

SOCIALISM? COMMUNISM?

What's the Difference?

“

I'll switch names in a heartbeat.

—DANNY KATCH, DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST AUTHOR

”

RED FLAGS
PRESS

redflagspress.org

SOCIALISM? COMMUNISM?

What's the Difference?

Except for a telling period in the twentieth century, knowledgeable socialists have considered "socialism" and "communism" interchangeable terms.

"Socialism," "communism." We know they're related words, but the distinctions are unclear.

Many who are not socialists think of communism as the authoritarian version of socialism. And they think of socialism as a humanitarian version of communism—one without the state power that made Stalin and Mao terrors to their people. Socialists are glad to let us make these assumptions. But this isn't how they see these terms.

For the great majority of today's knowledgeable socialists, the meaning of "socialism" is identical to "communism." They view these terms as synonymous. Why? Because that's how Karl Marx, the most important socialist of all time, saw them.

There's been one important exception to this rule. For much of the twentieth century, socialists used the terms "socialism" and "communism" as labels for two different phases of socialist society. However, these were two theoretical stages of the same society, not—as in the misconception—two competing versions of the philosophy.

The primary goal of this paper is to clarify the similarities and differences between "socialism" and "communism," but doing so has an added benefit. Examining how socialists use these terms also provides an opportunity to demonstrate that, despite their constant criticism of sales and marketing in our capitalist society, socialists are salespeople themselves. We'll see a vivid illustration of how socialists engage in the same marketing-driven decision-making that other salespeople do.

"INDISTINGUISHABLE TERMS ... COMPLETELY INTERCHANGEABLE"

When it comes to understanding any aspect of socialism, the best place to start is always with the thinking of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Karl Marx is the most important socialist thinker of all time. His thinking has defined socialism for 150 years. It still does today. Marx is without question socialist superstar

number one. And his colleague Friedrich Engels is the undisputed runner-up, socialist superstar number two.

So how did Marx and Engels distinguish socialism from communism?

They didn't. They used these terms interchangeably. Communism meant socialism. Socialism meant communism.

This fact is confirmed by socialist thinker Peter Hudis, who says that for Marx, socialism and communism were

indistinguishable terms

and

completely interchangeable.¹

And Paul Burkett (another socialist thinker, as is everyone quoted in this paper) says socialism and communism were for Marx

two terms that he used interchangeably.²

Similarly, David Adams says Marx

did not differentiate between the concept of socialist society and communist society.³

One more example comes from Binay Sakar and Adam Buck, writing jointly. They explain that

for Marx and Engels socialism and communism were synonymous.⁴

Marx and Engels often used "communism" when referring to Marx's specific version of socialism and to distinguish his ideas from other ideas being labeled socialism at the time. But even in this they were inconsistent.

For example, their most famous jointly authored work is *The Communist Manifesto*—a work that detailed Marx's specific version of socialism/communism.⁵ And the second most successful work by either Marx or Engels is Engel's *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, in which the "scientific" socialism Engels speaks of is, again, Marx's vision of socialism/communism.⁶

Over time, Marx's version of the philosophy became a black hole: a source of such intense gravitational pull that it sucked in and destroyed all its competitors. From that

point on, the “indistinguishable terms” “socialism” and “communism” both meant, effectively, Marxism.

Even today’s “democratic socialism” is fundamentally the socialism/communism created by Marx. Despite Marx’s thinking being tightly linked with history’s authoritarian socialist disasters, Michael Harrington, the founder of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), doesn’t distance today’s democratic socialism from Marx in any way. Instead, Harrington links democratic socialism to Marx and his beliefs.

Harrington repeatedly labels Marx a democratic socialist.⁷ And he states that the objective of today’s socialism remains achieving the goal Marx established for his philosophy. This is the same goal that has defined socialism/communism for the past 150 years: a society based on the axiom “From each according to their ability, to each according to their need.”⁸

It’s impossible to overstate Marx’s impact on socialist beliefs. The vast majority of knowledgeable socialists are followers of Marx and see the world from his perspective. His vision is their vision.

