

**KARL
MARX
FREDERICK
ENGELS**

**Collected
Works**



**Volume 27
Engels: 1890-1895**

Contents

Preface	XIII
---------------	------

FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

February 1890-April 1895

1. The Elections of 1890 in Germany	3
2. What Now?	7
3. The Foreign Policy of Russian Tsardom	11
I	13
II	21
III	29
4. On Anti-Semitism	50
5. Preface to the Fourth German Edition (1890) of the <i>Manifesto of the Communist Party</i>	53
6. May 4 in London	61
7. Draft of a Reply to the Editors of the <i>Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung</i>	67
8. Reply to the Editors of the <i>Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung</i>	69
9. The International Workers' Congress of 1891	72
10. Farewell Letter to the Readers of the <i>Sozialdemokrat</i>	76
11. Reply to Mr. Paul Ernst	80
12. To the Editors of the <i>Berliner Volksblatt</i>	86
13. To the National Council of the French Workers' Party	87
14. To the Editors of the <i>Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik</i> and <i>Népszava</i> in Budapest	89

15. To the Members of the Executive of the Communist German Workers' Educational Society	91
16. Preface to Karl Marx's <i>Critique of the Gotha Programme</i>	92
17. In the Case of Brentano Versus Marx. Regarding Alleged Falsification of Quotation. The Story and Documents	95
I	99
II	103
III	106
IV	110
V	113
VI	118
VII	122
Documents	132
I. The Incriminated Quotations	132
II. Brentano and Marx	135
III. Sedley Taylor and Eleanor Marx	155
IV. Engels and Brentano	164
18. Greetings to the French Workers on the 20th Anniversary of the Paris Commune	177
19. Introduction to Karl Marx's <i>The Civil War in France</i>	179
20. Re: the Spanish Edition of Karl Marx's <i>The Poverty of Philosophy</i>	192
21. To the Committee for the International Meeting for the Claims of Labour	193
22. Introduction to Karl Marx's <i>Wage Labour and Capital</i> (1891 Edition)	194
23. Preface to the Fourth Edition of <i>Socialism: Utopian and Scientific</i>	202
24. To the Early History of the Family (Bachofen, McLennan, Morgan)	203
25. Message of Greetings to the Second Austrian Party Congress ...	215
26. A Critique of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891	217
I. Preamble in Ten Paragraphs	219
II. Political Demands	225
III. Economic Demands	230
Appendix to Section I	231
27. The Brussels Congress. The Situation in Europe	233
The Brussels Congress	233
The Situation in Europe	233
28. Socialism in Germany	235

I	237
II	241
29. To the Editors of the <i>Volksfreund</i>	251
30. The Covering Letter to the Statement to the Editor, <i>Daily Chronicle Office</i>	252
31. The Late Madam Karl Marx	253
32. To the Choir Club of the Communist German Workers' Educational Society, Tottenham Street	254
33. To the Committee of the Communist German Workers' Educational Society	256
34. Preface to the 1892 English Edition of <i>The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844</i>	257
35. Reply to the Honourable Giovanni Bovio	270
36. Preface to the Polish Edition (1892) of the <i>Manifesto of the Communist Party</i>	273
37. Greetings to the French Workers on the Occasion of the 21st Anniversary of the Paris Commune	275
38. Preface to the Second German Edition of Karl Marx's <i>The Poverty of Philosophy</i>	277
39. Introduction to the English Edition (1892) of <i>Socialism: Utopian and Scientific</i>	278
40. To the Third Austrian Party Congress in Vienna	303
41. Carl Schorlemmer	304
42. Preface to the Second German Edition (1892) of <i>The Condition of the Working-Class in England</i>	307
43. On Certain Peculiarities in England's Economic and Political Development	324
44. To the National Council of the Socialist Workers' Party of Spain	326
45. Addenda to the Biography	328
46. The American Presidential Election	329
47. Marx, Heinrich Karl	332
48. To the Editors of the <i>Berliner Volks-Tribüne</i>	344
49. Letter to a Member of the Committee of the Communist German Workers' Educational Society	347
50. A Newly-Discovered Case of Group Marriage	348
51. To the Workers' Educational Association of Vienna	352
52. To the Executive Committee of the Social-Democratic Party of Hungary	353
53. On the Latest Caper of the Paris Police	354
54. The Italian Panama	356

I	356
II	358
III	360
55. To the Italian Reader	365
56. Can Europe Disarm?	367
Foreword	371
I	372
II	374
III	377
IV	381
V	383
VI	386
VII	388
VIII	390
57. To the German Workers on May Day 1893	394
58. To the Austrian Workers on May Day 1893	396
59. For the Czech Comrades on Their May Day Celebration	398
60. Nonetheless	399
61. To the Spanish Workers on May Day 1893	400
62. To the Editorial Board of the Bulgarian Magazine <i>Sotsial-Demokrat</i>	402
63. To Czech Social Democrats	403
64. Closing Speech at the International Socialist Workers' Congress in Zurich. August 12, 1893	404
65. Speech at a Social-Democratic Meeting in Vienna on September 14, 1893	406
66. To Czech Socialist Workers. To the Editorial Board of the <i>Sociálny Demokrat</i> in Prague	408
67. Speech at a Social-Democratic Meeting in Berlin on September 22, 1893	409
68. To the Cologne Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany	411
69. To the German Workers' Educational Society in London	412
70. To the International Congress of Socialist Students	413
71. Preface to the Pamphlet <i>Internationales aus dem "Volksstaat" (1871-75)</i>	414
72. Introductory Note (1894) to <i>The Bakuninists at Work</i>	419
73. Afterword (1894) to "On Social Relations in Russia"	421
74. The Third Volume of Karl Marx's <i>Capital</i>	434
75. On the Contents of the Third Volume of <i>Capital</i>	435
76. The Future Italian Revolution and the Socialist Party	437

77. To the National Council of the French Workers' Party on the Occasion of the 23rd Anniversary of the Paris Commune	441
78. To the Fourth Austrian Party Congress	442
79. To the Executive of the Social-Democratic Party of Hungary on the Third Party Congress	443
80. On the History of Early Christianity	445
I	447
II	452
III	460
81. To the English Socialist and Working Men's Organisations	470
82. To the Third Congress of the Socialist Party of the Italian Working People	472
83. Greetings to the Socialists of Sicily	474
84. Conditions for a Loan for the Founding of the Daily <i>Arbeiter-Zeitung</i>	476
85. International Socialism and Italian Socialism	477
86. Letter to the Editors of the <i>Vorwärts</i>	479
87. The Peasant Question in France and Germany	481
I	485
II	494
88. On the Fourth Volume of Karl Marx's <i>Capital</i>	503
89. To the German Workers' Educational Society in London	504
90. Message of Greetings to the Austrian Workers on the Daily Publication of the <i>Arbeiter-Zeitung</i>	505
91. Introduction to Karl Marx's <i>The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850</i> (1895).....	506
92. To the Executive of the German Workers' Educational Society in London	525
93. To the Committee of the Independent Labour Party	526

APPENDICES

1. An Old Friend of Labour	529
2. Engels, Frederick	530
3. Interview of Frederick Engels by the Correspondent of <i>L'Éclair</i> on April 1, 1892	533
4. Biographical Article on Engels	539
5. Record of Frederick Engels' Speech at a Meeting to Commemorate the Paris Commune	541
6. Message of May Day Greetings to the Austrian Workers. 1893	542
7. Interview of Frederick Engels by the Correspondent of <i>Le Figaro</i> on May 11, 1893	543
8. Interview of Frederick Engels by the <i>Daily Chronicle</i> Correspondent at the End of June 1893	549

NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i>	557
<i>Name Index</i>	637
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i>	659
<i>Index of Periodicals</i>	677
<i>Subject Index</i>	682
<i>Glossary of Geographical Names</i>	699

ILLUSTRATIONS

Title page of the German edition (1890) of the <i>Manifesto of the Communist Party</i>	55
First page of F. Engels' manuscript <i>A Critique of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891</i>	221
Half-title of the English edition of <i>Socialism: Utopian and Scientific</i> presented by Engels to F. A. Sorge	279
Title page of the English edition of <i>Socialism: Utopian and Scientific</i>	280
Title page of the English edition of <i>The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844</i>	309
Reverse of the title page of <i>The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844</i> presented by Engels to Eleanor Marx-Aveling	310
List of K. Marx's works drawn up by F. Engels	333
List of F. Engels' works drawn up by himself	337
List of F. Engels' works drawn up by himself (<i>continued</i>)	338
Title page of the Italian edition of the <i>Manifesto of the Communist Party</i> presented to Engels by F. Turati	363
Title page of the pamphlet <i>Can Europe Disarm?</i>	369
Cover of <i>Internationales aus dem "Volksstaat" (1871-75)</i>	415
Title page of <i>Internationales aus dem "Volksstaat" (1871-75)</i> presented by Engels to Dr. Rudolf Meyer	416

TRANSLATORS:

- JOHN PEET: Works 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 25, 29, 32,
40, 41, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 64, 71, 78,
79, 86, 89, 90, 92
- BARRIE SELMAN: Works 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21, 27, 28,
33, 37, 49, 51, 56, 60, 61, 65, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75,
76, 77, 84, 88, Appendices: 3, 6
- VERONICA THOMPSON: Works 20, 33, 44, 82, 83, 85
- DAVID FORGACS: Works 35, 55
- VICTOR SCHNITTKE: Works 42 (part), 45, 66, 68,
Appendices 2, 4, 5
- STEPAN APRESYAN: Works 63, 66

Preface

Volume 27 of the *Collected Works* of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels contains the writings of Frederick Engels from the beginning of 1890 up to his death in 1895, thus completing the part of this edition which includes the works of Marx and Engels other than those on economics, which comprise volumes 28 to 37.

The works in this volume reflect Engels' wide range of activities in the final years of his life. These include editing the manuscripts of Volume Three of *Capital* for publication, helping socialist parties in working out theses and tactics, day-to-day contacts with representatives of various national working-class movements and attempting to consolidate the revolutionary forces of the international proletariat. Engels also paid particular attention to foreign policy questions against the background of a growing threat of war in Europe.

In this volume the reader will find a number of items which, although brief, are of major theoretical importance. They vary greatly in form, including articles for journals and newspapers, prefaces and introductions to new editions of works by Marx and by Engels himself, messages of greetings to socialist parties and workers' organisations, various notes, and so on.

The contents of this volume are closely connected with the volumes containing Engels' correspondence for 1890-1895 (vols 48, 49 and 50). Many of the problems merely mentioned in passing here are examined in greater detail in his letters. In his writings and correspondence of this period Engels sums up, as it were, his reflections on the historical experience of the struggle for emancipation of the proletariat over the preceding decades, and at the same time considers new trends in economics and

politics, trying to assess the effect of these changes on the prospect of the international revolutionary process.

Throughout the whole volume runs the idea that the capitalist mode of production has proved to be stabler than it appeared before, and capable of developing further and of extending its spheres of influence. In this connection Engels emphasises the need for socialist parties to make use of bourgeois-democratic institutions to win over the mass of the working class and other strata of the working people whilst at the same time continuing to struggle for the ultimate goal, the establishment of a new social order.

Engels examines all the major problems characteristic of this historical period both from the viewpoint of the most pressing tasks and of the more remote prospects of the working-class struggle. He devotes his attention to changes in the political life of many European states, the impressive achievements of the working-class movement (the formation and consolidation of the socialist parties and the creation of a new international proletarian alliance, the Second International), and the growth of this movement into a significant political force. Alongside the recognition of Marxism as the theoretical basis for socialist parties, he also perceives a certain revival of opportunism and anarchism, and a tendency to vulgarise and distort Marx's teaching. Engels notes the increasingly uneven development of capitalism and the aggravation of contradictions between the leading capitalist countries, fraught with the danger of war in Europe.

Engels' research work was always concrete. His theoretical writings were inseparable from his practical participation in the working-class struggle. This is equally true of the final period of his life. Almost all the works published in this volume were written either in response to specific events in the working-class and socialist movement or in connection with the need to develop and explain highly important questions of Marxist theory.

A major place in this activity was occupied by questions concerning Marx's economic teaching. Engels considered it his prime duty to complete the work on and disseminate Marx's *Capital*. The end of 1894 saw the publication of Volume Three. Engels had worked on the manuscripts for about ten years. He gave a brief outline of the contents and a description of its connection with the earlier volumes in "The Third Volume of

Karl Marx's *Capital*" and "On the Contents of the Third Volume of *Capital*", published here. In the Preface to Volume Three (see present edition, Vol. 37) Engels described the difficulties he had encountered in his work, noting that the delay in publication was due to pressing obligations to the international workers' movement. The fourth German edition of Volume One of *Capital* came out in 1890 and the second edition of Volume Two in 1893, both under his editorship. In the preface to the fourth German edition of Volume One (see present edition, Vol. 35) Engels showed yet again the invalidity of attempts by certain bourgeois economists to accuse Marx of misquoting and thereby discredit him as a scholar. (See also *In the Case of Brentano Versus Marx* which is also devoted to this question.)

The new edition, prepared by Engels, of Marx's popular work *Wage Labour and Capital* (1891) also served to propagate Marx's economic teaching. Engels made some alterations and additions to the text of this work (written in 1849) in keeping with Marx's subsequent development of his economic teaching. The Introduction to this edition contains a popular exposition of the principles of Marxist political economy, above all, of the mechanism of capitalist exploitation.

Up to his very last days Engels sought to keep abreast of the processes taking place in capitalist economy. He concentrated on the changes in the forms of organisation of capitalist production which had been detected in embryo by Marx and himself back in the 1870s, and which acquired a more distinct character in the last decade of the 19th century. In his work "A Critique of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891" and in several other articles he noted the rapidly growing significance of such forms of production and capital concentration as joint-stock companies, cartels and trusts, "which dominate and monopolise whole branches of industry" (p. 224) and are an "organised monopoly" (p. 330). Engels saw this phenomenon, and also the increasing role played by stock-exchange operations and the export of capital, as well as the growing unevenness in the development of different countries, as the main tendencies determining the future development of the capitalist mode of production, which later, at the turn of the century, led to the entry of capitalism into a qualitatively new stage, imperialism. These ideas were worked out in greater detail by Engels in his Supplementary Notes to Volume Three of *Capital*, "The Stock Exchange" (present edition, Vol. 37), in some footnotes to the text of that volume and additions to the fourth German edition of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* published in

1891 (present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 318 and 323), and also in the additions to the text of *Anti-Dühring* made in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (present edition, Vol. 25, pp. 639-40 and 642).

The tendency for free competitive capitalism to grow into monopoly capitalism and the increasing role of the bourgeois state in the management of the economy were regarded by Engels, on the one hand, as evidence of the relative stability of capitalism—its ability to create new forms of the organisation of production more in keeping with the growing productive forces and—on the other, as a factor contributing to the aggravation of contradictions between the major capitalist states.

An important part of Engels' theoretical work was the formulation of tactics for socialist parties with due regard for changes that had occurred in the previous twenty years in the economic and political life of European states, particularly in the working-class movement itself. A considerable portion of this volume is taken up by works which analyse the situation and prospects of the working-class struggle and determine the ways and means of attaining immediate and ultimate aims in the context of the specific national characteristics of each country. Engels wrote many of them in the form of prefaces and introductions to new editions of Marx's and his own works. For these new editions he chose such works as elucidated key problems of the struggle of the previous few decades and were therefore particularly relevant to socialist parties formed during the preceding ten to fifteen years; these works were to help them master the Marxist method of analysing current events and find the most effective means for practical struggle. The new publications of such works as *The Civil War in France* and *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* by Marx, their joint work *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Engels' *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* and others enabled him in the introductions and prefaces not only to express his own ideas on the forms and prospects of the struggle for emancipation, but also to introduce readers to the Marxist method of studying contemporary political and tactical problems.

Another group of works consists of articles written in connection with specific events in the working-class movement or in the political life of individual countries. These writings proved to be of great interest for the international socialist movement as a whole.

Changes in the political climate were felt most of all in Germany. This was directly linked with the successes of the German Social Democrats, the strongest contingent of the international socialist working-class movement at that time. The present volume opens with two articles dealing with the major victory of the German socialists in the elections to the Reichstag on February 20, 1890—"The Elections of 1890 in Germany" and "What Now?"—in which Engels highly assesses this event which meant the failure of attempts by the reactionary bourgeois-Junker governmental bloc to put down the revolutionary vanguard of the German working class. The fate of the Anti-Socialist Law was thus predetermined. In the autumn of the same year it was repealed. Its initiator and the main organiser of the persecution of the socialists, Bismarck, had retired even before that, shortly after the elections. The collapse of the Bismarck regime was important not only for the German working class. It showed that the policy of outright suppression of the socialist working-class movement had outlived itself. It became clear that the bourgeoisie would now increasingly determine its policy with a view to combining its political hegemony with the legalisation of the working-class movement. This tendency manifested itself in other West European countries as well. Socialist parties were faced with the need to interpret the qualitative changes in political life and work out tactics suited to the new situation. Engels called on them to do this, stressing that in the present circumstances legal means of struggle could be far more effective than attempts to force events without any chance of success. "The attempt must be made," wrote Engels in his "Farewell Letter to the Readers of the *Sozialdemokrat*", "to get along with legal methods of struggle for the time being. Not only we are doing this, it is being done by all workers' parties in all countries where the workers have a certain measure of legal freedom of action, and this for the simple reason that it is the most productive method for them" (this volume, p. 78).

In the article "Socialism in Germany", which analyses the results of the parliamentary elections in that country over the preceding twenty years, he again stresses that legality "is working so well for us that we would be mad to spurn it as long as the situation lasts" (p. 241). Engels sets out these conclusions in most detail in his final work "Introduction to Karl Marx's *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* (1895)". He again reminds readers that the socialists now have to wage their struggle in a totally new situation, a time of relatively peaceful development, when they can

successfully make use of legal means of working in the masses and in the interests of the masses in most capitalist states. Engels regarded it as the most important international achievement of the German Social Democrats that they had managed, even under the Anti-Socialist Law, to become a truly mass party and thus to prove the correctness of their chosen tactics by combining legal and illegal means without resorting to violence. "Everywhere the German example of utilising the suffrage, of winning all posts accessible to us, has been imitated" (p. 520).

Historical experience, particularly that of the Paris Commune, has shown that the victory of the socialist revolution, in whatever form, is impossible without the conscious participation of the broad masses. Consequently Engels insisted on the need to use all possible means to win over the masses: "Where it is a question of a complete transformation of the social organisation, the masses themselves must also be in on it, must themselves already have grasped what is at stake, what they are fighting for, body and soul" (ibid.). Here Engels was referring not only to the workers, but to other strata of working people, above all, the peasantry. "...Even in France," he wrote further on, "the Socialists are realising more and more that no lasting victory is possible for them unless they first win over the great mass of the people, i.e. the peasants in this instance" (pp. 520-21).

However, in this work and others published in this volume, Engels at the same time warns against relying exclusively on legal means of struggle and stresses constantly that socialist parties should be ready to use other tactics, including violent ones, if the ruling classes again resort to aggressive methods of suppressing the workers' movement and if the course of historical development leads to a revolutionary crisis.

At the same time Engels saw the complexities and difficulties facing socialist parties in the new historical conditions. This applied to the German Social Democrats in particular. The transition to new forms of struggle had produced phenomena in their ranks which aroused Engels' misgivings. In the articles "Reply to the Editors of the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung*" and "Reply to Mr. Paul Ernst", both published in this volume, and others, Engels condemned actions by the oppositional group of the "Young" at the beginning of the 1890s, which made demagogic use of the opportunist mistakes of individual party leaders and accused all its leadership of renouncing revolutionary aims. The oppositional group also sought to force upon the party "tactics that are utterly insane" (p. 85) and adventuristic and make it



reduce parliamentary activity, etc., to a minimum. Such tactics, Engels shows, would inevitably lead to a break with the masses and might provoke the authorities to renew persecutions; in short, they “would be sufficient to bury the strongest party of millions” (p. 70). Engels’ speeches and also his numerous letters to comrades-in-arms (see present edition, Vol. 48) rendered important assistance to the party leaders in their struggle against the group of the “Young”, which ceased to exist shortly afterwards.

Engels saw another, even greater, danger in the opportunist moods of a number of active party members, which were increasingly reflecting reformist trends. His exposure of such views was of special importance in connection with the drafting in 1891 of a new programme for the Social-Democratic Party of Germany. Precisely because of this Engels considered it expedient to publish Marx’s manuscript *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (present edition, Vol. 24) hitherto known only to a few party leaders. In his Preface to the publication Engels wrote: “I think I would be guilty of suppression if I any longer withheld from publicity this important—perhaps the most important—document relevant to this discussion” (this volume, p. 92). It focussed the attention of the German Social Democrats on the importance of revolutionary theory for the day-to-day practice of the working-class movement to counterbalance the pragmatism characteristic of the opportunists, in particular, the followers of Lassalle. It dealt a heavy blow to the cult of Ferdinand Lassalle, still widespread at that time among German Social Democrats. This publication displeased some party leaders at first, but it was widely appreciated in party circles. The appearance of this work by Marx largely made it possible to overcome Lassallean influence in the new party programme.

“A Critique of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891”, written in the form of comments on the draft and not then intended for publication is a most important document reflecting Engels’ role in the victory of Marxist programmatic and tactical principles in German Social Democracy. Stressing that the draft “differs very favourably from the former programme” and “is, on the whole, based on present-day science” (p. 219), Engels made a number of comments whose theoretical significance goes far beyond concrete criticism of the draft’s individual theses. He noted, in particular, the erroneous nature of the categorical assertion that the poverty of the workers was growing: “This is

incorrect when put in such a categorical way. The organisation of the workers and their constantly growing resistance will possibly check the *increase of misery* to a certain extent. However, what *certainly* does increase is the *insecurity of existence*" (p. 223).

In this work Engels gave a precise and apt definition of the nature of opportunism, directed straight at the representatives of the right wing of the German Social Democrats: "This forgetting of the great, the principal considerations for the momentary interests of the day, this struggling and striving for the success of the moment regardless of later consequences, this sacrifice of the future of the movement for its present ... is and remains opportunism" (p. 227).

Most of Engels' criticisms of the draft programme referred to the section on political demands. He stressed the profound inner connection of the struggle for the socialist transformation of society with the struggle for democratic rights. In the specific conditions of Germany, he noted, the prime task of the proletariat was to do away with the "semi-absolutist, and moreover indescribably confused political order" (p. 226) and to set up a democratic republic, that vital prerequisite for the proletariat to gain political power. Engels did not exclude the possibility that, in countries with established democratic traditions where "the representatives of the people concentrate all power in their hands" (*ibid.*), this process might take place peacefully.

Although not all Engels' suggestions were fully accepted, he was satisfied with the text of the programme adopted at the Erfurt Congress of the party in October 1891. On the whole this programme was of a Marxist nature and served for many years as a model for the socialists of other countries.

Engels examined the problems of the state and also speculated about the society of the future in his "Introduction to Karl Marx's *The Civil War in France*". Bearing in mind the experience of the two decades following the Paris Commune, he gave a profound analysis of the Commune's historical significance and lessons. He noted in particular its efforts to "safeguard itself against its own deputies and officials" and to create guarantees against the "transformation of the state and the organs of the state from servants of society into masters of society" (pp. 189, 190) by ensuring that all officials were elected and could be dismissed at any time on a decision of the voters and that all material privileges

for them were abolished. "In this way," he believed, "an effective barrier to place-hunting and careerism" would be set up (p. 190).

Concerning the long-term prospects for the state after the establishment of socialist social relations, Engels expressed the conviction that it would continue to exist "until such time as a generation reared in new, free social conditions is able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap heap" (ibid.). He repeated this idea in the "Preface to the Pamphlet *Internationales aus dem 'Volksstaat' (1871-75)*", adding that the party's ultimate aim was "to surpass the entire State, and thus democracy too" (p. 417).

Engels' description of the class essence of the state was aimed directly at Social-Democratic philistines who feel "a superstitious reverence for the state" (p. 190). One of Engels' last works, "The Peasant Question in France and Germany", was also directed against opportunist elements in international Social Democracy.

In this work Engels developed further the principles of the proletarian party's agrarian programme and its tactics in relation to the peasantry. The work was prompted by two events. First, by the adoption, by the congress of the French Workers' Party in September 1894, of an agrarian programme in which one of the party's tasks was to retain small peasant holdings under capitalism and defend the interests of all peasants, including those who exploited hired labour, which was in direct contradiction to the ultimate aims of the socialists. Second, by an address at the congress of the German Social Democrats by the leader of their Bavarian organisation Georg Vollmar, who set forth similar aims and denied the need for a differentiated approach to the various categories of peasants. These facts testified to a lack of clarity on this question among socialists, which is what led Engels to write this article.

It is Engels who explained that under capitalism the peasantry should not be regarded as a single whole, because it is in the process of differentiation and the interests of its different categories are not the same. Therefore the tactics of socialist parties in respect of the big, middle and small peasantry should be different. Engels explained the importance of an alliance of the proletariat with the small peasantry both for the historical fate of the peasants themselves and for the success of the socialist transformation of society. Socialist parties, he wrote, should explain to the small peasantry the dangers which the development of capitalism posed for them, the coincidence of their vital interests with the interests of the working class, and what they

stood to gain from the abolition of capitalism. Engels believed that after the victory of the socialist revolution the main path of agricultural development would lie in the cooperation of peasant farms, in turning small-scale property "into co-operative property operated co-operatively" (p. 497). He particularly emphasised that the cooperative organisation of peasant farms should proceed on a strictly voluntary basis and warned against being over-hasty here.

Concerning future society, Engels frequently stressed that one could speak only about certain main features, basic laws, which could be determined proceeding from known facts and trends of development, but not about details, for the discussion of which life had not yet provided material. "We are *evolutionaries*, we have no intention of dictating definitive laws to mankind. Prejudices instead of detailed organisation of the society of the future?" Engels asked the correspondent of the French newspaper *Le Figaro*, who interviewed him in May 1893. "You will find no trace of that amongst us. We shall be satisfied when we have placed the means of production in the hands of the community" (p. 547).

The entire contents of this volume bear eloquent testimony to the outstanding role which Engels continued to play even in the final years of his life in the international working-class socialist movement. As Engels himself wrote in his Preface to Volume Three of *Capital* "the work as go-betweens for the national movements of Socialists and workers in the various countries" (present edition, Vol. 37) shifted entirely to his shoulders after the death of Marx. Engels invariably combined this activity with his theoretical studies, even if this affected their progress. "But if a man has been active in the movement for more than fifty years, as I have been," he continued, "he regards the work connected with it as a bounden duty that brooks no delay" (*ibid.*). The more the movement itself grew, socialist parties were formed, and new socialist newspapers and journals appeared, the wider and stronger Engels' international contacts became and the greater was his authority as a teacher and adviser of socialists the world over. He contributed directly to the socialist press of Germany, France, Italy, Austria, Britain and other countries, and to the Russian émigré press. The numerous documents published in this volume, such as greetings to various national contingents of the working-class movement, letters to the press, speeches, etc., show the extent of his influence in the international working-class movement,

his tireless struggle to consolidate Marxism as the ideological basis of the proletariat's struggle.

To the very end of his days Engels maintained regular contact with the socialists of almost all the European countries and the United States, giving them valuable assistance in solving theoretical and tactical problems. The role he played in the international socialist movement may further be seen from the fact that correspondents of the bourgeois press frequently turned to him, as can be seen from his interviews in the Appendices to this volume.

Some of the works in the volume reflect Engels' actual participation in the British working-class movement of the time, and the assistance he gave to those who were trying to set up a mass proletarian party in Britain. Engels hoped that such a party would "put an early end to the seesaw game of the two old parties which have been succeeding each other in power and thereby perpetuating bourgeois rule" (this volume, p. 323). His hopes that the Independent Labour Party set up in 1893 would play such a role did not materialise.

Engels continued to render the utmost assistance to his followers in the French socialist movement. He welcomed the successes of the socialist movement in Austria-Hungary and noted with satisfaction the first perceptible advances of the socialist cause in the Slav countries ("To the Editorial Board of the Bulgarian Magazine *Sotsial-Demokrat*", "For the Czech Comrades on Their May Day Celebration" and others). In his "Preface to the Polish Edition (1892) of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*" Engels noted the growing role of the young Polish proletariat in the struggle for the independence and national revival of Poland.

In the first half of the 1890s Engels devoted considerable attention to the Second International formed in 1889. He helped with the preparatory work for its initial congresses, striving to ensure that the influence of Marx's adherents predominated and struggling to preserve the unity of the international working-class movement and bring the mass workers' organisations, particularly the British trade unions, into this new international alliance (see, for example, pp. 74-75). "We must permit discussion in order not to become a sect," Engels wrote, "but the common standpoint must be retained" (p. 405). Addressing the International Socialist Workers' Congress in Zurich in 1893, Engels noted with satisfaction that the new International, created on the basis of uniting the independent socialist parties, was much stronger than the former (pp. 404-05).

Engels attached great importance to the May Day celebrations, first held in 1890 following a decision of the Paris Congress of the Second International under the slogan of the struggle for an eight-hour working day. He called this event "the first international *action* of the militant working class" (p. 61). Engels himself took part in May Day meetings in London and sent May Day greetings to the workers of various countries. He sought to turn this celebration into a traditional display of the solidarity of the international proletariat, regarding it as an important means of the international education of the working masses and of winning them over to socialism.

Unity among the revolutionary forces of international socialism was of great importance in promoting the vital interests of the working class, and also in fighting militarism and the threat of war in Europe. Several works in the volume, such as *The Foreign Policy of Russian Tsardom*, "Socialism in Germany" and *Can Europe Disarm?*, deal with problems of international relations, providing an analysis of the causes behind the aggravation of contradictions between the leading capitalist countries and setting out the tasks of socialists in the struggle against the threat of war.

Referring to the military-political blocs which were formed at that time, the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, on the one hand, and the Franco-Russian Alliance, which was finally set up at the beginning of the 1890s, on the other, Engels wrote: "Both camps are preparing for a decisive battle, for a war, such as the world has not yet seen, in which 10 to 15 million armed combatants will stand face to face" (p. 46). He attached special importance to the role played by the ruling circles of the Russian Empire and to its diplomatic activities, and believed that tsarist autocracy, notwithstanding considerable changes in the international alignment of forces beginning from the 1870s, remained the main bulwark of European reaction.

The question of the ways and future destiny of the revolutionary movement in Russia was, thus, closely connected with the future of the international working-class movement. With his article *The Foreign Policy of Russian Tsardom*, written specially for the first Russian Marxist journal *Sotsial-demokrat* published in Geneva, Engels wanted to attract the attention of Russian socialists and the socialist parties of other countries to the international significance of the imminent popular revolution in Russia.

Engels closely followed the socio-economic development of Russia and the mounting signs of the imminent revolutionary

crisis there on account of the role tsarist Russia played in world politics as the "last stronghold" of European reaction. He finally concluded that "the transformation of the country into a capitalist industrial nation, the proletarianisation of a large proportion of the peasantry and the decay of the old communistic commune" was proceeding swiftly (p. 433). The collapse of tsarist autocracy, Engels argued, would have a decisive impact on the political climate in Europe, undermine the positions of reactionary regimes and, perhaps, also lead to their downfall. "It [a Russian revolution]," wrote Engels in his "Afterword (1894) to 'On Social Relations in Russia'", "will also give the labour movement of the West fresh impetus and create new, better conditions in which to carry on the struggle, thus hastening the victory of the modern industrial proletariat" (ibid).

In the face of the growing threat of a war of unprecedented proportions, which would inflict great losses primarily on the working masses of the belligerent countries, Engels invariably stressed that the international working class had a vital interest in preserving peace. He did his utmost to support all the actions of socialists aimed against militarism and the threat of war. In connection with the forthcoming discussion in the German Reichstag of a new draft military law Engels published a series of articles entitled *Can Europe Disarm?*, which were intended to assist the actions of Social-Democratic deputies on this question. Engels put forward a well-argued programme for the gradual reduction of arms and the turning of standing armies "into a militia based on the universal arming of the people" (p. 371). While Engels was under no illusions as to the plan being accepted by the European powers, he believed that his proposals would provide Social Democrats with a new weapon for exposing the anti-popular militaristic policy of the ruling circles and serve to extend their influence.

A number of theoretical works in this volume develop the materialist interpretation of history and its application to concrete historical research. In the Introduction to the English edition (1892) of his work *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, an introduction of theoretical importance in its own right, Engels used the term "historical materialism" for the first time and gave a concise, apt description of this vital part of Marxism. He defined it as a view "of the course of history which seeks the ultimate cause and the great moving power of all important historic events in the

economic development of society, in the changes in the modes of production and exchange, in the consequent division of society into distinct classes, and in the struggles of these classes against one another" (p. 289). Demonstrating the invalidity of attempts by agnostics to prove that the world is unknowable, Engels develops and substantiates the thesis that human practice is the criterion of truth. The Introduction contains a vivid account of the main stages in the ideological and political struggle of the bourgeoisie against feudalism and shows that, with the development of the working-class movement, the bourgeoisie rejected free-thinking and turned again to religion, seeing it as a means of struggle against the revolutionary workers' movement.

The articles "On the History of Early Christianity" and "To the Early History of the Family" are examples of the application of the materialist interpretation of history to concrete historical issues. Engels revised this edition in the light of the latest scientific data.

Engels' reply to Paul Ernst, one of the leaders of the opposition group of the "Young" in German Social Democracy, attacks the vulgarisation of historical materialism. Engels comes out firmly against the oversimplified, schematic use of Marx's teaching to explain historical phenomena. "... The materialist method," he wrote, "turns into its opposite if, in an historical study, it is used not as a guide but rather as a ready-made pattern in accordance with which one tailors the historical facts" (p. 81). This letter is one of the first in a series written in the first half of the 1890s and known as the "Letters on Historical Materialism". They elaborate on the numerous questions relating to the materialist interpretation of history. Engels explains that the view of the economy as the only active factor in the historical process is nothing but a primitive interpretation of historical materialism.

* * *

The volume contains 93 works by Engels, of which 45, among them *In the Case of Brentano Versus Marx, Can Europe Disarm?* and "The Italian Panama", are published in English for the first time, and eleven have appeared in English earlier only in part.

Works written by Engels in several languages, including English, are reproduced here from the English version. Any significant discrepancies are indicated in the footnotes.

In texts written in languages other than English, any English words and expressions are printed in small caps. Where there are

whole passages originally written in English, these are marked with asterisks.

Headings provided by the editors are given in square brackets.

Obvious misprints discovered in dates, numbers, etc., have been corrected by checking the sources used by Engels, usually without any further note.

The texts and notes for the first part of the volume were compiled and prepared by Yevgenia Dakhina and for the latter part (beginning with the "Introduction to the English Edition (1892) of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*") by Tatiana Chikileva. The preface was written by Boris Tartakovsky with the assistance of Yevgenia Dakhina and Tatiana Chikileva. The name index, the index of quoted and mentioned literature and the index of periodicals were compiled by Svetlana Kiseleva. The volume was edited by Boris Tartakovsky and Valentina Smirnova (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The English translations were done by David Forgacs, John Peet, Barrie Selman, Veronica Thompson (Lawrence & Wishart), Stepan Apresyan and Victor Schnittke (Progress Publishers), and edited by Nicholas Jacobs (Lawrence & Wishart), Cynthia Carlile, Stephen Smith, Maria Shcheglova and Anna Vladimirova (Progress Publishers) and Norire Ter-Akopyan, scientific editor (USSR Academy of Sciences).

The volume was prepared for the press by Margarita Lopukhina, Mzia Pitskhelauri, Maria Shcheglova and Anna Vladimirova and assistant editor Natalia Kim (Progress Publishers).

FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

February 1890-April 1895

The Newcastle Daily Chronicle.

No. 9,945.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1890.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

[THE ELECTIONS OF 1890 IN GERMANY]¹

That the Social-Democratic party of Germany was sure to obtain a startling success at the general election of 1890 could not be doubted by any one who had followed the political development of that country for the last decade. In 1878 the German Socialists were placed under rigorous coercion laws,² in virtue of which all their newspapers had been suppressed, their meetings stopped or dissolved, their organisation annihilated, their every attempt to re-form it punished as a "secret society", sentences summing up to more than a thousand years' imprisonment having thus been pronounced against members of the party. Nevertheless, they succeeded in smuggling into the country, and regularly distributing every week some 10,000 copies of their organ printed abroad, the *Sozialdemokrat*, and thousands upon thousands of pamphlets; they succeeded in penetrating into the German Parliament (nine members)³ and into innumerable town councils, amongst others that of Berlin. The growing strength of the party was evident even to its most embittered enemies.

Yet such a success as they have scored on the 20th February must surprise even the most sanguine among themselves. Twenty-one seats conquered: that is to say, in twenty electoral districts they proved stronger than all other parties put together. Fifty-eight second ballots, that is to say, in 58 districts they are either the strongest, or the strongest but one, of all parties which have put forward candidates, and the fresh election will finally decide between the two candidates who had the greatest number, while neither had the absolute majority of votes. As to the total number of Socialist votes given, we can only make an approximate estimate. In 1871 they summed up not more than 102,000; in

1877, 493,000; in 1884, 550,000; in 1887, 763,000; in 1890, they cannot be less than 1,250,000, and may be considerably more. The strength of the party has increased in three years by at least 60-70 per cent.

In 1887 there were but three parties with more than a million voters, the National Liberals, 1,678,000; the Centre or Catholic party, 1,516,000; and the Conservatives, 1,147,000.⁴ This time the Centre will hold its own, the Conservatives have lost a good deal, and the National Liberals have lost enormously. Thus the Socialists will still be outnumbered by the Centre, but they will either fully come up to, or outnumber, the National Liberals as well as the Conservatives.

This election establishes a complete revolution in the state of parties in Germany. It will indeed inaugurate a new epoch in the history of that country. It marks the beginning of the end of the Bismarck period. The situation, at the present moment, is as follows.

With his rescripts on labour legislation and international labour conferences, young William broke loose from his mentor Bismarck.⁵ The latter thought it prudent to give his young master plenty of rope, and to wait quietly until William II, had got himself into a mess with his hobby of playing the working man's friend: then would be the time for Bismarck to step in as the *deus ex machina*.^a This time Bismarck did not care much how the elections went; an unmanageable Reichstag, to be dissolved as soon as the young Emperor had found out his mistake, would be rather an advantage to Bismarck, and considerable Socialist success might help to prepare a good cry to go to the country with when the time for dissolution arrived. And the wily Chancellor, this time, has indeed got a Reichstag that nobody will be able to manage. William II, will very soon find out the impossibility, for a man in his position, and with the present state of mind of both the landed aristocracy and the middle class, of carrying out even a shadow of the objects alluded to in his rescripts, while the elections have already convinced him that the working class of Germany will take anything he may offer them as an instalment, but will not give up one jot of their principles and demands, nor relax in their opposition against a Government which cannot live but by gagging the working majority of the people.

^a Literally: a god from a machine (by which in ancient theatre gods appeared in the air); a person or thing that comes in the nick of time to solve difficulty.— *Ed.*

Thus, before long there will be a conflict between Emperor and Parliament; the Socialists will be accused, by all rival parties, with being the cause of it all; the new election cry will be there, ready made; and then Bismarck, having given the necessary lesson to his lord and master, will step in and dissolve.

But then he will find that things have changed. The Socialist workmen will be stronger and more determined than ever. The aristocracy Bismarck never could rely on; they always considered him as a traitor to true Conservatism, and will be ready to throw him overboard as soon as the Emperor chooses to drop him. The middle class were his mainstay, but they have lost confidence in him. The little family quarrel between Bismarck and the Emperor has come to be publicly known. It has proved that Bismarck is no longer all-powerful, and that the Emperor is not proof against dangerous crotchets. In which of the two, then, is the German middle class Philistine to trust? The wise man is becoming powerless, and the powerful man proves to be unwise. In fact, the confidence in the stability of the order of things established in 1871, a confidence which, as regards the German middle class, was unshakeable while old William reigned, Bismarck governed, and Moltke was at the head of the army—that confidence is gone, and gone for ever. The growing load of taxation, the high price of living caused by ridiculous import duties on everything, food as well as manufactured goods, the unbearable burden of military service, the constant and ever-renewed fear of war, and that a war of European dimensions, when 4-5 millions of Germans would have to take up arms—all this has done its work in alienating from the Government the peasant, the small tradesman, the workman, in fact the whole nation, with the exception of the few who profit by the State-created monopolies. All this would be borne, as inevitable, so long as old William, Moltke, and Bismarck formed a ruling triumvirate which seemed invincible. But now old William is dead, Moltke is pensioned off, and Bismarck has to face a young Emperor whom he himself filled with an unbounded vanity, who is consequently considering himself a second Frederick the Great, and is, after all, but a conceited coxcomb, eager to shake off the yoke of his Chancellor, and, withal, a plaything in the hands of court intriguers. With such a state of things, the immense pressure upon the people no longer is patiently borne; the old faith in the stability of things is gone; resistance, which formerly appeared hopeless, now becomes a necessity; and thus, unmanageable as this Reichstag seems, maybe it will be far less so than the next.

Thus Bismarck very likely is miscalculating his game. If he dissolve, even the *spectre rouge*, the anti-Socialist cry, may fail him. But then he has one undoubted quality: reckless energy. If it suits him, he may provoke riots and try what effect a little "bleeding" may have. But then he ought not to forget that at least one-half of the German Socialists have passed through the army. There they have learned the discipline which has enabled them so far to withstand all provocation to riot. But there they have also learnt something more.

Written between February 21 and
March 1, 1890

Reproduced from the *Newcastle
Daily Chronicle*

First published in the *Newcastle Daily
Chronicle*, No. 9945, March 3, 1890 and,
with minor alterations, in the *Berliner
Volksblatt*, No. 81, April 6, 1890

WHAT NOW?⁶

February 20, 1890 is the beginning of the end of the Bismarck era. The alliance between Junkers and money-bags for the exploitation of the mass of the German people—for the Cartel⁷ was this and nothing else—is bearing its fruit. The tax on spirits, the sugar premium, the corn and meat duties, which conjured millions from the people's pockets into the pockets of the Junkers; the industrial protective tariffs, introduced just at the moment when German industry, by its own efforts and in free trade, had won for itself a position in the world market, introduced specifically and exclusively so that the manufacturer could sell at home at monopoly prices, and abroad at giveaway prices; the whole system of indirect taxation, which oppresses the poorer masses of the people and scarcely touches the rich; the tax burden, growing to the intolerable, to cover the cost of endlessly growing armaments; the increasingly imminent danger of world war, growing along with the armaments and threatening to "finish off" four to five million Germans, because the seizure of Alsace-Lorraine has driven France into the arms of Russia, and thus made Russia the arbiter of Europe; the unparalleled corruption of the press, through which the government systematically swamped the people with alarmist lies each time the Reichstag was renewed; the police corruption aimed at bribing or forcing the wife to betray her husband, and the child its father; the system of *agents provocateurs*, as good as unknown in Germany until that time; police despotism far exceeding the period before 1848; the shameless flouting of all justice by the German courts, with the noble Reich Court leading the way; the outlawing of the entire working class by the Anti-Socialist Law—all this has had its

day, and a long day at that, thanks to the cowardice of the German philistine—but now it is coming to an end. The Cartel majority has been smashed, smashed irrevocably, so that only one thing can patch it up even for a single moment—a coup de force.

What now? Botch together a new majority for the old system? Oh, there would be enthusiasm for this, and not only in the Government. Amongst the *Freisinnige*⁸ there are enough jitterers who would themselves play at the Cartel rather than let the wicked Social Democrats in—the dreams of suitability for government, buried together with Frederick III, are rapping once again on the coffin-lid. But the Government has no use for liberalism, and it is not *yet* ripe for an alliance with the Junkers from east of the Elbe, and they, after all, are the most important class in the Empire!

And the Centre? In the Centre, too, there are Junkers *en masse*, Westphalian, Bavarian and so on, who burn with desire to sink into the arms of their brothers east of the Elbe, who voted with relish for the taxes favouring the Junkers; and in the Centre too there are enough bourgeois reactionaries who want to go even further back than the Government can—who, if they could, would impose upon us once more the entire Middle Ages complete with guilds. A specifically Catholic party, after all, like any specifically Christian party, can be nothing else but reactionary. So why not a new Cartel with the Centre?

Simply because it is not Catholicism which actually holds the Centre together, but *hatred of the Prussians*. It is composed exclusively of elements hostile to the Prussians, which are strongest, of course, in the Catholic areas; Rhineland peasants, petty bourgeois and workers, South Germans, Hanoverian and Westphalian Catholics. Around the Centre are grouped the other bourgeois and peasant anti-Prussian elements: the Guelphs and other particularists, the Poles, the Alsatians.⁹ The very day the Centre becomes the party of government, it will fall apart into a portion composed of Junkers, guildsmen and reactionaries and a portion consisting of peasants and democrats; and the gentlemen in the first portion know that they will not be able to show themselves to their electors again. Despite this, the attempt will be made, despite this the majority of the Centre will be ready for an accommodation. And we can have no objection to this. This specifically anti-Prussian Catholic party was itself a product of the Bismarck era, the rule of what is specifically Prussian. If the latter should fall, it is only just that the former too should fall.

