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## SOCIALISM

### ANARCHISM

- **IN EUROPE:** 19th-20th C.
  - Pierre Proudhon
  - Mikhail Bakunin
  - Louis Blanc
  - Louis Michel
  - Pierre Kropotkin
  - Leo Tolstoy
  - Luigi Fabbri

- **IN UK & USA:** 19th-20th C.
  - William Godwin
  - Johann Most
  - Oscar Wilde
  - James Connolly
  - Big Bill Haywood; Mother Jones; Joe Hill; John Reed

- **Early-Mid 20th C.**
  - Alexander Berkman
  - Murray Bookchin

- **Mid-Late 20th C.**
  - Jean-Paul Sartre
  - Michael Albert
  - Mikhail Bakunin
  - Emma Goldman
  - Noam Chomsky

- **Latter Fr. Engels**
  - Ferdinand Lassalle
  - William Morris
  - Eduard Bernstein
  - Charlotte Gilmore

### DEMOCRATIC

- **Late 20th-21st C.**
  - Bertall Ollman
  - Robin Hahnel
  - John Roemer
  - Martha Nussbaum
  - John Rawls

- **ANGELOPHONE**
  - Michael Albert
  - Robin Hahnel
  - John Roemer
  - Martha Nussbaum

### ANARCHISM

- **Rudolf Rocker;**
- **Paul Goodman**
- **Luigi Fabbri**
- **Leo Tolstoy**
- **Hakim Bey**

- **IN EUROPE:**
  - **SOCIALISM**
  - **HUMANSIM:** 19th Century
    - Louis Blanqui
    - Camillo Cienfuegos
    - Karl Marx

  - **SOCIALISM:** 19th-Mid 19th Century
    - Ferdinand Lassalle
    - Friedrich Engels
    - Wilhelm Liebknecht
    - August Bebel

  - **V.I. Lenin**
  - **Leon Trotsky**
  - **Karl Liebknecht**
  - **Antonio Gramsci**
  - **Josef P. Cannon**

  - **EVEN MORE:**
  - **SOCIALISM:**
    - **SOCIALIST:**
      - Rosa Luxemburg
      - Karl Liebknecht
      - Franz Mehring
    - **SOCIALIST:**
      - Leon Trotsky
      - Garret Helberg
      - Max Adler
      - Victor Adler
      - Karl Remer
      - Otto Neurath
      - Friedrich Adler
    - **SOCIALIST:**
      - V.I. Lenin
      - Leon Trotsky
      - Karl Liebknecht
      - Franz Mehring
      - Joseph P. Cannon

## SOCIALISM

### ANARCHISM & HUMANISM

- **Early-Mid 20th C.**
  - Diego Rivera
  - Frida Kahlo
  - Andre Breton
  - Raya Dunayevskaya; C.L.R. James;
  - Jean-Paul Sartre;
  - Maurice Merleau-Ponty;
  - Adam Schaff

### ANARCHISM & LIBERTARIAN SOCIALISM

- **Mid-Late 20th C.**
  - Noam Chomsky
  - Daniel Gurrin
  - Murray Bookchin
  - Colin Ward
  - Hakim Bey
  - Paul Goodman
  - Germaine Greer

### SOCIALIST ARTISTS & HUMANISTS

- **Early-Late 20th C.**
  - Pierre Mager
  - Jean-Paul Sartre
  - Paul Goodman
  - Jean-Paul Sartre
  - Maurice Merleau-Ponty
  - Adam Schaff
  - C.L.R. James

### ANARCHISM
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    - Noam Chomsky
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    - C.L.R. James
    - Emma Goldman
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This chart includes key figures and their contributions to the history of Marxism and Socialism, spanning various historical periods and movements. Each figure is associated with specific ideological perspectives, such as Marxism, Anarchism, and Democratic Socialism, highlighting their influential roles in shaping these political and economic theories.
### Key:

- **Φ** = Philosophy or Philosophers

#### Bold Scoring and Progressively Larger Type indicates levels of Importance (in my opinion)

- **Red Type** = Marxist/Marxian Political Figures & Social Scientists (13 categories)
- **Pink Type** = Analytical Marxist/Marxian Philosophers (4 categories)
- **Brown Type** = Continental-Style Marxist/Marxian Philosophers (9 categories)
- **Purple Type** = Socialist – but not necessarily Marxist – Figures (4 categories)
- **Green Type** = Socialist Anarchist (or Quasi-Anarchist) Figures (6 categories)
- **Blue Type** = Social Democratic & Reformist Communist Figures (6 categories)
- **Light Blue Type** = Utopian Socialists (1 category)
- **Black Type** = Important Non-Marxist Figures (Many of Whom are Quasi-Marxist, and All of Whom are Important to Take into Consideration) (9 categories)

Roman numerals such as i, ii, iii indicate endnotes.