For the vast majority of today’s socialists, therefore, socialism and communism are synonyms. They treat these two terms interchangeably just as Marx did and because Marx did. For example, Paula Allman in *Revolutionary Social Transformation* and co-authors Binkay Satayr and Adam Buck in *Marxism, Leninism—Worlds Apart* both employ the same “socialism/communism” construction used in this paper, with a slash between the two words, demonstrating that they see these terms as indistinguishable.⁹

“IN A HIGHER PHASE”

There’s been one significant exception to the rule that socialists since Marx use “socialism” and “communism” interchangeably. For a chunk of the twentieth century, they used these terms as the names of two distinct stages of a post-capitalist society.

One of Marx’s most important pronouncements about the nature of the post-capitalist society he envisioned is that it would have two stages. There would be a first stage following capitalism, a phase that would still be “stamped with the birthmarks” of capitalism.¹⁰ This first phase would eventually be followed by what he called a “higher phase,”¹¹ a perfected phase in which all residual aspects of capitalism had been stamped out.

Marx's two-phase idea has been socialist gospel since his pronouncement made it so. As knowledgeable socialists are well aware, Marx said the "higher phase" would commence when a society based on his philosophy could

inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!¹²

The "from each according to their ability" portion of the saying is socialism's mandatory duty to give our abilities—our time and talents—to society.¹³ The "to each according to their needs" portion is what socialism promises to give us in return for performing our socialist duty.

Marx didn't refer to his two stages by different names. He simply used the "from each according to their ability, to each according to their needs" standard as the benchmark that defined the second phase.

The promise of a world based on socialism's most famous credo remains the centerpiece of today's socialist sales pitch. But rarely do socialists make it clear this standard is one that would *never* apply in the first phase of socialist society, but only if Marx's higher phase could be achieved.

The first phase of Marx's two-stage plan is based on an alternate version of the socialist motto—one today's socialists rarely mention when selling their philosophy. This alternate version is "from each according to their ability, to each according to their work."

The alternate version requires the exact same duty of "from each according to their ability." But the clause that defines what we receive ends in "work," not "needs." During the first (and very likely only¹⁴) phase of socialist society, we would still be under mandatory duty to those running society, but we would *not* receive according to our *needs*.

Doubling Down on Duty

The central role of mandatory duty in socialist philosophy is illustrated by the fact there are not one but two critical socialist sayings that begin with socialism's duty of "from each according to their ability." Both of these socialist axioms start with duty, just as socialism does itself.

FROM EACH ACCORDING TO THEIR ABILITY, TO EACH ACCORDING TO THEIR NEEDS.

FROM EACH ACCORDING TO THEIR ABILITY, TO EACH ACCORDING TO THEIR WORK.

Socialists sell us the famous "needs" version knowing full well that what they plan to deliver is the lesser-known "work" version.

For more about the implications of these sayings, see the RFP paper "Doubling Down on Duty."

For more about other aspects of socialist duty, see the RFP paper "The Ripple Effects of Socialist Duty."

"TO EACH ACCORDING TO HIS NEEDS (COMMUNISM)"

Marx didn't use different names for his two phases. But in 1917, another socialist icon, Vladimir Lenin, took a new approach. Lenin began using "socialism" as the label for Marx's first phase and "communism" as the name of the second:

From capitalism mankind can pass directly only to socialism, i.e., to the social ownership of the means of production and the distribution of products according to the amount of work performed by each individual. Our Party looks farther ahead: socialism must inevitably evolve gradually into communism, upon the banner of which is inscribed the motto, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."¹⁵

The practice Lenin started remained the socialist norm until the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in the 1990s.

In *The A B C of Socialism*, published in 1953, noted American socialists Leo Huberman and Sybil May ask and answer the question, "What is the difference between socialism and communism?" Their answer reflects the naming convention Lenin began:

Socialism grows directly out of capitalism; it is the first form of the new society. Communism is a further development or "higher stage" of socialism.

From each according to his ability, to each according to his deeds (socialism). From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs (communism).¹⁶

Using Lenin's paradigm, they call the first phase "socialism" and the second phase "communism." They also explicitly link the terms "socialism" and "communism" in parentheses to the different standards that socialists say apply in each phase.