We may therefore expect a momentary alliance of the Centre

and the Government. But the Centre does not consist of National Liberals—on the contrary, it is the first party to emerge triumphant from the struggle against Bismarck, to send him to Canossa.¹⁰ It will thus certainly not be a Cartel, and Bismarck can only use a new Cartel.

So what will happen? Dissolution. New elections. Appeal to the fear of a Social Democratic tidal wave? It is too late for this as well. If Bismarck wanted this, then he would not fall out with his new Emperor even for a moment, still less make a great fuss about this quarrel.

As long as the old William was still alive, the invincibility of the Bismarck, Moltke, William triumvirate was unshakeably firm in the eyes of the German philistine. But now William is gone, Moltke has been made to go, and Bismarck vacillates as to whether he should be forced to go, or go by himself. And the young William who has replaced the old one has proved in the course of his quite short government, and particularly through his renowned decrees,¹¹ that respectable bourgeois philistines cannot possibly rely upon him, and also that he will not allow himself to be ordered about. The man in whom the philistines believed no longer has the power, and the philistines cannot believe in the man who has the power. The old confidence in the eternity of the inner order of the Empire founded in 1871 is gone, and no power on earth can restore it. The philistine, the last pillar of the old policy, has become shaky. How can dissolution help here?

A coup d'état? But this releases not only the people, but also the princes of the Empire from their loyalty to the Imperial Constitution thus broken; this means the disintegration of the Empire.

A war? Child's play to launch one. But what would become of it once launched defies the imagination. Should Croesus cross the Halys¹² or William cross the Rhine, he will destroy a great empire—but which? His own, or that of the enemy? It is well known that peace persists only thanks to the unending revolution in weapons technology, which precludes anyone getting ready for war, and thanks to everybody's fear of the absolutely incalculable prospects of the only war now still possible, a world war.

Only one thing can help: an uprising, provoked by governmental brutality and suppressed with double and triple brutality, a general state of siege, and re-election in conditions of terror. Even that would only produce a few years' stay of execution. But it is the only way—and we know that Bismarck is one of those who will stop at nothing. And did not William too say: At the slightest

resistance I shall have them all shot down? And therefore this way certainly will be applied.

The German Social-Democratic workers have just won a triumph, a triumph well earned through their tough steadfastness, their iron discipline, their cheerful humour in battle, their tirelessness; but it certainly came unexpectedly, even to themselves, and has astonished the world. The increase in the Social Democratic vote in every new election has proceeded with the irresistible force of a natural process; brutality, police despotism, judicial despicability—all these bounced off without effect; the steadily growing attack force moved forwards, forwards with increasing rapidity and now stands there, the second strongest party in the Empire. And should the German workers now spoil their own game by allowing themselves to be misled into a hopeless putsch for the sole reason of helping Bismarck out of his mortal anguish? At the moment when their own courage, their courage above all praise, is supported by the interaction of all outside circumstances, when the whole social and political situation, when even all their enemies have to work for the Social Democrats, as though they were paid by them—at this moment should discipline and self-control fail, and should we throw ourselves upon the outstretched sword? Never! The Anti-Socialist Law has trained our workers too well for this, for this we have far too many old soldiers in our ranks, amongst them too many who have learned to stand at order arms in a hail of bullets till the moment is ripe for the attack.

Written between February 21 and
March 1, 1890

First published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*,
No. 10, March 8, 1890 and in *Arbeiter-
Zeitung*, No. 11, March 14, 1890

Printed according to *Der Sozial-
demokrat*, checked with the *Ar-
beiter-Zeitung*

Published in English for the first
time

THE FOREIGN POLICY
OF RUSSIAN TSARDOM¹³

Written in December 1889-February 1890 (translated into English in March 1890)

First published, in Russian, in *Sotsialdemokrat*, Nos. 1 and 2, February and August 1890, in *Die Neue Zeit*, No. 5, May 1890 and, in Engels' English translation, in the *Time*, April and May 1890

Reproduced from the *Time*,
checked with *Die Neue Zeit*

TIME.

NEW SERIES.

APRIL, 1890.

I

Not only Socialists, but every progressive party in every country of Western Europe,^a has a double interest in the victory of the Russian Revolutionary Party.

First, because the Empire of the Tsar^b is the mainstay of European reaction, its last fortified position and its great reserve army at once; because its mere passive existence is a standing threat and danger to us.

Secondly—and this point is not now being sufficiently insisted upon—because by its ceaseless meddling in the affairs of the West, it cripples and disturbs our normal development, and this with the object of conquering geographical positions, which will assure to Russia the mastery over Europe, and thus^c crush every chance of progress under the iron heel of the Tsar.

It is impossible, in England, to write about Russian foreign policy without at once recalling the name of David Urquhart. For fifty years he worked indefatigably to spread among his countrymen a knowledge of the aims and methods of Russian diplomacy, a subject he thoroughly understood; and yet, all he got for his pains was ridicule and the reputation of an unmitigated bore. Now, the ordinary Philistine does indeed class under that head

^a In *Die Neue Zeit* the opening sentence begins as follows: "We, the West European workers' party...". (Hereinafter in this work the discrepancies between the English original and the text in *Die Neue Zeit* are given in quotation marks without further reference to the source.)—*Ed.*

^b The German has: "the Russian Empire of the Tsar".—*Ed.*

^c In the German the end of the sentence reads: "would make the victory of the European proletariat impossible".—*Ed.*

every one who insists upon unpalatable subjects, be they ever so important. But then, Urquhart, who hated the Philistine without understanding either his nature or his historical unavoidability for the time being, was bound to fail. A Tory of the old school, with the fact before his eyes that in England the Tories alone had hitherto offered effective resistance to Russia, and that the action of English and foreign Liberals, including the whole revolutionary movement on the Continent, had generally led to advantages gained by that power, he held that, to really resist Russian inroads, one must needs be a Tory (or else a Turk), and that every Liberal and Revolutionist was, knowingly or not, a Russian tool. His constant occupation with Russian diplomacy led him to look upon it as something all-powerful, as indeed the only active agent in modern history, in whose hands all other governments were but passive tools; so that, but for his equally exaggerated estimate of the strength of Turkey, one cannot make out why this omnipotent Russian diplomacy has not got hold of Constantinople long ago. In order thus to reduce all modern history since the French Revolution to a diplomatic game of chess between Russia and Turkey, with the other European States for Russia's chessmen, Urquhart had to set himself up as a sort of Eastern prophet who taught, instead of simple historic facts, a secret esoteric doctrine in a mysterious hyper-diplomatic language, full of allusions to facts not generally known, but hardly ever plainly stated; and who, as infallible nostrums against the supremacy of Russian over English diplomacy, propounded the renewed impeachment of Ministers and the substitution, for the Cabinet, of the Privy Council. Urquhart was a man of great merit, and a fine Englishman of the old school to boot; but Russian diplomatists might well say: *Si M. Urquhart n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer.*^a

Among the Russian Revolutionists, too, there still exists a comparatively great ignorance of this side of Russian history. On the one hand, because in Russia itself only the official legend is tolerated; on the other, with a great many, because they hold the Government of the Tsar in too great contempt, believing it incapable of anything rational, incapable, partly from stupidity, partly from corruption. And for Russian internal policy this is

^a "If Mr. Urquhart did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him." Instead of this paragraph the German has: "It is to the credit of Karl Marx that he was the first to stress, and repeatedly did so from 1848, that the West European workers' party is obliged for this last reason to wage a life-and-death war against Russian Tsardom. In calling for the same, I am merely continuing the efforts of my late friend, catching up on what he did not live to do."—*Ed.*

right enough; here the impotence of Tsardom is clear as day. But we ought to know not only the weakness but the strength too of the enemy. And its foreign policy is unquestionably the side on which Tsardom is strong—very strong. Russian diplomacy forms, to a certain extent, a modern Order of Jesuits, powerful enough, if need be, to overcome even the whims of a Tsar, and to crush corruption within its own body, only to spread it the more plenteously abroad; an Order of Jesuits originally and by preference recruited from foreigners, Corsicans like Pozzo di Borgo, Germans like Nesselrode, Russo-Germans^a like Lieven, just as its founder, Catherine II, was a foreigner.

The old Russian aristocracy had still too many worldly, private and family interests; they had not the absolute reliability which the service of this new order demanded. And as the personal poverty and celibacy of the Catholic Jesuit priest could not be forced upon them, they had, for the time, to be relegated to secondary or representative positions, embassies, &c., and thus gradually a school of native diplomats built up. Up to the present time only one thoroughbred Russian, Gortschakoff, has filled the highest post in this order, and his successor Von Giers again bears a foreign name.

It is this secret order, originally recruited from foreign adventurers, which has raised the Russian Empire to its present power. With iron perseverance, gaze fixed resolutely on the goal, shrinking from no breach of faith, no treachery, no assassination, no servility, lavishing bribes in all directions, made arrogant by no victory, discouraged by no defeat, stepping over the corpses of millions of soldiers and of, at least, one Tsar,¹⁴ this band, unscrupulous as talented, has done more than all the Russian armies to extend the frontiers of Russia from the Dnieper and Dwina to beyond the Vistula, to the Pruth, the Danube and the Black Sea; from the Don and Volga beyond the Caucasus and to the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes; to make Russia great, powerful, and dreaded, and to open for her the road to the sovereignty of the world. But by doing this it has also strengthened the power of Tsardom at home. To the Jingo public the fame of victory, the conquests following on conquests, the might and glamour of Tsardom, far outweigh all sins, all despotism, all injustice, and all wanton oppression; the tall talk of Chauvinism fully compensates for all humiliations at home. And this the more, the less the actual causes and details of these

^a The German has: "Baltic Germans".—*Ed.*

successes are known in Russia, and are replaced by an official legend, such as benevolent governments everywhere (in Prussia and France, *e.g.*) invent for the good of their subjects, and for the greater encouragement of patriotism. Thus the Russian who is a Chauvinist, will sooner or later fall on his knees before the Tsar, as we have seen in the case of Tichomirow.

But how could such a band of adventurers manage to acquire this enormous influence in European history? Very simply. They have not created something new out of nothing, they have but made the right use of an existing situation. Russian diplomacy has had a very obvious, material foundation for all its achievements.

Look at Russia in the middle of last century—a colossal territory even at that time, peopled by a peculiarly homogeneous race. A sparse, but rapidly-growing population; therefore an assured growth of power with mere lapse of time. This population, intellectually stagnant, devoid of all initiative, but, within the limits of their traditional mode of existence, fit to be used for, and to be moulded into, anything; tenacious, brave, obedient, contemptuous of hardship and fatigue, unsurpassable stuff for soldiers in the wars of that time where the fighting of compact masses was decisive. The country itself with only one—its Western—side turned towards Europe, and so only attackable on that side; without any centre, the conquest of which might compel a peace; almost absolutely safeguarded against conquest by absence of roads, immenseness of surface, and poverty of resources. Here was a position of impregnable strength, ready for any one who knew how to use it, whence that might be done with impunity, which would have brought war after war upon any other Government in Europe.

Strong to impregnability on the defensive side, Russia was correspondingly weak on the offensive. The mustering, organisation, equipment and movements of her armies in the interior, met with the greatest obstacles, and to all material difficulties was added the boundless corruption of the officials and officers. All attempts to make Russia capable of attack on a large scale have, so far, failed, and probably the latest, present attempts to introduce universal compulsory conscription,¹⁵ will fail as completely. One might say that the difficulties grow as the square of the masses to be organised, quite apart from the impossibility, with such a small town population, of finding the enormous number of officers now required. This weakness has been no secret to Russian diplomacy; hence it has, whenever possible, avoided war, has only accepted it as a last resort, and then only under the most favourable

conditions. Those wars alone suit it in which the allies of Russia have to bear the brunt of the burden, to lay bare their territory to devastation as the seat of war, to supply the great mass of combatants, and in which, to the Russian troops, falls the *rôle* of reserve forces. In that *rôle* they are generally spared in battle, but in decisive engagements, with relatively small sacrifices, they reap the glory of turning the balance of victory; such was their part in the war of 1813-1815.¹⁶ But a war carried on under such favourable conditions is not always to be had; hence Russian diplomacy prefers to use the antagonistic interests and desires of the other powers for its own ends, to set these powers by the ears, and to exploit their enmities for the benefit of the Russian policy of conquest. Only against those who are clearly the weaker—Sweden, Turkey, Persia—does Tsardom fight on its own account, and in these cases it has not to share the spoils with anyone.

But to return to the Russia of 1760. This homogeneous, unattackable country had for neighbours only countries which were actually or apparently effete, approaching disintegration, and thus pure *matière à conquêtes*.^a In the north, Sweden, whose power and prestige had been lost just because Charles XII. had attempted to invade Russia, and in doing so had ruined Sweden and made evident the unattackability of Russia. In the south, the Turks, and their tributaries the Crimean Tartars, wrecks of former greatness; the offensive power of the Turks broken for the last 100 years; their power of defence still considerable, but also on the decline; and as best proof of this growing weakness, rebel movements among the subject Christians, the Slavs, Roumanians, and Greeks, who formed the majority of the population in the Balkan Peninsula. These Christians, belonging almost exclusively to the Greek Church, were thus akin to the Russians by faith, and the Slavs among them, the Servians and Bulgarians, were moreover connected with them by race. Russia had therefore only to proclaim her duty to protect the oppressed Greek Church and the downtrodden Slavs, and the field for conquest—under the name of “freeing the oppressed”^b—was ready to hand. In the same way there were south of the Caucasus small Christian States and Christian Armenians under the suzerainty of Turkey, as whose “saviour”^c Tsardom could pose. And then, here in the south, a victor’s prize like none other Europe could offer, enticed the lustful conqueror: the old capital of the Eastern Roman

^a Object for conquest.—*Ed.*

^b The words “the oppressed” are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^c The German has: “liberator”.—*Ed.*

Empire, the metropolis of the whole Greco-Catholic world, the town whose Russian name already expresses supremacy over the east and the prestige which invests its possessor in the eyes of Eastern Christendom—Constantinople-Tsaregrad.

Tsaregrad as the third Russian capital alongside of Moscow and Petersburg: this meant not only moral supremacy over Eastern Christendom, it meant also the decisive step towards supremacy over Europe. It meant sole command of the Black Sea, Asia Minor, the Balkan Peninsula. It meant, whenever the Tsar pleased, the closing of the Black Sea to all merchant vessels and men-of-war except Russian, its transformation into a Russian Naval Port, and a place of manoeuvre exclusively for the Russian fleet, which from this safe refuge could pass through the fortified Bosphorus, and return thither as often as it chose. Then Russia would only need to obtain the same command, directly or indirectly, of the Sound and the Belts, to become unattackable at sea also.

Command of the Balkan Peninsula would bring Russia as far as the Adriatic. And this frontier on the south-west would be untenable, unless the Russian frontier were correspondingly advanced all along the west, and the sphere of her power considerably extended. But here the conditions were, if possible, still more favourable.

First of all, Poland, completely disorganised, a republic of nobles, founded upon the spoliation and oppression of the peasants, with a constitution that made all national action impossible,¹⁷ and thus made the country an easy prey for its neighbours. Since the beginning of the century it had existed only, as the Poles themselves said, through disorder (*Polska nierzadem stoi*); the whole country was constantly occupied and traversed by foreign troops, who used it as an eating and drinking-house (*karczma zajezdna*, said the Poles), in which they usually forgot to pay the bill. Already Peter the Great had systematically ruined Poland—here his successors had but to reach out their hand for it. And to do this they had another pretext—the “Principle of Nationalities”.¹⁸ Poland was not a homogeneous country. At the time when Great Russia came under the Mongolian yoke, White Russia, and Little Russia found protection against the Asiatic invasion, by uniting themselves into the so-called Lithuanian Principality. This Principality later on voluntarily united itself with Poland.¹⁹ Afterwards, in consequence of the higher civilization of the Poles, the White and Little Russian nobility had become largely Polish; and at the time of the Jesuit supremacy in Poland,²⁰ in the

16th century, the Greco-Catholic Poles^a had been forced into union with the Roman Church. This gave the Tsars of Great Russia the welcome pretext to claim the former Lithuanian territory, as a land Russian by nationality but now oppressed by Poland, although the Little Russians at least, according to the greatest living authority on Slavonic languages, Miklosic, do not speak a mere Russian dialect, but a separate language; and the further pretext for interference as protectors of the Greek faith, for the benefit of the Uniate Greco-Catholics,²¹ although these had long since become reconciled to their position with regard to the Roman Church.

Beyond Poland lay another country that seemed to have fallen into hopeless ruin—Germany. Since the Thirty Years' War, the Holy Roman Empire^b was only nominally a State. The position of the princes within the Empire was more and more approaching complete sovereignty; their power of defying the Emperor, which in Germany replaced the Polish *liberum veto*,²² had been, by the Peace of Westphalia,²³ expressly placed under the guarantee of France and of Sweden; a strengthening of the central power was therefore made dependent on the assent of the foreigner, whose direct interest it was to prevent anything like it. In addition to this, Sweden, thanks to her German conquests, was a member of the German Empire, with seat and vote at the Imperial Diets. In every war the Emperor encountered German Princes of the Empire among the allies of his foreign foes; every war was therefore a civil war. Almost all the larger and secondary Princes of the Empire had been bought by Louis XIV., and the country was so ruined economically that, without the annual influx of French bribe-money, it would have been impossible to keep money at all in the country for use as a circulating medium.* The Emperor had, therefore, long since sought his strength not within his Empire, which only cost him money and brought him nothing but worry and vexation, but in his Austrian, German, and extra-German dominions. And side by side with the power of Austria as distinct from Germany, the Prussian power was already rising as rival.

Such was the position of things in Germany in the time of Peter the Great. This really great man—great in a quite different way from Frederick “the Great”, the obedient servant of Peter’s

* “See Gülich. *Geschichtliche Darstellung des Handels u. Jena 1830*, 2. Band, S. 201-206.” [*Engels’ note to the German edition.*]

^a The German has: “Greco-Catholic Russians”.—*Ed.*

^b The German has: “Holy Roman-German Empire”.—*Ed.*

successor, Catherine II.—was the first who thoroughly grasped the wonderfully favourable condition of Europe for Russian ends. Not only in respect to Sweden, Turkey, Persia, Poland, did he see clearly—far more clearly than appears from his so-called Testament, which seems the work of an epigone²⁴—the main points of Russian policy; he firmly fixed it, and began to carry it out. He did the same in respect to Germany. He concerned himself far more with Germany than any country except Sweden. Sweden he must break; Poland he could have whenever he chose to stretch out his hand; Turkey was still too far away from him; but to set a firm foot in Germany, to obtain the position which France used so fully, and which Sweden was too weak to use, that was his chief task. He did everything to become a German Prince of the Empire, by the acquisition of German territory, but in vain; he could only initiate the system of intermarriage with German Princes, and the diplomatic exploitation of the internal dissensions of Germany.

Since Peter's time the position of things had become still more favourable to Russia through the rise of Prussia. This gave the German Emperor, within the Empire itself, an antagonist almost his equal, who perpetuated the divisions of Germany and brought them to a head. And at the same time this antagonist was still weak enough to be dependent upon the help of France or of Russia, especially of Russia, so that the more he emancipated himself from his vassalage with regard to the German Empire, the more surely did he sink into the vassalage of Russia.

Thus there remained in Europe only three Powers to be considered: Austria, France, England. And to set these by the ears, or to bribe them with the bait of new territory, was no difficult matter. England and France were still, as ever, rivals on the sea; France was to be got by the prospect of the acquisition of territory in Belgium and Germany; Austria could be bribed by dangling before her eyes advantages to be gained at the expense of France, Prussia, and, since the time of Joseph II., of Bavaria. Here then, by the adroit use of conflicting interests, were strong, overwhelmingly strong allies to be had for any diplomatic move of Russia. And now, face to face with these frontier lands in full disruption, face to face with three great Powers, whose traditions, economic conditions, political or dynastic interests, and lust after conquest, involved them in endless disputes and kept them occupied in outwitting one the other, here was the one homogeneous, youthful, rapidly-growing Russia, hardly attackable, and absolutely unconquerable, and at the same time an unworked, almost

unresisting, plastic raw material. What an opportunity for people of talent and ambition, for people striving after power, no matter how or where, so long only as the power was real, so long as it provided a real arena for their talent and ambition! And the "enlightened" 18th Century produced such people in numbers: people who in the service of "Humanity" traversed all Europe, visited the Courts of all enlightened Princes—and what Prince then but wished to be "enlightened",—who settled down wherever they found a favourable spot, a semi-aristocratic, semi-middleclass,^a denationalized International of "Enlightenment". This International fell on its knees before the Semiramis of the North, one equally denationalized, Sophia Augusta of Anhalt, called Jekaterina II. of Russia, and it was from the ranks of this International that this same Catherine drew the elements for her Jesuit order of Russian diplomacy.^b

Let us now see how this order of Jesuits works, how it uses the ever-changing aims of the rival Powers as a means for obtaining its one aim—never changing, never lost sight of—the World-Supremacy of Russia.

II

Never were things^c more favourable to the plans for the aggrandisement of Tsardom than in 1762, when, after murdering her husband, the "great whore", Catherine ascended the throne. All Europe was split up into two camps by the Seven Years' War.²⁵ England had broken the power of France, on the high seas, in America, in India, and now left her continental ally, Frederick II. of Prussia, to shift for himself. The latter, in 1762, was on the brink of destruction, when suddenly Peter III. of Russia^d withdrew from the war against Prussia. Deserted by his last^e ally,

^a The German has: "an aristocratic-middle-class".—*Ed.*

^b *Die Neue Zeit* has an extra paragraph here: "In his work on Thomas More, Karl Kautsky showed how the original form of the bourgeois Enlightenment, the 'humanism' of the 15th and 16th centuries, was superseded by Catholic Jesuitism. It is precisely in the same way that we see here its second, fully mature, form being superseded by modern Jesuitry, by Russian diplomacy in the 18th century. This transformation into the opposite, this ultimate arrival at a point which represents the diametrical opposite of the point of departure, is the naturally ordained fate of all historical movements that are unaware of the reasons for and conditions of their existence and thus merely geared to illusory aims. They are mercilessly brought into line by the 'irony of history'."—*Ed.*

^c The German has: "Never was international situation".—*Ed.*

^d Added in the German: "ascended the throne and".—*Ed.*

^e Added in the German: "and only".—*Ed.*

England, with Austria and France permanently hostile, exhausted by a seven years' struggle for existence, Frederick had no choice but to throw himself at the feet of the newly-crowned Tsarina. This assured him not only a powerful protection, but the promise of that part of Poland that divided Eastern Prussia from the main body of his kingdom, and the conquest of which now became the one aim of his life.

On the 31st March (11th April), 1764, Catherine and Frederick signed a treaty of alliance at Petersburg,²⁶ the secret article of which bound both to maintain, if need be^a by force of arms, the existing Polish Constitution—that best means of ruining Poland—against every attempt at reform. With this the future partition of Poland was sealed. A piece of Poland was the bone which the Tsarina threw to the Prussian dog,^b so that he might quietly submit to be chained up by Russia for a century.

I shall not go into the details of the first partition of Poland.²⁷ But it is characteristic that it was carried out, against the wish of the old-fashioned Maria Theresa, by the three great pillars of European “enlightenment”, Catherine, Frederick, and Joseph. The two latter, proud of the superior statesmanship with which they trampled upon the superstition of a traditional law of nations, were yet stupid enough not to see how, by sharing in the Polish booty, they had signed themselves over, body and soul, to Russian Tsardom.

Nothing could have been more useful to Catherine than these “enlightened” princely neighbours of hers. “Progress” and “enlightenment” were the parrot-cry of Russian Tsardom in Europe during the eighteenth century, just as the deliverance of enslaved^d nations is in the nineteenth.

No spoliation, no violence, no oppression on the part of Tsardom, but has been perpetrated under pretext of “progress”,^e “enlightenment”, “Liberalism”, “the deliverance of the oppressed”. And the childish Liberals of Western Europe—down to Mr. Gladstone—believe it to this day,^e while the equally stupid Conservatives believe as firmly in the bunkum about the defence of legitimacy,²⁸ the upholding of order, religion, the balance of power,^f and the sanctity of treaties—all of which are at one and

^a The words “if need be” are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^b The German has “Prussia”.—*Ed.*

^c The beginning of the sentence is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^d The word is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^e The German has “believed it”.—*Ed.*

^f The German has “balance of power in Europe”.—*Ed.*

the same time in the mouth of official Russia. Russian diplomacy has succeeded in soft-soaping the two great Bourgeois parties of Europe. To be Legitimist and Revolutionist, Conservative and Liberal, orthodox and "advanced",^a all in one breath, is permitted to Russia, and to Russia alone. Imagine the contempt with which such a Russian diplomatist looks down upon the "cultured" Occident.

After Poland it was the turn of Germany. Austria and Prussia came to loggerheads in the Bavarian Succession War, 1778,²⁹ and again to the advantage of no one but Catherine. Russia had grown too big to speculate any longer, as Peter had done,^b upon entering the German Empire by acquiring some small German principality. She now aimed at obtaining the position she already held in Poland, and which France possessed in the German Empire—that of guarantee of German anarchy against every attempt at reform. And this position she attained. At the Peace of Teschen, 1779, Russia, together with France, undertook the guarantee of this Treaty, and of all former Treaties of Peace therein confirmed, more especially the Peace of Westphalia of 1648. With this the impotence of Germany was signed and sealed, and she was marked out for future partition between France and Russia.

Turkey was not forgotten. Russian wars with Turkey always occur in those times when there is peace on Russia's western frontier, and, if possible, when Europe is occupied elsewhere. Catherine waged two such wars. The first resulted in conquests by the Sea of Azov, and in the independence of the Crimea; four years later, that country was transformed into a Russian Province. The second extended the Russian frontier from the Bug to the Dniester. During both these wars Russian agents had egged on the Greeks to rebel against Turkey. Of course, the rebels were eventually left in the lurch by the Russian Government.³⁰

During the American War of Independence, Catherine for the first time formulated, for herself and her allies, what was called the Northern^c "armed neutrality" (1780), the demand for the limitation of the rights claimed by England in time of war for her navy on the high seas. These demands have remained ever since the constant aim of Russian policy; they were, in the main, conceded by Europe, and consented to by England herself, in the

^a The German has "enlightened" instead of "advanced".—*Ed.*

^b The end of the sentence reads: "upon being granted the rights of a constituent member of the German Empire".—*Ed.*

^c The words "what was called the Northern" are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

Peace of Paris of 1856.³¹ The United States of America alone will none of it.

The outbreak of the French Revolution was another windfall for Catherine. Far from fearing the revolutionary ideas might spread to Russia, she saw in the Revolution only a new opportunity of setting the other European States by the ears, so that Russia might have a free hand. After the death of her two "enlightened" friends and neighbours,^a Frederick William II. in Prussia and Leopold in Austria tried^b an independent policy. The Revolution gave Catherine the best possible opportunity—on a pretext of combating Republican France—of again chaining both of them to Russia, and at the same time, while they were busy on the French frontier, of making fresh inroads upon Poland. Both Austria and Prussia walked into the trap. And although Prussia—which from 1787-1791 had played the part of ally of Poland against Catherine—just in the nick of time thought better of it, and on this occasion claimed a larger share in the Polish spoil, and although Austria, too, had to be squared with a slice of Poland, yet Catherine was again able to lay hands on the greatest part of the plunder³²; almost the whole of White Russia and of Little Russia were united to Great Russia.

But this time there was a reverse side to the medal. While the plundering of Poland took up, in 1792-94,³³ part of the strength of the Coalition, it weakened their power to attack France, until France was strong enough, single-handed, to achieve victory. Poland fell, but her resistance had saved the French Revolution,³⁴ and the French Revolution started a movement against which even Tsardom is powerless. And for this, we, in the West, shall never forget Poland. Nor is this—as we shall see—the only occasion on which the Poles have saved the European Revolution.

In the policy of Catherine we find all the chief points of the Russian policy of to-day sharply defined: the annexation of Poland, even though for a time part of the plunder must be handed over to her neighbours; the marking out of Germany for the next spoil; Constantinople, the great, never-to-be-forgotten, slowly-to-be-attained, final goal; the conquest of Finland as a protection to Petersburg; Sweden to be indemnified by Norway, which Catherine offered to Gustavus III.³⁵ at Fredrikshamn; the weakening of British supremacy on the seas, by international treaty-limitations; the stirring up revolt among the Christian and

^a Frederick II and Joseph II.—*Ed.*

^b In the original mistakenly "she tried".—*Ed.*

Rayah in Turkey; finally, the ample provision of both Liberal and Legitimist phraseology to be used as occasion required as dust for the eyes of those believers in phrases, the occidental "cultured" Philistine and his so-called public opinion.

At the death of Catherine, Russia already possessed more than the wildest national Chauvinism could have asked for. All who bore the Russian name, barring only the few Austrian Little Russians, were under the sceptre of her successor,^a who had now a perfect right to call himself Autocrat of all the Russians.

Not only had the approach to the sea been gained; on the Baltic as on the Black Sea Russia possessed a broad littoral and numerous harbours. Not only Finns, Tartars, and Mongolians, but Lithuanians, Swedes, Poles, and Germans were under Russian dominion. What more do you desire?

To any other nation this would have sufficed. For Russian diplomacy—the nation was not consulted—this was only the stepping-stone to other conquests.

The French Revolution had worn itself out, and had brought forth its own dictator—a Napoleon. Thereby it had to all appearance justified the superior wisdom of Russian diplomacy, which had not allowed itself to be intimidated by the huge revolt.^b The rise of Napoleon now gave it the opportunity for new successes.

Germany was nearing the fate of Poland. But Catherine's successor, Paul, was obstinate, capricious, unreliable; he was constantly thwarting the action of Russian diplomacy; he became unbearable, he had to be got rid of. It was easy enough to find the necessary officers of the Guards to do this: the heir to the Crown, Alexander, was in the plot, and served as cloak to it. Paul was strangled, and immediately a fresh campaign was begun to the greater honour and glory of the new Tsar, who through the manner of his accession had become the life-long slave of the diplomatic band of Jesuits.

They left it to Napoleon to completely break up the German Empire, and to push to a crisis the confusion existing there. But when it came to the settling of accounts Russia again stepped in.

The peace of Luneville (1801)³⁶ had given France the whole left^c bank of the Rhine, on condition that the German Princes thus dispossessed should be indemnified on the right bank out of the possessions of the spiritual members of the Empire, Bishopries,

^a Paul I.—*Ed.*

^b The German has "popular uprising" instead of "revolt".—*Ed.*

^c The German has "German" instead of "left".—*Ed.*

Abbeys, etc. Now Russia insisted upon her position of guarantee, won at Teschen in 1779³⁷: in the parcelling out of this indemnity she and France, the two guarantees of German Imperial disunion and decay,^a clearly had a weighty word to say. And the dissension, greed, and general infamy^b of the German Princes took care that this word of Russia and of France should be decisive. Thus it came about that Russia and France drew up a plan for the division of the spiritual princes' lands among the dispossessed potentates, and that this plan, drawn up by the foreigner, in the interest of the foreigner, was, in all essentials made part and parcel of the German Imperial constitution by the Reichs-Deputations-Hauptschluss, 1803.³⁸

The German Empire^c was practically dissolved; Austria and Prussia acted as independent European states, and, like Russia and France, looked upon the small German States simply as a field for conquest. What was to become of these small States? Prussia was still too small and too young to lay claim to supremacy over them, and Austria had just lost the last trace of such supremacy. But both Russia and France put in a claim for the inheritance of the German Empire. France had destroyed the old Empire by force of arms; she pressed upon the small States by her immediate neighbourhood all along the Rhine; the fame of the victories of Napoleon and the French armies did the rest towards throwing the small German Princes at her feet. And Russia? Now that the end for which she had been striving just a hundred years was almost within reach, now that Germany lay completely disintegrated, exhausted unto death, helpless, impotent, should Russia just at this moment let her prey be snatched from under her very nose by the Corsican upstart?

Russian diplomacy at once entered upon a campaign for the conquest of supremacy over the small German States. That this was impossible without a victory over Napoleon was self-evident. It was therefore necessary to win over the German Princes, and the so-called public opinion of Germany—so far as it could then be said to exist. The Princes were worked upon by diplomatic, the Philistine by literary means. While cajolery, threats, lies and bribery were soon broadcast at the Courts, the public was deluged with mysterious pamphlets, in which Russia was belauded as the

^a The German has "ruin" instead of "disunion and decay".—*Ed.*

^b The German has "habitual betrayal of the Empire" instead of "general infamy".—*Ed.*

^c In the German the beginning of the sentence reads: "The German imperial union..."—*Ed.*

only Power that could save Germany and give her effective protection, and whose right and duty it moreover was to do this by virtue of the Treaty of Teschen of 1779. And when the war of 1805 broke out, it must have been clear to anyone whose eyes were at all open, that the only question was whether the small States should form a French or a Russian Confederacy of the Rhine.

The fates favoured Germany. The Russians and Austrians were beaten at Austerlitz, and the new Confederacy of the Rhine was formed, but anyhow, it was not an outpost of Tsardom.³⁹ The French yoke, at least, was a modern one; at all events it forced the disgraceful German Princes to do away with the most crying infamies of their former political system.^a

After Austerlitz came the Prusso-Russian alliance, Jena, Eylau, Friedland, and the Peace of Tilsit in 1807.⁴⁰ Here again was shown what an immense advantage Russia has in her strategically safe position. Defeated in two campaigns, she gained new territory at the expense of her former ally, and the alliance with Napoleon for the sharing of the world: for Napoleon the West, for Alexander the East!

The first fruit of this alliance was the conquest of Finland. Without any declaration of war, but with the assent of Napoleon, the Russians advanced; the incapacity, discord, and corruption of the Swedish generals secured an easy victory; the daring march of Russian troops across the frozen Baltic compelled a violent change of dynasty at Stockholm, and the surrender of Finland to Russia.⁴¹ But when three years later the breach between Alexander and Napoleon was impending, the Tsar summoned Marshal Bernadotte, the newly-elected Crown Prince of Sweden, to Abo, and promised him Norway if he would join the league of England and Russia against Napoleon.⁴² Thus it was that in 1814 the plan of Catherine was carried out.^b

But Finland was only the prelude. The real object of Alexander was, as ever, Constantinople. At Tilsit and at Erfurt,⁴³ Moldavia and Wallachia had been unconditionally promised him by Napoleon, and the prospect held out of a partition of Turkey, from which, however, Constantinople was to be excluded. Since 1806 Russia had been at war with Turkey, and this time not only the Greeks, but the Servians too had rebelled.⁴⁴ But what has been said erroneously with regard to Poland, is true of Turkey.

^a The German has: "...former mode of existence".—*Ed.*

^b The following words are added in the German: "Finland for me, Norway for you."—*Ed.*

Disorganisation saved it. The sturdy common soldier, the son of the sturdy Turkish peasant, found in this very disorganisation a means of making good the evil done by the corrupt Pashas. The Turks could be beaten but not subdued, and the Russian army advanced but slowly on its way towards the Bosphorus.^a

The price, however, for this "free hand" in the East was the acceptance of Napoleon's Continental System, the suspension of all trade with England.⁴⁵ And this meant, to the Russia of that time, commercial ruin. This was the time when Eugene Onegin (in Pushkin's epic) learnt from Adam Smith how a nation grows wealthy, and how it has no need of money so long as it possesses plenty of the produce of labour. While, on the other hand, his father could not see it, and had to mortgage one estate after another.^b

Russia could only get money by maritime commerce, and by the export of her national products^c to England, then the chief market; and Russia was now far too much occidentalised to do without money. The commercial blockade became unbearable. Political Economy proved more powerful than Diplomacy and the Tsar put together; intercourse with England was quietly resumed, the terms of the Tilsit Treaty were broken, and the war broke out in 1812.

Napoleon, with the combined armies of the whole of the West, crossed the Russian frontier. The Poles, who were in a position to know, advised him to halt by the Dwina and the Dnieper, to organise Poland, and there to await the Russian attack. A general of the calibre of Napoleon must have known that this was the right plan. But Napoleon, standing on that giddy height with its insecure foundation, *could* no longer venture on a protracted campaign. Immediate successes, dazzling victories, treaties of peace taken by assault, were indispensable to him. He cast the Polish advice to the winds, went to Moscow, and so brought the Russians to Paris.

The destruction of the great armies of Napoleon, on the retreat from Moscow, gave the signal for a universal uprising against the French supremacy in the West. In Prussia the whole nation rose, and forced coward Frederick William III. into war with Napoleon. As soon as Austria had completed her armaments she joined Russia and Prussia. After the battle of Leipzig⁴⁶ the Rhenish Confederacy⁴⁷ deserted Napoleon, and, barely eighteen months

^a The German has: "Tsaregrad".—*Ed.*

^b Alexander Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin*, I, 7; Engels' translation in prose.—*Ed.*

^c The German has "raw materials" instead of "national products".—*Ed.*

after Napoleon's entry into Moscow, Alexander entered Paris, the lord and master of Europe.

Turkey, betrayed by France, had signed a peace at Bucharest in 1812, and sacrificed Bessarabia to Russia. The Congress of Vienna gave Russia the kingdom of Poland,⁴⁸ so that now almost nine-tenths of what had been Polish territory were annexed to Russia. But more important than all this was the position which the Tsar now occupied in Europe. He had now no rival on the Continent. He had Austria and Prussia in tow. The French Bourbon dynasty had been re-installed by him, and was therefore equally obedient. Sweden had received Norway from him as reward for her friendly policy⁴⁹; even the Spanish dynasty owed its restoration far more to the victories of the Russians, Prussians, and Austrians, than to those of Wellington, which, after all, never could have overthrown the French Empire. Never before had Russia held so commanding a position. But she had taken another step beyond her natural frontiers. If Russian Chauvinism has some—I will not say justification—but some sort of excuse for the conquests of Catherine, there can be nothing of the kind with regard to those of Alexander. Finland is Finnish and Swedish, Bessarabia Roumanian, the kingdom of Poland^a Polish. Here there is no longer any question of the union of scattered and kindred races, all bearing the name of Russians; here we see nothing but barefaced conquest of alien territory by brute force, nothing but simple theft.

III

The downfall of Napoleon meant the victory of the European monarchies over the French Revolution, whose last phase had been the Napoleonic Empire. This victory was celebrated by the restoration of "Legitimacy". Talleyrand fancied he was taking in the Tsar Alexander with this phrase, coined expressly for the purpose; but in reality it was Russian Diplomacy that by means of it led all Europe by the nose. Under the pretext of defending Legitimacy, Russian Diplomacy founded the "Holy Alliance", that expansion of the Russo-Austro-Prussian League into a conspiracy of all European sovereigns against their peoples, under the presidency of Russia.⁵⁰ The other princes believed in it; what the Tsar and his diplomatists thought of it we shall see directly.

Their next move was to take advantage of their newly-acquired

^a The German has "the Poland of the Congress" instead of "the Kingdom of Poland".—*Ed.*

supremacy, by advancing a step nearer Constantinople. To this end they could employ three levers; the Roumanians, the Servians, the Greeks. The Greeks were the most promising element. They were a commercial people, and the merchants suffered most from the oppression of Turkish Pashas. The Christian peasant under Turkish rule was materially better off than anywhere else. He had retained his pre-Turkish institutions, and complete self-government; so long as he paid his taxes, the Turk, as a rule, took no notice of him; he was but seldom exposed to acts of violence, such as the peasant of Western Europe had had to bear in the Middle Ages at the hands of the nobles. It was a degraded kind of existence, a life on sufferance, but materially anything but wretched, and, on the whole, not unsuited to the state of civilisation of these peoples; it took therefore a long time before these Slav Rajahs discovered that this existence was intolerable. On the other hand, the commerce of the Greeks, since Turkish rule had freed them from the crushing competition of Venetians and Genoese, had rapidly thriven, and had become so considerable that it could now bear Turkish rule no longer. In point of fact, Turkish, like all Oriental rule, is incompatible with Capitalist Society; the appropriated surplus-value is not safe from the hands of rapacious Satraps and Pashas; the first fundamental condition of profitable trading^a is wanting—security for the person and property of the merchant. No wonder, then, that the Greeks, who had twice revolted since 1774, should now rise again.⁵¹

The Greek rebellion then furnished the handle; but in order to enable Russian Diplomacy to apply the necessary pressure, the West must be prevented from interfering, and must therefore be provided with other work at home. And here the phrase of "Legitimacy" had brilliantly prepared the way. The "Legitimate" rulers had made themselves heartily hated everywhere. Their attempts to reinstate pre-revolutionary conditions had stirred up the Bourgeoisie throughout the whole of the West; in France and Germany, things were in a ferment; in Spain and Italy, open rebellion broke out.⁵² Russian Diplomacy had a finger in the pie in all these conspiracies and rebellions. Not that it had made them, or even materially aided in their momentary successes. But what it could do, through its officious agents,^b to sow discontent and disaffection among the subjects of its Legitimist allies, that it did.

^a The German has "condition of bourgeois enterprise" instead of "profitable trading".—*Ed.*

^b The German further has: "to sow discord at home among its Legitimist allies, that it did".—*Ed.*

And it openly protected the rebel elements in the West, whenever and wherever they appeared under the mask of sympathy with Greece; the Philhellenes who collected funds, sent volunteers and fully armed corps to Greece, what were they but the Carbonari and other Liberals of the West?

All of which did not prevent the enlightened Tsar Alexander at the Congresses of Aix-la-Chapelle, Troppau, Laibach, Verona, from urging his Legitimist allies to act energetically against their rebellious subjects, and from sending the Austrians in 1821 to Italy, and the French in 1823 to Spain, to suppress the revolution there⁵³; and from even apparently condemning the Greek rebellion, while at the same time he kept stirring it up, and encouraging the Philhellenes of the West to redoubled efforts. Once again stupid Europe was befooled in an incredible fashion. To the Princes and the Reactionaries, Tsardom preached Legitimacy and the maintaining of the *status quo*^a; to the Liberal Philistine, the deliverance of oppressed nations^b—and both believed it.

The French Minister at Verona, the romanticist Chateaubriand, was completely captivated by the Tsar, who seduced the French by the prospect of recovering the left bank of the Rhine, if only they would be obedient and stick to Russia. With this hope, subsequently strengthened by binding pledges under Charles X., Russian Diplomacy kept France in leading strings, and with few interruptions directed her Eastern Policy till 1830.

In spite of all this, the world looked with distrust, or at best with indifference upon the humanitarian policy of the Tsar,^c who under the pretext of freeing the Greek Christians from the Mohammedan yoke, strove to put himself in the place of the Mohammedan. For, as the Russian Ambassador in London, Prince Lieven, says, (Dispatch of 18-30th October, 1825):

“All Europe looks with terror upon the Russian Colossus, whose giant strength waits but for a sign to be directed against her. Her interest is, therefore, to support Turkey, the natural enemy of our Empire.”^d

^a The words “and the maintaining of the *status quo*” are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^b The German has: “the deliverance of oppressed nations and enlightenment”.—*Ed.*

^c In the German the sentence reads: “In spite of all this, the humanitarian policy pursued by the Tsar, who ... Mohameddan, did not make the desired headway...”.—*Ed.*

^d The quotation is probably taken from *Recueil de documents relatifs à la Russie pour la plupart secrets et inédits, utiles à consulter dans la crise actuelle*, Paris, 1854, pp. 52-53.—*Ed.*

Hence, the failure of all Russian attempts to invade the Danubian Provinces with the tacit consent of Europe, and thus to force Turkey to capitulate.^a Just then, in 1825, help came to Turkey from Egypt; the Greeks were everywhere beaten and the revolt almost suppressed. Russian policy was face to face with either a defeat, or else a bold resolve.

The Chancellor, Nesselrode, took council with his Ambassadors. Pozzo di Borgo in Paris (Dispatch of 4-16th October, 1825), and Lieven in London (Dispatch of 18-30th October, 1825), declared unreservedly for a bold move; the Danubian Provinces must at once, and without any regard to Europe, be occupied, even at the risk of a European war. This was evidently the universal opinion of Russian Diplomacy. But Alexander was limp, capricious, *blasé*, mystico-romantic; he had of the Grec du Bas Empire^b (as Napoleon called him) not only the cunning and deceit, but also the irresolution and want of energy. He began to take Legitimacy seriously, and seemed to have had enough of Greek rebellion. During this critical period,^c he travelled about in the South, near Taganrog, inactive and at that time, before railways, almost inaccessible. Suddenly the news came that he was dead. There were whispers of poison. Had Diplomacy got rid of the son as it had of the father? At any rate, he could not have died more opportunely.

