles of matter.”(ibid, p:12)

Afterwards scientists discovered atoms are divisible and thus Engels’ observation was proved to be correct.

### **The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man**

In this brilliant writings, Engels had shown, how many hundreds of thousands years ago an especially highly developed race of anthropoid apes, who lived somewhere in the tropical zone, through the process of evolution transformed themselves into man. Here, he also elaborates the decisive role of labour in this respect. We can learn much from this valuable contribution of Engels. I will now read out some portions from this writings.

“Labour is the source of all wealth- the political economists assert. It is this – next to nature, which supplies it with the material that it converts into wealth. But it is even infinitely more than this. It is the prime basic condition for all human existence, and this to such an extent that, in a sense, we have to say that labour created man himself.” (p:80; *Marx-Engels, Selected Works in two volumes, Vol-II; published by Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955*)

“Presumably as an immediate consequence of their

mode of life, which in climbing assigns different functions to the hands than to the feet, these apes when walking on level ground began to disaccustom themselves to the aid of their hands and to adopt a more and more erect gait. This was *the decisive step in the transition from ape to man.*”(p:80)

“But the decisive step was taken: *the hand had become free* and could henceforth attain ever greater dexterity and skill, and the greater flexibility thus acquired was inherited and increased from generation to generation.

Thus, the hand is not only the organ of labour; *it is also the product of labour.* Only by labour, by adaptation to ever new operations, by inheritance of the thus acquired special development of muscles, ligaments and, over longer periods of time, bones as well, and by the ever-renewed employment of this inherited finesse in new, more and more complicated operations, has the human hand attained the high degree of perfection that has enabled it to conjure into being the paintings of a Raphael, the statues of a Thorwaldsen, the music of a Paganini.” (p:81-82)

“But the hand did not exist by itself: it was only one member of an entire, highly complex organism. And what benefitted the hand, benefitted also the whole body it served; and this in two ways.

In the first place, in consequence of the law of correlation of growth as Darwin called it. According to this law, particular forms of separate parts of an organic being are always bound up with certain forms of other parts that apparently have no connection with the first.” (p:82)

“The mastery over nature, which began with the development of the hand, with labour, widened man’s horizon at every new advance. He was continually discovering new, hitherto unknown properties of natural objects. On the other hand, the development of labour necessarily helped to bring the members of

society closer together by multiplying cases of mutual support, joint activity, and by making clear the advantage of this joint activity to each individual. In short, men in the making arrived at the point where *they had something to say* to one another. The urge created its organ; the undeveloped larynx of the ape was slowly but surely transformed, by means of modulation in order to produce constantly more developed modulation, and the organs of the mouth gradually learned to pronounce one articulate letter after another.”(p:82-83)

After discussing all these, he has shown how the brain of the ape gradually transformed into man’s brain, more developed, more perfected and larger.

“First labour, after it and then with it speech – these were the two most essential stimuli under the influence of which the brain of the ape gradually changed into that of man, which, for all its similarity is far larger and more perfect. Hand in hand with the development of the brain went the development of its most immediate instruments – the sense organs. Just as the gradual development of speech is necessarily accompanied by a corresponding refinement of the organ of hearing, so the development of the brain as a whole is accompanied by a refinement of all the senses.”(p:83-84)

Then Engels has shown when and why common ownership of agricultural land was replaced by individual ownership which resulted in the class division of the society.

“The original common ownership of land corresponded, on the one hand, to a level of development of human beings in which their horizon was restricted in general to what lay immediately at hand, and presupposed, on the other hand, a certain superfluity of available land allowing a certain latitude for correcting any possible bad results of this primeval type of economy. When this surplus land was

exhausted, common ownership declined. All higher forms of production, however, led to the division of the population into different classes and thereby to the antagonism of ruling and oppressed classes.”(p:91)

## **The Origin of the Family, Private property and the State**

In the Preface to The First Edition (1884) of ‘The Origin of the Family, Private property and the State’, Engels places this precious book as the fulfilment of the legacy of Marx. Here is the scientific elaboration of the history of human civilization in its successive stages, viewed from the standpoint of dialectical materialism. I will just mention a few portions from it.