Here, in a speech he gave in 1973, Fidel Castro also employs the twentieth-century socialist standard:

That everyone contribute according to his ability, that each one receive according to his work is a principle, an inexorable law in the construction of socialism. When we learn to understand this principle ... we learn to distinguished it from another principle of the communist society established by Karl Marx: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. This is precisely what

distinguishes the socialist phase from the communist phase of the revolutionary process.¹⁷

Socialism and communism were not used to describe two different philosophies. They were used as labels for two different phases in the implementation of the very same philosophy—phases that were based on the identical standard of duty but on different plans for what one would receive for performing that duty.

THE WORD "COMMUNISM" DISAPPEARS (BUT THE CONCEPT DOESN'T)

When the USSR and its European socialist allies collapsed in the early 1990s, the practice of using "socialism" and "communism" as labels for Marx's two phases all but ended. This was a byproduct of a more general move to eliminate the terms "communism" and "communist" from the socialist vocabulary. Why? Because the results of socialist/communist authoritarianism had made "communism" even more toxic to the general public than "socialism."

The results of communist authoritarianism have made "communism" toxic to the general public.

Today's socialists still believe in the two-phase process that Marx prophesied. But very few use the term "communism" as a name for Marx's second phase. Instead, they only use the term "socialism" and distinguish the second phase as Marx did: by referencing the "to each according to their needs" standard.¹⁸

The fact that the expression "to each according to their needs" indicates Marx's second phase (what for much of the twentieth century socialists called "communism") likely comes as news to you. But it is most definitely *not* news to any knowledgeable socialist. It's gospel.

Among socialists, the expression "to each according to their needs" is a dog whistle—a phrase that communicates many things to socialist insiders that non-socialists don't hear. As discussed above, when savvy socialists hear "to each according to their needs," they hear a phrase they know signified "communism" for the better part of the last century. They also hear a saying that signals the achievement of numerous other key socialist objectives, including a world in which all businesses large and

small have been eliminated (a longstanding socialist desire—but one that few of today’s socialists voice out loud for fear of hurting their sales and marketing efforts).¹⁹

Today, socialists have returned to treating socialism and communism as synonyms, no longer as distinct labels for Marx’s two phases. And the great majority of socialists have also standardized “socialism” and dropped “communism” from their vocabulary. Why? To make their product easier to sell.

“BECAUSE IT HAS A LESS TAINTED REPUTATION”

Most socialists have simply stopped using “communism” and “communist” without explaining their reasons for doing so. But in his recent (2015) book *Socialism ... Seriously*, Danny Katch isn’t so circumspect. Katch says he typically uses “socialist,” and not “communist,” when describing himself and his views.

Why has Katch chosen “socialist” over “communist”? He says,

I tend to use *socialism* because it has a less tainted reputation.²⁰

He continues, saying that if future socialists revert to using “communist,”

I’ll switch names in a heartbeat.²¹

Katch considers the terms “socialist” and “communist” to be interchangeable, and that’s hardly surprising. The socialist messiah Karl Marx considered these terms to be indistinguishable. So, that’s how the socialist faithful see things too.

What else is true of Katch’s decision to call himself a “socialist” instead of a “communist”? His selection of labels is driven entirely by sales considerations.

Katch chooses to describe himself as a socialist and not a communist (a label he would switch to “in a heartbeat”) due to his concern that the word “communist” is “tainted.” Of the two interchangeable terms, he picks the one that’s better for sales.

What makes this particularly humorous is that, true to socialist norm, Katch’s book includes attacks on sales and marketing in capitalist society.²² Apparently, it’s fine for socialists to make choices motivated by sales considerations but unethical when non-socialists do the same.

Given the appalling results of earlier socialist/communist experiments, it’s hardly surprising today’s socialists have stopped using “communist,” the more “tainted” of the two terms. And it’s not really unethical for them to do so—or at least it isn’t

so long as they don't try to peddle the notion that communism means something different than socialism.

But let's recognize this for what it is: it's sales-driven behavior from those who claim to disdain sales and marketing. And let's hold socialists to the same standards of ethical selling we have a right to expect from all salespeople.