With Nicolas a Tsar came to the throne, than whom no better could have been desired by Diplomacy—a conceited mediocrity, whose horizon never exceeded that of a company officer, a man who mistook brutality for energy, and obstinacy in caprice for strength of will,^d who prized beyond everything the mere *show* of power, and who, therefore, by the mere show of it, could be got to do anything. Now more energetic measures were resorted to, and the war against Turkey brought about. Europe did not interfere. England, by means of Liberal talk, France, by means of the promises already mentioned, had been induced to combine their Mediterranean fleets with the Russian, and, on the 20th October, 1827, in the midst of peace, to attack and destroy the Turco-Egyptian fleet, at Navarino.⁵⁴ And if England soon drew back,

^a The German has: "The war in Greece continued with alternating success, whilst all Russian attempts to invade the Danubian Provinces with authoritative European approval, and thus force Turkey to capitulate, failed".—*Ed.*

^b The Greek of the period of Eastern Roman Empire.—*Ed.*

^c The beginning of the sentence is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^d The words "conceited" and "a man who ... of will" are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

Bourbon France remained faithful. While the Tsar declared war upon Turkey, and his troops crossed the Pruth on the 6th of May, 1828, 15,000 French troops were getting ready to embark for Greece, where they landed in August and September. This was sufficient warning for Austria, not to fall upon the flank of the Russian advance on Constantinople: a war with France would have been the result, and the Russo-French bond—Constantinople for the one, the left bank of the Rhine for the other—would then have come into effect.

At the head of the Russian army,^a Diebitsch advanced as far as Adrianople, but there found himself in such a position that he would have had to re-cross the Balkan if the Turks could have held out another fortnight. He had only 20,000 men, of whom a fourth were down with the plague. Then the Prussian Embassy at Constantinople managed to negotiate a peace by lying reports as to a threatening, but really quite impossible, Russian advance. The Russian General was, in Moltke's words,

“saved from a position which perhaps needed only to be prolonged a few days to hurl him from the height of victory to the abyss of destruction”. (Moltke, *Der Russisch-Türkische Feldzug*, p. 390.)

Anyhow, the Peace gave Russia the mouths of the Danube, a slice of territory in Armenia, and ever new pretexts for meddling in the affairs of the Danubian Provinces.⁵⁵ These now became, till the Crimean War, the *karczma zajezdna* (eating-house) for Russian troops, from whom, during this period, they were scarcely ever free.

Before these advantages could be further turned to account, the Revolution of July broke out.⁵⁶ Now the Liberal phrase-mongering of the Russian agents was, for a while, pocketed; it was only a question now of safeguarding “Legitimacy”. A campaign of the Holy Alliance against France was being prepared when the Polish Insurrection broke out, and for a year held Russia in check. Thus, for the second time, did Poland, by her own self-immolation, save the European Revolution.⁵⁷

I pass over the Russo-Turkish relations during the years of 1830-1848. They were important, inasmuch as they enabled Russia, for once, to appear in the part of defender of Turkey against her rebel vassal, Mehemet Ali of Egypt, to send 30,000 men to the Bosphorus for the defence of Constantinople, and by means of the Treaty of Hunkiar Iskelessi to place Turkey for

^a The beginning of the sentence is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

some years practically under Russian supremacy⁵⁸; inasmuch as Russia succeeded in 1840, through the treachery of Palmerston, in transforming, in one night, a European coalition threatening Russia, into a coalition against France⁵⁹; and as, finally, she could prepare the Danubian Principalities for annexation by continued occupation, by quartering her soldiers upon the peasants,^a and by bribing the Boyards with the "Règlement organique"*.⁶⁰

In the main, however, this period was devoted to the conquest and Russification of the Caucasus, a task accomplished only after a struggle of twenty years.

A severe mishap, however, befell the diplomacy of Tsardom. When the Grand Duke Constantine, on the 29th November, 1830, had to fly from Warsaw before the Polish insurgents, the whole of his diplomatic archives fell into their hands; the despatches of the Foreign Minister,^c and official copies of all the important despatches of the Ambassadors. The whole machinery of Russian diplomacy, and all the intrigues woven by it^d from 1825 to 1830, were laid bare. The Polish Government sent Count Zamoyski with these despatches to England and France in 1835. On the instigation of William IV. they were published by David Urquhart in the "Portfolio".^e This "Portfolio" is still one of the chief sources, and certainly the most incontestible one, for the history of the intrigues by which Tsarish diplomacy seeks to arouse quarrels among the nations of the West, and by means of these dissensions to make tools of them all.

Russian diplomacy had by this time weathered so many Western-European revolutions, not only without loss, but with actual gain, that she was in a position to hail the outbreak of the Revolution of February, 1848, as a fresh piece of good luck. That

* A rural code which placed at the disposal of the Boyards—the landed aristocracy of the country—the greater portion of the peasants' working-time, and that without any remuneration whatever. For further particulars see Karl Marx, "Capital", Ch. X., pp. 218-222 of the English edition. [*Engels' note to the English edition.*]^b

^a The German has "exploitation of the peasants" instead of "by quartering her soldiers upon the peasants".—*Ed.*

^b In place of Engels' note, the German text gives the following: "(see Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Ch. VIII)" which corresponds to Chapter X of the English edition (present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

^c K. V. Nesselrode.—*Ed.*

^d The words "and all the intrigues woven by it" are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^e The reference is to the despatches by C. Lieven and K. Pozzo di Borgo published in *The Portfolio*, Nos 4, 5, 7 and 8, 1835; Engels erroneously has 1834.—*Ed.*

the revolution spread to Vienna, and thus not only removed Russia's chief opponent, Metternich, but also roused up from their slumber the Austrian Slavs, presumptive allies of Tsardom; that it seized Berlin, and so cured the impotent weakling,^a Frederick William IV., of his hankering after independence from Russia—what could be more welcome? Russia was safe from all infection, and Poland was so strongly garrisoned that she could not move. And when now the revolution actually spread as far as the Danubian Principalities,⁶¹ Russian diplomacy had what it wanted—a pretext for a new invasion of Moldavia and Wallachia, there to re-establish order and consolidate Russian rule.

But this was not enough. Austria—the most stubborn, the most dogged opponent of Russia on the side of the Balkan Peninsula—Austria had been brought to the verge of ruin by the Hungarian and Viennese insurrections. The victory of Hungary was, however, synonymous with a renewed outbreak of the European Revolution, and the numerous Poles in the Hungarian army were so many pledges that this revolution should not again halt at the Russian frontier. Then Nicolas played the magnanimous. He sent his armies to overrun Hungary; he crushed the Hungarian forces by superior numbers, and thus sealed the defeat of the European Revolution. And as Prussia was still making efforts to use the revolution for setting aside the German Confederation, and for bringing at least the smaller North German States under her supremacy, Nicolas summoned Prussia and Austria before his judgment-seat at Warsaw, and decided in favour of Austria.⁶² Prussia, as a reward for her long years of subserviency to Russia, was ignominiously humiliated, because, for a moment, she had shown feeble velleities of resistance. The Schleswig-Holstein question Nicolas also decided against Germany, and after assuring himself of his adaptability to the ends of Tsardom, appointed the Glücksburger Christian as heir to the throne of Denmark.⁶³ Not only Hungary, the whole of Europe, lay at the feet of the Tsar, and that it lay there was a direct consequence of the Revolution. Was not Russian diplomacy right, then, if it secretly rejoiced over revolutions in the West?

But the Revolution of February was, after all, the first death-knell of Tsardom. The meagre soul of the narrow-minded Nicolas could not sustain such undeserved good fortune; he could not carry corn; he was in too great a hurry to set out for

^a The German has "ambitious but incapable" instead of "impotent weakling".—*Ed.*

Constantinople. The Crimean war broke out: England and France came to the rescue of Turkey; Austria was burning to "*étonner le monde par la grandeur de son ingratitude*".^a For Austria knew that in return for the help in the Hungarian war, and for the Warsaw judgment, she was expected to remain neutral, or even to facilitate Russian conquests on the Danube, conquests which meant the hemming in of Austria by Russia, on the north, the east, and the south, from Cracow to Orsova and Semlin. And this time, for once in a way, Austria had the courage of her opinion.

The Crimean War was one colossal Comedy of Errors, in which one constantly asks oneself: *Qui trompe-t-on ici*,^b which is the dupe? But this comedy cost countless treasures and over a million human lives. Hardly had the first allied detachments reached Bulgaria when the Austrians moved forward into the Danubian Provinces, and the Russians retired beyond the Pruth. By this means Austria had, on the Danube, slipped in between the two belligerents; a continuance of the war on this side was only possible with her consent. But Austria was to be had for the purpose of a war on the western frontier of Russia. Austria knew Russia would never forgive her brutal ingratitude; Austria was therefore ready to join the Allies, but only for a real war, which should restore Poland, and considerably push back the western frontier of Russia. Such a war must also make impossible the neutrality of Prussia,^c through whose territory Russia received her supplies; a European Coalition would have blockaded Russia by land as well as by sea, and would have attacked her with such superior forces that victory was certain.

But this was by no means the intention of England and France. Both, on the contrary, were glad to be freed from the danger of a serious and real war by Austria's action. What Russia wished, that the Allies should go to the Crimea and get themselves stuck fast there, Palmerston proposed and Louis Napoleon eagerly jumped at. To push forward into the interior of Russia from the Crimea, would have been strategical madness. So the war was happily turned into a sham war, to the intense satisfaction of the parties most interested. But the Tsar Nicolas could not, in the long run,

^a "Astound the world by the grandeur of her ingratitude"—a phrase ascribed to Felix Schwarzenberg, the head of the Austrian government, in connection with a sharp turn of Austrian foreign policy against Russia.—*Ed.*

^b P. Beaumarchais, *Le Barbier de Seville*, III, 11. The sentence is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^c In the German the sentence reads: "Such a war was bound to draw Prussia ... supplies, into the Alliance..."—*Ed.*

put up with foreign troops settling down even on the frontier of his Empire, on Russian territory; for him the mock war soon became a war in earnest. Now, what was his most favourable ground for a mock war, was, for a real war, the most dangerous. The strength of Russia in defence, the immense extent of her territory, thinly populated, impassable, poor in resources, recoiled upon Russia as soon as Nicolas concentrated all forces on Sebastopol, upon one single point of the periphery. The South Russian Steppes that should have been the grave of the invaders, became the grave of the Russian armies, which Nicolas, with his own brutally stupid imperiousness, drove one after the other, the last in the midst of winter, to the Crimea. And when the last, hastily collected, poorly equipped, wretchedly provided army had lost some two-thirds of its men on the march—whole battalions perished in snow-storms—and the survivors were too weak even for a serious attack on the enemy, then the inflated, empty-headed Nicolas collapsed miserably, and escaped the consequences of his Caesarian madness by taking poison.⁶⁴

The terms of peace which his successor^a now hastened to sign, were anything but harsh. Far more incisive, however, were the consequences of the war *within* Russia. To rule absolutely at home, the Tsar must be more than unconquerable abroad; he must be uninterruptedly victorious, must be in a position to reward unconditional obedience by the intoxication of Chauvinist triumph, by conquests following upon conquests. And now Tsardom had miserably broken down, and that too in its outwardly most imposing representative^b; it had laid bare the weakness of Russia to the world, and thus its own weakness to Russia. An immense sobering down followed. The Russian people had been too deeply stirred by the colossal sacrifices of the war, their devotion had been appealed to far too unsparingly by the Tsar, for them to return there and then to the old passive state of unthinking obedience. For gradually Russia, too, had developed economically and intellectually; alongside of the nobility there were now springing up the elements of a second educated class, the Bourgeoisie. In short, the new Tsar had to play the Liberal, but this time at home. This meant the beginning of an internal history of Russia, of an intellectual movement within the nation itself, and of the reflex of this movement: a public opinion, feeble at first, but perceptible more and more, and to be despised less

^a Alexander II.—*Ed*

^b In the German the end of the sentence reads: "...it had exposed Russia to the world and thus itself to Russia".—*Ed*.

and less. And herewith arose the foe before whom Russian diplomacy must ultimately succumb. For this sort of diplomacy is possible only in a country where, and so long as, the people remain absolutely passive, have no will other than that of the Government, no mission but to furnish soldiers and taxes for carrying out the objects of the diplomats. As soon as Russia has an internal development, and with that, internal party struggles, the attainment of a constitutional form under which these party struggles may be fought out without violent convulsions, is only a question of time. But then the traditional Russian policy of conquest is a thing of the past; the unchanging identity of the aims of Russian diplomacy is lost in the struggle of parties for power; the absolute command over the forces of the nation is gone—Russia will remain difficult to attack, and relatively as weak in attack, but will become, in all other respects, a European country like the rest, and the peculiar strength of its diplomacy will be broken for ever.

“*La Russie ne boude pas, elle se recueille,*”^a said Chancellor Gortchakoff after the war.⁶⁵ He himself did not know how truly he spoke. He was speaking only of diplomatic Russia. But non-official Russia was also recovering herself. And this *recueillement* was encouraged by the government itself. The war had proved that Russia needed railways, steam engines,^b modern^c industry, even on purely military grounds. And thus the government set about breeding a Russian capitalist class. But such a class cannot exist without a proletariat, a class of wage-workers,^d and in order to procure the elements for this, the so-called emancipation of the peasants had to be taken in hand; his personal freedom the peasant paid for by the transference of the better part of his landed property to the nobility. What of it was left to him was too much for dying, too little for living. While the Russian peasant *Obshtchina** was attacked thus at the very root, the new development of the bourgeoisie was artificially forced^e as in a hot-house, by means of railway concessions, protective duties, and other privileges; and thus a complete social revolution was initiated in town and country, which would not allow the spirits

* The self-governing Commune of the Russian peasants. [*Engels' note to the English edition.*]

^a “Russia is not sulking, she is collecting herself.”—*Ed.*

^b The words “steam engines” are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^c The German has here “large-scale”.—*Ed.*

^d The words “a class of wage-workers” are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^e The German has: “the new development of the big bourgeoisie was forced...”.—*Ed.*

once set in motion to return to rest again. The new^a bourgeoisie was reflected in a Liberal-constitutional movement, the just-arising proletariat in the movement which is usually called Nihilism. These were the real results of Russia's *recueillement*.

Meanwhile diplomacy did not yet seem to see what an opponent had arisen at home. On the contrary, abroad it seemed to be gaining victory on victory. At the Paris Congress, in 1856, Orlov was the centre figure, and played the leading part^b; instead of making sacrifices, Russia won new successes; the maritime rights claimed by England, and disputed by Russia ever since the time of Catherine, were definitely abrogated, and the foundations laid of a Russo-French alliance against Austria.⁶⁶ This alliance came into effect in 1859, when Louis Napoleon lent himself to the avenging of Russia upon Austria. The consequences of the Russo-French conventions, which Mazzini exposed at the time, and according to which, in the event of Austria's prolonged resistance, a Russian Grand Duke was to be brought forward as candidate to the throne of an independent Hungary,—these consequences Austria escaped by quickly signing a peace. But since 1848 the people have been spoiling the handicraft of diplomacy. Italy became independent and united, against the will of the Tsar and of Louis Napoleon.⁶⁷

The war of 1859 had alarmed Prussia also. She had nearly doubled her army, and had placed a man at the helm, who in one respect, at least, was a match for Russian diplomatists—in his utter indifference as to what means he employed. This man was Bismarck. During the Polish insurrection of 1863, he, with theatrical ostentation, sided with Russia against Austria, France, and England, and did everything to help her to victory.⁶⁸ This secured him, in 1864, the defection of the Tsar from his traditional policy in the Schleswig-Holstein Question; these Duchies were, with the permission of the Tsar, torn from Denmark.⁶⁹ Then came the Prusso-Austrian war of 1866; and here again the Tsar rejoiced over the renewed chastisement of Austria, and the growing power of Prussia—the only faithful vassal, faithful even after the kickings of 1849-50. The war of 1866 brought in its wake the Franco-German war of 1870, and again the Tsar sided with his Prussian “Dyadya Molodetz”,* kept Austria

* “Uncle’s a brick,” habitual exclamation of Alexander II. on receiving William’s telegraphic announcements of victories. [*Engels’ note to the English edition.*]

^a The German has “young” instead of “new”.—*Ed.*

^b The German has: “At the Paris Congress, in 1856, Orlov played the much-sought-after leading role...”.—*Ed.*

directly in check, and thus deprived France of the only ally that could have saved her from complete defeat. But like Louis Napoleon in 1866, Alexander was taken in by the rapid successes of the German armies in 1870. Instead of a protracted war, exhausting both combatants to death, there came the swift repetition of blow upon blow, which in five weeks overthrew the Bonapartist Empire, and led its armies captive into Germany.

At this time there was but one place in Europe where the position was rightly understood, and that was in the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. On the 9th of September, 1870, it issued a manifesto which said:—

“As in 1865 promises were exchanged between Louis Bonaparte and Bismarck, so in 1870 promises have been exchanged between Gortschakoff and Bismarck.⁷⁰ As Louis Bonaparte flattered himself that the war of 1866, resulting in the common exhaustion of Austria and Prussia, would make him the supreme arbiter of Germany, so Alexander flattered himself that the war of 1870, resulting in the common exhaustion of Germany and France, would make him the supreme arbiter of the Western Continent. As the Second Empire thought the North German Confederation incompatible with its existence, so autocratic Russia must consider herself endangered by a German Empire under Prussian leadership. Such is the law of the old political system. Within its pale the gain of one State is the loss of the other. The Tsar's paramount influence over Europe roots in his traditional hold on Germany. At a moment when in Russia herself volcanic social agencies threaten to shake the very base of autocracy, could the Tsar afford to bear with such a loss of foreign prestige? Already the Muscovite journals repeat the language of the Bonapartist journals after the war of 1866. Do the Teuton patriots really believe that liberty and peace will be guaranteed to Germany by forcing France into the arms of Russia? If the fortune of arms, the arrogance of success, and dynastic intrigue lead Germany to a spoliation of French territory, there will then only remain two courses open to her. Either she must at all risks become the *avowed tool* of Russian aggrandisement, or, after some short respite, make again ready for another ‘defensive’ war, not one of those new-fangled ‘localised’ wars, but a *war of races*, a war with the combined Slavonian and Roman races.”^a

^a K. Marx, *Second Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War* (see present edition, Vol. 22, p. 267). In the German a free rendering of the quotation is given, which reads: “The war of 1866, it said, had been fought with the consent of Louis

The new German Empire did Russia the service to wrest Alsace-Lorraine from France,⁷¹ and thereby to throw France into Russia's arms. The diplomacy of the Tsar was now in the enviable position of having both France and Germany, now deadly foes by virtue of this dismemberment, dependent upon Russia. This advantageous position seemed to favour a step further towards Constantinople; the Turkish War of 1877 was declared. After long struggles the Russian troops, in 1878, got as far as the gates of the Turkish capital, when four English men-o'-war appeared in the Bosphorus, and forced Russia, in sight of the towers of the Church of St. Sophia, to halt, and to submit her proposed Treaty of Peace of San Stefano to a European Congress for revision.⁷²

And yet an immense success had—apparently—been obtained. Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, enlarged and made independent by Russia, and therefore in her debt; the quadrilateral between the Danube and the Balkan, the strongest bulwark of Turkey,⁷³ dismantled; the last rampart of Constantinople, the Balkan, torn from Turkey and disarmed; Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, nominally Turkish, actually Russian, vassal states; the territory lost in 1856 in Bessarabia, recovered; new and important positions conquered in Armenia; Austria, by the occupation of Bosnia, made an accomplice in the partition of Turkey, and, moreover, an eternal opponent of all Servian efforts for unity and independence; finally, Turkey, by loss of territory, exhaustion, and an exorbitant war indemnity, reduced to absolute dependence upon Russia, to a position in which, as Russian diplomacy knows only too well,^a she only holds, for the time being the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus in trust for Russia. And thus it seemed as if Russia had but herself to choose the moment when to take possession of

Napoleon; but the victories and growth of Prussian power had been sufficient to drive France into a hostile position vis-à-vis Prussia. The renewed successes of 1870 and the concomitant further growth in Prussian-German power were likewise to compel the Russian Tsar to adopt a hostile position towards Germany, although he supported Germany diplomatically during the war. Russia's predominance in Europe was conditional on its traditional power over Germany which had now been broken. At a time when the revolutionary movement was becoming a menace in Russia itself, the Tsar could not take this loss of prestige abroad. And if Germany was now to drive France into Russia's arms by annexing Alsace-Lorraine, it must either submit to becoming the overt tool of Russian designs for conquest, or else, after a short pause, prepare for a war against Russia and France at the same time, a war, which might easily degenerate into a race-war against its Slav and Roman allies."—*Ed.*

^a The German has "as the Russians believed quite correctly" instead of "as Russian diplomacy knows only too well".—*Ed.*

her great ultimate object, Constantinople, "*la clef de notre maison*".^a

In reality, however, things were quite otherwise. If Alsace-Lorraine had thrown France into the arms of Russia, the advance on Constantinople and the Berlin Peace threw Austria into the arms of Bismarck. And with that the whole situation again changed. The great military powers of the Continent divided themselves into two huge camps, threatening each other: Russia and France here; Germany and Austria there. Around these two the smaller states have to group themselves. But this means that Russia^b cannot take the last great step, cannot really take possession of Constantinople without a universal war, with fairly evenly balanced chances, whose final issue will probably depend, not upon the original belligerent parties, but upon England. For a war of Austria and Germany against Russia and France cuts off the whole of the West from the Russian supply of corn. All the western countries exist only by means of corn imported from abroad. This then could only be supplied by sea, and the naval superiority of England would allow her to cut off this supply either from France or from Germany, and thus starve out either one or the other, according to the side which she might take.* But to fight for Constantinople in a general war, in which England would turn the scales—that is exactly what Russian diplomacy has worked 150 years to avoid. It would in itself mean a defeat.

The importance of checkmating England's probable resistance to Russia's final installation on the Bosphorus has not been overlooked by the diplomatists of St. Petersburg. After the Crimean war, and especially after the Indian mutiny of 1857,⁷⁴ the conquest of Turkestan, attempted already in 1840,⁷⁵ became urgent. In

* The maritime rights, so long claimed by England, and at last abandoned by the Declaration of Paris, 1856, would not be missed by her in an ordinary war with one or two Continental Powers. The latter would, in this age of railroads, even if blockaded by sea, always be supplied, by land, with any quantity of imports by conterminous neutrals; this was, indeed, the chief service rendered to Russia, during the Crimean War, by Prussia. But in a European war, such as now threatens us, the whole Continent would be cut up into hostile groups; neutrality would become, in the long run, impossible; international commerce by land would be almost, if not altogether, suspended. Under such circumstances England might regret giving up her maritime rights. But then, such a war would also display the full force and effect of England's naval superiority, and it may be questioned whether anything more would be at all required. [*Engels' note to the English edition.*]

^a "The key to our house"—the words Alexander I said to the French Ambassador Caulaincourt in 1808.—*Ed.*

^b The German has: "Russian Tsardom".—*Ed.*

1865, a foothold was gained on the Jaxartes by the occupation of Tashkent; in 1868 Samarkand, in 1875 Khokand was annexed, and the Khanates of Bokhara and Khiva brought under Russian vassalage. Then began the weary advance upon Merv from the south-east corner of the Caspian; in 1881, Geok Tepé, the first important advanced post in the desert was taken, in 1884 Merv surrendered, and now the Transcaspian Railway bridges over the gap in the Russian line of communications between Mikhailowsk on the Caspian and Tchardjui on the Oxus. The present Russian position in Turkestan is as yet far from offering a safe and sufficient basis for an attack upon India. But it constitutes, at all events, a very significant menace of future invasion and a cause of constant agitation amongst the natives. While the English raj in India had no possible rival, even the mutiny of 1857 and its deterrent suppression might be looked upon as events fortifying, in the long run, the dominion of England. But with a European first-rate military power settling down in Turkestan, forcing or coaxing Persia and Afghanistan into vassalage, and slowly but irresistibly advancing towards the Hindukush and Suleiman ranges, things are very different. The English raj ceases to be an unalterable doom imposed upon India; a second alternative opens up before the natives; what force has made force may undo; and whenever England now attempts to cross Russia's path on the Black Sea, Russia will try to find unpleasant work for England in India. But in spite of all this, England's maritime power is such that she still can hurt Russia far more than Russia can hurt her, in a general war such as now seems impending.^a

Moreover, the alliance with a republican France, whose rulers are subject to constant change, is by no means safe for Tsardom, and still less in accordance with its heart's desire. Only a restored French monarchy could offer satisfactory guarantees as ally in a war so terrible as that which is now alone possible. Hence, too, for the last five years Tsardom has taken the Orleans under its special protection; they have had to intermarry with it, by marrying into the Danish Royal Family—that Russian advanced post on the Sound.⁷⁶ And to prepare the restoration, in France, of the Orleans, now equally promoted into a Russian advanced post, General Boulanger was made use of. His own followers in France boast that the secret source whence money was so lavishly provided them, was no other than the Russian government, which had found them 15 million francs for their campaign.⁷⁷ Thus is

^a This paragraph is deleted in the German.—*Ed*

Russia again meddling in the internal affairs of the Western countries, this time undisguisedly as the mainstay of reaction, and is playing off the impatient Chauvinism of the French bourgeois against the revolutionary spirit of the French workmen.

Altogether it is since 1878 that we begin to really see how much the position of Russian diplomacy has changed for the worse since the people are more and more permitting themselves to put in a word, and that with success. Even in the Balkan Peninsula, the territory where Russia appears *ex professo*^a as the champion of nationalities, nothing seems to succeed now. The Roumanians, as a reward for having made victory possible to the Russians at Plevna,⁷⁸ have been compelled to give up their portion of Bessarabia, and will hardly allow themselves to be taken in by drafts on the future with respect to Transsylvania and the Banat. The Bulgarians are heartily sick of the Tsar's method of liberation, thanks to the Tsar's agents sent into their country. Only the Servians, and possibly the Greeks—both outside the direct line of fire on Constantinople—are not yet recalcitrant. The Austrian Slavs, whom the Tsar felt called upon to deliver from German bondage, have since, in the Cisleithan Provinces of the Empire⁷⁹ at least, played the part of the ruling race. The phrase of the emancipation of oppressed Christian^b nations by the almighty Tsar is played out, and can, at most, be applied to Crete and Armenia only, and that will no longer draw in Europe, not even with sanctimonious English Liberals; for the sake of Crete and Armenia, not even Tsar-worshipping Mr. Gladstone will risk a European war, after the exposure, by Mr. Kennan of the infamous brutality with which the Tsar suppresses every attempt at opposition in his own dominions,^c after the notoriety given to the flogging to death of Madame Sihida and other Russian "atrocities".⁸⁰

And here we come to the very kernel of the matter. The internal development of Russia since 1856, furthered by the Government itself, has done its work. The social revolution has made giant strides; Russia is daily becoming more and more Occidentalised; modern manufactures, steam,^d railways, the transformation of all payments in kind into money payments, and with this the crumbling of the old foundations of society are developing with ever accelerated speed. But in the same degree is also

^a Openly.—*Ed.*

^b The words "oppressed Christian" are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^c The rest of the sentence is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^d The word is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

evolving the incompatibility of despotic Tsardom with the new society in course of formation. Opposition parties are forming—constitutional and revolutionary—which the Government can only master by means of increased brutality. And Russian diplomacy sees with horror the day approaching, on which the Russian people will demand to be heard, and when the settlement of their own internal affairs will leave them neither time nor wish to concern themselves with such puerilities as the conquest of Constantinople, of India, and of the supremacy of the world. The Revolution that in 1848 halted on the Polish frontier, is now knocking at the door of Russia and it now has, within, plenty of allies who only wait the right moment to throw open that door to it.

It is true, that whoever reads Russian newspapers, might suppose that all Russia enthusiastically applauds the Tsar's policy of conquest; in them there is nothing but Jingoism, Panslavism, the deliverance of Christians from the Turkish, of Slavs from the German and Magyar, yoke. But, firstly, every one knows in what chains the Russian press lies bound; secondly, the Government itself has for years fostered this Jingoism and Panslavism in all schools; and thirdly, these newspapers express—so far as they express any sort of independent opinion, only the opinion of the town population, *i.e.* of the newly-created Bourgeoisie, naturally interested in new conquests as extensions of the Russian home market. But this town population is a vanishing minority throughout the country. As soon as a National Assembly gives the immense majority of the Russian people—the rural population—an opportunity of making itself heard, we shall see quite another state of things. The experiences of the Government with regard to the Zemstvos (County Councils)^a and which forced it to take away again all power from the Zemstvos⁸¹ prove that a Russian National Assembly, in order to settle only the most pressing internal difficulties, would at once have to put a decided stop to all hankering after new conquests.

The European situation to-day is governed by three facts: (1) the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany; (2) the impending advance of Russian Tsardom upon Constantinople; (3) the struggle in all countries, ever growing fiercer, between the Proletariat and the Bourgeoisie, the working-class and the

^a The words in brackets are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

middle-class, a struggle whose thermometer is the everywhere advancing Socialist movement.

The two first necessitate the grouping of Europe, to-day, into two large camps. The German annexation makes France the ally of Russia against Germany; the threatening of Constantinople by Tsardom makes Austria and even Italy the allies of Germany. Both camps are preparing for a decisive battle, for a war, such as the world has not yet seen, in which 10 to 15 million armed combatants will stand face to face. Only two circumstances have thus far prevented the outbreak of this fearful war: first, the incredibly rapid improvements in firearms, in consequence of which every newly-invented arm is already superseded by a new invention, before it can be introduced into even *one* army; and, secondly, the absolute impossibility of calculating the chances, the complete uncertainty as to who will finally come out victor from this gigantic struggle.

All this danger of a general war will disappear on the day when a change of things in Russia will allow the Russian people to blot out, at a stroke, the traditional policy of conquest of its Tsars, and to turn its attention to its own internal vital interests, now seriously menaced, instead of dreaming about universal supremacy.

On that day the German Empire^a will lose all its allies against France, whom the danger from Russia has driven into its arms. Neither Austria nor Italy will then have even the smallest interest in pulling the German Emperor's^b chestnuts out of the fire of a colossal European war. The German Empire will fall back to that isolated position, in which, as Moltke says, everyone fears and no one loves it,^c the unavoidable result of its policy. Then, too, the mutual sympathy between Russia striving after freedom and Republican France, will be as suitable to the state of both countries, as it will be free of danger to Europe generally; and then Bismarck, or whoever succeeds him, will think thrice before he forces on a war with France, in which neither Russia against Austria, nor Austria against Russia covers his flank, in which both these countries would rejoice at any defeat he might suffer, and in which it is very doubtful whether he could, single-handed, overcome the French. Then all sympathies would be on the side of

^a The German has "Bismarck" instead of "the German Empire".—*Ed.*

^b William II. The German has "Bismarck's" instead of "the German Emperor's".—*Ed.*

^c In his speech in the German Reichstag on February 16, 1874 Moltke said: "Since our successful wars we have gained respect everywhere, but love nowhere."—*Ed.*

France, and she would, at worst, be safe from further spoliation. Instead, therefore, of steering towards a war, the German Empire would probably soon find its isolated condition so intolerable that it would seek a sincere reconciliation with France, and thus all the terrible danger of war would be removed. Europe could disarm, and Germany would have gained most of all.

On the same day Austria will lose her only historical *raison d'être*, the only justification for her existence, that of barrier against a Russian advance on Constantinople. When the Bosphorus is no longer threatened by Russia, Europe will lose all interest in the maintenance of this motley hodge-podge of many peoples. Equally indifferent then will be the whole of the so-called Eastern question, the continuation of Turkish supremacy in Slav, Greek, and Albanian regions, and the dispute about the possession of the entrance to the Black Sea, which no one will then be able to monopolise against the rest of Europe. Magyars, Roumanians, Servians, Bulgarians, Arnauts,^a Greeks, Armenians,^b and Turks, will then, at last, be in a position to settle their mutual differences without the interference of foreign Powers, to establish among themselves the boundaries of each national territory, to order their internal affairs according to their own necessities and wishes. It will at once be seen that the great hindrance to the autonomy and free grouping of the nations and fragments of nations between the Carpathians and the Ægean Sea was no other than that same Tsardom which used the pretended emancipation of these nations as a cloak for its plans of world-supremacy.

France will be freed from the unnatural, compulsory position into which her alliance with the Tsar has forced her. If the alliance with the Republic is repugnant to the Tsar, far more repugnant to the revolutionary French people is this league with the despot, the executioner of both Poland and Russia. In a war by the side of the Tsar, France would be forbidden, in the event of a defeat, to make use of her great, her only effective means of preservation, her salvation in 1793: the Revolution, the calling out of all the strength of the people by terror, and the revolutionist propaganda in the country of the enemy; in such an event the Tsar would at once join hands with the enemies of France, for times have changed since 1848, and the Tsar, in the meantime, has learnt to know from personal experience what the Terror is. The alliance with the Tsar, then, is no strengthening of France; on

^a The Turkish name for Albanians.— *Ed.*

^b The word is deleted in the German.— *Ed.*

the contrary, at the moment of greatest danger Tsardom will keep sheathed the sword of France. But if in Russia, in the place of the almighty Tsar, there is a National Assembly, then the friendship of newly-freed Russia for the French Republic will be self-understood and natural; then it will further instead of impeding the revolutionary movement in France, then it will be a gain to the European Proletariat fighting for its emancipation. So France, too, must gain by the overthrow of the omnipotence of the Tsar.

Then will also disappear the excuse for the mad armaments which are turning Europe into one large camp, and which make war itself seem almost a relief. Even the German Reichstag would then find itself obliged to refuse the ever-increasing demands for war supplies.

And with this, Western Europe would be in a position to occupy itself, undisturbed by foreign diversions and interference, with its own immediate historical task, with the conflict between Proletariat and Bourgeoisie, and^a the solution of the economic problems connected with it.

The overthrow of the Tsar's despotic rule in Russia would also directly help on this process. On the day when Tsardom falls—this last stronghold of the whole European Reaction—on that day a quite different wind will blow across Europe. For the gentlemen in Berlin and Vienna^b know perfectly well, in spite of all differences with the Tsar about Constantinople, etc., that the time may come when they will throw into his maw Constantinople, the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles, anything he wants, if only he will protect them against Revolution. On the day, therefore, when this chief stronghold itself, when Russia^c passes into the hands of the Revolution, the last remnant of confidence and security of the reactionary governments of Europe is gone; they will be thrown upon their own resources, and will soon learn how little they are worth then. The German Emperor^d might perhaps be tempted into sending an army to restore the authority of the Tsar—than which there could be no better way to destroy his own authority.^e

For there can be no doubt that Germany—quite independent of

^a In the German the end of the sentence reads: "with effecting the transition from capitalist to socialist society".—*Ed.*

^b The German has: "For the reactionary governments of Europe..."—*Ed.*

^c The words "when Russia" are deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^d William II.—*Ed.*

^e In the German another sentence is printed instead of this one: "Perhaps they might opt to send in their armies to establish the authority of the Tsar—what an irony of world history!"—*Ed.*

any possible action of Russia or France—is rapidly approaching a revolution. The last general election shows that the German Socialists are doubling their strength every three years; that to-day, of all single parties in the empire, they are the strongest, counting 1,437,000 votes out of a total of seven millions; and that all penal and coercive legislation was utterly powerless to stop their advance.⁸² But the German Socialists, while willing to accept, on account, any economic concessions the young Emperor may make to the working class, are determined, and after ten years' coercion more determined than ever, to recover the political liberty conquered in 1848 on the Berlin barricades, but lost again to a great extent under Manteuffel and Bismarck. They know that this political liberty will alone give them the means of attaining the economic emancipation of the working class. In spite of any appearances to the contrary, a struggle is imminent between the German Socialists and the Emperor, the representative of personal and paternal government. In this struggle, the Emperor must ultimately be beaten. The electoral returns prove that the Socialists are making headway rapidly even in the country districts, while the large towns already as good as belong to them; and, in a country where every able-bodied adult male is a soldier, this means the gradual conversion of the army to Socialism. Now let a sudden change of system take place in Russia, and the effect upon Germany must be tremendous; it must hasten the crisis and double the chances of the Socialists.^a

These are the points why Western Europe in general, and especially its working class,^b is interested, very deeply interested, in the triumph of the Russian Revolutionary Party, and in the overthrow of the Tsar's absolutism. Europe is gliding down an inclined plane with increasing swiftness towards the abyss of a general war, a war of hitherto unheard-of extent and ferocity. Only one thing can stop it—a change of system in Russia. That this must come about in a few years there can be no doubt. May it come to pass in good time before the otherwise inevitable occurs.

^a The paragraph is deleted in the German.—*Ed.*

^b The German has "the West European workers' party" instead of "its working class".—*Ed.*

ON ANTI-SEMITISM

(FROM A PRIVATE LETTER TO VIENNA)⁸³

...But whether you might not be doing more harm than good with your anti-Semitism is something I would ask you to consider. For anti-Semitism betokens a retarded culture, which is why it is found only in Prussia and Austria, and in Russia too. Anyone dabbling in anti-Semitism, either in England or in America, would simply be ridiculed, while in Paris the only impression created by M. Drumont's writings—wittier by far than those of the German anti-Semites—was that of a somewhat ineffectual flash in the pan. Moreover, now that he is standing for the Municipal Council he has actually had to declare himself an opponent of Christian no less than of Jewish capital. And M. Drumont would be read even were he to take the opposite view.

In Prussia it is the lesser nobility, the Junkers with an income of 10,000 marks and outgoings of 20,000, and hence subject to usury, who indulge in anti-Semitism, while both in Prussia and Austria a vociferous chorus is provided by those whom competition from big capital has ruined—the petty bourgeoisie, skilled craftsmen and small shop-keepers. But in as much as capital, whether Semitic or Aryan, circumcised or baptised, is destroying *these* classes of society which are reactionary through and through, it is only doing what pertains to its office, and doing it well; it is helping to impel the retarded Prussians and Austrians forward until they eventually attain the present-day level at which all the old social distinctions resolve themselves in the one great antithesis—capitalists and wage-labourers. Only in places where this has not yet happened, where there is no strong capitalist class and hence no strong class of wage-labourers, where capital is not yet strong enough to gain control of national production as a

whole, so that its activities are mainly confined to the Stock Exchange—in other words, where production is still in the hands of the farmers, landowners, craftsmen and suchlike classes surviving from the Middle Ages—there, and there alone, is capital mainly Jewish, and there alone is anti-Semitism rife.

In North America *not a single Jew* is to be found among the millionaires whose wealth can, in some cases, scarcely be expressed in terms of our paltry marks, gulden or francs and, by comparison with these Americans, the Rothschilds are veritable paupers. And even in England, Rothschild is a man of modest means when set, for example, against the Duke of Westminster.^a Even in our own Rhineland from which, with the help of the French, we drove the aristocracy 95 years ago and where we have established modern industry, one may look in vain for Jews.

Hence anti-Semitism is merely the reaction of declining medieval social strata against a modern society consisting essentially of capitalists and wage-labourers, so that all it serves are reactionary ends under a purportedly socialist cloak; it is a degenerate form of feudal socialism and we can have nothing to do with that. The very fact of its existence in a region is proof that there is not yet enough capital there. Capital and wage-labour are today indivisible. The stronger capital and hence the wage-earning class becomes, the closer will be the demise of capitalist domination. So what I would wish for us Germans, amongst whom I also count the Viennese, is that the capitalist economy should develop at a truly spanking pace rather than slowly decline into stagnation.

In addition, the anti-Semite presents the facts in an entirely false light. He doesn't even know the Jews he decries, otherwise he would be aware that, thanks to anti-Semitism in eastern Europe, and to the Spanish Inquisition in Turkey, there are here in England and in America thousands upon thousands of *Jewish proletarians*; and it is precisely these Jewish workers who are the worst exploited and the most poverty-stricken. In England during the past twelve months we have had *three* strikes by Jewish workers.⁸⁴ Are we then expected to engage in anti-Semitism in our struggle against capital?

Furthermore, we are far too deeply indebted to the Jews. Leaving aside Heine and Börne, Marx was a full-blooded Jew; Lassalle was a Jew. Many of our best people are Jews. My friend Victor Adler, who is now atoning in a Viennese prison for his devotion to the cause of the proletariat, Eduard Bernstein, editor

^a H. L. Grosvenor.—*Ed.*

of the London *Sozialdemokrat*, Paul Singer, one of our best men in the Reichstag—people whom I am proud to call my friends, and all of them Jewish! After all, I myself was dubbed a Jew by the *Gartenlaube* and, indeed, if given the choice, I'd as lief be a Jew as a 'Herr von'^a!

London, April 19, 1890

Frederick Engels

First published in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*,
No. 19, May 9, 1890

Printed according to the news-
paper

^a A German honorific indicating membership of the nobility.—*Ed*

[PREFACE TO THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION (1890)
OF THE *MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY*]⁸⁵

Since the above was written,^a a new German edition of the *Manifesto* has again become necessary, and much has also happened to the *Manifesto* which should be recorded here.

A second Russian translation—by Vera Zasulich—appeared in Geneva in 1882; the preface to that edition was written by Marx and myself.^b Unfortunately, the original German manuscript has gone astray; I must therefore retranslate from the Russian, which will in no way improve the text.⁸⁶ It reads:

“The first Russian edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, in Bakunin’s translation, was published in the early sixties^c by the printing office of the *Kolokol*.⁸⁷ At that time the significance to the West of the Russian translation of this work was at most that of a literary curiosity. Such a view would no longer be possible today. What a limited field the proletarian movement still occupied at that time (January 1848^d) is best shown by the last chapter of the *Manifesto*: “Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Opposition Parties.”^e The most notable omissions here are Russia and the United States. It was the time when Russia constituted the last great reserve of European reaction and when

^a The reference is to Engels’ Preface (1883) to the German edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (see present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 118-19).—*Ed.*

^b K. Marx and F. Engels, “Preface to the Second Russian Edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*” (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 425-26).—*Ed.*

^c К. Марксъ, Ф. Энгельсъ, *Манифестъ Коммунистической партіи*. Женева, 1869.—*Ed.*

^d The manuscript of the Preface to the Russian edition of 1882 has “December 1847” instead of “January 1848”.—*Ed.*

^e The manuscript of the Preface to the 1882 Russian edition has further the following words: “in the various countries”.—*Ed.*

emigration to the United States absorbed the surplus forces of the European proletariat. Both countries supplied Europe with raw materials and at the same time provided markets for the sale of its manufactured goods. Thus both served, each in its own way, as pillars of the European social order.

“How all that has changed today! It is that self-same European emigration which has made possible the immense development of North American agriculture which, through its competition, is shaking the very foundations of European landed property—large and small. It has also enabled the United States to make a start on exploiting its tremendous industrial resources, and with such energy and on such a scale that this is bound in a short while to put an end to the industrial monopoly of Western Europe.^a And these two circumstances react in revolutionary manner also on America itself. The small and medium landed property of the self-employed^b farmers, the foundation of America’s entire political system, is increasingly succumbing to competition from giant farms, whilst simultaneously in the industrial regions a numerically strong proletariat is taking shape for the first time alongside a fabulous concentration of capitals.

“Let us move on to Russia. During the revolution of 1848-49 not only the European monarchs, but also the European bourgeois, saw in Russian intervention their sole salvation from a European proletariat just awakening to its own power. They proclaimed the Tsar^c head of European reaction. Today he^d languishes in Gatchina, a prisoner of war of the revolution,⁸⁸ and Russia forms the vanguard of the revolutionary movement in Europe.

“It was the task of the *Communist Manifesto* to proclaim the inevitably impending demise of contemporary bourgeois property. But in Russia we find that, alongside the capitalist system, developing with a feverish haste, and bourgeois landed property, only just beginning to develop, more than half the land is the common property of the peasants.

“Now the question is: can the Russian peasant community,^e a

^a In the manuscript of the Preface to the 1882 Russian edition there follows: “and especially of England”.—*Ed.*

^b The word “self-employed” was added by Engels to the German edition of 1890.—*Ed.*

^c Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^d Alexander III.—*Ed.*

^e The manuscript of the Preface to the 1882 Russian edition has the Russian word *Obshchina*—village community—transliterated as *Obschtschina* instead of “peasant community”.—*Ed.*

Sozialdemokratische Bibliothek.

XXXIII.