“For Morgan rediscovered in America, in his own way, the materialist conception of history that had been discovered by Marx forty years ago, and in his comparison of barbarism and civilization was led by that conception to the same conclusions, in the main points, as Marx had arrived at.”(*preface to the first edition 1884; p-170; Marx Engels Selected Works, Vol-II*)

“According to the materialistic conception, the determining factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and reproduction of immediate life. But this itself is of a twofold character. On the one hand, the production of the means of subsistence— of food clothing and shelter and the tools requisite therefore; on the other, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species.”(*p: 170-171*)

I will now read out portions where Engels draws our attention to the fact that the ‘State’ did not always exist. It has a beginning and an end. It arose in a particular stage of human civilization when society became class divided. At the time when Engels wrote this book, challenging the

eternal concept of 'State', it was not only something completely new, but it was revolutionary as well. He said —

“As the state arose from the need to keep class antagonisms in check, but as it arose, at the same time, in the midst of the conflict of these classes, it is, as a rule the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class. Thus, the state of antiquity was above all the state of the slave-owners for the purpose of holding down the slaves, as the feudal state was the organ of the nobility for holding down the peasant serfs and bondsmen, and the modern representative state is an instrument for exploiting of wage-labour by capital.”(p:319)

“The state, then, has not existed from all eternity. There have been societies that did without it, that had no conception of the state and state power. At a certain stage of economic development, which was necessarily bound up with the cleavage of society into classes, the state became a necessity owing to this cleavage. We are now rapidly approaching a stage in the development of production at which the existence of these classes not only will have ceased to be a necessity, but will become a positive hindrance to production. They will fall as inevitably as they arose at an earlier stage. Along with them the state will inevitably fall. The society that will organize production on the basis of a free and equal association of the producers will put the whole machinery of the state where it will then belong: into the Museum of antiquities, by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe.”(p:321)

### **On the History of Early Christianity**

In 1894, Engels wrote the famous book 'On the History of Early Christianity'.

Here he discussed the historic role and objective of Christianity and Communism and difference between the two.

“...Christianity was originally a movement of oppressed people: it first appeared as the religion of slaves and of poor people deprived of all rights, of peoples subjugated or dispersed by Rome. Both Christianity and the workers’ socialism preach forthcoming salvation from bondage and misery; Christianity places this salvation in a life beyond, after death, in heaven; socialism places it in this world, in a transformation of society. Both are persecuted and baited, their adherents are despised and made the objects of exclusive laws, the former as enemies of the human race, the latter as enemies of the state, enemies of religion, the family, social order.” (*p-313; Marks-Engels on Religion, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1957*)

### **Manifesto of the Communist Party**

Now, I will place before you some points from the historic book ‘Communist Manifesto’, jointly written by Marx and Engels in 1848 to show how these are even relevant today.

“The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.”

“The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country.”

“Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.”

“All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority.”

“In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.”

“Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will, whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.”

“The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word.”

“National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

United action, of the leading civilised countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of

the proletariat.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.”

Then he defines the historic tasks of the proletariat:

“If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.”

“In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.”

“The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.”

### **Marx and Engels guided the working class movements of their time**

Marx and Engels also guided the working-class movements of their time. This point I did not touch, because it will take much time. At that time there were many movements and struggles in Europe against feudalism.

Most of the struggles were led by bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie. But workers and peasants also participated in these struggles. Marx and Engels tried to guide the workers and peasants to play an independent role. Marx and Engels actively participated in those struggles. They were banished from this country to that country and ultimately settled in England. Marx and Engels could not lead Paris Commune because it was led by petty-bourgeois anarchists such as Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Louis Auguste Blanqui. The First International was formed in 1864 in London. In it Bakunin and Lassalle worked as detractors and it was dissolved in 1876. When the 2nd international was formed in 1889, Engels was requested to address the concluding session. He was welcomed with a rousing ovation. There he said:

“This ovation is not for me. This ovation is for the photo which is hanging here” in other words, the ‘photo of Marx’. It is at the initiative of Engels in 1889, that 1<sup>st</sup> May was decided to be observed as the day of the working class demanding 8 hours working day. Engels participated in the first May Day, a big rally in London in 1890, and with much pain he said there, “If only Marx were still by my side to see this with his own eyes.”

What a pain he felt at the absence of Great Marx!

### **Marxist theory is not a dogma, but an advancing Science**

Now I ask, what is the purpose of this meeting and my discussion? Is it a ritual function? Or for our scholastic satisfaction? Definitely not so. We are remembering one of our two great teachers in order to know and to learn from him. It is our task to carry forward the lessons of Marxism, which was further developed successively as a science by Great Lenin, Stalin, Mao-Tse-Tung and then Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. As Lenin said,

“We do not regard Marxist theory as something completed and inviolable, on the contrary, we are convinced that it has laid the corner stone of the science which socialists must further advance in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life.”  
*(Selected Works; vol-XI)*

Today, we are observing Engels Memorial Day in such a situation where on the one hand there are waves after waves of movements are coming up throughout the world. Accumulated grievances of the common people are bursting forth in the form of sporadic struggles. But there is no guiding leadership, no ideology, no culture, no organization. Movements after movements are rising and waning, again rising and again subsiding.