Unfortunately, there are many cases where socialists fail this standard—instances where they engage in what would seem to be intentionally misleading practices.

"DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM": A MARKETING SLOGAN

An example of socialist marketing spin that fails the ethics test? Rebranding socialism as "democratic socialism."

The motivation for adopting the name "democratic socialism" is the same as that which has led socialists to ditch "communism." It's an attempt to separate today's socialism from earlier socialist/communist disasters, making socialism easier to sell.

What makes the use of "democratic socialism" unethical is that the explicit intent is to give us the impression today's socialists are marketing a new and improved product, when knowledgeable socialists recognize this isn't the case. That "democratic socialism" is a marketing slogan and not a new version can be demonstrated in at least seven ways,²³ including the following three.

First, Marx and Engels are said to be democratic socialists.²⁴ This is an affirmation of the fact democratic socialism is based on their ideas—the ideas that have defined socialism for the past 150 years and that were front and center in authoritarian socialist regimes.

Second, knowledgeable socialists know that selling socialism as democratic isn't anything new. It's been marketed as democratic socialism for over a century. The very socialist experiments we now think of as bad old authoritarian socialism—as communism—were said to be democratic.²⁵

Third, the product under the "democratic socialist" label is based on the same principles as plain old socialism. Why? Because it is plain old socialism, with what we erroneously

A New Socialism?

Many assume that today's democratic socialism is a new version that's been altered to solve the problems of socialism's authoritarian past. But it's not. "Democratic" socialism is a branding strategy, not a new recipe.

For more, see the RFP paper "The 'Keto-Friendly' Political Philosophy."

assume is a new label. Today's democratic socialism is based on the exact same requirement of duty to society that applied in every authoritarian socialist disaster. This requirement of duty played an outsized role in these socialist experiments ending up totalitarian despite being sold as democratic.

Socialists have long believed incorrectly, but fervently, that socialism is by definition democratic. It can only be sales trickery for socialists to let anyone think today's "democratic socialism" represents a new version based on new principles.

"THE GOAL": WHAT WAS CALLED COMMUNISM

Following the collapse of the USSR in the 1990s, the majority of socialists adopted the sales tactic Danny Katch discloses above: ceasing to use the terms "communism" and "communist" because of their tainted connotations. Socialists have authored an untold number of new books and articles since the 1990s, but it's now unusual for "communism" to appear, even as the name for Marx's higher phase.²⁶

However, even though most socialists no longer use "communism" as its label, Marx's higher phase remains socialism's prime objective. For example, what does DSA founder Michael Harrington say remains "clearly" the goal of socialism? He explains,

the goal of socialism, clearly, is to overcome greed and act on the basis of "to each according to his/her need, from each according to his/her ability."²⁷

Harrington has flipped the order of the clauses, but it's obviously the same saying Marx used as the benchmark for his higher phase—the same one that for much of the twentieth century was called "communism," as Leo Huberman and Sybil May (writing jointly) explain:

From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs (communism).²⁸

And Fidel Castro has said:

In communism, each one contributes according to his capacity and receives according to his need.²⁹

That Harrington says the goal of socialism is what he's fully aware had been called communism does not mean he should be labeled a communist. It's the right of socialists to change the terms they use when they sell, just as it's the right of salespeople selling other products to do likewise.

But we shouldn't be fooled into thinking that eliminating "communism" from the socialist vocabulary is anything more than a sales tactic. Even though it's now rare to use the term "communism," socialists still consider "socialism" and "communism" interchangeable terms. And disappearing "communism" from view doesn't mean that the 150-year-old goal of the philosophy has changed one iota.

"I'LL SWITCH NAMES IN A HEARTBEAT"

To recap, as socialist thinkers tell us, "for Marx and Engels socialism and communism were synonymous."³⁰ These are "two terms that he [Marx] used interchangeably."³¹

Given the dominant role Karl Marx ("democratic socialist" Marx) continues to play in socialist thought, the fact that he considered "socialism" and "communism" to be "indistinguishable terms"³² tells us that this is how today's knowledgeable socialists also view these words. That's why Danny Katch says that, were "communist" to lose its stigma, he would "switch names in a heartbeat."³³ That's why most socialists would likely do the same.