Das
Kommunistische Manifest.

~~~~~  
Vierte autorisierte deutsche Ausgabe.

Mit einem neuen Vorwort von Friedrich Engels.

---

*Louis-Léon Laforgue  
F. Engels  
London 9/8/90.*

London.

German Cooperative Publishing Co.  
114 Kentish Town Road NW.  
1890.

Title page of the German edition (1890)  
of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*





form of the primeval common ownership of land, albeit greatly eroded, pass directly to the higher, communist form of common ownership, or must it first pass through the same process of dissolution as demonstrated in the historical development of the West?

“The only answer possible to this question today is the following. If the Russian revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that the two complement each other, then present-day Russian common ownership may serve as a starting point for communist development.

“*London, January 21, 1882.*”

At about the same date, a new Polish version appeared in Geneva: *Manifest Komunistyczny*.<sup>a</sup>

Furthermore, a new Danish translation has appeared in the *Socialdemokratisk Bibliotek*, København, 1885.<sup>b</sup> Unfortunately it is not quite complete; certain essential passages, which seem to have presented difficulties to the translator, have been omitted, and in addition there are signs of carelessness here and there, which are all the more unpleasantly conspicuous since the translation indicates that had the translator taken a little more pains he would have done an excellent piece of work.

A new French version appeared in 1886 in *Le Socialiste* of Paris; it is the best published to date.<sup>c</sup>

After this a Spanish version was published the same year, first in *El Socialista*<sup>d</sup> of Madrid, and then reissued in pamphlet form: *Manifiesto del Partido Comunista* por Carlos Marx y F. Engels, Madrid, Administración de *El Socialista*, Hernán Cortés 8.

As a matter of curiosity I may also mention that in 1887 the manuscript of an Armenian translation was offered to a publisher in Constantinople. But the good man did not have the courage to publish something bearing the name of Marx and suggested that the translator set down his own name as author, which the latter, however, declined.

After one and then another of the more or less inaccurate

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifest Komunistyczny 1847*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels, *Det Kommunistiske Manifest*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifeste du parti communiste, Le Socialiste*, Nos. 1-11, August 29-November 7, 1885. The date “1886” is given by Engels by mistake. The translation was done by Laura Lafargue and edited by Engels.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifiesto del Partido Comunista, El Socialista*, Nos. 14-17, 19-22, June 11-August 6, 1886.—*Ed.*

American translations had been repeatedly reprinted in England,<sup>a</sup> an authentic version at last appeared in 1888. This was by my friend Samuel Moore, and we went through it together once more before it was sent to press. It is entitled: *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Authorised English Translation, edited and annotated by Frederick Engels, 1888, London, William Reeves, 185 Fleet St., E.C.<sup>b</sup> I have added some of the notes of that edition to the present one.

The *Manifesto* has had a history of its own. Greeted with enthusiasm, at the time of its appearance, by the then still not at all numerous vanguard of scientific Socialism (as is proved by the translations mentioned in the first preface<sup>c</sup>), it was soon forced into the background by the reactionary developments that originated with the defeat of the Paris workers in June 1848, and was finally excommunicated "according to law" by the conviction of the Cologne Communists in November 1852.<sup>89</sup> With the disappearance from the public scene of the workers' movement that had begun with the February revolution,<sup>d</sup> the *Manifesto* passed into the background.

When the working class of Europe had again gathered sufficient strength for a new onslaught upon the power of the ruling classes, the International Working Men's Association came into being. Its aim was to weld together into *one* huge army the whole militant working class of Europe and America. Therefore it could not *set out* from the principles laid down in the *Manifesto*. It was bound to have a programme which would not shut the door on the English TRADE UNIONS, the French, Belgian, Italian and Spanish Proudhonists and the German Lassalleans.\* This programme—the preamble to the Rules of the International<sup>e</sup>—was drawn up by Marx with a

\* Lassalle personally, to us, always acknowledged himself to be a "disciple" of Marx, and, as such, stood, of course, on the ground of the *Manifesto*. Matters were quite different with regard to those of his followers who did not go beyond his demand for producers' co-operatives supported by state credits and who divided the whole working class into supporters of state assistance and supporters of self-assistance.

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels, *The Manifesto of the Communists*, London, 1886; K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communists, Justice*, Nos. 208-13, January 7-February 11, 1888.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The Preface by Engels to the 1888 English edition. See present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 512-18.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The Preface by Marx and Engels to the 1872 German edition. See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 174-75.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The 1848 revolution in France.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 14-16.—*Ed.*

master hand acknowledged even by Bakunin and the anarchists. For the ultimate triumph of the ideas set forth in the *Manifesto* Marx relied solely and exclusively upon the intellectual development of the working class, as it necessarily had to ensue from united action and discussion. The events and vicissitudes in the struggle against capital, the defeats even more than the successes, could not but demonstrate to the fighters the inadequacy hitherto of their universal panaceas and make their minds more receptive to a thorough understanding of the true conditions for the emancipation of the workers. And Marx was right. The working class of 1874, at the dissolution of the International, was altogether different from that of 1864, at its foundation. Proudhonism in the Latin countries and the specific Lassalleanism in Germany were dying out, and even the then arch-conservative English TRADE UNIONS were gradually approaching the point where in 1887 the chairman of their Swansea Congress<sup>a</sup> could say in their name: "Continental Socialism [...] has lost its terrors for us."<sup>b</sup> Yet by 1887 Continental Socialism was almost exclusively the theory heralded in the *Manifesto*. Thus, to a certain extent, the history of the *Manifesto* reflects the history of the modern working-class movement since 1848. At present it is doubtless the most widely circulated, the most international product of all socialist literature, the common programme of many millions of workers of all countries, from Siberia to California.

Nevertheless, when it appeared we could not have called it a *socialist* manifesto. In 1847 two kinds of people were considered socialists. On the one hand were the adherents of the various Utopian systems, notably the Owenites in England and the Fourierists in France, both of whom at that date had already dwindled to mere sects gradually dying out. On the other, the manifold types of social quacks who wanted to eliminate social abuses through their various universal panaceas and all kinds of patchwork, without hurting capital and profit in the least. In both cases, people who stood outside the labour movement and who looked for support rather to the "educated" classes. The section of the working class, however, which demanded a radical reconstruction of society, convinced that mere political revolutions were not enough, then called itself *communist*. It was still a rough-hewn, only instinctive, and frequently somewhat crude Communism. Yet it was powerful enough to bring into being two

<sup>a</sup> W. Bevan.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> W. Binning, *The Trades' Union Congress, The Commonweal*, No. 88, September 17, 1887.—*Ed.*

systems of Utopian Communism—in France the “Icarian” Communism of Cabet, and in Germany that of Weitling. Socialism in 1847 signified a bourgeois movement, Communism, a working-class movement. Socialism was, on the Continent at least, quite respectable, whereas Communism was the very opposite. And since we were very decidedly of the opinion as early as then that “the emancipation of the workers must be the act of the working class itself”,<sup>90</sup> we could have no hesitation as to which of the two names we should choose. Nor has it ever occurred to us since to repudiate it.

“Working men of all countries, unite!” But few voices responded when we proclaimed these words to the world forty-two years ago, on the eve of the first Paris revolution in which the proletariat came out with demands of its own. On September 28, 1864, however, the proletarians of most of the Western European countries joined hands in the International Working Men’s Association of glorious memory. True, the International itself lived only nine years. But that the eternal union of the proletarians of all countries created by it is still alive and lives stronger than ever, there is no better witness than this day. Because today, as I write these lines, the European and American proletariat is reviewing its fighting forces, mobilised for the first time, mobilised as *one* army, under *one* flag, for *one* immediate aim: the standard eight-hour working day to be established by legal enactment, as proclaimed by the Geneva Congress of the International in 1866, and again by the Paris Workers’ Congress in 1889.<sup>91</sup> And today’s spectacle will open the eyes of the capitalists and landlords of all countries to the fact that today the working men of all countries are united indeed.

If only Marx were still by my side to see this with his own eyes!

London, May 1, 1890

F. Engels

First published in *Das Kommunistische Manifest*, London, 1890

Printed according to the book

MAY 4 IN LONDON<sup>92</sup>

The May Day celebration of the proletariat was epoch-making not only by its universal character which made it the first international *action* of the militant working class. It also marked most gratifying advances in the various countries taken individually. Friend and foe agree *that on the whole Continent it was Austria, and in Austria Vienna, that celebrated the holiday of the proletariat in the most brilliant and dignified manner*, and that the Austrian, above all the Viennese, workers thereby won themselves an entirely different standing in the movement. Only a few years ago the Austrian movement had declined almost to zero, and the workers of the German and Slav crown lands were split into hostile contingents that wore themselves out in internecine strife. Anyone who had claimed ever just three years ago that on May 1, 1890 Vienna and the whole of Austria would set an example to all others of how a proletarian class holiday should be celebrated, would have been laughed out of court. We shall do well not to forget this fact when judging those squabbles stemming from internal discord in which the workers of other countries continue to wear themselves out to this day, as, for instance, in France. Who would claim that Paris cannot do what Vienna has done?

But on May 4 Vienna was cast in the shade by London. And I consider it to be the most important and magnificent aspect of the entire May Day celebration that on May 4, 1890, the *English proletariat*, rousing itself from forty years of hibernation, *rejoined the movement of its class*. This cannot be appreciated without looking at the past history of May 4.

Towards the beginning of last year the world's largest and most poverty-stricken working-class district, the East End of London, was stirred gradually into action. On April 1, 1889, the GAS

WORKERS' AND GENERAL LABOURERS' UNION was founded; today it has some 100,000 members. It was largely through the participation of this interested union (many are gas workers in winter and dock workers in summer) that the big dockers' strike started on its way and shook even the bottom-most section of the East London workers out of their self-neglect.<sup>93</sup> Trades union upon trades union was formed among these, mostly unskilled workers, while those already in existence there, having hitherto barely kept themselves going, now blossomed forth at speed. But these new TRADES UNIONS are very different from the old ones. The latter, encompassing "skilled" workers, are exclusive; they bar all workers who have not received a guild training, and thereby themselves give rise to competition from those not in the guild; they are rich, but the richer they become, the more they degenerate into mere health-insurance and death benefit funds; they are conservative and they steer clear above all of ... socialism, as far and as long as they can. The new "unskilled" unions, on the other hand, admit *every* worker in the given trade; they are essentially, and the gas workers even exclusively, unions geared to organising and funding strikes. And while they are not socialists to a man, they nevertheless absolutely insist on being led by socialists and no others. But socialist propaganda had already been actively pursued for years in the East End, where it was above all Mrs. E. Marx-Aveling and her husband, Edward Aveling, who had four years earlier discovered the most fertile ground for propaganda in the "Radical clubs"<sup>94</sup> consisting almost exclusively of workers, had worked on them steadily and, as is now evident, to the best effect. During the dock workers' strike Mrs. Aveling was one of the three women who organised the distribution of relief, and as a token of gratitude Mr. Hyndman, the runaway of Trafalgar Square,<sup>95</sup> slanderously alleged that in return they had been paid three pounds sterling every week from the strike fund. Mrs. Aveling led last winter's strike in Silvertown almost unaided,<sup>96</sup> as also in the East End, and in the gas workers' union she represents a women's branch founded by herself.

Last autumn the gas workers won an eight-hour working day here in London, but in an unsuccessful strike lost it again in the southern part of the city,<sup>97</sup> acquiring sufficient proof that this gain is by no means safe for all times in the northern part either. Is it surprising, then, that they readily accepted Mrs. Aveling's proposal to hold a May Day celebration, as decided by the Paris Congress, in support of a legal eight-hour day in London? In concert with several socialist groups, the Radical clubs and the

other TRADES UNIONS in the East End, they set up a Central Committee to organise a large demonstration for the purpose in Hyde Park. As it transpired that all attempts to hold the demonstration on Thursday, May 1, were bound to fail this year, a decision was taken to postpone it till Sunday, May 4.

To ensure that, as far as possible, *all* London workers took part, the Central Committee, in its naïve impartiality, invited the London TRADES COUNCIL as well. This is a body made up of delegates from the London TRADES UNIONS, mostly of the older "skilled" unions, and one in which, as might be expected, the anti-socialist elements still command a majority. The TRADES COUNCIL realised that the movement for an eight-hour day was threatening to grow beyond its control. The old TRADES UNIONS also favour an eight-hour working day, but not one to be established by law. What they mean by an eight-hour day is that normal daily wages should be paid for eight hours—so-and-so much per hour—but that any amount of overtime should be permitted daily, provided every hour of overtime is paid at a higher rate—say, at the rate of one and a half or two ordinary hours. The point therefore was to tie in the demonstration with this version of the working day, one to be won by "free" agreement but certainly not to be made statutory by an Act of Parliament. To this end the TRADES COUNCIL allied itself with the SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION under the above-mentioned Mr. Hyndman, an association which poses as the One True Church of English Socialism, which, quite in keeping with its nature, concluded a life-and-death alliance with the French Possibilists<sup>98</sup> and sent a delegation to their congress, and which therefore from the outset regarded the May Day celebration the Marxist Congress had decided to hold as a sin against the Holy Ghost. The movement was growing beyond the control of the Federation as well; but to fall in line with the Central Committee would mean placing itself under "Marxist" leadership; on the other hand, if the TRADES COUNCIL were to take the matter into its own hands and if the celebration were held on May 4 instead of the 1st, it would no longer be anything like the wicked "Marxist" May Day celebration and so it [the Federation] could join in. Notwithstanding the inclusion in its programme of a legal eight-hour day, the Social Democratic Federation eagerly clasped the hand proffered by the TRADES COUNCIL.

Now the new allies, strange bed-fellows though they were, played on the Central Committee a trick which would, it is true, be considered not only permissible but quite clever by the political ways of the English bourgeoisie, but one which European and



American workers will probably find perfectly ordinary. The fact is that in the case of mass meetings in Hyde Park the organisers must first announce their intention to the BOARD OF WORKS and reach agreement with it on details, namely secure permission to move onto the grass the carts that are to serve as platforms. Besides, regulations say that after a meeting has been announced, no other meeting may be held in the Park on the same day. The Central Committee had not yet made the announcement; but scarcely had the bodies allied against it heard the news than they registered a meeting in the Park for May 4 and obtained permission for seven platforms, doing so behind the backs of the Central Committee.

The TRADES COUNCIL and the Federation considered that they had thus rented the Park for May 4 and had victory in the bag. The former called a meeting of delegates from the TRADES UNIONS, to which it also invited two delegates from the Central Committee; the Central Committee sent three, including Mrs. Aveling. The TRADES COUNCIL treated them as if it were running the whole show. It informed them that *only* trades unions, that is to say no socialist associations or political clubs, were to take part in the demonstration and carry banners. Just how the Social Democratic Federation was to participate in the demonstration remained a mystery. The Council had already edited the resolution to be submitted to the meeting, and had *deleted* from it the demand for a *legal* eight-hour day; a proposal that this be reinserted was neither accepted for debate, nor was it voted on. And lastly, the Council refused to admit Mrs. Aveling as a delegate, claiming that she was not a manual worker (which is not true), and this despite the fact that its own President, Mr. Shipton, had not lifted a finger in his own trade for fully fifteen years.

The workers on the Central Committee were outraged by the trick played on them. It looked as if the demonstration had been finally put into the hands of two bodies representing only small minorities among the London workers. There seemed to be no remedy but to storm the platforms of the TRADES COUNCIL, as the gas workers had threatened.—Then Edward Aveling went to the Ministry and, contrary to regulations, secured permission for the Central Committee likewise to bring seven platforms to the Park. The attempt to fix the demonstration in accordance with the interests of the minority had failed; the TRADES COUNCIL pulled in its horns and was glad to be able to negotiate with the Central Committee on an equal footing over arrangements for the demonstration.

One has to know this past history to appreciate the nature and

significance of the demonstration. Prompted by the East End workers who had recently joined the movement, the demonstration elicited such a universal response that two elements—which were no less hostile to each other than both of them together were to the fundamental idea of the demonstration—had to pull together in order to seize the leadership and use the meeting to their own advantage. On the one hand, the conservative TRADES COUNCIL preaching equal rights for capital and labour; on the other, a Social Democratic Federation posing as radical and talking of social revolution whenever it was safe to do so—and the two joined together to play a mean trick with an eye to capitalising on a demonstration mortally hated by both. These events meant that the May 4 meeting was split into two parts. On the one side we find the conservative workers, whose horizons do not extend beyond the wage-labour system, and next to them a feeble but power-hungry socialist sect; on the other side, the great bulk of workers who had recently joined the movement and who want no more to do with the Manchesterism of the old TRADES UNIONS,<sup>99</sup> preferring to win their complete emancipation themselves, with allies of their own choice, and not with those imposed by a tiny socialist clique. On one side we find stagnation represented by TRADES UNIONS that have not yet completely freed themselves from the craft spirit, and by a narrow-minded sect backed by the most wretched of allies; on the other, the living free movement of the re-awakening English proletariat. And it was apparent even to the blindest where there was fresh life in that double gathering and where stagnation. Surrounding the seven platforms of the Central Committee were dense crowds as far as the eye could see, marching up with music and banners, over a hundred thousand in the procession, reinforced by almost as many who had come individually; everywhere harmony and enthusiasm, and yet order and organisation. Around the platforms of the combined reactionaries, on the other hand, everything seemed dull; their procession was greatly inferior to the other, poorly organised, ragged and mostly late, so that in some parts things did not get under way there until the Central Committee was already through. While the Liberal leaders of some Radical clubs, and the officials of several TRADES UNIONS joined the TRADES COUNCIL, the members of the selfsame associations—in fact, four entire branches of the Social Democratic Federation—marched together with the Central Committee. For all that, the TRADES COUNCIL succeeded in winning some attention, but the decisive success was achieved by the Central Committee.

What the numerous onlooking bourgeois politicians took home with them as the overall impression was the certainty that the English proletariat, which for fully forty years had trailed behind the great Liberal Party and served it as election fodder, had awakened at last to a new life and action of its own. There can be no doubt that on May 4, 1890 the English working class joined the great international army. And that is a fact of epoch-making proportions. The English proletariat rests on the most advanced industrial development and, moreover, possesses the greatest freedom of political action. Its long hibernation—the result, on the one hand, of the failure of the Chartist movement of 1836-50 and, on the other hand, of the colossal rise of industry between 1848 and 1880—has finally come to an end. The grandchildren of the old Chartists are stepping into the front line. For eight years the broad masses have been moving into action, now here, now there. Socialist groups have emerged, but none has been able to transcend the bounds of a sect; agitators and would-be party leaders, mere speculators and careerists among them, they have remained officers without an army. It has almost invariably been like the famous Robert Blum column of the Baden campaign of 1849<sup>100</sup>: one colonel, eleven officers, one bugler and one private. And the bickering among those various Robert Blum columns over the leadership of the future proletarian army has been anything but edifying. This will cease before long, just as it has ceased in Germany and in Austria. The tremendous movement of the masses will put an end to all these sects and little groupings by absorbing the men and showing the officers their proper places. Those who don't like it may sneak away. It won't come off without friction, but come off it will, and the English proletarian army will, much sooner than some expect, be as united, as well organised and as determined as any, and will be jubilantly hailed by all its comrades on the Continent and in America.

Written between May 5 and 21, 1890

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*,  
No. 21, May 23, 1890

[DRAFT OF A REPLY TO THE EDITORS  
OF THE *SÄCHSISCHE ARBEITER-ZEITUNG*] <sup>101</sup>

In their farewell message in No. 105 (August 31, 1890) the retiring editors of the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung* state that petty-bourgeois parliamentary socialism now had a majority in Germany. But majorities often very quickly became minorities,

“and so the retiring editors of the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung* join Friedrich Engels in hoping that, as the naive state socialism of Lassalle was overcome in the past, the success-hungry parliamentary tendency among the present-day Social Democrats will also soon be overcome by the common sense of the German working class”.<sup>a</sup>

Had I been able to entertain the slightest doubt about the nature of the latest student revolt in our German party, then my eyes would have been opened by this height of impertinence displayed by the ex-editors of one of its main organs. The ex-editors “join” me in hoping—therefore I join them in hoping—that the tendency represented by people such as Auer, Bebel, Liebknecht, Singer should soon have the minority, and that the “principled attitude” represented by the ex-editors the majority of the German workers behind it. This means that the hopes of the ex-editors have been directly and *falsely attributed* to me and I shall see that they are made to answer for this personally.

I have felt no urge to involve myself in the brawl initiated by these student gents and men of letters. However, I have expressed my opinion frankly to all who wished to hear it. And if the brawling gents want to hear it publicly, so be it.

When these gents began to kick up a row against the party executive and the parliamentary group, I asked myself in surprise:

<sup>a</sup> “An unsere Leser!”, *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung*, No. 105, August 31, 1890.—  
*Ed.*

what are they after? What is all this aimed at? As far as I could see, there was no reason at all for the whole enormous palaver. On the disputed question of May Day the party executive had perhaps hesitated too long with its declaration. However, it consisted of five persons, living in four widely separated places, and needing time to reach an understanding. But when it spoke, it said the right thing, the only fitting thing in the situation. Events in Hamburg have proved it more than right.<sup>102</sup>

In the debate some members of the parliamentary group and the party executive have certainly been clumsy. Things like this occur always and everywhere, and reflect upon the individual, not the whole group. In its draft rules the parliamentary group has been responsible for some few offences against the democratic code of conduct.<sup>103</sup> But this is only a draft, and it is up to the Party Congress to adopt it, reject it, or amend it. The London Conference of the International in 1871 also committed such sins of form, and the Bakuninists immediately took them up, making them the formal lever for their attacks on the General Council.<sup>104</sup> For all that, everybody knows today that the real democracy rested in the General Council, and not in the Bakuninist Council,<sup>105</sup> which had engineered a whole secret conspiratorial apparatus in order to put the International at its service.

When, at the time of the Steamer Subsidy, the then parliamentary group did not for a moment know what it wanted, and sought to make the editors of the *Sozialdemokrat* the scapegoat for their own perplexity, I took a thoroughly decisive stand on the side of the editors and against the parliamentary group.<sup>106</sup> I would do the same again today were the parliamentary group or the party executive really to do things which seriously endangered the party. But there is no question of anything of this sort today; the<sup>a</sup>

Written on about September 6, 1890

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in:  
Marx and Engels, *Works*, First Russian  
Edition, Vol. XVI, Part II, Moscow, 1936

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript breaks off here.—*Ed.*

[REPLY TO THE EDITORS  
OF THE *SÄCHSISCHE ARBEITER-ZEITUNG*]<sup>107</sup>

TO THE EDITORS OF THE *SOZIALDEMOKRAT*

The signatory requests the publication of the following letter, which was dispatched yesterday to the present editors of the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung* in Dresden.

\* \* \*

In their farewell message (No. 105 of August 31, 1890) the retiring editors of the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung* state that petty-bourgeois parliamentary socialism had a majority in Germany. But majorities often very quickly became minorities,

"...and so the retiring editors of the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung* join Friedrich Engels in hoping that, as the naive state socialism of Lassalle was overcome in the past, the success-hungry parliamentary tendency among the present-day Social Democrats will also soon be overcome by the common sense of the German working class".<sup>a</sup>

The retiring editors greatly surprise me in the above. And perhaps themselves too.... To date I know nothing of a majority for petty-bourgeois parliamentary socialism in the German party. So they may "hope" whatever they like and as long as they will, but I do not "join" them in hoping.

Had I been able to entertain any doubt about the nature of the latest revolt by men of letters and students in our German party, then it would vanish faced with the height of impertinence of this attempt to announce my solidarity with the somersaults of these gentlemen.

<sup>a</sup> "An unsere Leser!", *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung*, No. 105, August 31, 1890.—  
*Ed.*

My only connection with the retiring editors was that for the past few weeks they had been sending me, unsolicited, their paper; I did not find it necessary, however, to tell them what I thought of it. Now I really have to tell them, and in public at that.

Theoretically I found in it—and this is true by and large for the rest of the “opposition” press—a frenziedly distorted “Marxism”, marked on the one hand by a considerable misunderstanding of the viewpoint which it claimed to represent, and on the other by a gross ignorance of the decisive historical facts on every occasion, and thirdly by that knowledge of their own immeasurable superiority which so advantageously distinguishes German scribblers. Marx foresaw such disciples when he had this to say at the end of the seventies about the “Marxism” raging among certain Frenchmen: “*tout ce que je sais, c’est que moi, je ne suis pas marxiste*”—“I know only this, that I am not a ‘Marxist’.”<sup>108</sup>

Practically, I found in the paper a ruthless disregard of all the actual conditions of party struggle, a death-defying “surmounting of obstacles” in the imagination, which may do all honour to the untamed youthful courage of the writers, but which, if transferred from the imagination to reality, would be sufficient to bury the strongest party of millions under the well-earned laughter of the whole hostile world. That even a small sect cannot allow itself, unpunished, such a schoolboy policy—in this respect the gentlemen have had curious experiences since then.

All the complaints against the parliamentary group or the party executive, which they have been storing up for months, boil down at most to simple trifles. But if the gentlemen like to strain at a gnat, this can be no reason for the German worker to swallow camels in appreciation.<sup>a</sup>

So they have harvested what they had sown. Quite apart from all the questions of context, the whole campaign was started with such childishness, such naive self-deception about their own importance, about the state of affairs and views within the party, that the outcome was a foregone conclusion. May the gentlemen take the lesson to heart. Some of them have written things which justified all manner of hope. Most of them could accomplish something, were they less convinced of the perfection of the stage of development they have reached at this moment. May they come to realise that their “academic education”—in any case requiring a thorough, critical self-assessment—does not provide them with an

<sup>a</sup> An allusion to the biblical expression: “Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel!” (Matthew, 23:24).—*Ed.*

officer's commission and a claim to a corresponding post in the party; that in our party everybody must work his way up; that positions of trust in the party are not won simply through literary talent and theoretical knowledge, even if both are undoubtedly present, but that this also demands familiarity with the conditions of party struggle and adjustment to its forms, proven personal reliability and constancy of character and, finally, a willingness to join the ranks of the fighters—in short, that they, the “academically educated” all in all have much more to learn from the workers than the workers from them.

*London*, September 7, 1890

*Frederick Engels*

First published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, No. 37, September 13, 1890, in the supplement to the *Berliner Volksblatt*, No. 214, September 14, 1890, and in the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung*, No. 112, September 17, 1890

Printed according to *Der Sozialdemokrat*, checked with the *Berliner Volksblatt* and *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung*

Published in English for the first time



THE INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' CONGRESS OF 1891<sup>109</sup>

At the congress of the English TRADES UNIONS in Liverpool (September 1890)<sup>110</sup> the National Council of the Belgian workers' party invited the TRADES UNIONS to the international congress which is to be held next year in Belgium.

The Belgians were given a mandate by the Possibilist Congress to convene an international congress in Belgium. The Marxist Congress (I employ this designation for brevity's sake) only gave them the mandate to convene a congress *in cooperation with the Swiss*; the place of the congress remained unspecified.

Short of a deliberate misunderstanding, the Belgians have therefore invited the Englishmen to the Possibilist Congress, the only one which they had a mandate to convene on their own. And the English accepted enthusiastically.

It will be impossible to make the young TRADES UNIONS of simple manual workers see that their good faith has been abused; that there will be two congresses in 1891, a good one and a bad one, and that it is the bad one which they have promised to attend. This is not simply my personal opinion; it is also the opinion of people who worked harder than anyone to get the TRADES UNIONS to enter the international movement. The campaign which the *Sozialdemokrat* waged against the English friends of the Possibilists<sup>111</sup> in 1889 could not be repeated this time with the same success. If there are two congresses, why did the others not invite us also, so that we could have made our choice? Now it's too late. That is what these practical men will say. They have accepted the Belgians' invitation and they will go to the congress which is to be held in Belgium. That is absolutely certain; unless the Belgians

and the Possibilists repel them by committing some unequalled stupidities; but they will not commit these stupidities.

This situation is the inevitable consequence of the mistakes committed by the Marxist Congress. The most important question was left unresolved—that of the future congress. Even worse, any solution was rendered almost impossible in that the convening was entrusted to *two* national committees, Belgian and Swiss, without whose prior agreement even the smallest step could not be taken—the surest way of ensuring that nothing would be done. And again, just as after the conference at The Hague,<sup>112</sup> the Belgians, instead of staying within the limits of the mandate given to them, acted purely in their own interests. They wished to make sure that the congress was held in Belgium, and they are convening it, without worrying about their Swiss co-mandatees. I have no wish to cast doubt on the sincerity and good intentions of the Belgian National Council; but, in practice, by the course of action which it has chosen, it is managing the affairs of the Possibilists at our expense. Instead of blaming the others, let us recognise that we are but suffering the consequences of our own failings. (Do not let us blame them too much; the mandate which we gave them virtually invited them not to take it literally.)

We have placed ourselves in a sort of impasse, in a situation in which we cannot move, whereas our rivals are acting. How can we escape from it?

First of all, it is certain that new attempts will be made from more than one quarter to prevent the “scandal” of two rival working men’s congresses. We would not be able to reject these attempts; on the contrary, if there is a repetition of the “scandal” it is in our greatest interest to ensure that the responsibility falls on the Possibilists and their allies. Anyone who has the slightest experience of the international movement knows that in the event of a split he who provokes it, or appears to provoke it, is always in the wrong in the eyes of the workers. Therefore, in the event that there are two congresses in 1891, let us act in such a way that it is not we who can be accused of being the cause.

If it is certain that these attempts to effect a union will be made—should we await them passively? Then we would be running the risk that at the last minute the Possibilists and their allies might present us with an ultimatum full of traps (such as we are familiar with)—traps hidden beneath soothing verbiage, so that the general public should not see any harm in it, whilst we would not be able to accept; this, then, is the fine situation facing us: either accept and walk into the trap with eyes wide open, or refuse and

carry the blame, in the eyes of the workers, for having brought about the collapse of the socialist union by sheer, inexplicable obstinacy!

In a word, the situation is quite intolerable. We must escape from it. How? By acting. Let us no longer sit back and rely on the mandate given to the Belgians and the Swiss—let us take the matter into our own hands.<sup>a</sup>

Would the union of the two congresses be a regrettable thing as far as we are concerned? Let us examine the question.

We may count, for certain, on 1) the French Collectivists<sup>113</sup> and Blanquists (the latter reduced by the large numbers that deserted to the Boulangist camp<sup>114</sup>), 2) the Germans, 3) the Austrians, 4) the Spanish socialists, 5) the “revolutionary” Danes,<sup>115</sup>  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the Danish socialists, 6) the Swedes and perhaps some Norwegians, 7) the Swiss, 8) the banished Russians and Poles.

The rival congress would comprise 1) the French Possibilists, 2) the English TRADES UNIONS, which would be represented en masse, and the English SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION, which has profited from the general upswing of the movement in England, 3) the Belgians, 4) the Dutch, 5) the Spanish trade unions from Barcelona, etc., 6) probably the Portuguese trade unions, 7) the Italians, 8) the “reformist” Danes,  $\frac{4}{5}$  of the socialist mass in Denmark, who might attract a few Norwegians, too.

According to circumstances the Belgians and the Dutch would come along to be represented at our congress also; on the other hand, the Swiss would be capable of sending some delegates to the Possibilist congress.

It follows that this time the Possibilists would have a much more respectable army than in 1889. If we have the Germans, they will balance them with the English, lost to us by our inaction and clumsiness; as for the others, they have as many nationalities as we, if not more. And with their skill in inventing mandates and fictitious representatives they would leave us a long way behind. Let us add that if we carry on with the system of inaction implemented hitherto, the blame for the split would certainly fall on us, which would cause a further reduction in the strength of our congress.

Let us now suppose that the merger has taken place. Then our strength will be swollen by all those who up to the present have been neutral because of the “scandal” of the split: the Belgians,

---

<sup>a</sup> The following six paragraphs up to the words “What are for us the indispensable conditions” are crossed by a vertical line in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

the Dutch, the Italians; they will inevitably attract the new English TRADES UNIONS, formed out of excellent elements, still pliable but well intentioned and intelligent. We have already taken root there; the contact of the French Collectivists and the Germans would be enough to bring them still closer to us, all the more so as the S.D.F., whom with its overbearing airs they find repugnant, is the pledged ally of the Possibilists. The Belgians only want congresses where they can take the lead and which the Possibilists have procured for them, particularly a big congress at Brussels. If we help them to bring about a merger *in their country*, the Flemish, who are the better element in their ranks, will side with us and will balance the Possibilist tendencies of the Bruxellois. The Dutch are fanatically keen on a merger, but they are far from being Possibilists.

What are for us the indispensable conditions?

1) That the joint congress should be convened by the two countries mandated by the two congresses of 1889. The Belgians will convene in the name of the Possibilist mandate, and the Belgians and the Swiss jointly in the name of our mandate, form to be determined.

2) That the congress should be its own master. The rules and regulations, agendas and resolutions of the preceding congresses do not exist for it. It makes its own rules, the method of checking the mandates, and its agenda without being bound by any precedent. No committee, whether appointed by one of the preceding congresses, or during the course of the merger negotiations, has the right to bind the congress in all matters.

3) The terms on which the various working men's associations are to be represented, and their proportions, will be laid down beforehand (definite proposals are desirable, it is not up to me to lay them down).

4) A committee whose composition remains to be decided will be instructed to draft plans for the rules, the checking of mandates, and an agenda, on which points the congress will make the final decision.

Written between September 9 and 15,  
1890

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol. XVI,  
Part II, Moscow, 1936

Printed according to the rough  
manuscript

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first  
time

**Abbestellung**  
Wenn eine Zeitung nicht länger  
abgenommen werden soll, so muss  
dies spätestens am 1. März des  
jeden Jahres bei dem  
Verleger bekannt gegeben werden.  
Die Kosten der Abbestellung sind  
zu zahlen.

# Der Sozialdemokrat

Organ der Sozialdemokratie deutscher Zunge.

**Verlag**  
des  
Gesamtdemokratischen-Verlagsbundes  
L. Bernstein & Co. London & N.  
114, North Row East,  
London.  
Verlag  
des  
Gesamtdemokratischen-Verlagsbundes  
L. Bernstein & Co. London & N.  
114, North Row East,  
London.

**Bestellung**  
Die Abonnements werden  
ab dem 1. März des  
jeden Jahres anfangen.

N. 39.

Alle in der Redaktion und Druckerei bei in Deutschland und Österreich verlassenen „Sozialdemokraten“ werden dem unterzeichneten Verleger zur Verfügung gestellt.  
Alle in der Redaktion und Druckerei bei in Deutschland und Österreich verlassenen „Sozialdemokraten“ werden dem unterzeichneten Verleger zur Verfügung gestellt.

27. September 1900.

## [FAREWELL LETTER TO THE READERS OF THE SOZIALDEMOKRAT]<sup>116</sup>

Might I too be permitted to bid farewell to the reader.

The *Sozialdemokrat* must vanish from the scene. Not only because this has been so often announced to the other parties. Far more because the *Sozialdemokrat* would itself under the changed circumstances necessarily become something else, with a different mission, different contributors, a different readership. And a paper which played such a specific historical role, a paper which was peculiar for the fact that in its columns, and in its columns only, the twelve most decisive years in the life of the German workers' party are reflected—such a paper cannot and must not change. It must remain what it was, or it must cease to exist. On this we all agree.

We also all agree that the paper cannot disappear without leaving a gap. No organ appearing in Germany, official or not, can replace it. For the party this is only a relative drawback: it is entering into different conditions of struggle and therefore needs different weapons and a different strategy and tactics. But it is an absolute loss for the contributors, and particularly for me.

Twice in my life I have had the honour and the pleasure of working for a periodical where I enjoyed to full measure the two most favourable conditions in which one can be effective in the press: firstly, unconditional press freedom, and secondly, the certainty that one was reaching exactly that public one wished to reach.

The first occasion was in 1848-1849 at the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*.<sup>117</sup> Those were revolutionary times, and in such times it is anyway a pleasure to work for the daily press. You see the effect of every word before your eyes, you see how the articles literally hit the target, as though they were shells, and how they explode.

The second occasion was at the *Sozialdemokrat*. This too was a revolutionary interval, after the party found its feet again at the Wyden Congress, and from then on resumed the fight "with all methods", legal or not.<sup>118</sup> The *Sozialdemokrat* was the embodiment of this illegality. For it there was no binding imperial constitution, no imperial criminal code, no Prussian common law. Illegally, defying and disdainful of all imperial and provincial legislation, it penetrated every week the frontiers of the Holy German Empire; detectives, spies, agents provocateurs, customs officials, doubled and trebled frontier forces were powerless: almost with the certainty of a bill of exchange it was presented to the subscriber on the date of maturity; no Stephan could prevent the German Reichspost from having to dispatch and deliver it. And this with over ten thousand subscribers in Germany; the banned writings of the period before 1848 were very rarely paid for by their bourgeois purchasers, but for twelve years the workers paid with the greatest punctuality for their *Sozialdemokrat*. How often did my heart, the heart of an old revolutionary, rejoice to observe this excellently lubricated noiseless interplay between editors, distributors and subscribers, this BUSINESSLIKE organised revolutionary work proceeding week after week, year in, year out with the same certainty!

And the paper was worth the troubles and dangers which its distribution cost. It was certainly the best paper the party ever possessed. And this was not simply because it, alone amongst them, enjoyed full freedom of the press. The principles of the party were expounded and recorded with unusual clarity and firmness, and the tactical line of the editors was almost always the correct one. And then there was something else. While our bourgeois press cultivated the most deathly boredom, the *Sozialdemokrat* generously reflected the cheerful humour with which our workers are wont to fight police harassment.

And the *Sozialdemokrat* was anything but a mere mouthpiece for the parliamentary group. When in 1885 the majority of the group favoured the Steamer Subsidy, the paper firmly supported the opposite opinion and held on to its right to do so, even when the majority forbade it this right in an order of the day which they themselves must today find incomprehensible. The fight lasted for just four weeks, during which the editors were warmly supported by the party comrades inside and outside Germany. On April 2 the ban was issued; on the 23rd the *Sozialdemokrat* published a declaration agreed between the parliamentary group and the editors, indicating that the group had rescinded its ban.<sup>119</sup>

At a later date it fell to the *Sozialdemokrat* to put to the test the renowned Swiss right of asylum.<sup>120</sup> There it became clear, as in all similar cases since 1830, that this right of asylum always collapses precisely when it really ought to come into force. But this is nothing new. Since the little republic's democratisation from 1830 on,<sup>121</sup> the neighbouring great powers have allowed it the democratic experiment domestically only on the condition that the right of asylum for refugees is exercised under the supervision of the interested great power. Switzerland is too weak not to submit. It cannot be blamed for this. Marx used to say, specifically with reference to Holland, Switzerland and Denmark, that today the worst situated was a small country which had had a great history. But in "free Switzerland" they should stop bragging about their immaculate right of asylum.

The *Sozialdemokrat* was the banner of the German party; after twelve years of struggle the party is victorious. The Anti-Socialist Law has fallen, Bismarck has been overthrown. The powerful German Empire set in motion against us all its instruments of power; the party scoffed at them, until finally the German Empire had to lower its flag before ours. The Imperial Government will try out common law against us for the while, and so we shall, for the while, try out those legal means which we have regained for ourselves by the vigorous use of illegal means. Whether the "legal" means are once again written into our programme or not is pretty immaterial. The attempt must be made to get along with legal methods of struggle for the time being. Not only we are doing this, it is being done by all workers' parties in all countries where the workers have a certain measure of legal freedom of action, and this for the simple reason that it is the most productive method for them. However, the prerequisite for this is that the other side also acts legally. If the attempt is made once again actually to place our party outside the common law, be it by means of new emergency legislation, unlawful convictions and practices by the Imperial Supreme Court, by police tyranny, or by other illegal encroachments by the executive, then the German Social Democrats will once again be driven to the illegal path as the only one open to them. Even for the English, the most law-abiding nation, the first condition of legality on the part of the people is that all other agents of power remain within the bounds of the law; should this not be the case, then in the English view of law, rebellion is the first civic duty.

If this should happen, what then? Will the party build barricades, appeal to the power of the gun? It will certainly not do

its opponents this favour. It will be saved from this by the knowledge of its own position of strength, given it by every general election to the Reichstag. Twenty per cent of the votes cast<sup>122</sup> is a very respectable figure, but this also means that the opponents together still have eighty per cent of the vote. And with our party seeing in this connection that its vote has doubled in the past three years, and that it can expect an even greater increase by the time of the next elections, then it would be mad to attempt a putsch<sup>123</sup> today with twenty against eighty and the army on top of that; the certain result would be—the loss of all the positions of power won in the past twenty-five years.

The party has a much better and well-tested means at its disposal. On the day our rights under common law are disputed, the *Sozialdemokrat* will reappear. The old machinery, held in reserve for this case, will start up again, improved, enlarged, newly oiled. And one thing is certain: on a second run the German Empire will not hold out for twelve years.

*Frederick Engels*

Written between September 12 and 18,  
1890

Printed according to the news-  
paper

First published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*,  
No. 39, September 27, 1890



## REPLY TO MR. PAUL ERNST

A friend sends me the Magdeburg *Volksstimme* of September 16. In an article therein, signed Paul Ernst, I find the following passage:

“And if Engels now describes our opposition as ‘student revolt’, I would ask him to demonstrate where we have championed other views but his own and Marx’s; and if I have depicted our parliamentary Social Democrats as partly very petty-bourgeois in character, Engels need only look at what he himself wrote in 1887 in the Preface to his *Housing Question*.”<sup>a</sup>

My dealing with German writers over the years have enriched me with many curious experiences. But it seems that there are even greater treats in store. I am supposed to tell Mr. Paul Ernst where “we” have championed other views, etc. Well, as far as the “we” is concerned, that is, the “opposition” which entered on to the scene with such high and mighty airs and made such a faint-hearted exit, and which I described as revolts by men of letters and students,<sup>124</sup> we can keep it short: in just about every article which they publish.

But as far as Mr. Ernst himself is concerned, I need not tell him that again. For I have already told him so—four months ago, in fact—and I suppose I must now plague the public, for better or for worse, with my “Ernst”<sup>b</sup> correspondence.

On May 31 this year Mr. Ernst wrote to me from Görbersdorf that Mr. Hermann Bahr was reproaching him in the *Freie Bühne* for wrongly applying the Marxist method of viewing history with

---

<sup>a</sup> See F. Engels, “Preface to the Second Edition of *The Housing Question*” (present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 424-33).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> “Ernst” in German means “earnest”.—*Ed.*

regard to the Scandinavian women's movement,<sup>a</sup> and would I please

"say in a few lines whether my view corresponds with Marx's or not, and furthermore permit me to use the letter against Bahr".

I replied to him on June 5 that I could not become involved in his dispute with Mr. Bahr, and that I was quite unfamiliar with the "Scandinavian women's movement".<sup>b</sup> I then went on:

"As regards your attempt to handle the matter in a materialist way, I should say first of all that the materialist method turns into its opposite if, in an historical study, it is used not as a guide but rather as a ready-made pattern in accordance with which one tailors the historical facts. And if Mr. Bahr believes he has caught you out in this respect, it seems to me that he may not be altogether unjustified.

"You subsume the whole of Norway and everything that happens there under one category, philistinism, and then unhesitatingly and erroneously apply to that Norwegian philistinism your opinion of *German* philistinism. But here there are two facts which present an insuperable obstacle.

"Firstly: When, throughout Europe, the victory over Napoleon turned out into the victory of reaction over the Revolution, the fear inspired by the latter sufficing only in its cradle, France, to wrest a bourgeois-liberal constitution<sup>125</sup> from the returning legitimists, Norway took occasion to give itself a constitution that was far more democratic<sup>126</sup> than any of its coevals in Europe.

"And, secondly, Norway has, during the past twenty years, experienced a literary revival unparalleled in any other country during that period save Russia. Philistine or not, this people has been far more creative than all the rest and is, indeed, putting its stamp on other literatures, not least the German.

"These facts, in my view, render it necessary to examine Norwegian 'philistinism' in the light of its particular characteristics.

"And in so doing you will probably find that a very important distinction emerges. In Germany philistinism was born of a failed revolution, a development that was interrupted and repressed. Its idiosyncratic, abnormally pronounced character made up of cowardice, bigotry, ineptitude, and a total lack of initiative,

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to H. Bahr, "Die Epigonen des Marxismus", *Freie Bühne für modernes Leben*, No. 17, May 28, 1890, which is spearheaded against P. Ernst, "Frauenfrage und soziale Frage", *Freie Bühne für modernes Leben*, No. 15, May 14, 1890.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See F. Engels' letter to P. Ernst of June 5, 1890 (present edition, Vol. 50).—*Ed.*

resulted from the Thirty Years' War and the period that ensued—the very time in which practically all the great nations were experiencing a rapid rise. That character persisted, even after Germany had again been gripped by the historical movement, and was strong enough to imprint itself, more or less a generalised German type, on all the other social classes in Germany until such time as our working class broke out of these narrow confines. If the German workers are flagrantly 'unpatriotic',<sup>127</sup> it is precisely because they have completely shaken off German philistine bigotry.