Arabic numerals such as 1, 2, 3 indicate the number of times a figure is mentioned in the chart. However, this does not necessarily indicate greater importance.

#### Comments on History of Marxism & Socialism: A Chart of Key Figures with Comments

1. This chart is meant to help illustrate the history of Marxism and socialism, primarily in the West (that is, primarily in Europe, the U.S., Canada). It does, however, include such important Non-Western Marxist/Communist political leaders as Mao Zedong, Chou Elai, and Ho Chi Minh.

2. It includes both theorists, on the one hand, and political leaders (and activists) in the Marxist and socialist traditions, on the other. Of course, many Marxist and socialist political leaders have also been theorists, and vice versa.
3. It is organized chronologically, going down, and each cell represents a particular group or type of theorists and/or political leaders.

4. In order to properly understand the Marxist tradition it is necessary to also understand the Socialist Anarchist/Liberal Socialist tradition, on the one hand, and Evolutionary Socialism/Social Democracy, on the other, since these three general traditions developed in conjunction and contention with each other, and each importantly impacted the development of the others. However, all three of these traditions accept the basic political positions that (1) some kind of socialism is historically possible and (2) a genuinely socialist society is better than any feasible kind of capitalism.

Political leaders and social-scientific theorists in the Marxist tradition are in Red Type, and mainly occupy the center columns. Thus, if one wants to view the history and evolution of core Marxism one need only follow the red columns from the top of the chart to the bottom.

5. This chart also includes philosophical schools of Marxism. In fact, it includes two general types of Marxist philosophical schools of thought: (A) Marxist theorists that are based on Continental Schools of philosophy (such as Hegelianism, Existentialism, structuralism, and post-structuralism) and Marxist theories that are based on Analytical Philosophy (particularly, Analytical Marxism). The former theorists are in Brown Type and the latter are in Pink Type.

Thus, if one wants to view the history and evolution of the Marxist tradition as a whole, including its political leaders and theorists, its social-scientific theorists (in the fields of sociology, economics, anthropology, political science, human geography, etc.), and its philosophers, one should follow Red, Brown, and Pink colored cells from the top of the chart to the bottom.

6. But if one really wants to understand the history and evolution of the Marxist tradition one also needs to understand the history and evolution of the other major socialist traditions with which it has always been intricately entwined. Thus, Socialist Anarchist figures are in Green Type, and Liberal Socialist figures are in Purple Type, and their cells are in the columns to the left. On the other hand, Evolutionary Socialists and Social Democratic figures (which overlap to a considerable degree) are mainly in the right hand columns and are in Blue Type.

7. The Marxist/Socialist tradition as a whole stands against the anti-socialist traditions that defend capitalism as preferable to any kind of socialism or communism. This includes various egalitarian liberal theories, moderate liberal theories, neoliberalism, right-libertarianism (which defends a more or less laissez faire capitalist economy and a more or less minimal state), as well as various conservative theories, and even fascism.

8. It should be noted, however, that many political philosophers and theorists who have expressed a view on this issue, especially over the past 50 years, are neutral between egalitarian liberal capitalist societies and various kinds of socialist societies, perhaps depending on a particular country's level of economic development and political culture. Such figures as John Rawls argue that the choice between these types of society depends upon empirical, historical facts and the practical judgment as to which kind of socioeconomic and political systems (of those feasible) can best meet the correct principles of social justice or the correct set of moral principles.

9. It should also be noted that some non-Marxist and non-Socialist theoretical traditions have importantly influenced the Marxist and broader Socialist traditions and, in turn, have often been importantly influenced by these traditions. I have included the most important of these philosophical and social-scientific traditions in Black Type on the chart.

10. However, in order to understand this chart and the claims I am making about it in my analysis, we must define the main terms we are using. In particular, we must define the following terms.
Main Types of Socioeconomic Systems

Capitalism
Capitalism is a socioeconomic system that has a market economy and (primarily) private ownership and control of large-scale economic enterprises and assets, and thus investment capital and its flow. It's main "law of motion" is the drive for private profit and capital accumulation. As such, capitalism as a socioeconomic system is compatible with any form of government from the most democratic to the least democratic, and from the most repressive to the least repressive. And, in fact, while some capitalist societies have had very democratic and liberal governments, others have had military dictatorships and even fascist dictatorships (such as Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy).

Socialism
A socialist economy is one that is characterized by (primarily) public ownership and control of large-scale economic enterprises and assets, and thus investment capital and its flow. However, on this definition a socialist economy, it can have either a market socialist economy or a command socialist economy. In any case, its main "law of motion" is supposed to be acting for the long-term public good. And, just as in the case of capitalism, a socialist economy is compatible with any form of government, from extremely democratic and non-repressive to extremely undemocratic and repressive. We can take socialism in this sense to be what Marx called the "first stage of communism."