Here also I point out another thing. Once Lenin said:

“Further, a number of states,...the oldest states in the West, find themselves in a position, as a result of their victory, ...to make a number of insignificant concessions to their oppressed classes, which nevertheless retard the revolutionary movements in those countries and create some semblance of ‘social peace’. ...on the other hand, ... the East has definitely come into revolutionary movements, have been definitely drawn into the general maelstrom of the world revolutionary movement.” *(vol- XXVIII)*

But now-a-days, we find that there is no such distinction between West and East, between this country and that country in respect to social and economic crises. Even in the most advanced countries, imperialist countries like America and European countries — I say, also in modern Russia and China which have turned into imperialist countries after counter revolution— every-where there are crises and discontents which are bursting out. Naturally, objective conditions are prepared in all advanced and backward countries for revolution but tragically subjective conditions are lacking.

## **Great men of all countries had hailed socialism**

It was Lenin who organized the first working class revolution successfully in Russia, following the teachings of Marx and Engels. Russia under the leadership of Lenin and then Stalin built up a new civilization which was hailed by not only the entire working class of the world but also by great personalities of the 20th century. Great men like Romain Rolland, Bernard Shaw, Einstein and in our country Rabindranath, Sarathchandra, Subramanian Bharati, Nazrul, Premchand, Subhash Bose, Bhagath Singh and many others hailed it. It was a new civilization, a new society where there was no retrenchment, no economic crisis, no unemployment. Jobs for all was guaranteed there. There was no exploitation of man by man. Equality between man and woman was established. Education and medical treatment was completely free. There was no problem of price increase. No beggary, no prostitution. No nationality, racial, religious, ethnic conflicts. These were abolished. Rabindranath termed it as: "A holy place for me." In 1941 he wrote a letter to the poet Amiya Chakravarty saying: 'I hope that this revolution would be successful.' Rabindranath lamented in his 80th birthday celebrations seeing the horrifying crisis of civilization. Crisis of which civilization? Crisis of this bourgeois civilization.

## **All the authorities – Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin-Mao-Tse-Tung-Shibdas Ghosh had warned about the dangers that socialism would face**

It is a very sad development that socialism which emerged as a new hope before mankind is no more. It is destroyed by counter revolution. Why it happened?

Now, I want to refer to Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. When renegade Khrushchev started slandering Stalin, it was welcomed by the imperialist bourgeois world. At that moment Comrade Shibdas Ghosh warned: 'Undermining

Stalin means undermining Leninism and thereby opening the floodgates of revisionism and counterrevolution'. Ultimately that tragedy befell on us.

What could they achieve by counter revolution in Russia? Again it brought unemployment, retrenchment, beggary and prostitution and it has become a dictatorial country, an imperialist country. What is happening in China now? It became an out and out imperialist country. Why Chinese goods are the cheapest in the world? Because, Chinese workers are being most exploited. People are not having any democratic right there. It's a fascist regime.

After counter revolution and restoration of capitalism in Russia, a frustration has overtaken the entire world communist movement. It is almost in complete disarray. Real Marxists can face defeat after defeat, but can never become frustrated. They find out by applying dialectical science, the causes of defeat and draw appropriate lessons from it and then advance for victory. It should not be forgotten even for a moment that for the final victories of different religions hundreds of years of struggles were necessary. Those also faced defeats after defeats. Those were struggles which were claimed to implement the teachings of God. Again, for the final victory of bourgeois democratic revolutions, 350 years of struggles were necessary. These were struggles only to replace one form of class exploitation by another form of class exploitation. But Russian and Chinese revolutions were to end all forms of class exploitations which had dominated history for few thousands of years. So it was a struggle against the history of thousands of years of old class exploitation. Remember, 70 years of socialism had to fight against few thousands of years of old system of class exploitation. What a gigantic struggle it was!

Moreover, starting from Marx, Engels and all the leaders of world communist movement never claimed that if socialism, that is, first phase of communism was achieved, it would not face any danger, rather they repeatedly told

that socialism was merely a transitional phase from capitalism to communism. So, always there were dangers of counter revolution and going back to the old system. And that happened due to some serious deviations from Marxism-Leninism. Let me recall the lessons provided by Marx after the fall of Paris Commune. On April 12, 1871, right at the time of the Paris Commune, Marx wrote to Kugelmann,

“...I declare that the next attempt of the French Revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to another but to smash it...”. But this was not carried out by the leadership of the Paris Commune, which resulted in its fall. After that with much pain Marx wrote, “...one thing especially was proved by the Commune viz., that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes....”

Lenin followed this lesson, destroyed the old bourgeois state and built up a new working class state, which existed for a few decades and had shown what a miracle could be done by the working class.