"Hence German philistinism is not a normal historical phase but a caricature taken to extremes, a form of degeneration, just as your Polish Jew is a caricature of the Jews. The English, French, etc., lower middle class is not at all on the same level as your German lower middle class.

"In Norway, on the other hand, the class of small peasants and the lower middle class with a slight admixture of middle class elements—as it existed, say, in England and France in the seventeenth century—have, for several centuries, constituted the normal state of society. Here there is no question of an archaic state of affairs having been forcibly imposed upon them by the failure of a great movement or by a Thirty Years' War. The country has been retarded by its isolation and by its natural circumstances, but its state was commensurate with the conditions of its production, and hence normal. It is only quite recently that large-scale industry has, sporadically and on a very small scale, begun to come into the country, where, however, there is no place for the most powerful lever for the concentration of capital—the stock exchange; and even the tremendous expansion of maritime trade has proved to be a conservative factor. For whereas everywhere else steam is superseding sail, Norway is enormously increasing the number of its sailing vessels and possesses, if not the largest, then certainly the second largest, fleet of windjammers in the world, most of them owned by small and medium-sized shipping firms, as in England in, say, 1720. But nevertheless this has brought some animation into the old, sluggish existence—animation which finds expression in, among other things, the literary revival.

"The Norwegian peasant was never a serf, so that the whole process takes place against an entirely different background, as in Castile. The lower middle class Norwegian is the son of a free peasant and, such being the case, is a *man* compared with the degenerate German philistine. And whatever the failings of, for

example, Ibsen's plays, these reflect a world which is, it is true, lower middle and middle class, but utterly different from the German world—a world in which people still have character and initiative and act independently if, by the standards of other countries, often eccentrically. Personally, I would prefer to get to know all I could about things of this sort before passing judgment."

So here I told Mr. Ernst, albeit politely, but nonetheless clearly and firmly, "where"—namely, in the article from the *Freie Bühne* which he sent to me himself. When I demonstrate to him that he uses the Marxist approach as nothing but a pattern to which he tailors the historical facts that is precisely an example of the "considerable misunderstanding" of the same approach with which I reproached the gentlemen.<sup>a</sup> And when I prove to him, using his own example of Norway, that his pattern of philistinism on German lines flies in the face of the historical facts when applied to Norway, I thereby catch him in advance and in person displaying the 'gross ignorance of the decisive historical facts on every occasion', with which I also reproached those gentlemen.<sup>b</sup>

And now look at the affected primness which Mr. Ernst feigns, like a country maiden treated like "one of those" by some blueblooded scoundrel in the streets of Berlin! He appears before me four months after the above letter, the picture of outraged virtue, demanding that I should tell him "where?". Mr. Ernst appears to have but two literary frames of mind. First he lets fly with impudence and self-assurance, as if there really was more to it than hot air; and when people proceed to defend themselves, [he protests that] he has said nothing at all and bemoans the base disregard shown to his pure feelings. Outraged virtue in his letter to me in which he complains that Mr. Bahr has treated him "with quite unbelievable insolence"! Injured innocence in his reply to me, in which he quite naively asks "where?", while he must have known the answer for a good four months. An unrecognised noble soul in the Magdeburg *Volksstimme*, in which he also asks old Bremer, who had quite rightly rapped his knuckles, "Where?"

And the sigh asks always: where?  
Always, where?

Does Mr. Ernst still want to know "where"? Well, let him turn, for example, to the article in the *Volks-Tribüne* on the "Dangers of

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 69-71.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

Marxism",<sup>a</sup> in which he appropriates without hesitation the odd assertion of the metaphysicist Dühring—as if, according to Marx, history makes itself quite automatically, without the cooperation of human beings (who after all are making it!), and as if these human beings were simply played like mere chessmen by the economic conditions (which are the work of men themselves!). A man who is capable of confusing the distortion of Marxist theory by an opponent such as Dühring with this theory itself must turn elsewhere for help—I give up.

Perhaps I may now be excused from answering any more "wheres"? Mr. Ernst is so prolific, he turns out articles with such alacrity that one comes across them everywhere. And when you imagine that you have finally seen the last of them, he turns up again as the author of sundry anonymous pieces. Then a mere mortal like myself is unable to keep up and is tempted to wish that instead of prescribing his remedies so freely, Mr. Ernst should have something prescribed for himself.

He says further:

"If I have depicted our parliamentary Social Democrats as partly very petty-bourgeois in character, Engels need only", etc.

*Partly* very petty-bourgeois? In the article in the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung* which forced me to reply,<sup>b</sup> it says that petty-bourgeois parliamentary socialism has now a *majority* in Germany. And I said that I knew nothing about this. Now Mr. Ernst merely wishes to defend the assertion that the parliamentary group is "partly" very petty-bourgeois. Again the unrecognised noble soul, to whom the wicked world imputes all kinds of outrages. Who has ever denied that the petty-bourgeois tendency is represented not only in the parliamentary group but also in the party as a whole? Every party has a right wing and a left wing, and that the right wing of the Social Democratic Party is petty-bourgeois is only in the nature of the things. If there is no more to it than that, why all the fuss? We have been well aware of this old story for years, but it is a far cry from that to a petty-bourgeois majority in the parliamentary group or in the party itself. If this danger were to pose a threat, we should not wait for the warnings of these strange loyal Eckarts. For the time being the vigorous and joyful proletarian struggle<sup>128</sup> against the Anti-Socialist Law and the rapid economic development have increasingly deprived this petty-

<sup>a</sup> P. E[rnst], "Gefahren des Marxismus", *Berliner Volks-Tribune*, No. 32, August 9, 1890 (supplement).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 69-71.—*Ed.*

bourgeois element of ground, air and light, whereas the proletarian element has grown more and more powerful.

There is, however, one thing which I can divulge to Mr. Paul Ernst by way of conclusion: there is something that is far more dangerous to the party than a petty-bourgeois group which can be consigned to the lumber-room at the next elections. I am referring to a clique of loud-mouthed men of letters and students, particularly when they are incapable of seeing the simplest things with their own eyes and of impartially weighing up the relative importance of the available facts or the strength of the forces involved when assessing an economic or political situation, and hence seek to force on the party tactics that are utterly insane, as gentlemen such as Bruno Wille and Teistler in particular, and to a lesser extent Mr. Ernst, have amply demonstrated. And this clique becomes even more dangerous if it unites to form a mutual assurance society, setting in motion all the means of organised advertising in order to smuggle its members into the editorial chairs of the party newspapers and control the party by means of the party press. Twelve years ago the Anti-Socialist Law saved us from this danger, which was already overtaking us, even then. Now that this law is going, the danger is back again. And I trust this will make it quite clear to Mr. Paul Ernst exactly why I am willing to fight tooth and nail to prevent myself from being identified with the elements of such a clique.

London, October 1, 1890

*Frederick Engels*

First published in the *Berliner Volksblatt*,  
No. 232, October 5, 1890

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

TO THE EDITORS OF THE *BERLINER VOLKSBLATT*

On my seventieth birthday I received so many messages of sincere support, so many unexpected testimonials, that it will unfortunately be impossible for me to answer each message personally. There was a veritable torrent of telegrams, letters, gifts, articles devoted specially to me in the party press of many different countries, but particularly in all parts of Germany. Therefore allow me to express thus my most sincere thanks to the friends old and new who remembered me so appreciatively on November 28.

Nobody knows better than I that the greater part of these testimonials were not due to me and my own services. It is my fate that I must harvest the glory and the honour the seed for which was sown by Karl Marx, a greater man than me. So I can only pledge myself to devote the remainder of my life to the active service of the proletariat, so that I may, if possible, make myself belatedly worthy of these honours.

London, December 2, 1890

*Frederick Engels*

First published in the *Berliner Volksblatt*,  
No. 284, December 5, 1890

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

# LE SOCIALISTE

ORGANE CENTRAL DU PARTI OUVRIER

|                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                   |                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>ABONNEMENTS<br/>7 mois 1 fr. 50, 6 mois 2 fr., un an 4 fr.<br/><b>10 CENT le NUMÉRO</b></p> | <p>TOUT CE QUI CONCERNE LA REDACTION DOIT ÊTRE ADRESSÉ<br/>AU SECRÉTAIRE du CONSEIL NATIONAL<br/>PARIS — 14, AVENUE DE MONTSOURIS, 14 — PARIS</p> | <p>ADMINISTRATION<br/>88, RUE MONTMARTRE, 88<br/>PARIS</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|

TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL  
OF THE FRENCH WORKERS' PARTY<sup>129</sup>

Citizens,

I thank you with all my heart for the congratulations which you were kind enough to send me on the occasion of my seventieth birthday.

Rest assured that what remains of my life and my strength will be spent in fighting for the proletarian cause. The moment I am no longer of any use to the struggle, may it be granted to me to die.

But the battles won by you, by our brothers in Germany, England, Austria-Hungary, Russia, in fact everywhere, form a series of sparkling victories enough to rejuvenate a man older and more exhausted than I am. And what gladdens me more than anything is the sincere brotherhood, which has been, I hope, established forever, between the French and German proletarians, despite the chauvinistic cries of our corrupt bourgeoisies.

It was your great countryman Saint-Simon who was the first to predict that the alliance of the three great Western nations—France, England and Germany—is the prime international requisite for the political and social emancipation of the whole of Europe.<sup>a</sup> I hope to see this alliance—the kernel of the European alliance which will put

<sup>a</sup> See H. Saint-Simon and A. Thierry, *De la réorganisation de la société européenne, ou de la nécessité et des moyens de rassembler les peuples de l'Europe en un seul corps politique, en conservant à chacun son indépendance nationale*; Idem., *Opinion sur les mesures à prendre contre la coalition de 1815*.—Ed.



an end for all time to the wars between governments and races—achieved by the proletarians of the three nations.

Long live the international social Revolution.

London, December 2, 1890

*Frederick Engels*

First published in *Le Socialiste*, No. 14,  
December 25, 1890

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Translated from the French

# NÉPSZAVA.

TARSADALMI ÉS KÖZGAZDASÁGI NEPLAP.

A MAGYARORSZÁGI ÁLTALANOS MUNKÁSPART KÖZPONTI KÖZLÖNYE

Bevezetés és kiadókivonat:  
VII. évf. 1890. évi kiadás: 200.  
Előfizetési-árak és hirdetések ára köldve.

Megjelen minden vasárnap.  
Egyre példány ára 6 kr.

Előfizetési-árak: Évesen 3 ár 25 kr., fél éven 18 kr.,  
hogyha 60 kr., egy hónap 60 kr.  
Munkásoknak: megvásárolásukhoz munkaadójuknak  
kell megadni a levelet.

[TO THE EDITORS  
OF THE *ARBEITER-WOCHEN-CHRONIK*  
AND *NÉPSZAVA* IN BUDAPEST]<sup>130</sup>

London, December 3, 1890

I would like to thank you most sincerely for the best wishes on my seventieth birthday conveyed in your letter of November 26.

I realise only too well that by far the greater part of the honours shown me on this day by yourselves and so many others, only falls to me as the surviving representative of *Marx*, and beg your permission to be allowed to lay it on his grave as a wreath of honour. However, what I can do to show myself belatedly worthy of him I shall do; you may count on this.

Many thanks for your kind invitation to the Hungarian Party Congress.<sup>131</sup> I shall sadly not be able to accept the invitation in person, but in spirit I shall be amongst you on the 7th and 8th inst.

The existence of a Hungarian Social-Democratic Workers' Party is a fresh proof that modern large-scale industry cannot install itself in any country without revolutionising the old pre-capitalist society, without creating not only a capitalist class but also a proletariat and thus producing the class struggle between the two and a workers' party striving for the overthrow of the bourgeois-capitalist world order. This workers' party, which is now developing ever more strongly in Hungary too, as I learn from the *Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik* you were kind enough to send me, has from the start the advantage of being international, of embracing Magyars, Germans, Romanians, Serbs and Slovaks. Please be kind

enough to convey my warmest greetings to this young party upon its Congress.

Long live international Social Democracy!

Long live the Hungarian Party Congress!

*Frederick Engels*

First published in the *Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik*, No. 50, December 14, 1890 and in *Népszava*, No. 50, December 14, 1890

Printed according to the *Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik*

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE  
OF THE COMMUNIST [GERMAN]  
WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY<sup>132</sup>

122 Regents Park Road, N.W.  
December 11, 1890

I am writing, albeit belatedly, to thank you for the congratulations enclosed with your kind letter of 28th of last month. Like you, I deeply regret that my friend Marx was not privileged to witness the present irresistible development of the proletarian-socialist movement, a development for which he more than anyone else laid the foundations.

May your wishes be fulfilled and victory be near!

Yours sincerely,

*F. Engels*

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 50,  
Moscow, 1981

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Published in English for the first  
time



Dr. 18.

IX. Jahrgang, I. Band.

1890-91.

[PREFACE TO KARL MARX'S  
*CRITIQUE OF THE GOTHA PROGRAMME*]<sup>133</sup>

The manuscript published here—the covering letter to Bracke<sup>a</sup> as well as the critique of the draft programme—was sent in 1875, shortly before the Gotha Unity Congress,<sup>134</sup> to Bracke for communication to Geib, Auer, Bebel, and Liebknecht and subsequent return to Marx. Since the Halle Party Congress<sup>135</sup> has put the discussion of the Gotha Programme on the agenda of the party, I think I would be guilty of suppression if I any longer withheld from publicity this important—perhaps the most important—document relevant to this discussion.

But the manuscript has yet another and more far-reaching significance. Here for the first time Marx's attitude to the line adopted by Lassalle in his agitation from the very beginning is clearly and firmly set forth, both as regards Lassalle's economic principles and his tactics.

The ruthless severity with which the draft programme is dissected here, the mercilessness with which the results obtained are enunciated and the shortcomings of the draft laid bare—all this today, after fifteen years, can no longer give offense. Specific Lassalleans now exist only abroad as isolated ruins, and in Halle

<sup>a</sup> See K. Marx's letter to W. Bracke of May 5, 1875 (present edition, Vol. 45).—*Ed.*

the Gotha Programme was given up even by its creators as altogether inadequate.

Nevertheless, I have omitted a few sharp personal expressions and judgements where these were immaterial, and replaced them by dots. Marx himself would have done so if he had published the manuscript today. The violence of the language in some passages was provoked by two circumstances. In the first place, Marx and I had been more intimately connected with the German movement than with any other; we were, therefore, bound to be particularly perturbed by the decidedly retrograde step manifested by this draft programme. And secondly, we were at that time, hardly two years after the Hague Congress of the International,<sup>136</sup> engaged in the most violent struggle against Bakunin and his anarchists, who made us responsible for everything that happened in the labour movement in Germany; hence we had to expect that we would also be saddled with the secret paternity of this programme. These considerations have now ceased to exist and with them the necessity for the passages in question.

For reasons of censorship, a few sentences have been indicated only by dots. Where I have had to choose a milder expression this has been enclosed in square brackets. Otherwise the text has been reproduced word for word.

London, January 6, 1891

*Fr. Engels*

First published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 1,  
No. 18, 1890-1891

Printed according to the journal



IN THE CASE  
OF BRENTANO VERSUS MARX

REGARDING ALLEGED FALSIFICATION OF QUOTATION.  
THE STORY AND DOCUMENTS<sup>137</sup>



Written in December 1890-February  
1891

First published as a pamphlet in: F. Engels, *In Sachen Brentano contra Marx wegen angeblicher Zitatsfälschung. Geschichtserzählung und Dokumente*, Hamburg, 1891

Printed according to the pamphlet

Published in English in full for the  
first time

In my Preface to the fourth edition of the first volume of Marx's *Capital*<sup>a</sup> I found myself obliged to return to a polemic against Marx, initiated by Anonymous in the Berlin *Concordia* in 1872, and taken up again by Mr. Sedley Taylor of Cambridge in *The Times* in 1883.<sup>b</sup> Anonymous, revealed by Mr. Taylor as Mr. Lujo Brentano, had accused Marx of falsifying a quotation. The short report on the affair which I gave in my Preface (it is printed amongst the attached Documents, No. 12<sup>c</sup>), certainly was not intended to be pleasant to Mr. Brentano; nothing was more natural than that he should answer me. And this took place in a pamphlet: *Meine Polemik mit Karl Marx. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage des Fortschritts der Arbeiterklasse und seiner Ursachen*. Von Lujo Brentano, Berlin, Walther & Apolant, 1890.<sup>d</sup>

This pamphlet gives us too much and too little. Too much, because it "also" gives us at length Mr. Brentano's views on "the advance of the working class and its causes". These views have absolutely nothing to do with the point at issue. I remark only this: Mr. Brentano's constantly repeated declaration that labour protection legislation and trade association organisations are fitted to improve the condition of the working class is by no means his own discovery. From the *Condition of the Working Class in England*

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 35; see also this volume, pp. 164-69.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See [L. Brentano,] "Wie Karl Marx citirt", *Concordia*, No. 10, March 7, 1872; S. Taylor, "To the Editor of *The Times*", *The Times*, No. 30990, November 29, 1883.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, pp. 164-69.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "My Polemic with Karl Marx. Also a Contribution to the Advance of the Working Class and Its Causes".—*Ed.*

and *The Poverty of Philosophy* to *Capital* and down to my most recent writings,<sup>a</sup> Marx and I have said this a hundred times, though with very sharp reservations. Firstly, the favourable effects of the resisting trade associations are confined to periods of average and brisk business; in periods of stagnation and crisis they regularly fail; Mr. Brentano's claim that they "are capable of paralysing the fateful effects of the reserve army" is ridiculous boasting. And secondly—ignoring other less important reservations—neither the protection legislation nor the resistance of the trade associations removes the main thing which needs abolishing: capitalist relations, which constantly reproduce the contradiction between the capitalist class and the class of wage labourers. The mass of wage labourers remain condemned to life-long wage labour; the gap between them and the capitalists becomes ever deeper and wider the more modern large-scale industry takes over all branches of production. But since Mr. Brentano would gladly convert wage-slaves into *contented* wage-slaves, he must hugely exaggerate the advantageous effects of labour protection, the resistance of trade associations, social piecemeal legislation, etc.; and as we are able to confront these exaggerations with the simple facts—hence his fury.

The pamphlet in question gives too little, since it gives, of the documents in the polemic, only the items exchanged between Mr. Brentano and Marx, and not those which have appeared since with regard to this question. So in order to place the reader in a position to form an overall judgement, I give, in the appendix: 1. the incriminated passages from the Inaugural Address of the General Council of the International<sup>b</sup> and from *Capital*; 2. the polemic between Mr. Brentano and Marx; 3. that between Mr. Sedley Taylor and Eleanor Marx; 4. my Preface to the 4th edition of *Capital* and Mr. Brentano's reply to it; and 5. passages relevant to Gladstone's letters to Mr. Brentano. It goes without saying that I thereby omit all those passages of Brentano's argument which do not touch upon the question of falsification of quotation, but only constitute his "contribution to the advance", etc.

---

<sup>a</sup> The reference probably is to Engels' "England in 1845 and 1885" and "Appendix to the American Edition of *The Condition of the Working Class in England*".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 5-13.—*Ed.*

## I

In No. 10 of the Berlin *Concordia*, March 7, 1872, there was a fierce anonymous attack upon Marx as the author of the Inaugural Address of the General Council of the International in 1864.<sup>a</sup> In this Address, it was stated, Marx had falsified a quotation from the budget speech made by Gladstone, at that time English Chancellor of the Exchequer, on April 16, 1863.

The passage from the Inaugural Address is printed in the appendix, Documents, No. 1.<sup>b</sup> The article from the *Concordia* also there, document No. 3.<sup>c</sup> In the latter, the charge is formulated as follows:

“What is the relationship between this speech and the quotation by Marx? Gladstone first makes the point that there has undoubtedly been a colossal increase in the income of the country. This is proved for him by the income tax. But income tax takes notice only of incomes of 150 pounds sterling and over. Persons with lower incomes pay no income tax in England. The fact that Gladstone mentions this so that his yardstick can be properly appreciated is utilised by Marx to have Gladstone say: ‘*This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property.*’ Yet this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone’s speech. It says quite the opposite. **Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content!**”

This is the charge and, let it be noted, the only charge, that Anonymous, who has now admitted he is called Lujo Brentano, makes against Marx.

No. 10 of the *Concordia* was sent to Marx from Germany in May 1872. The copy still in my possession today bears the inscription

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 5-13.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 132-33.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 135-36.—*Ed.*

“Organ of the German Manufacturers’ Association”. Marx, who had never heard of this sheet, assumed the author to be a scribbling manufacturer, and dealt with him accordingly.

Marx demonstrated in his reply in the *Volksstaat* (Documents, No. 4<sup>a</sup>) that the sentence had not only been quoted in the same way by Professor Beesly in 1870 in *The Fortnightly Review*,<sup>b</sup> but also before the publication of the Inaugural Address in [H. Roy,] *The Theory of the Exchanges*, London, 1864; and finally that the report in *The Times* on April 17, 1863 also contained the sentence, in form and in content, as he had quoted it:

“The augmentation I have described” (namely as “this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power”) “is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property.”<sup>c</sup>

If this passage, a passage which is certainly compromising in the mouth of an English Chancellor of the Exchequer, is not to be found in Hansard,<sup>d</sup> this is simply because Mr. Gladstone was clever enough to get rid of it, in accordance with traditional English parliamentary practice.

In any case, proof was given here that the sentence allegedly lyingly added *is to be found verbatim* in *The Times* of April 17, 1863 in its report of the speech delivered by Mr. Gladstone the evening before. And *The Times* was a Gladstonian organ at that time.

And what is the reply now from Mr. “Modesty” Brentano? (*Concordia*, July 4, 1872, Documents, No. 5.<sup>e</sup>)

With an impertinence he would never have dared under his own name, he repeats the charge that Marx lyingly added the sentence: this charge, he adds, is

“serious, and combined with the convincing evidence provided, absolutely devastating”.

The evidence was nothing but the passage in Hansard in which the sentence is missing. It could thus at the most be “devastating” for this selfsame ill-fated sentence, which appeared in *The Times* and not in Hansard.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 136-40 and also Vol. 23, pp. 164-67.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> E. S. Beesly, “The International Working Men’s Association”, *The Fortnightly Review*, No. XLVII, November 1, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Gladstone’s speech in the House of Commons on April 16, 1863 (*The Times*, No. 24535, April 17, 1863).—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates*, Third Series, Vol. CLXX, London, 1863, p. 244.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See this volume, pp. 140-44.—*Ed.*

But this victorious crowing was only intended to help negotiate this same unpleasant fact that the “lyingly added” sentence had been confirmed as authentic by the *Times* report. And with the feeling that this evidence for the prosecution was pretty “convincing”, and that it would become “absolutely devastating” in time, our anonymous would-be professor now zealously attacks the quotation in Beesly and in *The Theory of the Exchanges*, causes a big stir, claims that Beesly quoted from the Inaugural Address and Marx from *The Theory of the Exchanges*, etc. All these are minor points. Even if they are true, they prove nothing on the question as to whether Gladstone spoke the sentence or Marx invented it. But by their very nature they could not be settled with absolute finality, either by Mr. Brentano at that time, or by me today. On the other hand, they serve to divert attention from the main point, namely from the fatal *Times* report.

Before venturing to deal with this, Anonymous flexes his muscles by using various items of strong language, such as “frivolity bordering upon the criminal”, “this lying quotation”, etc.; and then he lays in with gusto as follows:

“But here we come, to be sure, to Marx’s third line of defence, and this far exceeds, in its *impudent mendacity*, anything which came before. Marx actually does not shrink from citing *The Times* of April 17, 1863 as proof of the correctness of his quotation. *The Times* of April 17, 1863, p. 7, page” (should be column) “5, line 17 et seq., reports, *however*, the speech as follows:

And here follows the *Times* report, which runs:

“The augmentation I have described” (namely as “this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power”) “and the figures of which are founded, I think, upon accurate returns, *is entirely confined to classes of property.*”

And now we can only stare wide-eyed at the “impudent mendacity” of Marx, who still dares to claim that the *Times* report contained the sentence: This intoxicating augmentation, etc., is entirely confined to classes of property!

The Inaugural Address states: “THIS INTOXICATING AUGMENTATION OF WEALTH AND POWER IS ENTIRELY CONFINED TO CLASSES OF PROPERTY.”

*The Times* states: “THE AUGMENTATION THERE DESCRIBED” (which not even Mr. Brentano, anonymous or not, has so far argued is not the “AUGMENTATION” in the phrase “THIS INTOXICATING AUGMENTATION OF WEALTH AND POWER”) “AND WHICH IS FOUNDED, I THINK, UPON ACCURATE RETURNS, IS AN AUGMENTATION ENTIRELY CONFINED TO CLASSES OF PROPERTY.”

And now that Mr. Brentano has pointed out in *The Times*, with his own index finger, the sentence which Marx allegedly lyingly added because it was missing in Hansard, and has thus taken upon

himself Marx's alleged impudent mendacity, he declares triumphantly that

"both reports" (*Times* and Hansard) "fully coincide materially. The report in *The Times* just gives, formally more contracted, what the shorthand report by Hansard gives verbatim. Yet despite the fact that the *Times* report contains the direct opposite of *that notorious passage* in the Inaugural Address, and the fact that according to the *Times* report, too, Mr. Gladstone said he believed this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power *not* to be confined to classes in easy circumstances Marx has the impudence to write in the *Volksstaat* of June 1: 'So, on April 16, 1863, Mr. Gladstone declared both in form and in content in the House of Commons, as reported in his own organ, *The Times*, on April 17, 1863, that this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property'"<sup>a</sup>

*Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem.* When two do the same, it is not the same.

When Marx has Gladstone say: This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property, this is "lyingly added", a "notorious passage", "completely forged". When the *Times* report has Gladstone say:

"This augmentation I have described as an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property,"

then this is only "formally more contracted" than the Hansard report, in which this sentence is missing, and the "direct opposite of that" (exactly the same) "notorious passage in the Inaugural Address". And when Marx then quotes the *Times* report in confirmation of this passage, Mr. Brentano states:

"...and finally he has the *impudence* to base himself on newspaper reports which *directly contradict* him".

This really does demand great "impudence". However, Marx has his on his face, and nowhere else.<sup>b</sup>

With the aid of "impudence" which may easily be distinguished from that of Marx, Anonymous, alias Lujo Brentano, then manages to have Gladstone say that

he "*believes* this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power *not* to be confined to classes in easy circumstances".

Actually, according to *The Times* and Hansard, Gladstone says he would look with pain and apprehension upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power if he believed it was confined to the classes in easy circumstances, and he adds, according to *The Times*, that it is, however, "confined to classes of property".

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 143.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Play on words: "Stirn" means forehead and impudence.—*Ed.*

"Indeed," the righteously indignant Anonymous finally exclaims, "to describe these practices we know only one word, a word with which Marx is very familiar (see *Capital*, p. 257<sup>a</sup>): they are simply 'nefarious'."

Whose practices, Mr. Lujo Brentano?

## II

Marx's reply (*Der Volksstaat*, August 7, 1872, Documents, No. 6<sup>b</sup>) is good-natured enough to deal with all the stir created by Mr. Brentano about Professor Beesly, *The Theory of the Exchanges*, etc.; we leave this aside as being of secondary importance. In conclusion, however, it produces another two facts which are absolutely decisive for the main issue. The "lyingly added" passage is to be found, besides in the *Times* report, in the reports of two other London morning papers of April 17, 1863. According to *The Morning Star*, Gladstone stated:

"This augmentation"—which had just been described as an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power—"is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property."

According to *The Morning Advertiser*:

"The augmentation stated"—an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power—"is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property."

For any other opponent, these proofs would be "absolutely devastating". Not, however, for the anonymous Brentano. His reply (*Concordia*, August 22, 1872, Documents, No. 7<sup>c</sup>), which betrays undiminished impudence, was never seen by Marx, since numbers of *Concordia* later than that dated July 11 were not sent to him. I myself first read this reply in Brentano's reprint (*Meine Polemik, etc.*, 1890<sup>d</sup>), and must therefore take note of it here, for better or for worse.

"The *dogged mendacity* with which he" (Marx) "clings to the distorted quotation ... is astonishing even for someone for whom no means are too base for his subversive plans."

The quotation remains "forged", and the *Times* report "shows the exact opposite, since *The Times* and Hansard fully coincide". The confidence of this declaration is, however, simply child's play

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Book I, Part III, Chapter X, Section 6 (see present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 144-51.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 152-54.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> L. Brentano, *Meine Polemik mit Karl Marx*, Berlin, 1890, pp. 21-23.—*Ed.*



compared to the “impudence” with which Mr. Brentano suddenly gives us the following information:

“Marx’s second method of obscuring the *Times* report was simply to suppress, in his German translation, the relative clause which showed that Gladstone had only said that the augmentation of wealth, which was shown by the income tax returns, *was confined to the classes of property*, since the working classes were not subject to income tax, and that thus nothing about the increase in the prosperity of the working classes could be learned from the income tax returns; not, however, that the working classes in reality had been excluded from the extraordinary augmentation of national wealth.”

Thus when *The Times* says that the oft-mentioned augmentation is confined to the classes of property, then it says the opposite of the “lyingly added” sentence, which says the same. As regards the “simply suppressed relative clause”, we shall not allow Mr. Brentano to get away with that, if he will bear with us for a moment. And now he has happily survived the first great leap, it is easier for him to assert that black is white, and white black. Now that he has managed to deal with *The Times*, *The Morning Star* and *The Morning Advertiser* will give him little trouble.

“For these papers, even as he” (Marx) “quotes them, speak for us. After Gladstone has said, according to both papers, that he does *not* believe” (which, as we know, Mr. Brentano claims) “*this* intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is confined to the classes which find themselves in pleasant circumstances, he continued: ‘*This* great increase of wealth *takes no cognizance at all* of the condition of the labouring population. *The augmentation which I have described is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property.*’ The context and the use of the expression ‘take cognizance’ show clearly that this increase and the augmentation of the increase cited, and the citing,” (*sic!*) “are intended to indicate those discernible in the income tax returns.”

The Jesuit who originated the saying *Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem* was a bungler compared to the anonymous Brentano. When *The Times*, *The Morning Star* and *The Morning Advertiser* declare unanimously that the sentence which Brentano claims Marx had “lyingly added” was actually uttered by Gladstone, then these papers speak unanimously “for” Mr. Brentano. And when Marx quotes this sentence verbatim, this is a “lying quotation”, “impudent mendacity”, “complete forgery”, “a lie”, etc. And if Marx cannot appreciate this, that passes the understanding of our Anonymous, alias Lujó Brentano, and he finds it “simply nefarious”.

But let us deal with the alleged “lying addition” once and for all by quoting the reports on our passage in all London morning papers on April 17, 1863.

We have already had *The Times*, *The Morning Star* and *The Morning Advertiser*.

*Daily Telegraph:*

"I may say for one, that I should look almost with apprehension and alarm on *this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power* if it were my belief that it was confined to the masses who are in easy circumstances. This question to wealth takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. *The augmentation stated is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property.*"

*Morning Herald:*

"I may say that I for one would look with fear and apprehension at *this intoxicating increase of wealth* if I were of opinion that it is confined to the classes in easy circumstances. *This great increase of wealth* which I have described, and which is founded on accurate returns *is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital*, and takes no account of the poorer classes."

*Morning Post:*

"I may say, I for one, would look with fear and apprehension when I consider this great increase of wealth if I believed that its benefits were confined to the classes in easy circumstances. *This augmentation of wealth* which I have described, and which is founded on accurate returns *is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital*, and takes no account of the augmentation of wealth of the poorer classes."

*Daily News:*

"I may say that I for one would look with fear and apprehension when I consider *this great increase of wealth* if I believed that its benefits were confined to the classes in easy circumstances. *This augmentation of wealth* which I have described, and which is founded upon accurate returns, *is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital*, and takes no account of the augmentation of wealth of the poorer classes."

*Standard:*

"I may say that I for one would look with fear and apprehension at *this intoxicating increase of wealth* if I were of the opinion that it was confined to the classes in easy circumstances. *This great increase of wealth* which I have described, and which is founded on the accurate returns *is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital*, and takes no account of the poorer classes."

The eight newspapers cited here were, as far as I know, the only morning papers published in London at that time. Their testimony is "convincing". Four of them—*The Times*, *The Morning Star*, *The Morning Advertiser*, *Daily Telegraph*—give the sentence in exactly the form which Marx had "lyingly added". The augmentation described earlier as an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power "*is entirely confined to classes of property*". The four others—*Morning Herald*, *Morning Post*, *Daily News* and *Standard*—give it in an "only formally more contracted" version, by which it is further reinforced; this augmentation "*is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital*".

The eight newspapers cited all have their separate complete staff of parliamentary reporters. They are thus the same number

of witnesses, fully independent of one another. In addition they are in their totality impartial, since they adhere to the most diverse party tendencies. And both of the two versions of the irrepressible sentence are vouched for by Tories and Whigs and radicals. According to four of them, Gladstone said: entirely confined to classes of property. According to four others he said: entirely confined to the augmentation of capital. Eight irreproachable witnesses thus testify that Gladstone really uttered the sentence. The only question is whether this was in the milder version used by Marx, or in the stronger version given in four of the reports.

Against them all, in isolated grandeur stands—Hansard. But Hansard is not irreproachable like the morning papers. Hansard's reports are subject to censorship, the censorship of the speakers themselves. And precisely for this reason "it is the custom" to quote according to Hansard.

Eight non-suspect witnesses against one suspect witness! But what does that worry our victory-confident Anonymous? Precisely *because* the reports of the eight morning papers put "that notorious passage" in Gladstone's mouth, precisely *because of this*, they "speak for" our Anonymous, precisely *by this* they prove even more that Marx "lyingly added" it.

Indeed, nothing actually exceeds the "impudence" of the anonymous Brentano.

### III

In reality, however, the ostentatious impudence we had to admire in Mr. Brentano, is nothing but a tactical manoeuvre. He has discovered that the attack on the "lyingly added" sentence has failed, and that he must seek a defensive position. He has found it; all that has to be done now is to retreat to this new position.

Already in his first reply to Marx (Documents, No. 5<sup>a</sup>) Mr. Brentano hints at his intention, though bashfully as yet. The fatal *Times* report compels him to do so. This report, it is true, contains the "notorious", the "lyingly added" passage, but that is actually beside the point. For since it "fully coincides materially" with Hansard, it says "the direct opposite of that notorious passage", although it contains it word for word. Thus it is no longer a question of the wording of the "notorious passage", but of its meaning. It is no longer a question of denying the passage's

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 140-44.—*Ed.*

existence, but of claiming that it means the opposite of what it says.

And Marx having declared in his second reply that lack of time forces him to end, once and for all, his pleasurable exchange of opinions with his anonymous opponent,<sup>a</sup> the latter can venture to deal with even greater confidence with this subject, which is not exactly proper at that. This he does in his rejoinder, reproduced here as No. 7 of the documents.<sup>b</sup>

Here he claims that Marx attempts to *obscure* the *Times* report, which materially fully coincides with Hansard, and this is in three ways. *Firstly* by an incorrect translation of CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES.<sup>c</sup> I leave aside this point as absolutely irrelevant. It is generally known that Marx had a command of the English language quite different from that of Mr. Brentano. But exactly what Mr. Gladstone thought when he used this expression—and whether he thought anything—it is quite impossible to say today, 27 years later, even for himself.

The *second* point is that Marx “simply suppressed” a certain “relative clause” in the *Times* report. The passage in question is previously cited at length in section II, p. 7.<sup>d</sup> By suppressing this relative clause, Marx is supposed to have suppressed for his readers the fact that the augmentation of wealth, as shown by the income tax returns, is confined to classes which possess property, since the labouring classes do not fall under the income tax, and thus nothing may be learned from the returns about the increase in prosperity amongst the workers; this does not mean, however, that in reality the labouring classes remain excluded from the extraordinary augmentation of national wealth.

The sentence in the *Times* report runs, in Mr. Brentano’s own translation:

“The augmentation I have described, and the figures of which are based, I think, upon accurate returns, is entirely confined to classes of property.”

The relative clause which Marx so maliciously “suppressed” consists of the words: “and the figures of which are based, I think, upon accurate returns”. By the persistent, since twice repeated, suppression of these highly important words, so the story goes, Marx wished to conceal from his readers that the said augmenta-

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 151.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 152-54.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> On the translation of this expression, see Marx’s footnote on p. 138 as well as his glosses on p. 148 of this volume.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, p. 104.—*Ed.*

tion was an augmentation *solely of the income subject to income tax*, in other words the income of the “classes which possess property”.

Does his moral indignation at the fact that he had run aground with “mendacity” make Mr. Brentano blind? Or does he think that he can make all sorts of allegations, since Marx will no longer reply in any case? The fact is that the incriminated sentence begins, according to Marx, both in the Inaugural Address and in *Capital*, with the words: “From 1842 to 1852 *THE TAXABLE INCOME* of the country increased by 6 per cent... In the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has ...”<sup>a</sup> etc.

Does Mr. Brentano know another “taxable income” in England apart from that subject to income tax? And has the highly important “relative clause” anything at all to add to this clear declaration that only income subject to income tax is under discussion? Or does he believe, as it almost appears, that people “forge” Gladstone’s budget speeches, make “lying additions” or “suppress” something in them if they quote them without, *à la* Brentano, also providing the reader with an essay on English income tax in which they “falsify” income tax into the bargain, as Marx proved (Documents, No. 6),<sup>b</sup> and as Mr. Brentano was forced to admit (Documents, No. 7).<sup>c</sup> And when the “lyingly added” sentence simply says that the augmentation just mentioned by Mr. Gladstone was confined to classes of property, does it not say essentially the same, since only classes of property pay income tax? But of course, whilst Mr. Brentano creates a deafening hullabaloo at the front door about this sentence as a Marxian falsification and insolent mendacity, he himself allows it to slip in quietly through the back door.

Mr. Brentano knew very well that Marx quoted Mr. Gladstone as speaking about “taxable income” and no other. For in his first attack (Documents, No. 3), he quotes the passage from the Inaugural Address, and even translated *TAXABLE* as “liable to tax”.<sup>d</sup> If he now “suppresses” this in his rejoinder, and if from now on until his pamphlet of 1890 he protests again and again that Marx concealed, intentionally and maliciously, the fact that Gladstone was speaking here solely of those incomes liable to income tax—should we now sling his own expressions back at him: “lying”, “forgery”, “impudent mendacity”, “simply nefarious”?

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 133.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 147.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 154.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.—*Ed.*

To continue with the text:

“Thirdly and finally, Marx attempted to conceal the agreement between the *Times* report and the Hansard report by failing to quote those sentences in which, according to *The Times* too, Gladstone directly and explicitly testified to the elevation of the British working class.”

In his second reply to the anonymous Brentano,<sup>a</sup> Marx had to prove that he had not “*lyingly added*” the “notorious” sentence, and in addition had to reject the insolent claim made by Anonymous: in relation to *this* point, the only point in question, the *Times* report and the Hansard report “fully coincided materially”, although the former included the sentence in question verbatim, and the latter excluded it verbatim. For this, the only point at issue, it was absolutely irrelevant what Mr. Gladstone had to say about the elevation of the British working class.

On the other hand the Inaugural Address—and this is the document which Brentano accuses of falsifying a quotation—states explicitly on p. 4,<sup>b</sup> only a few lines before the “notorious” sentence, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Gladstone), during the millennium of free trade, told the House of Commons:

“The average condition of the British labourer has improved in a degree we know to be extraordinary and unexampled in the history of any country or any age.”

And these are precisely the words which, according to Brentano, Marx maliciously suppressed.

In the whole polemic, from his first retort to Marx in 1872 (Documents, No. 5<sup>c</sup>) down to his introduction and appendix to *Meine Polemik, etc.*, 1890, Mr. Brentano suppresses, with a sleight of hand which we must on no account describe as “insolent mendacity”, the fact that Marx directly quoted in the Inaugural Address these Gladstonian declarations about the unparalleled improvement in the situation of the workers. And in this rejoinder, which, as already mentioned, remained unknown to Marx up to his death, and to me until the publication of the pamphlet *Meine Polemik, etc.*, in 1890, in which the accusation about the lyingly added sentence was only apparently maintained, though in reality dropped, and the lyingly added sentence not only shamefacedly admitted as genuine Gladstonian property, but also as “speaking for us”, i.e. for Brentano—in this rejoinder a retreat is beaten to the new line of defence: Marx has distorted and

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 136-40.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 132.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 140-44.—*Ed.*

twisted Gladstone's speech; Marx has Gladstone say that, it goes, the riches of the rich have grown enormously, but that the poor, the working population, have at the most become less poor. But in fact Gladstone said, in plain words, that the condition of the workers had improved to an unexampled degree.

This second line of defence was pierced by the irresistible fact that precisely in the incriminated document, in the Inaugural Address, these same Gladstonian words were quoted explicitly. And Mr. Brentano *knew* this. "But what does it matter? The readers" of the *Concordia* "cannot check up on him!"

Incidentally, regarding what Gladstone really said, on this we shall have a few short words to say in a little while.

In conclusion, Mr. Brentano, in the security, first of his anonymity, and second of Marx's declaration that he has no wish to bother with him further, indulges in the following private jollity:

"When Mr. Marx finally ends his article by breaking into abuse, we can assure him that his opponent could desire nothing more than the confession of his weakness which lies herein. Abuse is the weapon of those whose other means of defence have run out."

The reader can check for himself the extent to which Marx "breaks into abuse" in his rejoinder. As far as Mr. Brentano is concerned, we have already presented some choice bouquets from his attestations of politeness. The "lies", "impudent mendacity", "lying quotation", "simply nefarious", etc., heaped upon Marx's head by all means constitute an edifying "confession of weakness", and an unmistakable sign that Mr. Brentano's "other means of defence have run out".

#### IV

Here ends the first act of our song and dance. Mr. Brentano, mysterious though not yet a privy councillor,<sup>a</sup> had achieved what he could scarcely have hoped to achieve. Admittedly, things had gone badly enough for him regarding the sentence allegedly "lyingly added"; and in fact he had dropped this original charge. But he had sought out a new line of defence, and on this line—*he had had the last word*, and with that you can, in the world of German professordom, claim you have stood your ground. And with this he could brag, at least amongst his own, that he had

<sup>a</sup> Play on words: "geheimnisvoll"—mysterious, "Geheimrat"—privy councillor.—*Trans.*

victoriously repelled Marx's onslaught, and slain Marx himself in the literary world. The luckless Marx, however, never heard a dying word about his slaughter in the *Concordia*; on the contrary, he had the "impudence" to live on for another eleven years, eleven years of mounting success for him, eleven years of uninterrupted growth in the numerical strength of his supporters in all countries, eleven years of constantly growing recognition of his merits.

Mr. Brentano and consorts wisely refrained from freeing the blinded Marx of his self-deception, or making it clear to him that he had actually been dead for a long time. But after he really did die in 1883, they could no longer contain themselves, their fingers itched too much. And now Mr. Sedley Taylor appeared on the scene, with a letter to *The Times* (Documents, No. 8).<sup>a</sup>

He provoked things himself, if he or his friend Brentano, as it almost appears, had not actually concocted it with M. Émile de Laveleye.<sup>b</sup> In that stilted style which betrays a certain recognition of his dubious cause, he states that it appears to him

"extremely singular that it was reserved for Professor Brentano to expose, eight years later, the *mala fides*" of Marx.

And then begin the vainglorious phrases about the masterly conduct of the attack by the godlike Brentano, and the speedily ensuring deadly shifts of the notorious Marx, etc. What things were like in reality our readers have already seen. All that fell into deadly shifts was only Brentano's claim about the lying addition of the sentence in question.

And finally in conclusion:

"On Brentano's showing, by a detailed comparison of texts, that the reports of *The Times* and of "Hansard" agreed in utterly excluding the meaning which craftily isolated quotation had put upon Mr. Gladstone's words, Marx withdrew from further controversy under the plea of want of time!"

The "detailed comparison of texts" is simply farcical. Anonymous Brentano quotes *only* Hansard. Marx supplies him with the *Times* report, which includes verbatim the controversial sentence missing in Hansard. Mr. Brentano now also quoted the *Times* report, and this three lines further than Marx quoted it. These three lines are supposed to show that *The Times* and Hansard fully agree, and thus that the sentence allegedly "lyingly added"

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 155.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See É. de Laveleye, "To the Editor of *The Times*, Liège, November 16". *The Times*, No. 30987, November 26, 1883.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Bad faith.—*Ed.*



by Marx is *not* in the *Times* report, although it stands there word for word; or at the very least, if it should stand there, that it then means the opposite of what it says in plain words. Mr. Taylor calls this daredevil operation a “detailed comparison of texts”.

Further. It is simply not true that Marx then withdrew under the plea of want of time. And Mr. Sedley Taylor knew this, or it was his business to know it. We have seen that before this Marx delivered proof to the anonymous godlike Brentano that the reports in *The Morning Star* and *The Morning Advertiser* also contained the “lyingly added” sentence. Only after this did he declare that he could waste no more time on Anonymous.

The further polemic between Mr. Sedley Taylor and Eleanor Marx (Documents, Nos 9, 10 and 11<sup>a</sup>) showed in the first place that he did not try for a moment to maintain the original charge about the lying addition of a sentence. He went so far as to claim that this was “of very subordinate importance”. Once again the direct disavowal of a fact which he knew, or which it was his business to know.

In any case we take note of his admission that this charge does not hold water, and congratulate his friend Brentano on this.