However, it must be pointed out that whether a country (or society) is socialist is not determined by the degree of government intervention in the economy (in terms of fiscal policy, monetary policy, etc.), the degree to which it provides public goods (such as the basic economic infrastructure, health care, public parks, etc.), how high its taxes are, or how extensive its social transfer (welfare) programs are.

On this analysis, the so-called social-democratic Nordic countries (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland) have capitalist economic systems rather than socialist economic systems because they are still characterized by (primarily) private ownership of their large-scale economic enterprises and assets as well as by the drive for private profit. (I am not making any sort of normative judgments about these societies at this point; I'm just categorizing them.) However, since the economies of these societies have greater government intervention and a higher degree of public (government) ownership of large-scale economic enterprises and assets than other capitalist societies, these economies are sometimes referred to as "mixed economies." But these economies are not even close to having public ownership of half of the large-scale economic enterprises and assets; thus it is somewhat misleading to refer to them as "mixed economies." They are fundamentally capitalist economies.

However, if an economy really has more or less equal public and private ownership of large-scale economic enterprises – say, even a 60%-40% or 65%-35% split – then it would be convenient to classify it as an Intermediate economy or Intermediate socioeconomic system. While some analysts argue that contemporary China has a capitalist economy and others argue that it has a market socialist economy, it might be the case that it presently has an Intermediate economy at this stage of its development. (Whether or not such an Intermediate economy is stable over the long run or whether it will inevitably develop into a more pure form of capitalism or more pure form of socialism is a matter of much debate.)

Communism
Communism (in the Classical Marxist sense of the term) is not only a classless society but also a stateless society. In the words of Marx, after the transitional phase of the first stage of communism – which today is normally referred to as socialism – comes the "higher stage of communism" in which the state has "withered away." Thus, on the issue of the "final" type of society they are aiming at – and thought could and would come about – Classical Marxists and Left-Wing Anarchists are in complete agreement. However, many socialists and Marxists today – including myself – view this "higher stage of communism" or "full-fledged communism" as a utopian impossibility (at least for large-scale societies as opposed to small communities). This is because we do not believe that the two necessary (and jointly sufficient) conditions for the evolution of such a stateless society will (or can) ever be fulfilled in the real world. These two conditions are (1)
material super-abundance (a condition in which anyone can have any material good or service they desire) and (2) the complete transformation of human nature (or psychology) such that everyone will be completely peaceful, cooperative, and altruistic such that a state is not needed either to enforce criminal (or civil) law or to coordinate economic and other human activities (which is supposedly accomplished by the spontaneous cooperation of everyone). The first condition – material super-abundance – is not possible in the real world not only because, as we now know, the natural environment puts limits on how many goods and services can be produced (while still having a livable environment) but also because people's time, itself, is a scarce commodity whose scarcity can never be eliminated. The second condition – the complete transformation of human nature – is not possible in the real world because, as we now know, human nature (or psychology) is not infinitely or indefinitely malleable (as was assumed by Classical Marxists, who accepted the Enlightenment doctrine of the "Perfectibility of Man.") Human beings are – among many other true descriptions – animals and, more specifically, primates who are sometimes prone to uncooperative and even violent thoughts and actions, as well as capable of cooperation, non-violence, and altruism. Although better social circumstances can quite likely significantly reduce the frequency of uncooperative and violent thoughts and actions, it is unrealistic to believe that all such thoughts and actions can be eliminated from human populations in the real world. For these reasons it is virtually certain that large-scale societies will always need a state (government) to enforce criminal (and civil) law and (at least partially) coordinate economic and other types of activities.

If this analysis is correct then there is no point to arguing for full-fledged communism. But this is really irrelevant since the only really important issue at this point in history that Marxists and socialists should be concerned with is whether we can develop genuinely socialist societies that will solve the terrible social problems of capitalism.

---

1 The figures in this category are more often referred to as "Libertarian Socialists." However, in contemporary political philosophy – at least in English-speaking countries – the terms "libertarian" and "libertarianism" have come to be primarily associated with right-libertarianism as elaborated by such thinkers as Robert Nozick, Milton Friedman, and Friedrich von Hayek, which promotes (more or less) laissez faire capitalism and a (more or less) minimal state. Thus, I believe it is better (more perspicuous) to refer to this kind of socialism as "Liberal Socialism." As I am using the term, "Liberal" Socialism refers to the views accepted by socialists who are more concerned with emphasizing decentralism and participatory democracy, and with ensuring "liberal" rights and liberties (such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of association, etc.) in any kind of society at any level of development, than are most orthodox Marxists. While Orthodox Marxists have always believed that both socialist and future communist societies would be free and democratic, they tended to be less concerned with emphasizing "liberal" rights and liberties.