### **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's warning against modern revisionism in the world communist movement**

But observing the imminent danger of counter revolutions in Russia and China, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh warned that although state and other political institutions are part of superstructure but not the whole, accordingly only revolutionary change of state, political institutions and economic base will not automatically change entire superstructure. So along with them and simultaneously, intensification of the class struggle is indispensable in the realm of superstructure to eliminate private property mental complex in all aspects of life. He said

“..more the consolidation and victories of socialism...the class struggle becomes more intense & acute and assumes a more shuttle form in the superstructure, i.e. in the ideological-cultural spheres.”  
(SW Vol. 1, P-3)

And

“..if along with the tremendous growth and development of the economy...the ideological-cultural-ethical standard of the society as a whole—starting from the philosophical understanding and cultural-ethical standard of the collective to the minutest details of the individual behavior, habit and practices—cannot be elevated to keep pace with the need for all out development of socialist economy, the gap that will be created is bound to lead to a lowering of standard in the ideological sphere....if backwardness continues to persist in the fields of epistemology and culture, then the entire party and the working class may being misled tread the revisionist-reformist path and bring about restoration of capitalism while waving the banner of Marxism-Leninism and chanting socialist slogans” ( SW Vol 1, p-203-204)

He further pointed out, intense struggle should be conducted against bourgeois individualism and sense of individual freedom, rights and bourgeois liberty continuing under the garb of socialism and all age-old cultural-habitual-traditional hang-over of past societies. Otherwise, there will always lie the danger of counter revolutionary attack from the superstructure to destroy the socialist economic base. This has happened in both the erstwhile socialist countries.

Surely this is a very important lesson for future working-class revolutions in different countries.

In the present situation, our party founded by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, a great Marxist leader and worthy student of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung, is raising high the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh thought. Our party is entrusted by history to

propagate Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh thought in our country and abroad in order to educate and organise the entire working class and exploited people. And for that, our comrades must be prepared ideologically, politically, ethically, culturally and organizationally.

We cannot forget the teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh that inner kernel of Marxism-Leninism lies in its culture, in higher culture. He commented: 'only by uttering some vocabulary of Marxism will not do.' We know that by merely going through the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao-Tse Tung and Comrade Shibdas Ghosh will not do. We can quote, but that will not do. What is necessary is that we are culturally changed, in other words, an all out change in all aspects of life —meaning, in our economic life, in our social life, in our married life, in love, affection, in approach to children and approach to the people. It means that in every aspect of life, we are behaving as a communist.

It is true, our party is developing. We are expanding quantitatively. But, quantity will not do unless it is a qualified quantity. This is very important. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh taught us that every moment in our thinking, in our behaviour, in our work, in our task and in our emotion, either we are a bourgeois or a revolutionary proletariat. Remember that we are products of capitalism. We are surrounded by capitalism. It is a most degraded and polluted capitalism. It is permeating us, polluting us and corrupting us at every moment. We must be vigilant. We have circulated one of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's quotations which says that even the highest leader may degenerate if he becomes self-complacent and ceases to conduct struggle.

Comrades, I have taken much time. We must take lessons from great Marx and Engels, the founders of world communist movement. How they struggled? Why they struggled? They did not struggle for name and fame. They struggled for the emancipation of the working class, the

oppressed people and for the progress of entire human civilization. With firm determination, unwavering perseverance, they practically had to swim against the turbulent countercurrent. They boldly weathered all stormy weathers. They courageously stood against a hostile world only with the sole dream of proletarian revolution. In their struggle neither there was a single moment for vacillation nor for indecision. Now as their students we have to fulfil their mission following the path of their arduous struggle. For that, we must study and reread Marxism-Leninism-ShibdasGhosh thought. And we must acquire the higher culture as taught by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. We must engage ourselves in organising class and mass struggles with full dedication, courage and emotion. If we can do it, if we can change ourselves, if we can move accordingly, we will be able to make revolution successful. Everywhere humanity is now crying for emancipation. It is crying for change. Who can provide it? Only the class conscious revolutionary proletariat can answer the cry of mankind. They are the grave diggers of capitalism as written in Communist Manifesto. But they must have the weapon. This weapon is the ideological weapon of Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh thought. And the culture is proletarian culture. Also a genuine proletarian party must be there. Task of that proletarian party is to dig the grave of capitalism, in other words, make the proletariat prepared ideologically, politically, morally and organisationally so that they are able to execute their historical task. And if we can move in that way, that will be the best tribute to great Engels. Let me conclude here.

My Red Salute to great Marx and Engels  
Long live Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh Thought  
Workers of all countries unite