So what is the charge now? Simply that of Mr. Brentano’s second line of defence that Marx had wished to distort the sense of Gladstone’s speech—a new charge of which, as we have noted, Marx never knew anything. In any case, this brings us to a completely different field. What was concerned to begin with was a definite fact: did Marx lyingly add this sentence or not? It is now no longer denied that Marx victoriously rebuffed this charge. The new charge of distorted quotation, however, leads us into the field of subjective opinions, which necessarily vary. *De gustibus non est disputandum*.<sup>b</sup> One person may regard as unimportant—intrinsically or for the purpose of quotation—something which another person declares to be important and decisive. The conservative will [never] quote acceptably for the liberal, the liberal never for the conservative, the socialist never for one of them or both of them. The party man whose own comrade is quoted against him by an opponent regularly discovers that the essential passage, the passage determining the real sense, has been omitted in quotation. This is such an everyday occurrence, something permitting so many individual viewpoints, that nobody attaches the slightest significance to such charges. Had Mr. Brentano utilised

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 156-63.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> There can be no argument about taste.—*Ed*

his anonymity to level this charge, and this charge alone, against Marx, then Marx would scarcely have regarded it as worth the trouble of a single word in reply.

In order to accomplish this new twist with that elegance peculiar to him alone, Mr. Sedley Taylor finds it necessary to repudiate thrice his friend and comrade Brentano. He repudiates him first when he drops his originally sole charge of "lying addition", and even denies its existence as original and sole. He repudiates him further when he summarily discards the infallible Hansard, to quote exclusively from which is the "custom" of the ethical Brentano,<sup>a</sup> and uses instead the *Times* report, which the selfsame Brentano calls "necessarily bungling". Thirdly, he repudiates him, and his own first letter to *The Times* into the bargain, by seeking the "quotation in dispute" no longer in the Inaugural Address but in *Capital*. And this for the simple reason that he had never laid his hand upon the Inaugural Address, to which he "had the hardihood" to refer in his letter to *The Times*!

Shortly after his controversy with Eleanor Marx he vainly sought this Address in the British Museum, and was introduced there to his opponent, whom he asked whether *she* could not obtain a copy for him. Whereupon, I sought out a copy amongst my papers, and Eleanor sent it to him. The "detailed comparison of texts" which this enabled him to make apparently convinced him that silence was the best reply.

And in fact it would be superfluous to add a single word to Eleanor Marx's retort (Documents, No. 11<sup>b</sup>).

## V

Third act. My Preface to the fourth edition of the first volume of Marx's *Capital*, reprinted as far as necessary in Documents, No. 12,<sup>c</sup> explains why I was forced to return to the bygone polemics of Messrs Brentano and Sedley Taylor. This Preface forced Mr. Brentano to make a reply: this was the pamphlet *Meine Polemik mit Karl Marx usw.* by Lujo Brentano, Berlin, 1890. Here he has reprinted his anonymous and now finally legitimated *Concordia* articles, and Marx's answers in the *Volksstaat*, accompanied by an introduction and two appendices, with which, for better or worse, we are obliged to deal.

<sup>a</sup> Play on words: "Sitte"—custom, "sittlich"—ethical.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume pp. 159-63.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 164-69.—*Ed.*

Above all we note that here too there is no longer any mention of the “lyingly added” sentence. The sentence from the Inaugural Address is quoted right on the first page, and it is then claimed that Gladstone had “stated in direct opposition to Karl Marx’s claim” that these figures referred only to those paying income tax (which Marx had Gladstone say too, since he explicitly limits these figures to *taxable* income) but that the condition of the working class had at the same time improved in unexampled fashion (which Marx also has Gladstone say, only nine lines before the challenged quotation). I would request the reader to compare for himself the Inaugural Address (Documents, No. 1<sup>a</sup>) with Mr. Brentano’s claim (Documents, No. 13<sup>b</sup>) in order to see how Mr. Brentano either “lyingly adds”, or fabricates in another manner, a contradiction where there is none at all. But since the charge about the lyingly added sentence has broken down ignominiously, Mr. Brentano, contrary to his better knowledge, must attempt to take in his readers by telling them Marx tried to suppress the fact that Gladstone had spoken here only of “taxable income”, or the income of classes which possess property. And here Mr. Brentano does not even notice that his first accusation is thus turned into the opposite, in that the second is a slap in the face of the first.

Having happily accomplished this “forgery”, *he* is moved to draw the attention of the *Concordia* to the “forgery” allegedly committed by Marx, and the *Concordia* then asks him to send it an article against Marx. What now follows is too delicious not to be given verbatim:

“The article was not signed by me; this was done, on the one hand, at the request of the editors *in the interests of the reputation of their paper*, and, on the other hand, I had all the less objection, since following earlier literary controversies pursued by Marx it was to be expected that this time too he would heap personal insults on his adversary, and for this reason it could *only be amusing* to leave him in the dark as to the identity of his adversary.”

So the editors of the *Concordia* wished “in the interests of the reputation of their paper” that Mr. Brentano should keep his name quiet! What a reputation this implies for Mr. Brentano amongst his colleagues in his own party. We can well believe that this actually happened to him, but that he himself shouts it from the rooftops is a really pyramidal achievement on his part. However, this is something which he has to settle with himself and with the editors of the *Concordia*.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 132-33.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 169-72.— *Ed.*

Since "it was to be expected that Marx would heap personal insults on his adversary", it could naturally "only be amusing to leave him in the dark as to the identity of his adversary". It was hitherto a mystery as to how you can heap *personal* insults upon a person you do *not* know. You can only get personal if you know something of the person in question. But Mr. Brentano, made anonymous in the interests of the paper's reputation, relieved his adversary of this trouble. He himself waded in with "insults", first with the "lyingly added" printed in bold type, and then with "impudent mendacity", "simply nefarious", etc. Mr. Brentano, the non-anonymous, obviously made a slip of the pen here. Mr. Brentano "on the other hand, had all the less objection" to the anonymity imposed upon himself, not so that the well-known Marx could "heap personal insults" upon the unknown Brentano, but so that the concealed Brentano could do this to the well-known Marx.

And this is supposed to "be amusing"! That's what actually transpired, but not because Mr. Brentano wanted it. Marx, as later his daughter, and now myself, have all tried to see the amusing aspect of this polemic. Such success as we have had, be it great or small, has been at the expense of Mr. Brentano. His articles have been anything but "amusing". The only contributions to amusement are the rapier-thrusts aimed by Marx at the shady side of his "left-in-the-dark person", which the man at the receiving end now wishes to laugh off belatedly as the "loutishness of his scurrilous polemics". The Junkers, the priests, the lawyers and other right and proper opponents of the incisive polemics of Voltaire, Beaumarchais and Paul Louis Courier objected to the "loutishness of their scurrilous polemics", which has not prevented these examples of "loutishness" from being regarded as models and masterpieces today. And we have had so much pleasure from these and similar "scurrilous polemics" that a hundred Brentanos should not succeed in dragging us down to the level of German university polemics, where there is nothing but the impotent rage of green envy, and the most desolate boredom.

However, Mr. Brentano once again regards his readers as so duped that he can lay it on thick again with a brazen face:

"When it was shown that *The Times* too ... carried this" (Gladstone's) "speech in a sense according with the shorthand report, he" (Marx) "acted, as the editors of the *Concordia* wrote, like the cuttlefish, which *dims* the water with a dark fluid, in order to make pursuit by its enemy more difficult, i.e. he tried as hard as he could to hide the subject of controversy by clinging to completely inconsequential secondary matters."

If the *Times* report, which contains the "lyingly added"

sentence word for word, accords in sense with the “shorthand” report—should be with Hansard—which suppresses it word for word, and if Mr. Brentano once again boasts that he had demonstrated this, this can mean nothing other than the charge concerning the “lyingly added” sentence has been completely dropped—though shamefacedly and quietly—and Mr. Brentano, forced from the offensive onto the defensive, is retreating to his second line of defence. We simply note this; we believe that in sections III and IV we have thoroughly broken through the centre of this second line, and turned both flanks.

But then the genuine university polemicist appears. When Brentano, emboldened by the scent of victory, has thus driven his enemy into the corner, the foe acts like the cuttlefish, darkening the water and hiding the subject of controversy by focussing attention on completely inconsequential secondary matters.

The Jesuits say: *Si fecisti, nega*. If you have perpetrated something, deny it. The German university polemicist goes further and says: If you have perpetrated a shady lawyer’s trick, then lay it at your opponent’s door. Scarcely has Marx quoted *The Theory of the Exchanges* and Professor Beesly, and this simply because they had quoted the disputed passage like he had, than Brentano the cuttlefish “clings” to them with all the suckers of his ten feet, and spreads such a torrent of his “dark fluid” all around that you must look hard and grasp firmly if you do not wish to lose from eye and hand the real “subject of controversy”, namely the allegedly “lyingly added” sentence. In his rejoinder, exactly the same method. First he starts another squabble with Marx about the meaning of the expression CLASSES IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES, a squabble which under the best of circumstances could produce nothing but that very “obscuration” which Mr. Brentano desires. And then dark fluid is again squirted in the matter of that renowned relative clause which Marx had maliciously suppressed, and which, as we have shown, could perfectly well be omitted, since the fact to which it indirectly alluded had already been stated quite clearly in an earlier sentence of the speech which had been quoted by Marx. And thirdly, our cuttlefish has enough dark sauce left over to obscure once again the subject of controversy, by claiming that Marx has again suppressed some sentences from *The Times*—sentences which had absolutely nothing to do with the single point at issue between them *at that time*, the allegedly lyingly added sentence.

And the same waste of sepia in the present self-apologia. First, naturally, *The Theory of the Exchanges* must be the whipping boy.

Then, all of a sudden, we are confronted with the Lassallean "iron law of wages" with which, as everyone knows, Marx was as little connected as Mr. Brentano with the invention of gunpowder; Mr. Brentano must know that in the first volume of *Capital* Marx specifically denied all and every responsibility for any conclusions drawn by Lassalle,<sup>a</sup> and that in the same book Marx describes the law of wages as a function of differing variables and very elastic, thus anything but iron. But when the ink-squirting has started there is no stopping it: the Halle congress,<sup>138</sup> Liebknecht and Bebel, Gladstone's budget speech of 1843, the English trade unions, all manner of far-fetched things are resorted to so as, faced with an opponent who has gone over to the offensive, to cover by self-apologia the defensive line of Mr. Brentano and his lofty philanthropic principles, treated so scornfully by the wicked socialists. One gets the impression that a round dozen cuttlefish were helping him do the "hushing up" here.

And all of this because Mr. Brentano himself knows that he has hopelessly run aground with his claim about the "lyingly added" sentence, and has not got the courage to withdraw this claim openly and honourably. To use his own words:

"Had he" Brentano "simply admitted that he had been misled by this book", Hansard, "...one might have been surprised that he had relied upon such a source" as absolutely reliable "but the mistake would at least have been rectified. But for him there was no question of this."

Instead the ink was squirted in gallons for obscuring purposes, and if I have to be so discursive here, this is only because I must first dispose of all these far-fetched marginal questions, and disperse the obscuring ink in order to keep eye and hand on the real subject of the controversy.

Meanwhile Mr. Brentano has another piece of information for us *in petto*,<sup>b</sup> which in fact "could only be amusing". He has, in fact, been so lamentably treated that he can find no peace and quiet until he has moaned to us about all his misfortune. First the *Concordia* suppresses his name in the interests of the reputation of the paper. Mr. Brentano is magnanimous enough to consent to this sacrifice in the interests of the good cause. Then Marx unleashes upon him the loutishness of his scurrilous polemics. This too he swallows. Only he wished to reply to this "with the verbatim publication of the entire polemic". But sadly

<sup>a</sup> See F. Lassalle, *Herr Bastiat-Schulze von Delitzsch, der ökonomische Julian, oder: Capital und Arbeit*, Berlin, 1864, Ch. III, see also *Capital*, Vol. I, "Preface to the First German Edition" (present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In store.—*Ed.*

“editors often have their own judgement; the specialist journal which I regarded as suitable above all others refused to publish, on the grounds that the dispute lacked general interest”.

Thus do the noble suffer in this sinful world; their best intentions founder on the baseness or indifference of man. And to compensate this unappreciated honest fellow for his undeserved misfortune, and since some time will probably pass before he rounds up an editor who has not “often his own judgement”, we herewith present him the “the verbatim publication of the entire polemic”.

## VI

In addition to the introductory self-apologia, Mr. Brentano's little pamphlet contains two appendices. The first contains extracts from *The Theory of the Exchanges*, intended to prove that this book was one of the main sources from which Marx concocted his *Capital*. I shall not go into detail about this repeated waste of sepia. I only have to deal with the old charge from the *Concordia*. His whole life long Marx could not and would not please Mr. Brentano. Mr. Brentano thus certainly has a whole bottomless sack of complaints against Marx, and I would be an idiot to let myself in for this. There would be no end to pleasing him.

But it is naïve that here, at the end of the quotations, “the reproduction of the real budget speech” is demanded from Marx. So that is what Mr. Brentano understands by correct quotation. However, if the whole actual speech is always to be reproduced, then no speech has ever been quoted without “forgery”.

In the second appendix Mr. Brentano has a go at me. In the fourth edition of *Capital*, volume one, I drew attention to *The Morning Star* in connection with the allegedly false quotation. Mr. Brentano utilises this to once again obscure completely, with spurts of sepia, the original point at issue, the passage in the Inaugural Address, and instead of this to hit out at the passage in *Capital* already quoted by Mr. S. Taylor. In order to prove that my source of reference was false, and that Marx could only have taken the “forged quotation” from *The Theory of the Exchanges*, Mr. Brentano prints in parallel columns the reports of *The Times* and *The Morning Star* and the quotation according to *Capital*. This second appendix is printed here as document No. 14b.<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 173-74.—Ed

Mr. Brentano has *The Morning Star* begin its report with the words "I MUST SAY FOR ONE" etc. He thus claims that the preceding sentences on the growth of taxable income from 1842 to 1852, and from 1853 to 1861 are missing in *The Morning Star*; from which it naturally follows that Marx did not use *The Morning Star* but *The Theory of the Exchanges*.

"The readers" of his pamphlet "with whom he is concerned, cannot check up on him!" But other people can, and they discover that this passage is certainly to be found in *The Morning Star*. We reprint it here, next to the passage from *Capital* in English and German for the edification of Mr. Brentano and his readers.

"*The Morning Star*", April 17, 1863

"*Capital*", Vol. I, 1st ed., p. 639; 2nd ed., p. 678; 3rd ed., p. 671; 4th ed., p. 617, Note 103<sup>a</sup>

\*"In ten years, from 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent, as nearly as I can make out—a very considerable increase in ten years. But in eight years from 1853 to 1861 the income of the country again increased from the basis taken in 1853 by 20 per cent. The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible."\*

\*"From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent..."

...In the 8 years from 1858 to 1861 ... it had increased from the basis taken in 1853, 20 per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible."\*

In German translation:<sup>b</sup>

The absence of this sentence in his quotation from *The Morning Star* is Mr. Brentano's main trump card in his claim that Marx quoted from *The Theory of the Exchanges* and not from *The Morning Star*. He confronts the claim that the quotation was taken from *The Morning Star* with the incriminating gap in the parallel column. And now the sentence is nevertheless to be found in *The Morning Star*, in fact exactly as in Marx, and the incriminating gap is Mr. Brentano's own invention. If that is not "suppression" and "forgery", into the bargain, then these words lack any sense.

But if Mr. Brentano "forges" at the *beginning* of the quotation, and if he now very carefully refrains from saying that Marx "lyingly added" a sentence in the *middle* of the same quotation, this in no way prevents him from insisting repeatedly that Marx suppressed the *end* of the quotation.

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VII, Chapter XXV, Section 5(a), present edition, Vol. 35.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Then follows the German translation of both quotations.—*Ed.*



In *Capital* the quotation breaks off with the passage:

“Whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say.”

Now in the reports in *The Times* and *The Morning Star* the sentence does not end here; separated only by a comma, there follow the words:

“but the average condition of the British labourer, we have the happiness to know to be extraordinary” (in *The Times*: has improved during the last 20 years in a degree which we know to be extraordinary) “and which we may almost pronounce to be unexampled in the history of any country and of any age”.

Thus Marx breaks off here in mid-sentence, “has Gladstone stop in mid-sentence”, “making this sentence quite meaningless”. And already in his rejoinder (Documents, No. 7<sup>a</sup>) Mr. Brentano calls this an “absolutely senseless version”.

Gladstone’s sentence: “Whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say” is a quite definite statement, complete in itself. If it makes sense, it makes sense when taken in isolation. If it makes no sense, no addition however long, tacked on behind a “yet”, can give it sense. If the sentence in Marx’s quotation is “completely senseless”, then this is not due to Marx who quoted it, but to Mr. Gladstone who uttered it.

To probe more deeply this important case, let us now turn to the only source which, according to Mr. Brentano, it is the “custom” to quote, let us turn to Hansard, pure of all original sin. According to Mr. Brentano’s own translation, it says:

“I will not presume to determine whether the wide interval which separates the extremes of wealth and poverty is less or more wide than it has been in former times”—*full stop*.

And only *after* this full stop does the new sentence begin:

“But if we look to the average condition of the British labourer”, etc.

Thus if Marx likewise sets a full stop here, he does just as the virtuous Hansard does; and if Mr. Brentano makes this full stop a new crime on the part of Marx, and claims that Marx has Gladstone stop in the mid-sentence, then he has relied upon the “necessarily bungling newspaper reports”, and he can only blame himself for the consequences. Thus the argument collapses that Marx has made the sentence completely senseless through his full stop; this comes not from him but from Mr. Gladstone, and let Mr. Brentano now correspond with him about the sense or nonsense of the sentence; we have nothing more to do with the matter.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 152-54.—*Ed.*

For Mr. Brentano is anyway in correspondence with Mr. Gladstone. What he has written to the latter we do not learn, of course, and we only learn very little of what Mr. Gladstone has written to him. In any case, Mr. Brentano has published from Gladstone's letters two meagre little sentences (Documents, No. 16<sup>a</sup>) and in my reply (Documents, No. 17<sup>b</sup>) I showed that "this arbitrary mosaic of sentences torn from their context" proves nothing at all *in* Mr. Brentano's favour whilst the fact that he indulges in this sort of ragged publication, instead of publishing the whole correspondence, speaks volumes *against* him.

But let us assume for a moment that these two little sentences only permitted the interpretation most favourable to Mr. Brentano. What then?

"You are completely correct, and Marx completely incorrect." "I undertook no changes of any sort." These are the alleged words—for Mr. Gladstone does not usually write in German, as far as I know—of the former minister.

Does this mean: I did not utter the "notorious" sentence, and that Marx "lyingly added" it? Certainly not. The eight London morning papers of April 17, 1863 would unanimously give the lie to such a claim. They prove beyond all doubt that this sentence was spoken. If Mr. Gladstone made no changes in the Hansard report—although I am twelve years younger than him, I would not like to rely so implicitly on my memory in such trivialities which occurred 27 years ago—then the omission of the sentence in Hansard says nothing in Mr. Brentano's favour, and a great deal against Hansard.

Aside from this one point about the "lyingly added" sentence, Mr. Gladstone's opinion is completely inconsequential here. For as soon as we disregard this point, we find ourselves exclusively in the field of inconsequential opinions, in which after years of strife each sticks to his guns. If Mr. Gladstone, should he happen to be quoted, prefers the quotation methods of Mr. Brentano, an admiring supporter, to those of Marx, a sharply critical opponent, then this is quite obvious, and his indisputable right. For us, however, and for the question as to whether Marx quoted in good or in bad faith, his opinion is not even worth as much as that of any old uninvolved third person. For here Mr. Gladstone is no longer a witness but an interested party.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 175.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 175-76.—*Ed*

## VII

In conclusion, let us go briefly into the question of what Mr. Gladstone said in that—thanks to Mr. Brentano, now “notorious”—passage of his budget speech of 1863, and what Marx quoted of what he said, or else what he “lyingly added” or “suppressed”. In order to oblige Mr. Brentano as far as possible, let us take as our basis the immaculate Hansard, and in his own translation.<sup>a</sup>

“In ten years from 1842 to 1852 inclusive, the taxable income of the country, as nearly as we can make out, increased by 6 per cent; but in eight years, from 1853 to 1861, the income of the country again increased upon the basis taken by 20 per cent. That is a fact so singular and striking as to seem almost incredible.”

Mr. Brentano himself has nothing against Marx’s quotation of this sentence, apart from the fact that it is allegedly taken from *The Theory of the Exchanges*. But of Brentano’s quotation it must be said here that it too is far removed from giving “the real budget speech”. He excises Mr. Gladstone’s following excursus on the causes of this astonishing augmentation without even indicating the omission with dots.—Further:

“Such, Sir, is the state of the case as regards the general progress of accumulation; but, for one, I must say that I should look with some degree of pain, and with much apprehension, upon this extraordinary and almost intoxicating growth, if it were my belief that it is confined to the class of persons who may be described as in easy circumstances. The figures which I have quoted take little or no cognizance of the condition of those who do not pay income tax; or, in other words, sufficiently accurate for general truth, they do not take cognizance of the property of the labouring population, or of the increase of its income.”

There now follows the sentence which according to Mr. Brentano was “lyingly added” by Marx, but which on the testimony of all eight morning papers of April 17 was certainly uttered by Mr. Gladstone:

“The augmentation I have described, and which is founded, I think, upon accurate returns, is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property.” (*The Times, The Morning Star, The Morning Advertiser, Daily Telegraph*.) “...is entirely confined to the augmentation of capital”. (*Morning Herald, Standard, The Daily News, Morning Post*.)

After the word “income”, Hansard immediately continues with the words:

“Indirectly, indeed, the *mere augmentation of capital* is of the utmost advantage to the labouring class, because that augmentation cheapens the commodity which in the whole business of production comes into direct competition with labour.”

<sup>a</sup> *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. CLXX, pp. 244-45.—*Ed.*

Although Hansard omits the “notorious” sentence, it says in substance just what the other papers say: it would be very embarrassing for the speaker if this intoxicating augmentation were confined to CLASSES IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES, but although it pains him, this augmentation he has described is confined to people who do not belong to the working class and who are rich enough to pay income tax; yes, it is indeed a “mere augmentation of capital”!

And here, finally, the secret of Mr. Brentano’s fury stands revealed. He reads the sentence in the Inaugural Address, finds in it an embarrassing admission, obtains the Hansard version, fails to find the embarrassing sentence in it, and hurries to publish to the world: Marx lyingly added the sentence in form and in content!—Marx shows him the sentence in *The Times*, *The Morning Star*, *The Morning Advertiser*. Now finally, for appearance’s sake at least, Mr. Brentano must make a “detailed comparison of texts” and discovers—what? That *The Times*, *The Morning Star*, *The Morning Advertiser* “fully coincide materially” with Hansard! Unfortunately he overlooks the fact that the “lyingly added” sentence must then fully coincide materially with Hansard, and that then in the end it must turn out that Hansard coincides materially with the Inaugural Address.

The whole hullabaloo therefore because Mr. Brentano had neglected to undertake the detailed textual comparison ascribed to him by Mr. Sedley Taylor, and because, in fact, he had himself not understood what Mr. Gladstone had said according to Hansard. Of course, this was not that easy, for although Mr. Brentano claims that this speech

“aroused the interest and admiration of the entire educated world ... notably through ... its clarity”,

readers have been able to see for themselves that in the Hansard version it is presented in a particularly stilted, complicated and involved language, tying itself up in its own repetitions. In particular the sentence stating that the increase in capital is of extraordinary advantage to the worker, because it cheapens the commodity which in the business of production *comes into direct competition with labour*, is sheer nonsense. If a commodity comes into competition with labour, and this commodity (for example, machinery) is cheapened, then the first and immediate result is a fall in wages, and according to Mr. Gladstone this should be “of great benefit to the workers”! How philanthropic it was of some London morning papers, i. e. *The Morning Star*, in their “necessarily bungling” reports, to replace the above incomprehensible

sentence by what Mr. Gladstone probably *wanted* to say, namely that an increase in capital is of benefit to the workers because it cheapens the main articles of consumption!

When Mr. Gladstone said that he should look with some degree of pain and much apprehension at this intoxicating growth if he believed that it was confined to classes in easy circumstances—whether Mr. Gladstone *thought* thereby of another growth of wealth than that of which he *spoke*, namely, in his opinion, of the greatly improved situation of the entire nation; whether he *forgot* at that moment that he was speaking of the increase in income of the classes that pay income tax and of no others: this we cannot know. Marx has been charged with forgery, and what is at issue is the text and the grammatical meaning of what Mr. Gladstone *said*, and not what he possibly *wanted* to say. Mr. Brentano does not know the latter either, and on this point Mr. Gladstone, 27 years later, is no longer a competent authority. And in no way does this concern us.

The abundantly clear meaning of the words is: taxable income has undergone an intoxicating augmentation. I should be very sorry if this augmentation just described were confined to classes of property, but it is confined to them, since the workers have no income liable to tax, and it is thus purely an increase in capital! But the latter, too, is of advantage to the workers, because they, etc.

And now Marx:

“This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... is entirely confined to classes of property.”<sup>a</sup>

Thus runs the sentence in the Inaugural Address, where it provided the occasion for this whole jolly controversy. But since Mr. Brentano has no longer dared to claim that Marx lyingly added it, since then the Inaugural Address has no longer been mentioned at all, and all attacks have been directed against the quotation of this passage in *Capital*. There Marx adds the following sentence:

“but... but it must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, because it cheapens the commodities of general consumption.”

The “arbitrarily thrown-together mosaic of sentences torn from their context” in Marx thus states “materially”, “only formally more contracted”, exactly what the immaculate Hansard has Gladstone say. The only reproach which can be levelled at Marx is that

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 173.—*Ed*

he utilised *The Morning Star* and not Hansard, and thus, in the final sentence, placed words of sense in Mr. Gladstone's mouth, although he had spoken nonsense. Further, according to Hansard<sup>a</sup>:

"But, besides this, a more direct and a larger benefit has, it may safely be asserted, been conferred upon the mass of the people [of the country]. It is a matter of profound and inestimable consolation to reflect, that while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have become less poor. I will not presume to determine whether the wide interval which separates the extremes of wealth and poverty is less or more wide than it has been in former times."

In Marx:

"...while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor. At any rate, whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say."

Marx gives only the two rare positive statements which, in Hansard, swim in a whole tureen of phrases as trivial as they are unctuous. It can be stated with certainty that they lose nothing thereby, but rather gain.

Finally the conclusion, according to Hansard:

"But if we look to the average condition of the British labourer, whether peasant, or miner, or operative, or artisan, we know from varied and indubitable evidence that during the last twenty years such an addition has been made to his means of subsistence as we may almost pronounce to be without example in the history of any country and of any age."

This sentence is quoted in the Inaugural Address a few lines above the "notorious" one just given. There we find:

"Such are the official statements published by order of Parliament in 1864, during the millennium of free trade, at a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House of Commons that:

"The average condition of the British labourer has improved in a degree we know to be extraordinary and unexampled in the history of any country or any age."<sup>b</sup>

Thus everything essential is cited. But that this may be read in the Inaugural Address, original edition, p. 4, this fact is stubbornly concealed from his readers by Mr. Brentano; however, his readers cannot check upon him, for we cannot possibly present each of them with a copy of the Address, as we did Mr. Sedley Taylor.

*Notabene:* In his second reply (Documents, No. 6<sup>c</sup>) Marx only

<sup>a</sup> *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. CLXX, p. 245.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 132.—*Ed*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 144-51.—*Ed*

had to defend the Inaugural Address, since up to then Mr. Brentano had not got the passage in *Capital* into his nagging range. And in his following rejoinder (Documents, No. 7<sup>a</sup>) Mr. Brentano's attack is still directed against the Inaugural Address and Marx's defence of this.

It is only after Marx's death that a new turn comes, and this not through Mr. Brentano but through his Cambridge shield-bearer. Only now is it discovered that in *Capital* Marx suppressed the resonant declarations made by Mr. Gladstone about the unexampled improvement in the condition of the British worker, and that this converted Mr. Gladstone's meaning into the contrary.

And here we have to say that Marx missed the opportunity for a brilliant burst of rhetoric. The whole section in the introduction to which this speech by Gladstone is quoted has the purpose of furnishing evidence that the condition of the great majority of the British working class was straitened and unworthy, just at the time of this intoxicating augmentation of wealth. What a magnificent contrast Gladstone's selfsame pompous words about the happy condition of the British working class, [a condition] unexampled in the history of any country and any age, would have provided to this evidence of mass poverty, drawn from the official publications of Parliament itself!

But if Marx wished to refrain from such a rhetorical effect, he had no reason to quote these words of Gladstone's. Firstly, they are nothing but the standard phrases which every British Chancellor of the Exchequer believes it to be his moral duty to repeat in good or even in tolerable business periods; they are thus meaningless. And secondly, Gladstone himself retracted them within a year; in his next budget speech of April 7, 1864, at a time of even greater industrial prosperity, he spoke of masses "on the border of pauperism", and of branches of business "in which wages have not increased", and proclaimed—according to Hansard:

"Again, and yet more at large, what is human life, but, in the great majority of cases, a struggle for existence?"\*

\* And here some more from this speech, according to Hansard: the number of paupers had fallen to 840,000. "That amount, however, does not include persons who are dependent upon charitable establishments; or who are relieved by private almsgiving... But, besides all those whom it comprises, think of those who are on the borders of that region, think how many of the labouring classes are struggling manfully but with difficulty to maintain themselves in a position above the place of

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 152-54.—*Ed.*

But Marx quotes this other budget speech of Gladstone's immediately after that of 1863, and if Mr. Gladstone himself, on April 7, 1864, declared that the unexampled blessings were non-existent, those blessings for the existence of which he had possessed "varied and indubitable evidence", then for Marx there was no longer the slightest shadow of a reason to quote these vivacious protestations, which were unfortunately ephemeral, even for Mr. Gladstone. He could content himself with the speaker's admissions that while the incomes of 150 pounds sterling and over had augmented intoxicatingly, the poor had in any case become less poor, and that the interval between extreme wealth and extreme poverty had scarcely been reduced.

We shall not comment on the fact that it is the habit of the official German economists to quote Marx in sentences torn from context. If he had created a hullabaloo in every such case, as Mr. Brentano has done here, he would never have been finished.

But now let us examine more closely the unexampled augmentation of the means of subsistence enjoyed at that time by the British labourer, peasant or miner, artisan or operative.

The *peasant* is in England and the greater part of Scotland only an agricultural day labourer. In 1861 there were a total of 1,098,261 such peasants, of whom 204,962 lived as farmhands on tenant farms.\* From 1849 to 1859 his money wage had increased by 1 shilling, in a few cases by 2 shillings a week, but in the final analysis this was mostly only a nominal increase. His position in 1863, the really abject housing conditions under which he lived, are described by Dr. Hunter (Public Health, VII Report, 1864):

"The costs occasioned by the agricultural labourer are fixed at the lowest figure at which he can live."

paupers." In the congregation of a clergyman in the East End of London, 12,000 out of 13,000 souls were always on the verge of actual want; a well-known philanthropist had declared that there were whole districts in the East End of London in which you cannot find an omnibus or a cab, in which there is no street music, nor even a street beggar... The means to wage the struggle for existence were, however, *somewhat better than previously* (!) ... In many places wages had increased, but in many others they had not, etc. And this jeremiad came just one year after the pompous announcement of the "unexampled" improvement!

\* The figures are taken partly from the census of 1861, partly from the report of the CHILDREN'S EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION, 1863-1867.<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> *Census of England and Wales for the year 1861*, London, 1863; *Children's Employment Commission (1862), Report (I-VI) of the Commissioners*, London, 1863.—Ed.



According to the same report, the food intake of a part of the day labourers' families (particularly in eight named counties) was below the absolute minimum necessary to avert starvation diseases. And Professor Thorold Rogers, a political supporter of Gladstone, declared in 1866 (*A History of Agriculture and Prices*) that the agricultural day labourer had once again become a serf, and, as he demonstrated at length, a poorly fed and poorly housed serf, much worse off than his ancestor at the time of Arthur Young (1770 to 1780), and incomparably worse than the day labourer in the 14th and 15th centuries. So Gladstone had no luck at all with the "peasants".

But how about the "miner"? On this we have the parliamentary report of 1866.<sup>a</sup> In 1861, 565,875 miners were working in the United Kingdom, 246,613 of them in coal mines. In the latter the wages of the men had risen slightly, and they mostly did an eight-hour shift, while the youngsters had to work 14 to 15 hours. Mine inspection was just a farce: there were 12 inspectors for 3,217 mines! The result was that the lives of the miners were sacrificed wholesale in largely avoidable explosions; the mine-owners compensated themselves in general for the small wage increases by wage deductions based on false weights and measures. In the ore mines, according to the report of the ROYAL COMMISSION of 1864, conditions were still worse.

But the "artisan"? Let us take the metalworkers, altogether 396,998. Of these, some 70,000 to 80,000 were machine fitters, and their situation was in fact good, thanks to the toughness of their old, strong and rich trade association. For the other metalworkers too, provided full physical strength and skill were called for, a certain improvement had taken place, as was natural with business having again become better since 1859 and 1860. In contrast, the situation of the women and children also employed (10,000 women and 30,000 under 18 in Birmingham and district alone) was miserable enough, and that of the nail makers (26,130) and chain makers miserable in the extreme.

In the textile industry, the 456,646 cotton spinners and weavers, and with them 12,556 calico printers, are decisive. And they must have been very surprised to hear of this unexampled happiness—in April 1863, at the height of the cotton famine and the American Civil War, at the time (October 1862) when 60 per cent of the spindles and 58 per cent of the looms stood idle, and the

---

<sup>a</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Mines...* Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be printed, 23 July, 1866.—*Ed.*

remainder were only working 2-3 days a week; when over 50,000 cotton operatives, individually or with families, were supported by the Poor Law or the relief committee and (in March 1863) 135,625 were employed by the same committee at starvation wages on public works or in sewing schools! (Watts, *The Facts of the Cotton Famine*, 1866, p. 211.)—The other textile operatives, particularly in the wool and linen branches, were relatively prosperous; the lack of cotton increased their employment.

The reports of the CHILDREN'S EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION give us the best information on how things looked in a number of smaller branches of business: hosiery—120,000 workers, of whom only 4,000 were protected by the Factory Act, amongst the others many quite young children, colossally overworked; lace-making and dressing, mostly cottage industry—of 150,000 workers only 10,000 protected by the Factory Act, colossal overworking of children and girls; straw-plaiting and straw-hat-making—40,000, almost all children, disgustingly slave-driven; finally the manufacture of clothing and shoes, employing 370,218 female workers for outerwear and millinery, 380,716 ditto for underwear and—in England and Wales alone—573,380 male workers, including 273,223 shoemakers and 146,042 tailors, of whom between  $\frac{1}{5}$  and  $\frac{1}{4}$  were under 20. Of these  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million, a maximum of 30 per cent of the men were passably off, working for private customers. The rest were exposed, as in all the branches of business mentioned in this paragraph, to exploitation through middle men, factors, agents, SWEATERS as they are called in England, and this alone describes their lot: terrible overwork for a wretched wage.

Things were no better with the “unexampled” fortune of the workers in paper-making (100,000 workers, half women), pottery (29,000), hat-making (15,000 in England alone), the glass industry (15,000), book printing (35,000), artificial flower-making (11,000), etc., etc.

In short, the CHILDREN'S EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION demanded that no fewer than 1,400,000 women, young people and children should be placed under the protection of the Factory Act, in order to guard them from mostly ruinous overwork.

And finally the number of PAUPERS dependent upon poor relief from public funds in 1863: 1,079,382.

On this basis we may make an unofficial list of those workers unquestionably very badly off in 1863: agricultural day labourers in round figures 1,100,000; cotton operatives 469,000; seamstresses and milliners 751,000; tailors and shoemakers, after the

deduction of 30%, 401,000; lace-makers 150,000; paper-makers 100,000; hosiery workers 120,000; smaller branches investigated by the CHILDREN'S EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION 189,000; and finally PAUPERS 1,079,000. Together 4,549,000 workers, added to which, in some cases, their family members.

And 1863 was a *good* business year. The crisis of 1857 had been fully overcome, demand was rising rapidly, with the exception of the cotton industry nearly all branches of business were very busy. So where is the "unexampled" improvement to be found?

The factory legislation of the forties had decisively improved the lot of those workers subject to it. But in 1863 this benefitted only the workers employed in wool, linen and silk, altogether about 270,000, while the cotton operatives were starving. For bleaching workers and dye workers, legal protection existed only on paper. Further: in branches of work in which full male strength and sometimes dexterity are indispensable, the resistance of the workers, organised in trade associations, had forced through for themselves a share of the proceeds of the favourable business period, and it may be said that on the average for *these* branches of work, involving heavy male labour, the living standard of the workers had risen decisively, though it is still ridiculous to describe this improvement as "unexampled". But while the great mass of productive work has been transferred to machines operated by weaker men, by women and young workers, the politicians like to treat the strong men employed in heavy work as the only workers, and to judge the whole working class according to their standard.

Against the 4½ million worse-off workers and PAUPERS detailed above, we have, as well-off, 270,000 textile workers in wool, linen and silk. Further we may assume that of the 376,000 metal workers one third were well-off, one third middling, and only the last third, including the workers under 18, the nail-makers, chain-smiths, and women, were badly off. We may classify the situation of the 566,000 miners as medium-good. The situation of the building craftsmen may be considered as good, apart from those in the cotton districts. Amongst the joiners, at most ⅓ were well-off, the great mass worked for blood-sucking SWEATERS. Amongst the railway employees there was already at that period colossal overworking, which has only brought about organised resistance in the last 20 years. In short, we may add together in total scarcely one million of whom we may say that their situation had improved in relation to the improvement in the business and the profits of the capitalists; what remains over is in a middling situation, has a few, on the whole insignificant, benefits from the better business

period, or consists of such a mixture of working people according to sex and age that the improvements for the men are offset by the overworking of the women and young workers.

And if this should not suffice, then one should consult the "Reports on PUBLIC HEALTH" which became necessary precisely because the "unexampled" improvement for the working class in the 20 years up to 1863 showed itself as typhus, cholera and other jolly epidemics, which finally spread from the working-class quarters to the genteel areas of the cities. Here the unexampled "augmentation of the means of subsistence" of the British worker is investigated with respect to housing and food, and it is found that in many cases his dwelling was simply a centre of infection, and his nourishment was on the borderline, or even beneath the border at which starvation diseases necessarily occur.

This was the real condition of the British working class at the beginning of 1863. This was the face of the "unexampled" improvement for the working class of which Mr. Gladstone boasted. And if Marx is to be blamed for anything, it is that he did Mr. Gladstone an unearned service by omitting his bragging statement.

---

Conclusion: Firstly, Marx "lyingly added" nothing.

Secondly, he "suppressed" nothing about which Mr. Gladstone might have a right to complain.

And thirdly, the octopus-like tenacity with which Mr. Brentano and his companions cling to this single quotation amongst the many thousands of quotations in Marx's writing proves that they know only too well "how Karl Marx quotes"—namely correctly.

## DOCUMENTS

## I

## THE INCRIMINATED QUOTATIONS

No. 1. THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS<sup>a</sup>

The original edition is entitled: \* "Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association, established September 28, 1864, at a Public Meeting held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London." Price one penny. Printed at the "Bee-Hive" Newspaper Office, 10, Bolt Court, Fleet Street, 1864.\* The address begins: "It is a great fact that the misery of the working masses has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled for the development of its industry and the growth of its commerce." By way of proof, facts are quoted from the *PUBLIC HEALTH Reports* about the poor nutrition of various groups of urban workers and agricultural day labourers in the country. It then continues:

\* "Such are the official statements published by order of Parliament in 1864, during the millennium of free trade, at a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House of Commons that

"the average condition of the British labourer has improved in a degree we know to be extraordinary and unexampled in the history of any country or any age."

"Upon these official congratulations jars the dry remark of the official *Public Health Report*:

"The public health of a country means the health of its masses, and the masses will scarcely be healthy unless, to their very base, they be at least moderately prosperous."

"Dazzled by the 'Progress of the Nation' statistics dancing before his eyes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims in wild ecstasy:

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 5-13.—*Ed.*

“From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent; in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has increased from the basis taken in 1853, 20 per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible!... This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power,’ adds Mr. Gladstone, ‘is entirely confined to classes of property.’”\*

In German translation<sup>a</sup>:

No. 2. CAPITAL

MARX: CAPITAL, VOLUME I, 3RD EDITION, PP. 670-672<sup>b</sup>

After these few examples one understands the cry of triumph of the Registrar-General<sup>139</sup> of the British people:

“Rapidly as the population has increased, it has not kept pace with the progress of industry and wealth.”<sup>101)</sup>

Let us turn now to the direct agents of this industry, or the producers of this wealth, to the working class.

“It is one of the most melancholy features in the social state of this country,” says Gladstone, “that while there was a decrease in the consuming power of the people, and while there was an increase in the privations and distress of the labouring class and operatives, there was at the same time a constant accumulation of wealth in the upper classes, and a constant increase of capital.”<sup>102)</sup>

Thus spoke this unctuous minister in the House of Commons of February 13th, 1843. On April 16th, 1863, 20 years later, in the speech in which he introduced his Budget:

“From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent.... In the 8 years from 1853 to 1861, it had increased from the basis taken in 1853, by 20 per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible ... this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... entirely confined to classes of property ... must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population because it cheapens the commodities of general consumption. While the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor. At any rate, whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say.”<sup>103)</sup>

<sup>101)</sup> “Census, etc.,” l. c. p. 11.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>102)</sup> Gladstone in the House of Commons, February 13, 1843. [Further follows the English text of the speech.—*Ed.*]

<sup>103)</sup> [The English text of the speech is quoted.—*Ed.*] Gladstone in the HOUSE OF COMMONS, April 16, 1863.

<sup>a</sup> In the original there follows the German translation of the preceding six paragraphs.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VII, Chapter XXV, Section 5(a) (present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Here, in the extract from *Capital*, Marx’s notes are numbered according to the third German edition.—*Ed.*

How lame an anti-climax! If the working class has remained "poor", only "less poor" in proportion as it produces for the wealthy class "an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power", then it has remained relatively just as poor. If the extremes of poverty have not lessened, they have increased, because the extremes of wealth have. As to the cheapening of the means of subsistence, the official statistics, e. g. the accounts of the LONDON ORPHAN ASYLUM, show an increase in price of 20% for the average of the three years 1860-1862, compared with 1851-1853. In the following three years, 1863-1865, there was a progressive rise in the price of meat, butter, milk, sugar, salt, coals, and a number of other necessary means of subsistence.<sup>104)</sup> Gladstone's next budget speech of April 7th, 1864, is a Pindaric dithyrambus on the advance of surplus-value-making and the happiness of the people "tempered by poverty". He speaks of masses "on the border of pauperism", of branches of trade in which "wages have not increased", and finally sums up the happiness of the working-class in the words: "human life is but, in nine cases out of ten, a struggle for existence".<sup>105)</sup> Professor Fawcett, not bound like Gladstone by official considerations, declares roundly:

"I do not, of course, deny that money wages have been augmented by this increase of capital" (in the last ten years), "but this apparent advantage is to a great extent lost, because many of the necessaries of life are becoming dearer" (he believes because of the fall in value of the precious metals) "...THE RICH GROW RAPIDLY RICHER, whilst there is no perceptible advance in the comfort enjoyed by the industrial classes.... They (the labourers) become almost the slaves of the tradesman, to whom they owe money."<sup>106)</sup>

<sup>104)</sup> See the official accounts in the Blue book: "MISCELLANEOUS STATISTICS OF THE UN. KINGDOM", PART VI, LONDON, 1866, pp. 260-273, passim. An addition to the second edition. Instead of the statistics of orphan asylums &c., the declamations of the ministerial journals in recommending dowries for the Royal children might also serve. The greater dearness of the means of subsistence is never forgotten there.

<sup>105)</sup> "THINK OF THOSE, WHO ARE ON THE BORDER OF THAT REGION (PAUPERISM)", "WAGES ... IN OTHERS NOT INCREASED ... HUMAN LIFE IS BUT, IN NINE CASES OUT OF TEN, A STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE." (Gladstone, HOUSE OF COMMONS, 7th April, 1864). The continual crying contradictions in Gladstone's budget speeches of 1863 and 1864 were characterised by an English writer by the following quotation from Molière:<sup>140)</sup>

"Voilà l'homme en effet. Il va du blanc au noir.  
Il condamne au matin ses sentiments du soir.  
Importun à tout autre, à soi même incommode,  
Il change à tous moments d'esprit comme de mode."

(*The Theory of the Exchanges etc.*, London, 1864, p. 135).

<sup>106)</sup> H. Fawcett, l. c., [*The Economic Position of the British Labourer*] pp. 67-68. As to the increasing dependence of labourers on the retail shopkeepers, this is the consequence of the frequent oscillations and interruptions of their employment.

## II

## BRENTANO AND MARX

## No. 3. THE CHARGE

CONCORDIA, No. 10, MARCH 7, 1872

*How Karl Marx Quotes*

The following passage may be found in the Inaugural Address\* of the International Working Men's Association written by Karl Marx.

"Dazzled by the 'Progress of the Nation' statistics dancing before his eyes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims in wild ecstasy: 'From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent; in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has increased from the basis taken in 1853, 20 per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible!... *This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power,*' **adds Mr. Gladstone,** '*is entirely confined to classes of property.*'"

This quotation by Marx has become famous. We have discovered it in a considerable number of writings. However, the authors rarely quoted the Inaugural Address of the International as the source upon which they had drawn. They inferred that they had themselves read Gladstone's budget speech. To what extent this was the case may be seen from the following comparison with Gladstone's speech (see Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Series, Vol. 170, p. 243 ff.):