There was an exception to the *socialism = communism* rule during the twentieth century, when socialists used the terms to distinguish Marx's two phases. But this practice largely ended when earlier socialist/communist experiments crashed and burned, leading socialists to purge "communism" from their vocabulary.

However, ceasing to use the word "communism" doesn't mean socialists have given up on achieving Marx's second phase, which was called communism in the twentieth century. DSA founder Harrington explains that "the goal of socialism, clearly,"³⁴ remains to create a society based on "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need," the standard every knowledgeable socialist realizes was called communism.

Our brief tour of how socialists think of the word "communism" relative to "socialism" also shows that socialists make choices based on sales considerations. Similarly, we've seen some of the details that demonstrate "democratic socialism" is a marketing slogan, not a new version of socialism. Given the socialist love of attacking sales and marketing as intrinsically unethical, these are telling hypocrisies.

Once we come to grips with the fact that socialists are salespeople and marketers, our need to take personal responsibility to learn more about socialist philosophy becomes clear. It doesn't matter whether what's being sold is a diet elixir or socialism/communism, we cannot rely on salespeople to properly inform us of the risks of their product. Let the buyer beware!

NOTES

1. Peter Hudis, *Marx's Concept of the Alternative to Capitalism* (Boston: Brill, 2012), 190.
2. Paul Burkett, "Marx's Vision of Sustainable Development," *Monthly Review* 57, no. 5 (October 2005): 34.
3. David Adam, "Marx's Critique of Socialist Labor-Money Schemes and the Myth of Council Communism's Proudhonism," Marxist Humanist Initiative, January 21, 2013, <https://www.marxisthumanistinitiative.org/alternatives-to-capital/marxs-critique-of-socialist-labor-money-schemes-and-the-myth-of-council-communisms-proudhonism.html>.
4. Binay Sakar and Adam Buick, *Marxism, Leninism—Worlds Apart* (West Bengal: Kolkata Avenel Press, 2012), ch. 11, <http://www.worldsocialistpartyindia.org/sc.php?cat=marxism-leninism-poles-apart>.
5. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1910).
6. Friedrich Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, trans. Edward Averling (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1892).
7. For example, Harrington dedicates his book *The Twilight of Capitalism* to "democratic socialist, Karl Marx" (Michael Harrington, *The Twilight of Capitalism* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976], v). For additional examples, see the RFP paper, "Karl Marx: 'Democratic Socialist'."
8. "The goal of socialism, clearly, is to overcome greed and act on the basis of 'to each according to his/her need, from each according to his/her ability.'" Michael Harrington, "What Socialists Would Do in America—If They Could," *Dissent*, Fall 1978, 445.
9. Paula Allman, *Revolutionary Social Transformation: Democratic Hopes, Political Possibilities and Critical Education* (Westport: Bergin and Garvey, 1999), 2; Sakar and Buick, *Marxism, Leninism*, ch. 10.
10. Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, in *Marx/Engels Collected Works* (London: Wishart, 1950), 2:22.
11. In his discussion of the two phases in *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx explicitly uses the term "communism" for both the lower and higher phases. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, 22–23.
12. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, 23.
13. In the 1840s, Louis Blanc coined this phrase that Marx would make famous twenty-five years later: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." Blanc explained the first half of this axiom, saying: "The more one *can*, the more one *must*. ... Thus the axiom: From each according to his ability. That is the DUTY" ("Plus un homme *peut*, plus il *doit*. ... D'où l'axiome : De chacun, selon ses facultés. Là est le DEVOIR"). Louis Blanc, *La Histoire de la Révolution de 1848* (Paris: C. Marpon, 1880), 1:148.
14. Why is socialism likely to be forever stuck in the first, lower phase—the phase in which we are under mandatory duty to socialist society but explicitly do not receive based on need? It's because a giant hurdle must be crossed to create a society based on "to each according to their needs" and thus Marx's "higher stage" of socialism/communism. As detailed in the RFP paper "The Secret Sauce of Socialism," socialists say that

NOTES

“to each according to their needs” means a world in which every good and service humans need is free for all worldwide forever. And they say that creating a world in which every good and service humans need is free for all worldwide forever requires the “constant over-production” (Marx’s term) of these goods. Constant overproduction of everything the world’s 7,500,000,000 humans need is a goal that’s both utopian (that is, impossible) and dystopian (that is, unsustainable). The odds such a world could ever exist are slim. The odds such a world could exist in your lifetime are none.