But this appellation ("Liberal Socialist") does not necessarily indicate that they are not revolutionaries. Indeed, most of those I list here were revolutionary socialists, although they were willing to also engage in reformist tactics such as contesting elections in capitalist societies.

2 By "Analytical" philosophy I only mean to indicate a type of philosophy that is devoted to the methodological standards of (1) conceptual clarity and (2) rigorous argumentation. These are the only two methodological commitments that characterize Analytical Philosophy; and there are no substantive views in any area of philosophy that all Analytical Philosophers share. However, another characteristic shared by almost all Analytical Philosophers is that while they feel free to help scientists and scientific theories achieve greater clarity and logical rigor, they do not believe that it is within the province or authority of Philosophy to contradict or correct established Science, especially the Natural Sciences. But, of course, some Analytical Philosophers – especially those in the area of the Philosophy of Science – sometimes make theoretical contributions to scientific theories but when they do so they are acting as scientists, not philosophers per se. (And, of course, some scientists – such as Darwin, Einstein, Nils Bohr, and Heisenberg – sometimes make philosophical claims, as well as scientific ones. But when they do so they are acting as philosophers, not scientists per se.)

By way of contrast, Analytical Philosophers often view the writings and theories of Continentally-Oriented Philosophers to be overly vague and imprecise and, when this is taken to an extreme, to even be nonsensical; and they also object to Continentally-Oriented Philosophers when they attempt to undermine the validity of the sciences.

But not all philosophers in this Continental Tradition (or Continentally-Oriented Tradition) are viewed by Analytical Philosophers as being objectionably vague and imprecise or as implausibly contradicting established science. For example, Maurice Merleau-Ponty as well as Michel Foucault are held in high regard by many Analytical Philosophers, as is Jurgen
Habermas and other Critical Theorists who have eschewed the Hegelian and/or Post-Hegelian leanings and terminologies of their earlier colleagues.

In any case, Analytical Marxists are simply those theorists who believe that important parts of Marxist empirical theory as well as the Marxist normative perspective are correct, but who also believe that these views can best be understood, elaborated, analyzed, and defended by utilizing the clear-headed methodology characteristic of Analytical Philosophy.

iii The Continentally-Oriented Philosophical Tradition stems from Hegelian and Post-Hegelian Philosophy, most commonly found in Continental Europe but, by stipulative definition, does not include European Philosophers prior to Hegel (such as Spinoza, Leibnitz, Malebranche, and Kant) nor more recent philosophers from Continental Europe who were not influenced by the Hegelian and Post-Hegelian Continental Traditions. A particularly notable example of a philosopher in the latter category is Gottlob Frege who, although a 19th Century German philosopher, was actually one of the great influences on the origin and development of Analytical Philosophy (which began with the work of British philosophers Bertrand Russell and G.E. Moore in the very early 20th Century).

Defined in this way, the Continentally-Oriented Philosophical Tradition includes such figures and schools of philosophy as Hegel, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, Feuerbach, the early Marx, the later Engels' "dialectical" views, Nietzsche, Bergson, 20th Century Hegelianism (Hypolite), Hegelian Marxism (Lukacs, Korsch), Phenomenology (Husserl), Anti-Humanistic Phenomenological Existentialism (Heidegger), Humanistic Phenomenological Existentialism (Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Camus, de Beauvoir), Religious Existentialism (Buber, Jaspers, Marcel), Structuralism (de Saussure, Levi-Strauss, Althusser), Critical Theory (Horkhimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Habermas, Richard Bernstein, Thomas McCarthy, et al.), Semiotics (Barthe, Eco), Hermeneutics (Gadamer, Ricour), and Post-Structuralism & Postmodernism (Foucault, Lyotard, Derrida, Deleuze & Guattari, Kristeva, Judith Butler, et al.).

iv I have lumped Socialist Anarchist and Liberal Socialist traditions together since they both have always put a premium of democracy. They differ, of course, in that Socialist Anarchists believe that the State is as evil as the Capitalist economic system and that both must be done away with, while Liberal Socialists believe that it is not possible to completely get rid of the State and propose, instead, that we make the government and society in general as democratic as possible. The socialist tradition I refer to as "Quasi-Anarchism" at least implicitly accepts the existence of the State as necessary in large-scale societies at least for the foreseeable future, even if they think that eventually such societies could evolve to the point at which the existence of a State would no longer be necessary. But these theorists also insist that governments and societies in general be made as democratic as possible, and often are proponents of Parecon (Participatory Economics) and Parpolity (Participatory Politics). On this definition, I suspect that such Social Ecologists as Murray Bookchin as well as many theorists associated with Zcom, Znet, and Zmagazine are proponents of Quasit-Anarchism including Noam Chomsky, Edward Herman, Michael Albert, and Robin Hahnel.

v I don't include neoconservatism here because it is not a general political vision of what kind of societies are justified but, rather, a vision of using naked power by states and, in particular, the U.S.