"The Income Tax, at 7d. in the pound, in the year 1842-3, attaching to Great Britain only, and in Great Britain only to incomes of £150 and upwards, was assessed upon an aggregate amount of income in the schedules I have named reaching £156,000,000. Upon the very same area, with the same limitations, in 1860-1 the amount of assessed income was £221,000,000. Further, I am not aware that there has been any change in the machinery of the tax, or any improvement in the powers of levying the tax, as compared with the powers of escaping it, that will in any way account for the difference. On the contrary, certain concessions and relaxations have from time to time been enacted by the Legislature, which, as far as they go, would rather tell in the opposite direction. The difference, however, amounts to no less than £65,000,000 of annual income, or two-sevenths of the whole annual taxable income of the country within the area described. That is a most remarkable result; but there is a certain feature of that result which, when carefully examined, is yet more remarkable; and that is the accelerated rate of increase in the latter portion of that period. I again invite the attention of the Committee for a few minutes. I compare two periods—one of them before 1853, and the other since 1853, the year when the basis was altered. In ten years from

\* Reprinted in the *Volksstaat*, No. 5 of January 17, 1872. [Note by Brentano.]



1842 to 1852 inclusive, the liable to tax income of the country, as nearly as we can make out, increased by 6 per cent; but in eight years, from 1853 to 1861, the income of the country again increased upon the basis taken by 20 per cent. That is a fact so singular and striking as to seem almost incredible. [...]

"Such, Sir, is the state of the case as regards the general progress of accumulation; but, for one, *I must say that I should look with some degree of pain, and with much apprehension, upon this extraordinary and almost intoxicating growth, if it were my belief that it is confined to the class of persons who may be described as in easy circumstances.* The figures which I have quoted take little or no cognizance of the condition of those who do not pay income tax; or, in other words, sufficiently accurate for general truth, they do not take cognizance of the property of the labouring population, or of the increase of its income. Indirectly, indeed, the mere augmentation of capital is of the utmost advantage to the labouring class, because that augmentation cheapens the commodity which in the whole business of production comes into direct competition with labour. *But, besides this, a more direct and a larger benefit has, it may safely be asserted, been conferred upon the mass of the people of the country. It is matter of profound and inestimable consolation to reflect, that while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have become less poor.* I will not presume to determine whether the wide interval which separates the extremes of wealth and poverty is less or more wide than it has been in former times. *But if we look to the average condition of the British labourer, whether peasant, or miner, or operative, or artisan, we know from varied and indubitable evidence that during the last twenty years such an addition has been made to his means of subsistence as we may almost pronounce to be without example in the history of any country and of any age.*"

What is the relationship between this speech and the quotation by Marx? Gladstone first makes the point that there has undoubtedly been a colossal increase in the income of the country. This is proved for him by the income tax. But income tax takes notice only of incomes of 150 pounds sterling and over. Persons with lower incomes pay no income tax in England. The fact that Gladstone mentions this so that his yardstick can be properly appreciated is utilised by Marx to have Gladstone say: "*This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property.*" Yet this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone's speech. It says quite the opposite. **Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content!**

No. 4. KARL MARX'S REPLY<sup>a</sup>

DER VOLKSSTAAT, No. 44, SATURDAY, JUNE 1, 1872

A friend<sup>b</sup> has sent me, from Germany, *Concordia. Zeitschrift für die Arbeiterfrage*, No. 10, dated March 7, in which this "organ of the German Manufacturers' Association" publishes an editorial entitled "*How Karl Marx Quotes*".

In the Inaugural Address of the International Working Men's Association I quote, amongst other material, a portion of

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 164-67.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> W. Liebknecht.—*Ed*

Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863, which is not contained in Hansard's semi-official report of parliamentary debates. On this basis, with comfortable manufacturers' logic the *Concordia* concludes: "This sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone's speech", and jubilates in the fullness of its heart with this mocking sentence in manufacturers' German, printed in mocking bold face:

**"Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content!"**

It would, in fact, be extremely strange if the Inaugural Address, originally printed in English in London under Gladstone's very eyes, had placed in his mouth a sentence interpolated by me, a sentence that, for seven and a half years, circulated unchallenged in the London press, to be finally detected by the "learned men" of the German Manufacturers' Association in Berlin.

The sentence in question of the Inaugural Address reads as follows:

\*"This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property" (p. 6, Inaugural Address etc.).\* (In the German translation literally:<sup>a</sup>)

In an article in *The Fortnightly Review* (November 1870), which attracted great attention and was discussed by all the London press, Mr. Beesly, Professor of History at the university here, quoted as follows, p. 518:

\*"An intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, as Mr. Gladstone observed, entirely confined to classes of property."\* (In the German translation:<sup>a</sup>)

Yet Professor Beesly's article appeared six years later than the Inaugural Address! Good! Let us now take a specialised publication, intended solely for the City and published not only *before* the appearance of the *Inaugural Address*, but even *before the International Working Men's Association was founded*. It is entitled: *The Theory of Exchanges. The Bank Charter Act of 1844*. London 1864, published by T. Cautley Newby, 30, Welbeck Street. It examines Gladstone's budget speech at length and p. 134 gives the following quotation from this speech:

\*"This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property."\* (In the German translation:<sup>a</sup>)

That is, word for word, exactly what I quoted.

This proves irrefutably that the German Manufacturers' Associa-

---

<sup>a</sup> Further there follows the German translation of the sentence.—Ed.

tion “*lied both in form and in content*” in decrying this “sentence” as a fabrication “by me”!

Incidentally: honest old *Concordia* printed in bold face another passage, in which Gladstone prattled about an elevation of the English working class, over the last 20 years, that was supposedly “extraordinary and unparalleled in all countries and in all periods”. The bold-face type is supposed to indicate that I had suppressed this passage. On the contrary! In the Inaugural Address I emphasised most strongly the screaming contrast between this shameless phrase and the “*APPALLING STATISTICS*”; as Professor Beesly rightly calls them, contained in the official English reports on the same period.\*

The author of *The Theory of the Exchanges*<sup>b</sup> quoted, like myself, not from Hansard, but from a London newspaper which, on April 17, published the April 16 budget speech. In my collectanea of cuttings for 1863, I have searched in vain for the relevant extract and thus, also, for the name of the newspaper that published it. This is, however, not important. Although the parliamentary reports of the London newspapers always differ from one another, I was certain that none of them could completely suppress such a striking quotation from Gladstone. So I consulted *The Times* of April 17, 1863—it was then, as now, Gladstone’s organ—and there I found, on p. 7, column 5, in the report on the budget speech:

\* “That is the state of the case as regards the *wealth of this country*. I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon *this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*, if it were my belief that it was confined to *classes who are in easy circumstances*.\*\* This takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. *The augmentation I have described*, and which is founded, I think, upon accurate returns, *is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property*.”\*

In the German translation:<sup>d</sup>

So, on April 16, 1863, Mr. Gladstone declared “*both in form and in content*” in the House of Commons, as reported in his own

\* Other whimsical apologetics from the same speech are dealt with in my work *Capital* (p. 638, 639).<sup>a</sup>

\*\* The words “*EASY CLASSES*”, “*CLASSES IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES*” were apparently first introduced by Wakefield for the really rich portion of the propertied class.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VII, Chapter XXV, Section 5(a) (present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Henry Roy.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> [E. G. Wakefield,] *England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations*, Vol. I-II, London, 1833.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Further there follows Marx’s translation into German: “So steht’s mit dem *Reichtum dieses Landes*. Ich für meinen Teil würde beinahe mit Besorgnis und mit Pein

organ, *The Times*, on April 17, 1863 that “*this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property*”, and his apprehension gives him a sort of shiver, but only because of his scruples that this was confined to one part of this class, the part in really easy circumstances.

*Italiam, Italiam!*<sup>a</sup> Finally we arrive at *Hansard*. In its edition, here botchily corrected, Mr. Gladstone was bright enough clumsily to excise the passage that would be, after all, compromising on the lips of an English Chancellor of the Exchequer. This is, incidentally, traditional English parliamentary practice, and by no means the invention of little Lasker versus Bebel.<sup>141</sup> A careful comparison of Gladstone’s speech itself, as it appeared in *The Times*, and its subsequent form, as distorted by the same Gladstone, would provide an amusing description of this unctuous, phrase-mongering, quibbling and strictly-religious bourgeois hero, who timidly displays his piousness and his liberal “ATTITUDES OF MIND”.

One of the most infuriating things in my work *Capital* consists in the masses of official proof describing how manufacturers work, something in which no scholar could previously find a thing wrong. In the form of a rumour this even reached the ears of the gentlemen of the German Manufacturers’ Association, but they thought:

“Was kein Verstand der Verständigen sieht,  
Das übet in Einfalt ein kindlich’ Gemüt.”<sup>b</sup>

No sooner said than done. They find a suspicious-looking quotation in the Inaugural Address and turn for information to a business friend in London, the first best Mundella, and he, being a manufacturer himself, rushes to despatch overseas, in black and white, the extract from *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates*. Now they have my fabrication secret. I manufacture not only the text, but the quotations too. Drunk with victory, they trumpet out to the world “*How Karl Marx Quotes!*” So my wares were discredited,

auf diese berauschende Vermehrung von Reichtum und Macht blicken, wenn ich sie auf die wohlhabenden Klassen beschränkt glaubte. Es ist hier gar keine Notiz genommen von der arbeitenden Bevölkerung. Die Vermehrung, die ich beschrieben habe” (which he has just described as “diese berauschende Vermehrung von Reichtum und Macht” [“*this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*”]) “ist ganz und gar beschränkt auf Eigentumsklassen.”—Ed.

<sup>a</sup> Virgil, *Aeneid*, III.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> “What the knowledge of the knowing cannot find,  
May be seen by an innocent childish mind.”

Fr. Schiller, *Die Worte des Glaubens*.—Ed.

once and for all, and, as is fitting for manufacturers, in the way of normal business, without the expense of learned men.

The irksome subsequent events will perhaps teach the Manufacturing Associates that, however well they may know how to forge goods, they are as well fitted to judge literary goods as a donkey is to play the lute.

London, May 23, 1872

*Karl Marx*

No. 5. RETORT BY ANONYMOUS

CONCORDIA, No. 27, JULY 4, 1872

### HOW KARL MARX DEFENDS HIMSELF

#### I

Our readers will perhaps recall the article "How Karl Marx Quotes" in No. 10 of this paper on March 7 this year. In it we dealt with a passage from the Inaugural Address of the International, written by Karl Marx, a passage which has won a certain fame and is frequently quoted by the Social Democrats as convincing proof of the irrevocable ruin of the working class should the state and social conditions of today persist. Here Marx quotes Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863. In this speech Gladstone first notes that there has been "an extraordinary and almost intoxicating growth" of the income of the country, and he uses the increase in income tax [revenue] to prove this. But the figures he quotes for this purpose "take little or no cognizance of the condition of those who do not pay income tax"; they "do not take cognizance of the property of the labouring population, or of the increase of its income". Persons with an income under 150 pounds sterling, in fact, pay no income tax in England. And the fact that Gladstone had mentioned this to allow a proper appreciation of his yardstick was utilised by Marx in order to have Gladstone say: "This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property." However, this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone's speech. On the contrary, Gladstone said that he did *not* believe this augmentation "had been confined to the class of persons who may be described as in easy circumstances". And indignant at the impudence with which Marx quoted distortingly, we exclaimed: "Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content!"

This was a serious charge; combined with the convincing evidence provided, it was absolutely devastating for the widespread trust amongst our Social Democrats in the unparalleled and thorough learnedness, truthfulness and infallibility of the London oracle. It could therefore not be allowed to pass without a refutation, or at least something which looked like a refutation. In number 44 of the *Volksstaat* dated June 1,\* Marx attempted to give such a refutation.<sup>a</sup> But our opponent has

\* That is almost a full three months after the article appeared in the *Concordia*. Despite this, the *Volksstaat* was impudent enough scarcely 14 days after carrying

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 136-40.—*Ed*

by no means been able to wash himself clean of the charge of *mala fides* in his quotations. In fact, the ways and means of his defence are more suitable than anything to prove his *mala fides*. The brazenness, namely, with which he once again abuses the fact that the readers of the *Volksstaat* have no possibility of checking his claims, this brazenness even exceeds his frivolity in quotation.

Marx naturally does not go so far as to challenge the correctness of our quotation from the shorthand report of Parliament. His immediate aim is to prove his *bona fides* in quotation, and to this end he refers to the fact that others have quoted like he did. He writes:

"In an article in *The Fortnightly Review* (November 1870),<sup>a</sup> which attracted great attention and was discussed by all the London press, Mr. Beesly, Professor of History at the university here, quoted as follows, p. 518: 'An intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, as Mr. Gladstone observed, entirely confined to classes of property.'—Yet Professor Beesly's article appeared six years later than the Inaugural Address!"

Quite right! Only the addition of another "yet" has been forgotten. This article by Professor Beesly deals, in fact, with the history of the International, and as the author himself informs every enquirer, was written on the basis of material provided him by Marx. And there is still more. At this point it is not Beesly who is quoting Gladstone at all; he is merely saying that the Inaugural Address of the International contains this quotation. "From this alarming statistics," Beesly writes, "the *Address* turns to the income-tax returns, which show that the taxable incomes of the country have increased by 20% in eight years, 'an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power', as Mr. Gladstone observed, entirely confined" etc.—A fine way of proof indeed! You trick some person who does not know your dishonesty into accepting a lying statement; this person repeats it in good faith; and then you cite this and the honesty of the person who repeated the statement in order to prove the correctness of the statement and your own honesty.—Marx continues his defence:

"Let us now take a specialised publication, intended solely for the City and published not only before the appearance of the Inaugural Address, but even before International Working Men's Association was founded. It is entitled: *The Theory of Exchanges. The Bank Charter Act of 1844*, London 1864, published by T. Cautley Newby, 30, Welbeck Street. It examines Gladstone's budget speech at length and p. 134 gives the following quotation from this speech: 'This intoxicating augmentation' etc., that is, word for word, exactly what I quoted.—This proves irrefutably that the German Manufacturers' Association 'lied in form' in decrying this 'sentence' as a fabrication 'by me'!... The author of *The Theory of the Exchanges*,"<sup>b</sup> Marx then continued, "quoted, like myself, not from Hansard, but

Marx's rebuttal to accuse us of "heroically silencing" this rebuttal. We believe that the *Volksstaat* had no reason to press so hard for the second, and sharper, treatment of its lord and master. Incidentally, the reason for the delay in our reply is partly due to the fact that one of the sources cited by Marx was not available here and had to be obtained from England, partly to the fact that the elucidation of this quotation demanded lengthy extracts from the relevant sources and consequently the above article became unusually long, so that, for reasons of space, we were obliged to postpone publication several times. *The editors of the "Concordia"*.

<sup>a</sup> E. S. Beesly, "The International Working Men's Association", *The Fortnightly Review*, No. XLVII, November 1, 1870.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> Henry Roy.—*Ed*

from a London newspaper which, on April 17, published the April 16 budget speech."

And in fact the author of this book, which incidentally is a vulgar diatribe, quoted from Hansard just as little as did Marx. But Marx, as we shall soon show, also did not even quote from a London newspaper. First, however, it must be noted here that when we stated that Marx had lyingly added the sentence in question to Gladstone's speech, we did not claim, either "in form or in content", that he himself had also fabricated it. This would only be the case if Marx himself had been the fabricator of that still very obscure book, though one might be tempted to believe this on account of the ghastly style in which it is written. The source from which Marx quotes this sentence is actually this book itself, and this is also the reason why, as he claims in his "collectanea of cuttings for 1863", he has "searched in vain for the relevant extract and thus, also, for the name of the newspaper that published it"! This origin of Marx's quotation is shown clearly by a comparison of the passage in *Capital*, his book in which Marx reviews Gladstone's budget speech, and *The Theory of the Exchanges*. There, on p. 639, particularly in Note 103,<sup>a</sup> this speech is quoted in the absolutely senseless version given verbatim by that book on p. 134. And the glosses too, which Marx bases on the contradiction contained in this version, are already contained in that book, in particular also the quotation from Molière given in Note 105 on p. 640 of *Capital*<sup>b</sup>; and in the same way the statement of the LONDON ORPHAN ASYLUM about the rising prices of foodstuffs quoted by Marx appears on p. 135 of that book, though Marx bases his claim for its correctness not on that book, but on that book's sources (see *Capital*, p. 640, Note 104).<sup>c</sup>

Now we ask; does anyone tell a lie only when he himself invents an untruth, or does he not tell a lie quite as much when he repeats it contrary to what he knows, or is bound to know better? We believe that the answer is beyond doubt. And secondly, when Marx repeated the untruth contained in *The Theory of the Exchanges*, did he not do this contrary to his better knowledge, or should he at least not have known better? The answer here is also simple. The first rule for any interpretation, a rule undoubtedly known to Mr. Marx, is to interpret passages which at first glance contain contradictions—and thus make no sense—in such a way that the contradiction disappears; and if the available text appears to make this impossible, one should make a textual criticism rather than believe in the presence of a contradiction. And this was all the more imperative in the case of a speech which aroused the interest and admiration of the entire educated world, notably through its mastery of the material and its clarity. And finally it was an act of frivolity bordering upon the criminal to act in any other way than scrupulously when intending to tear out of context a passage which provides one half of the contradiction in this version and to cast it as a denunciation of the propertied amongst the propertyless all over the world. Karl Marx should have taken umbrage at this version if only on the basis of general learning, science and conscientiousness; and the criminal frivolity with which he accepts this lying quotation is completely inexcusable in his case, since the full text of Gladstone's speech was available to him. On the one hand, the English newspapers reproduced this speech the day after it was delivered, and, if not true to the word, then true to the sense. And then, immediately after the delivery of the speech, Gladstone published it verbatim in his book *Financial Statements*, London, 1863, which attracted great

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 133.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 134.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

attention; and on p. 403 of that book the speech is printed just as we quoted it. Finally, Marx could refer to the shorthand report of this speech in *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, and it is the custom to always quote a speech to Parliament from the shorthand report, even if it contains no contradictions to the necessarily bungling newspaper reports.

But here we come, to be sure, to Marx's third line of defence, and this far exceeds, in its impudent mendacity, anything which came before. Marx actually does not shrink from citing *The Times* of April 17, 1863 as proof of the correctness of his quotation. *The Times* of April 17, 1863, p. 7, col. 5, line 17ff, reports, however, the speech as follows:

"That is the state of the case as regards the wealth of this country. **I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, if it were my belief that it was confined to classes finding themselves in pleasant circumstances.** This takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation I have described, *and the figures of which are based, I think, upon accurate returns,\** is entirely confined to classes of property." (Marx quotes *The Times* to this point; we quote further.) "Now, the augmentation of capital is of indirect benefit to the labourer, because it cheapens the commodity which in the business of production comes into direct competition with labour. (*Hear, hear!*) But we have this profound, and, I must say, inestimable consolation, that, while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor.—Whether the extremes of poverty are less extreme than they were I do not presume to say, *but the average condition of the British labourer, we have the happiness to know, has improved during the last 20 years in a degree which we know to be extraordinary, and which we may almost pronounce to be unexampled in the history of any country and of any age. (Cheers.)*"

A comparison of this *Times* report with the report after Hansard in the *Concordia* of March 7 will show that both reports fully coincide materially. The report in *The Times* just gives, formally more contracted, what the shorthand report by Hansard gives verbatim. Yet despite the fact that the *Times* report contains the direct opposite of that notorious passage in the Inaugural Address, and the fact that according to the *Times* report, too, Mr. Gladstone said he believed this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power *not* to be confined to classes in easy circumstances, Marx has the impudence to write in the *Volksstaat* of June 1:

"So, on April 16, 1863, Mr. Gladstone declared 'both in form and in content' that 'this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property'."

But even more. Since we had already presented to the public the complete text of the speech from Hansard, and this text completely excluded the possibility of any distortion, an attempt is made to delete this very embarrassing circumstance with the phrase in the Hansard "edition, here botchily corrected, Mr. Gladstone

\* In his German quotation in the *Volksstaat* Marx omits this relative clause and instead inserts: "which he" (Gladstone) "had just described as 'this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power.'" This omission and this insertion too are designed to mislead the reader about the sense of Gladstone's words. The omitted relative clause and in addition the general context show that the sense of the speech is as follows: The augmentation of wealth shown by the income tax returns is certainly confined to the classes of property (since this tax is only imposed upon persons with an income of 150 pounds sterling and over), but with regard to the labouring class, we know, etc. [*Note by Brentano.*]



was bright enough clumsily to excise the passage that would be, after all, compromising on the lips of an English Chancellor of the Exchequer"! All that is lacking is the claim that Gladstone probably did this in deference to the diatribe *The Theory of the Exchanges*, which did not appear until 1864!

What can one say about such methods? First we are presented, on the basis of an obscure diatribe, with a quotation which was completely forged, and the contradictory substance of which proved that it was forged, even without confronting it with the original. Called to account in this matter, Marx states that others quoted in the same way as he did, and refers to people whom he himself fooled with this lie. Even more: from the fact that his fuzzy sources accord with him, he tries to fashion an argument to excuse himself and show the correctness of his quotation, as though both of them had drawn upon a joint, correct, third source, though in fact one had only copied from the other. And finally he has the impudence to base himself on newspaper reports which directly contradict him. Indeed, to describe these practices we know only one word, a word with which Marx himself is very familiar (see *Capital*, p. 257): they are simply "nefarious".

Marx closes his defence with these words: "The irksome subsequent events will perhaps teach the Manufacturing Associates that, however well they may know how to forge goods, they are as well fitted to judge literary goods as a donkey is to play the lute."

We confidently leave it to the reader to decide on which side the forgery and the irksomeness ultimately lie. In a further article we shall explain to Mr. Marx the importance which we attach to the content of Gladstone's words.

---

The second article, *Concordia*, No. 28, July 11, 1872, contains absolutely nothing of relevance, and is therefore omitted.

No. 6. MARX'S SECOND REPLY<sup>a</sup>

DER VOLKSSTAAT, No. 63, AUGUST 7, 1872

In the *Concordia* of July 4, the German Manufacturers' Association attempted to prove to me that its "learned men" were as well fitted to judge literary goods as the Association was to forge commercial ones.

With reference to the passage from Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863, as quoted in the Inaugural Address of the International, the manufacturers' organ (No. 10) stated:

**"Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content."**

It thus declares that I fabricated the sentence in both form and content, with hair and bones. Even more: it knows exactly how I did so. The paper writes: "The fact that Gladstone mentioned

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 190-97.—*Ed*

this, etc., *was utilised by Marx in order to have Gladstone say, etc.*" By quoting the sentence from a work published *before* the Inaugural Address, *The Theory of the Exchanges*, I exposed the crude lie of the manufacturers' organ.<sup>a</sup> As the paper itself relates, it then ordered from London this work which it did not know, and convinced itself of the facts of the matter. How could it lie itself out of the situation? See here:

"When we stated that Marx had lyingly added the sentence in question to Gladstone's speech, we did not claim, either in form or in content, *that he himself had also fabricated it.*"

Here we obviously have a case of equivocation peculiar to the mind of manufacturers. For example, when a manufacturing swindler, in agreement with business colleagues, sends out into the world rolls of ribbon that contain, instead of the alleged three dozen ells only two dozen, then he has in fact *lyingly added* one dozen ells, precisely because he "*has not fabricated*" them. Why, moreover, should lyingly added sentences not behave just like lyingly added ells? "The understandings of the greater part of men," says Adam Smith, "are necessarily formed by their ordinary employments",<sup>b</sup> the understandings of the manufacturer included.

Through the *Volksstaat*, I extended the erudite materials of the manufacturers' organ, not only with the quotation from *The Theory of the Exchanges*, but also with the pages from my work *Capital* concerning Gladstone's budget speeches. Now, from the material with which I provided it, the paper attempts to prove that I did not quote the disputed passage from a "London newspaper", but from *The Theory of the Exchanges*. The chain of arguments is another sample of manufacturers' logic.

I told the manufacturers' sheet that *The Theory of the Exchanges* quotes on page 134 exactly as I quoted, and it discovers—that I quoted exactly as *The Theory of the Exchanges* quotes on page 134.

And further!

"And the glosses too, which Marx bases on the contradiction contained in this version, are already contained in that book."

This is simply a lie. On page 639 of *Capital*, I give my glosses to the words in Gladstone's speech:

"While the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor. Whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say."

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 136-40.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Vol. 2, London, 1776, p. 366.—*Ed*

My remark on this is: "How lame an anti-climax! If the working class has remained 'poor', only 'less poor' in proportion as it produces for the wealthy class 'an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power', then it has remained relatively just as poor. If the extremes of poverty have not lessened, they have increased, because the extremes of wealth have."<sup>a</sup> And these "glosses" are nowhere to be found in *The Theory of the Exchanges*.

"And the glosses too ... are already contained in that book, in particular also the quotation from Molière given in Note 105 on p. 640 of *Capital*."<sup>142</sup>

So, "in particular also" I quote Molière, and leave it up to the "learned men" of the *Concordia* to detect and communicate to the public the fact that the quotation comes from *The Theory of the Exchanges*. In fact, however, I state expressly in Note 105, p. 640 of *Capital* that the author of *The Theory of the Exchanges*<sup>b</sup> "characterises with the following quotation from Molière" the "continual crying contradictions in Gladstone's budget speeches".

Finally:

"... in the same way the statement of the LONDON ORPHAN ASYLUM about the rising prices of foodstuffs quoted by Marx appears on p. 135 of that book, though Marx bases his claim for its correctness not on that book, but on that book's sources (see *Capital*, p. 640, Note 104)".

The *Concordia* advisedly forgets to inform its readers that "that book" gives *no sources*. What was it trying to prove? That I took from that "book" a passage from Gladstone's speech without knowing its source. And how does the *Concordia* prove it? By the fact that I really did take a quotation from that book, and checked it with the original sources, independent of the book!

Referring to my quotation from Professor Beesly's article in *The Fortnightly Review* (November 1870), the *Concordia* remarks.

"This article by Professor Beesly deals, in fact, with the history of the International, and as the author himself informs every enquirer, was written on the basis of material provided him by *Marx* himself."

Professor Beesly states:

"To no one is the success of the association so much due as to Dr. Karl Marx, who, in his acquaintance with the history and statistics of the industrial movement in all parts of Europe, is, I should imagine, without a rival. I am LARGELY indebted to him for the information contained in this article."<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VII, Chapter XXV, Section 5(a) (present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Henry Roy.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> E. S. Beesly, "The International Working Men's Association", *The Fortnightly Review*, No. XLVII, November 1, 1870, pp. 529-30.—*Ed.*

All the material with which I supplied Professor Beesly referred exclusively to the history of the International, and not a word concerned the Inaugural Address, which he had known since its publication. The context in which his above remark stood left so little doubt on this point that *The Saturday Review*, in a review of his article,<sup>a</sup> more than hinted that *he himself* was the author of the Inaugural Address.\*

The *Concordia* asserts that Professor Beesly did not quote the passage in question from Gladstone's speech, but only stated "*that the Inaugural Address contained this quotation*". Let us look into this.

Professor Beesly states:

"The address [...] is probably the most striking and powerful statement of the workman's case as against the middle class that has ever been compressed into a dozen small pages. I wish I had space for copious extracts from it."

After mentioning the "frightful statistics of the Blue Books",<sup>143</sup> to which the Address refers, he goes on:

"From these appalling statistics the address passes on to the income-tax returns, from which it appeared that the taxable income of the country had increased in eight years twenty per cent, 'an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power', as *Mr. Gladstone observed*, 'entirely confined to classes of property'."

Professor Beesly sets the words: "*as Mr. Gladstone observed*" outside quotation marks, saying these words on his own behalf, and thus proves to the *Concordia* with the greatest clarity that he knows Gladstone's budget speech—solely from the quotation in the Inaugural Address! As the London business friend of the German Manufacturers' Association, he is the only man who knows Gladstone's budget speeches, just as he, and he alone, knows: "Persons with an income under 150 pounds sterling, in fact, pay no income tax in England." (See the *Concordia*, Nos. 10 and 27.) Yet English tax officials suffer from the *idée fixe* that this tax only stops at incomes under **100** pounds sterling.

Referring to the disputed passage in the Inaugural Address, the manufacturers' paper stated:

"*Yet this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone's speech.*" I proved the contrary with a quotation from the "*Times*" report of April 17, 1863. I gave the quotation in the *Volksstaat* in both English and German, since a commentary was necessary on account of Gladstone's assertion that he would "look almost with

\* Professor Beesly drew my attention, in writing, to this *quid pro quo*.

<sup>a</sup> "Mr. Beesly and the International Working Men's Association", *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, No. 785, November 12, 1870, pp. 610-11.—Ed.

apprehension and with pain upon *this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*, if it were" his "belief that it was confined to the *CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES*". Basing myself on Wakefield, I declared that the "*CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES*"—an expression for which there is no German equivalent—means the "really rich", "the really prosperous portion" of the propertied classes. Wakefield actually calls the real middle class "*THE UNEASY CLASS*", which is in German roughly "die ungemächliche Klasse".\*

The manufacturers' worthy organ not only suppresses my exposition, it ends the passage I quoted with the words: "Marx quotes *The Times* to this point", thus leaving the reader to suppose that it had quoted from my translation; in fact, however, the paper, leaving my version aside, does not translate "*CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES*" as "wohlhabenden Klassen"<sup>a</sup> but as "Klassen, die sich in *angenehmen Verhältnissen befinden*".<sup>b</sup> The paper believes its readers capable of understanding that not all sections of the propertied class are "prosperous", though it will always be a "pleasant circumstance" for them to possess property. Even in the translation of my quotation, as given by the *Concordia*, however, Gladstone describes the progress of capitalist wealth as "*this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*", and remarks that here he has "*taken no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population*", closing with words to the effect that this "*augmentation is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property*". Once the "learned man" of the German Manufacturers' Association has, in the report of *The Times* of April 17, 1863, thus had Gladstone say "both in form and in content", the same as I had him say in the Inaugural Address, he strikes his swollen breast, brimming with conviction, and blusters:

"Yet despite this ... Marx has the impudence to write in the *Volksstaat* of June 1: 'So, on April 16, 1863, Mr. Gladstone declared 'both in form and in content' in the House of Commons, as reported in his own organ, *The Times*, on April 17, 1863 that '*this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property*.'"

The "learned man" of the German Manufacturers' Association obviously knows exactly what to offer his readership!

In the *Volksstaat* of June 1, I remarked that the *Concordia* was

\* "THE MIDDLE OR UNEASY CLASS" [E. G. Wakefield] ("ENGLAND AND AMERICA", London, 1833, V. I, p. 185).

<sup>a</sup> Prosperous classes.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Classes *finding themselves* in *pleasant circumstances*.—Ed.

trying to make its readers believe I had suppressed in the Inaugural Address Gladstone's phrases about the improvement in the condition of the British working class, though in fact the exact opposite was the case, and I stressed there with great emphasis the glaring contradiction between this declamation and the officially established facts. In its reply of July 4, the manufacturers' paper repeated the same manoeuvre. "Marx quotes *The Times* to this point," the paper says, "we quote further." In confrontation with the paper, I needed only to quote the disputed passage, but let us look for a moment at the "further".

After pouring forth his panegyric on the increase of capitalist wealth, Gladstone turns to the working class. He takes good care not to say that it had shared in the "*intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*". On the contrary, he goes on, according to *The Times*: "Now, *the augmentation of capital* is of indirect benefit to the labourer, etc." *He consoles* himself further on with the fact "that while the rich have been growing *richer*, the poor have been growing *less poor*". Finally, he asserts that he and his enriched parliamentary friends "have the *happiness* to know" the opposite of what parliamentary enquiries and statistical data prove to be the fact, viz.,

"that the average condition of the British labourer has improved during the last 20 years in a degree which we know to be extraordinary, and which we may almost pronounce to be unparalleled in the history of any country and of any age".

Before Mr. Gladstone, all his predecessors "*had the happiness*" to supplement the picture of the augmentation of capitalist wealth in their budget speeches with self-satisfied phrases about the improvement in the condition of the working class. Yet he gives the lie to them all; for the millennium dates only from the passing of Gladstone's reasons for consolidation and congratulation is, however, a matter of indifference here. We are concerned solely with this: that, from his standpoint, the pretended "extraordinary" improvement in the condition of the working class in no way contradicts the "*intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power that is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property*". On the contrary. It is the orthodox doctrine of the mouthpieces of capital—Mr. Gladstone being one of the best paid—that the most infallible means for working men *to benefit themselves* is—to *enrich* their exploiters.

The shameless stupidity or stupid shamelessness of the manufacturers' organ culminates in its assurance: "The report in *The*

*Times* just gives, formally more contracted, what the shorthand report by Hansard gives *verbatim*.\* Now let us see both reports:

## I

*From Gladstone's speech of April 16, 1863, printed in "The Times" of April 17, 1863*

"That is the state of the case as regards the wealth of this country. I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon *this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power* if it were my belief that it was confined to the CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. This takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. *The augmentation I have described ... is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property.* Now the augmentation of capital is of indirect benefit to the labourer etc."

## II

*From Gladstone's speech of April 16, 1863, printed by Hansard, Vol. 170, parliamentary debates of March 27 to May 28, 1863*

"Such [...] is the state of the case as regards the general progress of accumulation; but, for one, I must say that I should *look with some degree of pain*, and with much apprehension, upon *this extraordinary and almost intoxicating growth*, if it were my belief that it is confined to THE CLASS OF PERSONS WHO MAY BE DESCRIBED AS IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. The figures which I have quoted take little or no cognizance of the condition of those who do not pay income tax; or, in other words, sufficiently accurate for *general truth* (!), they do not take cognizance of the *property* (!) of the labouring population, or (!) of the increase of its *income*. Indirectly, indeed, the mere augmentation of capital is of the utmost advantage to the labouring class, etc."

I leave it to the reader himself to compare the stilted, involved, complicated CIRCUMLOCUTION OFFICE<sup>a</sup> style of the Hansard publication with the report in *The Times*.

Here it is enough to establish that the words of the *Times* report: "This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... the augmentation I *have described ... is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property*", are in part garbled by Hansard and in part completely suppressed. Their emphatic "exact wording" escaped no earwitness. For example:

"*The Morning Star*", April 17, 1863 (*Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863*).

\* The manufacturers' paper appears actually to believe that the big London newspapers employ no shorthand writers for their parliamentary reports.

<sup>a</sup> The name is taken from Ch. Dickens' *Little Dorrit*.—Ed.

“I must say, for one, I should look with apprehension and with pain upon *this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*, if it were my belief that it was confined to the CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. *THIS GREAT INCREASE OF WEALTH* takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. *THE AUGMENTATION IS AN AUGMENTATION ENTIRELY CONFINED TO THE CLASSES POSSESSED OF PROPERTY.* BUT *THAT AUGMENTATION* must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, etc.”

“*The Morning Advertiser*”, April 17, 1863 (Gladstone’s budget speech of April 16, 1863).

“I must say, for one, I should look almost with apprehension and ALARM upon *this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*, if it were my belief that it was confined to the CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. *This great increase of wealth* takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. *THE AUGMENTATION STATED is an augmentation entirely confined to the CLASSES POSSESSED OF PROPERTY.* *THIS AUGMENTATION* must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, etc.”

Thus, Gladstone subsequently filched away from the semi-official Hansard report of his speech the words that he had uttered in the House of Commons on April 16, 1863: “*This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property.*” The *Concordia* did not, therefore, find this in the excerpt provided by their business friend in London, and trumpeted:

“Yet this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone’s speech. **Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content.**”

It is no surprise that they now weepingly tell me that it is the critical “*custom*” to quote parliamentary speeches as officially falsified, and not as they were actually delivered. Such a “*custom*” in fact accords with the “general” Berlin “education”, and the limited thinking of the German Manufacturers’ Association which is typical of Prussian subjects.<sup>144</sup> Lack of time forces me to end, once and for all, my pleasurable exchange of opinions with the Association, but as a farewell, another nut for its “learned men” to crack. In what article did a man — and what was his name — utter to an opponent of a rank at least equal with that of the *Concordia*, the weighty words: “*Asinus manebis in secula seculorum*” \*?

London, July 28, 1872

Karl Marx

\* “Thou wilt remain an ass for evermore.”



## No. 7. THE REJOINER OF ANONYMOUS

CONCORDIA, No. 34, AUGUST 22, 1872

*More on the Character of Karl Marx*

On August 7, in the *Volksstaat*, Karl Marx replied to the article "How Karl Marx Defends Himself" in No. 27 of the *Concordia*. Astonishing is the dogged mendacity with which he clings to the distorted quotation from Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863, astonishing even for someone for whom no means are too base for his subversive plans. In fact this can only be explained by the fear, which must be called forth in the author, of the very embarrassing effect of confessing that this quotation, the bombshell of the Inaugural Address, is false, given the great circulation of the latter.

It will be recalled that in his first defence Marx admitted the shorthand report of Gladstone's speech in Hansard did not contain this quotation. But the reason was: Mr. Gladstone had clumsily excised this compromising passage! Initial proof: Professor Beesly, in an article in *The Fortnightly Review* had quoted this speech in the same way as the Inaugural Address.

This could lead the reader to believe that Professor Beesly had quoted Gladstone's speech in an essay on some other historical theme than the International. We therefore remarked, firstly, that this article dealt with the history of the International, and was written on the basis of material that Marx himself had provided the author with. And Marx does not now deny this. However, he assures us that the material he provided did not contain a single word referring to the contents of the Inaugural Address, which had been known to Professor Beesly since its publication. However, we never said or insinuated such a thing. And we absolutely believe Mr. Marx's assurance. Had he shown Mr. Beesly *The Theory of the Exchanges* as the source of his quotation, Beesly would certainly have refrained from reprinting it. Secondly, we replied—and this is the main rejoinder: it was not Beesly who quoted the passage in question from Gladstone's speech; he only cited it in an analysis of the Inaugural Address. We quoted word for word the relevant sentence from Beesly's article, as can be seen in No. 27 of the *Concordia*. The fact that Beesly, in his analysis, gave the words "as Mr. Gladstone observed" without quotation marks\* is now used by Marx to explain to his readers that Beesly, suddenly interrupting his analysis, said these words on his own behalf!!

Marx sought to find further proof that Gladstone had clumsily excised the words in question from his speech in the fact that *The Theory of the Exchanges*, a publication which appeared before the Inaugural Address, quoted Gladstone's budget speech word for word as in the Address. We checked with the book, saw that this was correct, but that everything suggests Marx himself took his quotation from this book. The main sign of this was that *Capital* by Marx, on p. 639, especially in Note 103, quotes this speech in the *absolutely senseless* version given verbatim by *The Theory of the Exchanges* on p. 134. This suggestion that *The Theory of the Exchanges* was the source of Marx's quotation is further supported by the fact that in the passage in his book *Capital* where he quotes the Gladstone speech just as *The Theory of the Exchanges* did on p. 134, he gives other quotations to be found at the same place in that book, and adds glosses like this. How does Mr. Marx reply to this? For a start, that he also added glosses which are not to be found in *The Theory of the Exchanges*. But neither is this precluded by our remark. Then he states

\* Additional note on republication: Professor Beesly copied the passage which he quoted from the Inaugural Address exactly as given there. There, however, the inserted clause is naturally without quotation marks. [*Note by Brentano.*]

that he specifically named the author of *The Theory of the Exchanges* as the author of the quotation from Molière. But we did not claim the contrary. Finally, regarding the statement of the LONDON ORPHAN ASYLUM, which Marx quotes on p. 640 of his book just as *The Theory of the Exchanges* does on p. 135, Marx himself admits that he quoted verbatim from this book, but that he checked the correctness with the original sources. Marx thus testifies himself that part of the glosses which he appends to the quotation from Gladstone's speech come from *The Theory of the Exchanges*. He thus bears witness to the correctness of the points with which we supported our main argument that he had also taken from *The Theory of the Exchanges* the quotation from Gladstone's speech. But he has nothing to say in answer to this main argument, in answer to the remark that he, like *The Theory of the Exchanges*, quotes Gladstone's speech in the *same absolutely senseless version*.

Thirdly and finally, Marx attempts to prove his claim that Gladstone subsequently falsified his own budget speech in the shorthand report in Hansard by referring to the report of this speech in *The Times* of April 17, 1863. But this report shows the exact opposite, since *The Times* and Hansard fully coincide materially. To obscure recognition of this fact by his readers, Marx utilises various methods. *The first method*, designed simultaneously to awaken amongst the readers of the *Volksstaat* new admiration for the erudition of their oracle, was a philological lecture. Gladstone explicitly stated, also according to the *Times* report, insofar as Marx quoted this, that he believed that the intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power of which he had spoken was *not* confined "TO THE CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES", i.e. the classes finding themselves in pleasant circumstances. Basing himself upon Wakefield, who had written a book entitled *The Middle or Uneasy Class*,<sup>a</sup> Marx now claimed that Gladstone had said he believed this augmentation was not confined to the "really rich", the "really prosperous portion" of the propertied classes; and since we took no notice of this entire argumentation, he now accuses us of suppression. But if we remained silent about this further attempt at falsification, the only reason was that it was, in fact, too manifest. For whatever Wakefield may have meant when he called the middle class THE UNEASY CLASS the whole context of Gladstone's speech, in the *Times* report too, shows that by the "CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES" Gladstone at this point meant those classes which are not part of the working population, since he drew a contrast between them and it.

Marx's *second method* of obscuring the *Times* report was simply to suppress, in his German translation of this report, the relative clause which showed that Gladstone had only said that the augmentation of wealth, which was shown by the income tax returns, was confined to the classes of property, since the working classes were not subject to income tax, and that thus nothing about the increase in the prosperity of the working classes could be learned from the income tax returns; not, however, that the working classes in reality had been excluded from the extraordinary augmentation of national wealth. Marx, who, as we just have seen, quite unwarrantably accused the *Concordia* of suppression, once again quietly suppressed this relative clause, although we had remonstrated with him about his distortion. And even more. We had stated, in accordance with the truth, that the report in *The Times* just gives, formally more contracted, what the shorthand report by Hansard gives verbatim; but he denies this and dares to print side by side the *Times* report and that from Hansard, though he naturally once again omits this relative clause. But what does it matter? The readers of the *Volksstaat*, with whom he

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to the book: [E. G. Wakefield,] *England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations*, Vol. I-II, London, 1833.—Ed.

is concerned, cannot check up on him!

Thirdly and finally, Marx attempted to conceal the agreement between the *Times* report and the Hansard report by failing to quote those sentences in which, according to *The Times* too, Gladstone directly and explicitly testified to the elevation of the British working class. We made a remark about this, and quoted in full the relevant passage of the *Times* report. Despite this, Marx lies to his readers that we had wanted to give the impression that we were quoting *The Times* according to his translation! But against this, he naturally suppresses our proof (in No. 28) that the glaring contradiction, according to Marx, between Gladstone's claim about the improvement in the condition of the British working class and the officially established facts, does not exist in reality; instead he repeats once again this accusation.

Apart from this, Marx, in his reply in the *Volksstaat* of August 7, produces two further witnesses to the correctness of his reading of Gladstone's budget speech: *The Morning Star* and *The Morning Advertiser* of April 17, 1863. But we do not need to check whether Marx has quoted the two papers without fresh falsification.\* For these papers, even as he quotes them, speak for us. After Gladstone had said, according to both papers, that he did *not* believe *this* intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is confined to the classes which find themselves in pleasant circumstances, he continued: "*This* great increase of wealth *takes no cognizance at all* of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation *which I have described* is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property." The context and the use of the expression "*take cognizance*" show clearly that *this* increase and the augmentation of the increase cited, and the citing, are intended to indicate those discernible in the income tax returns.

But the introduction of these new alleged witnesses is only an expression of the faked thoroughness, intended to perpetuate the faith of *Volksstaat* readers in their oracle. Marx's article in the *Volksstaat* of August 7 is a model of this, and worthy of perusal by our readers in person. We need only quote one more example of this, in order to deprive Mr. Marx of the argument that we wished to conceal from our readers that he had corrected us on a point of minor import. We had stated that in England persons with an income under 150 pounds sterling paid no income tax. Mr. Marx taunts us that we do not know this tax only ceases on incomes under 100 pounds sterling. In fact the law of 1842 left all incomes under 150 pounds sterling quite free of tax, but in 1853 the tax was extended downwards to 100 pounds sterling, although the newly included incomes were treated more lightly, since they were subjected to a lower rate of tax than those of 150 pounds sterling and above. In 1863 the favoured sector was extended to 200 pounds sterling exclusive upwards, and the tax reduction granted in the manner that for every income from that figure down to 100 pounds sterling inclusive, 60 pounds sterling could be subtracted as tax-free.