15. Vladimir Lenin, “Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution (Draft Platform for the Proletarian Party),” in *Lenin Collected Works*, trans. Isaac Bernard (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964; orig. 1917), 24:84, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/tasks/ch12.htm#v24zz99h-084-guess>.

16. Leo Huberman and Sybil H. May, *The ABCs of Socialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1953), 51.

17. Fidel Castro, “Fidel Castro Addresses Cuban Workers Congress [November 16, 1973],” Castro Speech Database, accessed June 15, 2020, <http://lanic.utexas.edu/project/castro/db/1973/19731116.html>.

18. As one example of the current norm, in “The Ethics of Eco-Socialism,” Michael Löwy discusses “eco-socialism” and defines its goal as to deliver goods on the basis of the “to each according to their needs” standard. Nowhere in his article does the word “communism” appear, even though Löwy without question knows that for the majority of the twentieth century “to each according to their needs” meant communism. Michael Löwy, “The Ethics of Eco-Socialism,” *New Socialist*, Fall 2007, 8.

19. How does “to each according to their needs” communicate the achievement of socialism’s goal of eliminating all businesses and all small-scale production? As knowledgeable socialists are aware, socialist theory says that a world based on “to each according to their needs” is to be a world in which every product and service humans need is available for free. It is also, again according to socialist theory, to be a world without money. By definition, a business is an entity that produces goods for sale in the hope of earning a profit by doing so. A world in which all goods are free and in which there isn’t even money is a world in which businesses are an impossibility. Knowledgeable socialists are aware of these deeper implications of socialist theory. When they hear another socialist using the expression “to each according to their need,” they hear that socialist affirming the socialist goal of eliminating all businesses. See the RFP paper “Why Socialism Says Craftwork Is ‘Idiocy.’”

20. Danny Katch, *Socialism ... Seriously: A Brief Guide to Human Liberation* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2015), 130.

21. Katch, *Socialism ... Seriously*, 130.

22. Katch, *Socialism ... Seriously*, 105.

23. For an overview of eight different facts that demonstrate “democratic socialism” is a marketing slogan, not a new version of socialism, see the RFP paper “The ‘Keto-Friendly’ Political Philosophy.”

24. In *Socialism, Past and Future*, Democratic Socialists of America founder Michael Harrington says: “Marx and Engels turn to what can only be described as democratic socialism” (Michael Harrington, *Socialism, Past and Future* [New York: Mentor, 1992], 47). See the RFP paper “Karl Marx: ‘Democratic Socialist.’”

25. For example, in 1944, noted socialist Beatrice Webb described the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, saying: “The USSR is not only a fully fledged political democracy, but also an industrial democracy” (Beatrice Webb, introduction to Sidney Webb and Beatrice Webb, *Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation*, 3rd ed. [London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1944], xlix). For additional examples, see the RFP paper “Democratic Socialism? Déjà Vu All Over Again.”

26. In one example of the fact that what had been called communism is now simply referred to as socialism, co-authors Binay Sakar and Adam Buick describe “a later stage of socialism with free access according to needs.” Sakar and Buick, *Marxism, Leninism*, ch. 10.

27. Harrington, “What Socialists Would Do in America,” 445.

NOTES

28. Huberman and May, *ABCs of Socialism*, 51.

29. Fidel Castro, "Castro Addresses Close of Youth Conference [April 4, 1982]," Castro Speech Database, accessed December 11, 2020, <http://lanic.utexas.edu/project/castro/db/1982/19820404.html>.

30. Sakar and Buick, *Marxism, Leninism*, ch. 11.

31. Burkett, "Marx's Vision of Sustainable Development," 34.

32. Hudis, *Marx's Concept of the Alternative to Capitalism*, 190.

33. Katch, *Socialism ... Seriously*, 130.

34. Harrington, "What Socialists Would Do in America," 445.