Mr. Marx closes his article by telling us that lack of time forces him to end, once and for all, his pleasurable exchange of opinions with us. We understand that Mr. Marx welcomes the opportunity of avoiding somebody who uncovers his forgeries. When Mr. Marx finally ends his article by breaking into abuse, we can assure him that his opponents could desire nothing more than the confession of guilt which lies herein. Abuse is the weapon of those whose other means of defence have run out.

\* Additional note on republication: Here too Marx omits the same sentences which he suppressed in his reproduction of the *Times* report. See the two reports at the beginning. [Note by Brentano.]

## III

## SEDLEY TAYLOR AND ELEANOR MARX

No. 8. ATTACK BY S. TAYLOR

THE TIMES, NOVEMBER 29, 1883

\* *To the Editor of "The Times"*

Sir,—I ask leave to point out in *The Times* that the origin of the misleading quotation from Mr. Gladstone's Budget speech of April 16, 1863, which so eminent a publicist as Professor Émile de Laveleye<sup>a</sup> has been led to reproduce through reliance on German sources, and with respect to which he inserts a correction in *The Times* of this day, is to be found as far back as 1864 in an address issued by the council of the famous International Working Men's Association.<sup>b</sup>

What appears extremely singular is that it was reserved for Professor Brentano (then of the University of Breslau, now of that of Strassburg) to expose, eight years later in a German newspaper, the bad faith which had manifestly dictated the citation made from Mr. Gladstone's speech in the address.

Herr Karl Marx, who as the acknowledged author of the address attempted to defend the citation, had the hardihood, in the deadly shifts to which Brentano's masterly conduct of the attack speedily reduced him, to assert Mr. Gladstone had "manipulated" (*zurechtgestümpert*) the report of his speech in *The Times* of April 17, 1863, before it appeared in "Hansard", in order "to obliterate" (*wegzupfuschen*) a passage which "was certainly compromising for an English Chancellor of the Exchequer". On Brentano's showing, by a detailed comparison of texts, that the reports of *The Times* and of "Hansard" agreed in utterly excluding the meaning which craftily-isolated quotation had put upon Mr. Gladstone's words, Marx withdrew from further controversy under the plea of "want of time"!

The whole of the Brentano-Marx correspondence is eminently worthy of being unearthed from the files of newspapers under which it lies buried, and republished in an English form, as it throws upon the latter disputant's standard of literary honesty a light which can be ill spared at a time when his principal work is presented to us as nothing less than a fresh gospel of social renovation.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

*Sedley Taylor*

Trinity College, Cambridge, November 26th \* (1883)

This letter appeared in *The Times* on November 29, 1883. On November 30, Eleanor, Marx's junior daughter, sent her reply to *The Times*. Her letter did not appear. She again wrote in vain to the editor. Then she addressed herself to the *Daily News*, but once more without success. Then she published both Mr. Sedley

<sup>a</sup> É. de Laveleye, "To the Editor of *The Times*. Liège, November 16", *The Times*, No. 30987, November 26, 1883.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 5-13.—*Ed.*

Taylor's accusation and her reply in the February 1884 issue of the socialist monthly *To-Day*. We publish her reply below.<sup>145</sup>

No. 9. ELEANOR MARX'S REPLY

TO-DAY, FEBRUARY 1884

\* *To the Editor of "The Times"*

Sir,—In *The Times* of November 29th Mr. Sedley Taylor refers to a certain quotation of a speech by Mr. Gladstone,

"to be found as far back as 1864, in an address issued by the council of the famous International Working Men's Association".

He continues: (I here quote Mr. Taylor's letter from "What appears" to "want of time").

The facts are briefly these. The quotation referred to consists of a few sentences from Mr. Gladstone's Budget speech of April 16th, 1863. After describing the immense increase of wealth that took place in this country between 1853 and 1861 Mr. Gladstone is made to say:

"This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property."

An anonymous writer, who turns out to be Professor Brentano, published in a German paper, *Concordia*, of the 7th March, 1872 a reply in which it was stated:

"This sentence does not exist in Mr. Gladstone's speech, Marx has added it lyingly, both as to form and contents" (*formel und materiel hinzugelogen*).

This was the only point at issue between my father and his anonymous opponent.

In his replies in the Leipzig *Volksstaat*, June 1st and August 7th, 1872,<sup>a</sup> Dr. Marx quotes the reports of Mr. Gladstone's speech as follows:

"*The Times*, April 17th:

"The augmentation I have described, and which is founded, I think, on accurate returns, is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property."

*Morning Star* 17th April:

"This augmentation is an augmentation confined entirely to the classes possessed of property,

*Morning Advertiser*, April 17th:

"The augmentation stated is altogether limited to classes possessed of property."

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 136-40, 144-51.—*Ed.*

The anonymous Brentano, in the “deadly shifts to which his own masterly conduct of the attack had reduced him”, now took refuge under the assertion usual in such circumstances, that if the quotation was not a forgery it was, at all events, “misleading”, in “bad faith”, “craftily isolated”, and so forth. I am afraid you would not allow me space to reply to this accusation of Herr Brentano, repeated now, after eleven years, by Mr. Taylor. Perhaps it will not be required, as Mr. Taylor says:

“The whole of this Brentano-Marx correspondence is eminently worthy of being unearthed from the file of newspapers in which it lies buried and republished in an English form.”

I quite agree with this. The memory of my father could only gain by it. As to the discrepancies between the newspaper reports of the speech in question and the report in “Hansard” I must leave this to be settled by those most interested in it.

Out of thousands and thousands of quotations to be found in my father’s writings this is the only one the correctness of which has ever been disputed. The fact that this single and not very lucky instance is brought up again and again by the professorial economists is very characteristic. In the words of Mr. Taylor,

“it throws upon the latter disputant’s” (Dr. Marx) “standard of literary honesty a light which can ill be spared at a time when his principal work is presented to us as nothing less than a fresh gospel of social renovation”.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

*Eleanor Marx*

London, November 30, 1883 \*

No. 10. SEDLEY TAYLOR’S RETORT

TO-DAY, MARCH 1884

\* *To the Editors of “To-Day”*

Gentlemen,

No one can regret more than I do that Miss Marx should have been refused the public hearing to which she was so manifestly entitled. I am, however, far from thinking with her that the question whether a particular sentence did, or did not, occur in Mr. Gladstone’s speech “was the only point at issue between” Dr. Marx and Professor Brentano. I regard that question as having been of very subordinate importance compared to the issue whether the quotation in dispute was made with the intention of conveying, or of perverting, Mr. Gladstone’s meaning.

It would obviously be impossible to discuss in this letter the contents of the voluminous Brentano-Marx controversy without making an inadmissible demand on your space. As, however, Miss Marx has in your columns characterised as a

"calumny" and "libel" an opinion publicly expressed by me,\* I feel bound to ask your insertion, side by side, of the two following extracts, which will enable your readers to judge for themselves whether Dr. Marx has quoted fairly or unfairly from the Budget Speech of 1863 in his great work, "Das Kapital". My reason for using the *Times* report in preference to that of Hansard will be obvious to readers of Dr. Marx' letters in his correspondence with Brentano.

*Times*, April 17, 1863

"In ten years, from 1842 to 1852 inclusive, the taxable income of the country, as nearly as we can make out, increased by 6 per cent.; but in eight years, from 1853 to 1861, the income of the country again increased from the basis taken by 20 per cent. That is a fact so strange as to be almost incredible....

"I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power if it were my belief that it was confined to the classes who are in easy circumstances. This takes no cognisance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation I have described, and which is founded, I think, upon accurate returns, is an augmentation entirely confined to classes possessed of property. Now, the augmentation of capital is of indirect benefit to the labourer, because it cheapens the commodity which in the business of production comes into direct competition with labour. But we have this profound, and I must say, inestimable consolation, that, while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor. Whether the extremes of poverty are less extreme than they were I do not presume to say, but the average condition of the British labourer, we have the happiness to know, has improved during the last 20 years in a degree which we know to be extraordinary, and which we may almost pronounce to be unexampled in the history of any country and of any age." \*

\* In the covering letter to the Editors of *To-Day*, not published here. [Note by Engels.]

<sup>a</sup> See Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VII, Chapter XXV, Section 5(a) (present edition, Vol. 35).—Ed.

*Capital*, 2nd edition, 1872  
page 678, note 103<sup>a</sup>

"From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent..

"In the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it

had increased from the basis taken in 1853, 20 per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible .....

"...This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power...

"...entirely confined to classes of property... must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population because it cheapens the commodities of general consumption...

"...while the rich have been growing richer the poor have been growing less poor! At any rate, whether the extremes of poverty are less I do not presume to say."

Mr. Gladstone, in *House of Commons*, 16th April, 1863

I invite especial attention to the hearing on Mr. Gladstone's meaning of the passages in the *Times* report which I have thrown into italics. The sentence, "*I must say ... easy circumstances,*" conveys the speaker's belief that the intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power previously described was *not* confined to those in easy circumstances. There is, it is true, a verbal contrariety with the later sentence, "The augmentation ... property," but the intervening words, "*This takes no cognisance ... population,*" unmistakably show what Mr. Gladstone meant, viz., that the figures which he had given, being based on the income-tax returns, included only incomes above the exemption limit,\* and therefore afforded no indication to what extent the total earnings of the labouring population had increased during the period under consideration. The closing passage, from "*but the average*" to the end, announces in the most emphatic language that, on evidence independent of that obtained from the income-tax returns, Mr. Gladstone recognised as indubitable an extraordinary and almost unexampled improvement in the average condition of the British labourer.

Now, with what object were these essential passages almost wholly struck out in the process by which the newspaper report was reduced to the remarkable form in which it appears in Dr. Marx' work? Clearly, I think, in order that the arbitrarily-constructed mosaic, pieced together out of such of Mr. Gladstone's words as were allowed to remain, might be understood as asserting that the earnings of the labouring population had made but insignificant progress, while the incomes of the possessing classes had increased enormously—a view which the omitted passages explicitly repudiate in favour of a very different opinion.

I must not pass over unnoticed the fact that the German translation of this docked citation in the text of "Das Kapital" is immediately followed there by the expression of Dr. Marx' contemptuous astonishment at the "lame anti-climax" presented by the sentence made to figure as the conclusion of Mr. Gladstone's paragraph, when compared with his previous description of the growth of wealth among the possessing classes.

I am, Gentlemen, yours truly,

*Sedley Taylor*

Trinity College, Cambridge  
February 8th, 1884 \*

No. 11. ELEANOR MARX'S SECOND REPLY<sup>146</sup>

TO-DAY, MARCH 1884

*To the Editors of "To-Day"*

\*Gentlemen,

Mr. Sedley Taylor disputes my statement that, when the anonymous slanderer fell foul of Dr. Marx, the only point at issue was whether Mr. Gladstone had used certain words or not. According to him, the real question was,

"whether the quotation in dispute was made with the intention of conveying or of perverting Mr. Gladstone's meaning".

\* This stood at £150 from 1842 to 1853, and was then lowered to £100.  
[Note by Taylor.]



I have before me the *Concordia* article (No. 10, 7th March, 1872), "How Karl Marx Quotes". Here the anonymous author first quotes the "Inaugural Address" of the International; then the passage of Mr. Gladstone's speech, in full, from Hansard; then he condenses the passage in his own way, and to his own satisfaction; and lastly, he concludes,

"Marx takes advantage of this to make Gladstone say, 'This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes possessed of property.' *This sentence, however, is nowhere to be found in Gladstone's speech. The very contrary is said in it. Marx has lyingly added this sentence, both as to form and contents.*"

That is the charge, and the only charge, made against Dr. Marx. He is indeed accused of perverting Mr. Gladstone's meaning by "lyingly adding" a whole sentence. Not a word about "misleading", or "craftily isolated" quotations. The question simply is, "whether a particular sentence did, or did not, occur in Mr. Gladstone's speech".

Of two things, one. Either Mr. Taylor has read Brentano's attacks and my father's replies, and then his assertion is in direct contradiction of what he cannot help knowing to be the truth. Or else he has not. And then? Here is a man who dates his letters from Trinity College, Cambridge, who goes out of his way to assail my dead father's literary honesty in a way which must needs turn out to be a "calumny" unless he proves his case; who makes this charge upon the strength of a literary controversy dating as far back as 1872, between an anonymous writer (whom Mr. Taylor now asserts to be Professor Brentano) and my father; who describes in glowing terms the "masterly conduct" in which Saint George Brentano led his attack, and the "deadly shifts" to which he speedily reduced the dragon Marx; who can give us all particulars of the crushing results obtained by the said St. George "by a detailed comparison of texts"; and who after all, puts me into this delicate position that I am in charity bound to assume that he has never read a line of what he is speaking about.

Had Mr. Taylor seen the "masterly" articles of his anonymous friend, he would have found therein the following:

"Now we ask; does anyone tell a lie only then when he himself invents an untruth, or does he not tell a lie quite as much when he repeats it contrary to what he knows, or is bound to know better?"

Thus saith the "masterly" Brentano, as virtuous as he is anonymous, in his rejoinder to my father's first reply (*Concordia*, No. 27, 4th July, 1872, p. 210).<sup>a</sup> And on the same page he still maintains against all comers:

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 140-44.—*Ed.*

"According to the *Times* report, too, Mr. Gladstone said he believed this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power *not* to be confined to classes of property."

If Brentano thus appears utterly ignorant of what was the real point at issue, is Mr. Sedley Taylor better off? In his letter to *The Times* it was a quotation made in the "Inaugural Address" of the International. In his letter to *To-Day* it is a quotation in "Das Kapital". The ground is shifted again, but I need not object. Mr. Taylor now gives us the Gladstonian passage as quoted on pages 678 and 679 of "Das Kapital", side by side with the same passage as reported—not by Hansard, but by *The Times*.

"My reason for using the *Times* report instead of that of Hansard, will be obvious to readers of Dr. Marx's letters and his correspondence with Brentano."

Mr. Taylor, as we have seen, is not of these "readers". His reason for his proceeding may therefore be obvious to others, but upon his own showing at least, it can hardly be so to himself.

Anyhow, from Hansard the Infallible we are brought down to that very report, for using which the anonymous Brentano (*Concordia*, same page, 210), assails my father as quoting "necessarily bungling (*stümperhafte*) newspaper reports". At any rate, Mr. Taylor's "reason" must be very "obvious" to his friend Brentano.

To me that reason is obvious indeed. The words which my father was accused of having lyingly added ("an augmentation", etc.), these words are contained in *The Times* as well as in the other dailies' reports, while in Hansard they are not only "manipulated", but entirely "obliterated". Marx established this fact. Mr. Taylor, in his letter to *The Times*, still awfully shocked at such unpardonable "hardihood", is now himself compelled to drop the impeachable Hansard, and to take refuge under what Brentano calls the "necessarily bungling" report of *The Times*.

Now for the quotation itself. Mr. Taylor invites especial attention to two passages thrown by him into italics. In the first he owns:

"*there is, it is true, a verbal contrariety* with the latter sentence; the augmentation ... property; but the intervening words: this takes ... population, unmistakably show what Mr. Gladstone meant," etc., etc.

Here we are plainly on theological ground. It is the well-known style of orthodox interpretation of the Bible. The passage, it is true, is in itself contradictory, but if interpreted according to the true faith of a believer, you will find that it will bear out a meaning not in contradiction with that true faith. If Mr. Taylor

interprets Mr. Gladstone as Mr. Gladstone interprets the Bible, he must not expect any but the orthodox to follow him.

Now Mr. Gladstone on that particular occasion, either did speak English or he did not. If he did not, no manner of quotation or interpretation will avail. If he did, he said that he should be very sorry if that intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power was confined to classes in easy circumstances, but that it was confined entirely to classes of property. And that is what Marx quoted.

The second passage is one of those stock phrases which are repeated, with slight variations, in every British budget speech, seasons of bad trade alone excepted. What Marx thought of it, and of the whole speech is shown in the following extract from his second reply to his anonymous slanderer;

“Gladstone, having poured forth his panegyric on the increase of capitalist wealth, turns towards the working class. He takes good care not to say that they had shared in the intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power. On the contrary, he continues (according to *The Times*): ‘Now, the augmentation of capital is of indirect benefit to the labourers,’ etc. He *consoles* himself with the fact that while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor. He asserts, finally, he and his enriched parliamentary friends ‘have the happiness to know’ the contrary of what official enquiries and statistical dates prove to be the fact, viz.,

“that the average condition of the British labourer has improved during the last 20 years in a degree which we know to be extraordinary, and which we may almost pronounce to be unexampled in the history of any country and of any age.”

“*Before* Mr. Gladstone, all his predecessors ‘had the happiness’ to complete in their budget speeches the picture of the augmentation of capitalist wealth by self-complacent phrases about the improvement in the condition of the working class. Yet he gives the lie to them all; for the millennium dates only from the passing of the Free Trade legislation. But the correctness or incorrectness of Gladstone’s reasons for consolation and congratulation is a matter of indifference here. What alone concerns us is this, that from his stand-point the pretended ‘extraordinary’ improvement in the condition of the working-class is not at all in contradiction with the augmentation of wealth and power which is entirely confined to classes possessed of property. It is the orthodox doctrine of the mouth-pieces of capital—one of the best paid of whom is Gladstone—that the most infallible means for working

men to benefit themselves is—to enrich their exploiters.” (*Volksstaat*, No. 63, August 7, 1872).<sup>a</sup>

Moreover, to please Mr. Taylor, the said passage of Mr. Gladstone’s speech is *quoted in full* in the Inaugural Address, page 5, immediately before the quotation in dispute. And what else but this address did Mr. Taylor originally impute? Is it as impossible to get a reference to original sources out of him, as it was to get reasons out of Dogberry?

“The continuous crying contradictions in Gladstone’s budget speeches” form the subject of Note 105 on the same page (679) of “*Das Kapital*” to which Mr. Taylor refers us. Very likely indeed, that Marx should have taken the trouble to suppress “in bad faith” one of the contradictions! Quite the contrary. He has not suppressed anything worth quoting, neither has he “lyingly” added anything. But he has restored, rescued from oblivion, a particular sentence of one of Mr. Gladstone’s speeches, a sentence which had indubitably been pronounced, but which somehow or other had found its way—out of Hansard.

*Eleanor Marx\**

---

<sup>a</sup> Cf. this volume, p. 149; present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 194-95.—*Ed.*

## IV

## ENGELS AND BRENTANO

No. 12. FROM ENGELS' PREFACE TO THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION OF MARX'S  
CAPITAL, VOLUME ONE<sup>a</sup>

Meanwhile a complete revision of the numerous quotations had been made necessary by the publication of the English edition.<sup>b</sup> For this edition Marx's youngest daughter, Eleanor, undertook to compare all the quotations with their originals, so that those taken from English sources, which constitute the vast majority, are given there not as retranslations from German but in the original English form. In preparing the fourth edition it was therefore incumbent upon me to consult this text. The comparison revealed various small inaccuracies. Page numbers wrongly indicated, due partly to mistakes in copying from notebooks, and partly to the accumulated misprints of three editions; misplaced quotation or omission marks, which cannot be avoided when a mass of quotations is copied from notebook extracts; here and there some rather unhappy translation of a word; particular passages quoted from the old Paris notebooks of 1843-45, when Marx did not know English and was reading English economists in French translations,<sup>c</sup> so that the double translation yielded a slightly different shade of meaning, e.g., in the case of Steuart, Ure, etc.,

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 35.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The English edition of *Capital* appeared in 1886, i.e. between the third (1883) and fourth (1890) German editions.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The reference is to Marx's extracts from the following books: A. Smith, *Recherches sur la nature et les causes de la richesse des nations*, Vols. 1-5, Paris, 1802; D. Ricardo, *Des principes de l'économie politique et de l'impôt*, Vols. 1-2, Paris, 1835; J. Mill, *Éléments d'économie politique*, Paris, 1832; J. R. MacCulloch, *Discours sur l'origine, les progrès, les objets particuliers, et l'importance de l'économie politique*, Paris, 1825 (*MEGA*, Abt. IV, Bd. 2, Berlin, 1981, pp. 332-86, 392-427, 428-70, 473-79).—*Ed.*

where the English text had now to be used—and other similar instances of trifling inaccuracy or negligence. But anyone who compares the fourth edition with the previous ones can convince himself that all this laborious process of emendation has not produced the smallest change in the book worth speaking of. There was only one quotation which could not be traced—the one from Richard Jones (4th edition, p. 562, Note 47). Marx probably slipped up when writing down the title of the book.<sup>a</sup> All the other quotations retain their cogency in full, or have enhanced it due to their present exact form.

Here, however, I am obliged to revert to an old story.

I know of only one case in which the accuracy of a quotation given by Marx has been called in question. But as the issue dragged beyond his lifetime I cannot well ignore it here.

On March 7, 1872, there appeared in the Berlin *Concordia*, organ of the German Manufacturers' Association, an anonymous article entitled: "How Karl Marx Quotes".<sup>b</sup> It was here asserted, with an effervescence of moral indignation and unparliamentary language, that the quotation from Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863 (in the Inaugural Address of the International Working Men's Association, 1864, and repeated in *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 617, 4th edition; p. 671, 3rd edition),<sup>c</sup> had been falsified; that not a single word of the sentence: "this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... is entirely confined to classes of property" was to be found in the (semi-official) shorthand report in Hansard. "Yet this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone's speech. It says quite the opposite." (In bold type): "**Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content!**"

Marx, to whom the number of *Concordia* was sent the following May, answered Anonymous in the *Volksstaat* of June 1st.<sup>d</sup> As he could not recall which newspaper report he had used for the quotation, he limited himself to citing, first the equivalent quotation from two English publications, and then the report in *The Times*, according to which Gladstone says:

\* "That is the state of the case as regards the wealth of this country. I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, if it were my belief that it was

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to R. Jones, *Text-book of Lectures on the Political Economy of Nations*, Hertford, 1852. See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter XXII (present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 135-36.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 132-34.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136-40.—*Ed.*

confined to classes who are in easy circumstances. This takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation I have described and which is founded, I think, upon accurate returns, is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property."\*

Thus Gladstone says here that he would be sorry if it were so, but it is so: this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property. And as to the semi-official Hansard, Marx goes on to say: "In its edition, here botchily corrected, Mr. Gladstone was bright enough clumsily to excise the passage that would be, after all, compromising on the lips of an English Chancellor of the Exchequer. This is, incidentally, traditional English parliamentary practice, and by no means the invention of little Lasker versus Bebel."<sup>147</sup>

Anonymous gets angrier and angrier. In his answer in the *Concordia*, July 4,<sup>a</sup> he sweeps aside second-hand sources and demurely suggests that it is the "custom" to quote parliamentary speeches from the shorthand report; adding, however, that the *Times* report (which includes the "lyingly added" sentence) and the Hansard report (which omits it) "fully coincide materially", while the *Times* report likewise contains "the direct opposite of that notorious passage in the Inaugural Address". This fellow carefully conceals the fact that the *Times* report explicitly includes that self-same "notorious passage", alongside of its alleged "opposite". Despite all this, however, Anonymous feels that he is stuck fast and that only some new dodge can save him. Thus, whilst his article bristles, as we have just shown, with "impudent mendacity" and is interlarded with such edifying terms of abuse as "bad faith", "dishonesty", "lying statement", "that lying quotation", "impudent mendacity", "a quotation completely forged", "this forgery", "simply nefarious", etc., he finds it necessary to divert the issue to another domain and therefore promises "to explain in a second article the importance which we" (the non-"mendacious" Anonymous) "attach to the content of Gladstone's words". As if his particular opinion, of no decisive value as it is, had anything whatever to do with the matter. This second article was printed in the *Concordia* on July 11.

Marx replied again in the *Volksstaat* of August 7<sup>b</sup> now giving also the reports of the passage in question from *The Morning Star* and *The Morning Advertiser* of April 17, 1863. According to both reports Gladstone said that he would look with apprehension, etc., upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power if he

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 140-44.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 144-51.—*Ed.*

believed it to be *confined* to CLASSES IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. But this augmentation *was* in fact ENTIRELY CONFINED TO CLASSES POSSESSED OF PROPERTY. So these reports too reproduced word for word the sentence alleged to have been “lyingly added”. Marx further established once more, by a comparison of the *Times* and the Hansard texts, that this sentence, which three newspaper reports of identical content, appearing independently of one another the next morning, proved to have been really uttered, was missing from the Hansard report, revised according to the familiar “custom”, and that Gladstone, to use Marx’s words, “had subsequently filched it away”. In conclusion Marx stated that he had no time for further intercourse with Anonymous. The latter also seems to have had enough, at any rate Marx received no further issues of *Concordia*.

With this the matter appeared to be dead and buried. True, once or twice later on there reached us, from persons in touch with the University of Cambridge, mysterious rumours of an unspeakable literary crime which Marx was supposed to have committed in *Capital*; but despite all investigation nothing more definite could be learned. Then, on November 29, 1883, eight months after Marx’s death, there appeared in *The Times* a letter dated from Trinity College, Cambridge, and signed Sedley Taylor,<sup>a</sup> in which this little man, who dabbles in the mildest sort of co-operative affairs, seizing upon some chance pretext or other, at last enlightened us, not only concerning those vague Cambridge rumours, but also Anonymous in the *Concordia*.

“What appears extremely singular,” says the little man from Trinity College, “is that it was reserved for *Professor Brentano* (then of the University of Breslau, now of that of Strassburg) to expose ... the bad faith which had manifestly dictated the citation made from Mr. Gladstone’s speech in the (‘Inaugural’) Address. Herr Karl Marx, who ... attempted to defend the citation, had the hardihood, in the DEADLY SHIFTS to which Brentano’s masterly conduct of the attack speedily reduced him, to assert that Mr. Gladstone had ‘manipulated’ the report of his speech in *The Times* of April 17, 1863, before it appeared in Hansard, in order to ‘obliterate’ a passage which ‘was certainly compromising for an English Chancellor of the Exchequer’. On Brentano’s showing, by a detailed comparison of texts, that the reports of *The Times* and of Hansard agreed in utterly excluding the meaning which craftily-isolated quotation had put upon Mr. Gladstone’s words, Marx withdrew from further controversy under the plea of ‘want of time!’”

So that was at the bottom of the whole business!<sup>b</sup> And thus was the anonymous campaign of Mr. Brentano in the *Concordia*

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 155.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx has: “des Pudels Kern”, an allusion to the saying. “Das also war des Pudels Kern”, in Goethe’s *Faust*, Act I, Scene III (“Faust’s Study”).—*Ed.*



gloriously reflected in the productively co-operating imagination of Cambridge. Thus he stood, sword in hand, and thus he battled, in his "masterly conduct of the attack", this St. George of the German Manufacturers' Association, whilst the infernal dragon Marx, "in deadly shifts", "speedily" breathed his last at his feet.

All this Ariostian battle-scene, however, only serves to conceal the dodges of our St. George. Here there is no longer talk of "lying addition" or "forgery", but of "CRAFTILY ISOLATED QUOTATION". The whole issue was shifted, and St. George and his Cambridge squire very well knew why.

Eleanor Marx replied in the monthly journal *To-Day* (February 1884)<sup>a</sup>, as *The Times* refused to publish her letter. She once more focussed the debate on the sole question at issue: had Marx "lyingly added" that sentence or not? To this Mr. Sedley Taylor answered that

"the question whether a particular sentence did or did not occur in Mr. Gladstone's speech" had been, in his opinion, "of very subordinate importance" in the Brentano-Marx controversy, "compared to the issue whether the quotation in dispute was made with the intention of conveying, or of perverting, Mr. Gladstone's meaning".

He then admits that the *Times* report contains "a verbal contrariety"; but, if the context is rightly interpreted, i.e., in the Gladstonian Liberal sense, it shows what Mr. Gladstone *meant* to say\* (*To-Day*, March 1884.)<sup>b</sup> The most comic point here is that our little Cambridge man now insists upon quoting the speech *not* from Hansard, as, according to the anonymous Brentano, it is "customary" to do, but from the *Times* report, which the same Brentano had characterised as "necessarily bungling". Naturally so, for in Hansard the vexatious sentence *is missing*.

Eleanor Marx had no difficulty (in the same issue of *To-Day*)<sup>c</sup> in dissolving all this argumentation into thin air. Either Mr. Taylor had read the controversy of 1872 in which case he was now making not only "lying additions" but also "lying suppressions"; or he had not read it and ought to remain silent. In either case it was certain that he did not dare to maintain for a moment the accusation of his friend Brentano that Marx had made a "lying" addition. On the contrary, Marx, it now seems, had not lyingly added but suppressed an important sentence. But this same sentence is quoted on page 5 of the Inaugural Address, a few lines before the alleged "lying addition". And as to the "contrariety" in

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 156-57.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 156-59.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 159-63.—*Ed.*

Gladstone's speech, is it not Marx himself, who in *Capital*, p. 618 (3rd edition, p. 672), Note 105<sup>a</sup> refers to "the continuous crying contradictions in Gladstone's budget speeches of 1863 and 1864"? Only he does not presume à la Mr. Sedley Taylor to resolve them into complacent Liberal sentiments. Eleanor Marx, in concluding her reply, finally sums up as follows:

"Marx has not suppressed anything worth quoting, neither has he 'lyingly' added anything. But he has restored, rescued from oblivion, a particular sentence of one of Mr. Gladstone's speeches, a sentence which had indubitably been pronounced, but which somehow or other had found its way—out of Hansard."

With that Mr. Sedley Taylor too had had enough, and the result of this whole professorial cobweb, spun out over two decades and two great countries, is that nobody has since dared to cast any other aspersion upon Marx's literary honesty; whilst Mr. Sedley Taylor, no doubt, will hereafter put as little confidence in the literary war bulletins of Mr. Brentano as Mr. Brentano will in the papal infallibility of Hansard.

London, June 25, 1890

*Frederick Engels*

No. 13. BRENTANO'S REPLY

*"My Polemic with Karl Marx", Berlin, 1890, pp. 3-5*

On September 28, 1864, a public meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London, at which Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen, Poles and Italians were represented. Karl Marx submitted to this meeting the Provisional Rules of an international workers' organisation which was to be founded, together with the Inaugural Address he had drafted for the same. Both were adopted unanimously, and the Inaugural Address went round the world. It contained a quotation from Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863, which attracted more attention than all the other statements contained therein:

"Dazzled by the 'Progress of the Nation' statistics dancing before his eyes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims in wild ecstasy: 'From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent; in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has increased from the basis taken in 1853, 20 per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible!... This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power,' adds Mr. Gladstone, 'is entirely confined to classes of property.'"

In the winter of 1871-72, while working on the second volume of my *Die Arbeitergilden der Gegenwart*, I was obliged to investigate (cf. II, 241) to what extent the oft-heard objection—that a wage increase diminishes the future demand for labour—accords with the facts. In the previous decades this objection had

<sup>a</sup> Ibid., p. 134.—Ed.

repeatedly been used against the English trade associations every time they called for wage increases. Here I recalled this quotation from Gladstone's budget speech. However, it appeared to me to be unwise to quote as a source the Address of the International, as many others had, and the relevant passage in Marx's *Capital*, Vol I, 1867, p. 639; I consulted the shorthand report of Gladstone's budget speech and found that this in fact showed that the wage increases in the period 1842-1861 had not limited the increase in the income of the possessing classes in any way which negatively affected their demand for labour; but that, on the contrary Gladstone had stated in direct opposition to Karl Marx's claim: "The figures which I have quoted take little or no cognizance of the condition of those who do not pay income tax ... of the property of the labouring population, or of the increase of its income... But if we look to the average condition of the British labourer, whether peasant, or miner, or operative, or artisan, we know from varied and indubitable evidence that during the last twenty years such an addition has been made to his means of subsistence as we may almost pronounce to be without example in the history of any country and of any age."

In view of the great importance of the Gladstone's quotation for the Social Democratic claim that in the framework of the existing state and social order the rich would necessarily become ever richer and the poor ever poorer, I drew the attention of the editors of the *Concordia, Zeitschrift für die Arbeiterfrage*, at that time appearing in Berlin, to the forgery which had been committed here. They asked me to write an article on the subject, which was published in the *Concordia* of March 7, 1872.<sup>a</sup> The article was not signed by me; this was done, on the one hand, at the request of the editors in the interests of the reputation of their paper, and, on the other hand, I had all the less objection, since following earlier literary controversies pursued by Marx it was to be expected that this time too he would heap personal insults upon his adversary, and that for this reason it could only be amusing to leave him in the dark as to the identity of his adversary.

Three months later Marx replied in the *Volksstaat*. In the polemic which then developed it became clear that Marx had not undertaken the forgery himself, but had taken the forged quotation from a diatribe which had been published anonymously in 1864. This work, entitled *The Theory of the Exchanges. The Bank Charter Act of 1844. The abuse of the metallic principle to depreciation. Parliament mirrored in Debate, supplemental to 'The Stock Exchange and the Repeal of Sir J. Barnard's Act'*, London: T. Cautley Newby, 30, Welbeck Street, 1864, is the work of a perverse Thersites<sup>b</sup> and consists largely of garbled quotations from writings and speeches on national economy, bestrewn with Latin, English and French verses and other comments, aimed at derision. Being of such a nature, this book has understandably remained in thorough obscurity.

Had Marx simply admitted that he had been misled by this book, and from then on reproduced the quotation correctly, one might have been surprised that he had relied upon such a source, but the mistake would at least have been rectified. But for him there was no question of this. And given the wide circulation which had been attained by the Inaugural Address, the loss of this show-piece as the result of this correction, would have been very embarrassing for the agitation. One of the main agitational methods of Social Democracy is that its representatives proclaim themselves the sole proprietors of real science; and as the Party Congress in Halle<sup>148</sup> showed, they prefer to accuse themselves of having utilised the iron law of wages in deliberate untruthfulness simply as a means of agitation, rather than

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 135-36.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The author is Henry Roy.—*Ed.*

confess that they have been shown to be in error. Instead of withdrawing, Marx therefore attempted to prove that Gladstone had subsequently tinkered with the shorthand report of his budget speech; the loutishnesses of his scurrilous polemics was now directed against the supposed manufacturer, who had attempted to tell him what to do with the help of an English business partner; when it was shown that *The Times* too, in its issue which appeared on the morning following the night in which Gladstone had made his speech, carried this speech in a sense according with the shorthand report, he acted, as the editors of the *Concordia* wrote<sup>a</sup>: "like the cuttlefish, which dims the water with a dark fluid, in order to make pursuit by its enemy more difficult, i.e. he tries as hard as he can to hide the subject of controversy by clinging to completely inconsequential secondary matters; and finally he saves himself with the explanation that for 'lack of time' he cannot go into the matter any further." And for all time he failed to reply to my analysis of his rejoinder published in the *Concordia* on August 22, 1872.

The fact that I was the author of the articles in the *Concordia* of March 7, July 4 and 11, and August 22, 1872<sup>b</sup> was known to a number of people, and in the second edition of Mehring's *Geschichte der Sozialdemokratie*,<sup>c</sup> which was published while Marx was still alive, I was publicly named as such. Having his attention thus drawn to it, Mr. Sedley Taylor of Trinity College, Cambridge studied the polemic, and wrote a letter about it to *The Times*.<sup>d</sup> This brought upon the scene Miss Eleanor Marx, daughter of Karl Marx, who had died in the meantime, and in the socialist monthly *To-Day* of March 1884 she not only defended her father's loyalty, but closed with the remark that her father had restored and rescued from oblivion a particular sentence from one of Gladstone's speeches, a sentence which had indubitably been pronounced, but which somehow or other had found its way out of the shorthand report in Hansard.<sup>e</sup>

Even at that time I considered replying to this obstinate clinging to the false quotation with the verbatim publication of the entire polemic. But editors often have their own judgement; the specialist journal which I regarded as suitable above all others refused to publish, on the grounds that the dispute lacked general interest. Engels was obviously of a different opinion. In the Preface to the fourth edition of the first volume of *Capital*, which he undertook, he returned to the polemic, but reported upon it in such a manner that the dishonesty with which it had been conducted by Marx was, understandably, not made clear; in addition he left unchanged the passage in *Capital*, I, 4th edition, p. 617, in which Marx had Gladstone say the opposite of what he really said; and even more, while Marx in his first edition simply referred to "Gladstone in H.o.C., April 16, 1863", the 4th edition added "*The Morning Star*, April 17, 1863", as though the report in this newspaper really contained the quotation as given by Marx! But the report in *The Morning Star* too contains all those sentences omitted by *The Theory of the Exchanges*, and subsequently by Marx, sentences which show that where Gladstone refers in his budget speech to income tax revenue, he is only contrasting the incomes of those who pay this tax with the incomes of those who, because of lower incomes, are free of this tax; that he perceives from the income tax lists an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, and remarks at the same time that the increase in income

<sup>a</sup> *Concordia*, No. 33, August 15, 1872.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 140-44, 152-54.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See F. Mehring, *Die Deutsche Sozialdemokratie. Ihre Geschichte und ihre Lehre*, Bremen, 1878, p. 221.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, p. 155.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See this volume, pp. 159-63.—*Ed.*

shown by these lists is confined to those in easy circumstances—quite naturally, since the incomes of the rest are not shown in these lists; but that he does *not* believe this augmentation is confined to these classes, since it is known from other sources that at the same time the condition of the British labourer has improved to a degree unexampled in any country and any age...

(The remainder has nothing to do with the charge and is simply a “Contribution to the Question” etc.—*F. Engels*.)

No. 14. FROM THE APPENDICES TO BRENTANO'S REPLY

a) From [H. Roy,] *The Theory of the Exchanges*, London, 1864, p. 134.

\*“From 1842 to 1852, the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent ... in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it had increased from the basis taken in 1853, 20 per cent! My honourable friend says, it is owing to Australian gold. I am sorry to see that he is lost in the depths of heresy upon the subject of gold. This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property, but must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, because it cheapens the commodities of general consumption—while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor! at any rate, whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say.”\*

*“Voilà l'homme en effet. Il va du blanc au noir.  
Il condamne au matin ses sentiments du soir.  
Importun à tout autre, à lui même incommode,  
Il change à tous moments d'esprit comme de mode.”*<sup>149</sup>

\*“The average condition of the British labourer has improved during the last twenty years in a degree we know to be extraordinary and unexampled in the history of any country or any age, a matter of the greatest thankfulness, because, etc. ... hardly have earnings given a sufficiency of prime necessities...”\*

Noteworthy for the connection between *The Theory of the Exchanges*, and Marx's remarks in *Capital*, I, 1st edition, p. 639 is also the following. Having advanced here the details, quoted from *The Theory of the Exchanges*, given by the LONDON ORPHAN ASYLUM, against Gladstone's sentence “WHETHER THE EXTREMES OF POVERTY ARE LESS EXTREME THAN THEY WERE, I DO NOT PRESUME TO SAY”, Marx turns against Gladstone's budget speech of April 7, 1864; *The Theory of the Exchanges* has an APPENDIX, in which, as a supplement to the pages just printed here, there is also a gloss on the budget of 1864. The style in which this is done is the same as that which is familiar enough from the foregoing. This excursus contains the following passage (p. 234):

\*“But the Chancellor is eloquent upon ‘poverty’... ‘Think of those who are on the border of that region...’, upon ‘wages ... in others it is true not increased... human life is, but, in nine cases out of ten, a struggle for existence.’”\*

Now compare with this Marx, I, 1st ed., p. 640, 4th ed., p. 618. Here too again, instead of the reproduction of the actual budget speech verbatim, [we find] the same mosaic of sentences torn from their context as in *The Theory of the Exchanges*. And here too it is not this source which is referred to, but simply to Gladstone, H.o.C., April 7, 1864. And then the text continues: “The continual crying contradictions in Gladstone's budget speeches of 1863 and 1864 were characterised by an English writer by the following quotation from Molière” (followed by the verse from Molière printed above).

It becomes clear that Marx took not only this quotation, but also the "continual crying contradictions in Gladstone's budget speeches of 1863 and 1864", invented by the author of *The Theory of the Exchanges*, from this book.

b) As was already remarked in the introduction to this reprint, Engels, in the fourth edition of the first volume of Marx's *Capital*, p. 617, added "*The Morning Star*, April 17, 1863" to the now-as-ever falsely reproduced quotation from Gladstone's budget speech. The relevant portions of this speech are given above on pp. 8 and 9 according to Hansard's shorthand report. Although on p. 13 the *Times* report—completely coincident in sense, with its wording condensed only as is a newspaper's wont, this report, together with that in *The Morning Star* quoted by Engels, and the wording of the quotation in Marx are presented parallel here:

\* *The Times*  
April 17, 1863

\* *The Morning Star*  
April 17, 1863

*Capital*  
I, 1st ed., p. 639,  
Note 103

"In ten years, from 1842 to 1852 inclusive, the taxable income of the country, as nearly as we can make out, increased by 6 per cent; but in eight years, from 1853 to 1861, the income of the country again increased from the basis taken by 20 per cent. That is a fact so strange as to be almost incredible... *I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, if it were my belief that it was confined to the classes who are in easy circumstances.* This takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation I have described, and which is founded, I think, upon accurate returns, is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property. Now, the augmentation of capital is of indirect benefit to the labourer, because it cheapens the commodity

*"I must say, for one, I should look with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, if it were my belief that it was confined to the classes who are in easy circumstances.* This great increase of wealth takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property. But that augmentation must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, because it cheapens the commodities which go to the general consumption. So that we have this pro-

\* "From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country

increased by 6 per cent. In the eight years from 1853 to 1861 it

had increased from the basis taken in 1853, 20 per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible .....  
.....  
.....  
..... "This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power

"is entirely confined to classes of property, but must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, because it cheapens the commodities of general consumption—

which in the business of production comes into direct competition with labour. (Hear, hear.) But we have this profound, and, I must say inestimable consolation, that while the rich have been growing richer the poor have been growing less poor. Whether the extremes of poverty are less extreme than they were I do not presume to say, but the average condition of the British labourer, we have the happiness to know, has improved during the last twenty years in a degree which we know to be extraordinary, and which we may almost pronounce to be unexampled in the history of any country and of any age. (Cheers.)”\*

found, and I almost say, inestimable consolation—while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor. (Hear, hear.) At any rate, whether the extremes are less extreme than they were I do not presume to say, but the average condition of the British labourer, we have the happiness to know to be extraordinary, and that we may almost pronounce it to be unexampled in the history of any country or any age. (Cheers)”\*

“while the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor! At any rate, whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say.”\*

Here, in the middle of a sentence, as the reprint above shows, *The Theory of the Exchanges* breaks off to insert a quotation from Molière; Marx who, as the comparison above shows, did not take the quotation from *The Morning Star* but—omitting a passage marked by him with dots—verbatim from *The Theory of the Exchanges*, has Gladstone end in the middle of a sentence...

The comparison above shows us that the arbitrarily thrown-together mosaic of sentences torn from their context, which Marx presents as Gladstone's budget speech, can be found as little in *The Morning Star* as in *The Times* or Hansard; on the other hand, it can be found solely in *The Theory of the Exchanges*. The heavily leaded sentences<sup>a</sup> are those omitted by Henry Roy, and still more by Karl Marx—compare the last sentence—in order to have Gladstone say the opposite of what he really said.

No. 15. FROM THE PARLIAMENTARY REPORTS  
OF THE LONDON PRESS OF APRIL 17, 1863

\* *Morning Herald*. I may say that I for one would look with fear and apprehension at this intoxicating increase of wealth if I were of opinion that it is confined to the classes in easy circumstances. This great increase of wealth which I have described, and which is founded on accurate returns is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital, and takes no account of the poorer classes.

*Morning Post*. I may say, I for one, would look with fear and apprehension when I consider this great increase of wealth if I believed that its benefits were confined to the classes in easy circumstances. This augmentation of wealth which I have described, and which is founded on accurate returns is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital, and takes no account of the augmentation of wealth of the poorer classes.

<sup>a</sup> In italics in this edition.—Ed.

*Daily Telegraph.* I may say for one, that I should look almost with apprehension and alarm on this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power if it were my belief that it was confined to the masses who are in easy circumstances. This question to wealth takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation stated is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property.

*Daily News.* I may say that I for one would look with fear and apprehension when I consider this great increase of wealth if I believed that its benefits were confined to the classes in easy circumstances. This augmentation of wealth which I have described, and which is founded upon accurate returns, is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital, and takes no account of the augmentation of wealth of the poorer classes.

*Standard.* I may say that I for one would look with fear and apprehension at this intoxicating increase of wealth if I were of the opinion that it was confined to the classes in easy circumstances. This great increase of wealth which I have described, and which is founded on the accurate returns is confined entirely to the augmentation of capital, and takes no account of the poorer classes.\*

No. 16. GLADSTONE TO BRENTANO

DEUTSCHES WOCHENBLATT, No. 49, DECEMBER 4, 1890

*Message*

In number 45 of the *Deutsches Wochenblatt* Professor Lujo Brentano published an essay "My Polemic with Karl Marx", which served at the same time as an introduction to a republication of this polemic as a pamphlet. This polemic dealt mainly with a parliamentary speech delivered by Gladstone in 1863, and which Marx reproduced in a distorted form in his Inaugural Address on the formation of the International Working Men's Association.

Obviously nobody is more qualified to settle this dispute about the wording of Gladstone's speech than Gladstone himself. It is therefore of special interest that Gladstone, as a result of the republication of Brentano's polemic with Marx, has addressed two letters to Brentano. On November 22 Gladstone wrote to Brentano: "You are completely correct, and Marx completely incorrect", and on November 28: "I undertook no changes of any sort". Thus the affair, which throws a revealing light on the Social Democratic line of argumentation, may finally be decided to the detriment of the Social Democratic standpoint.

By uncovering this deceit Brentano has done a service, and it was very timely that he chose this precise moment to rekindle the memories of this dispute.

O.A.

No. 17. ENGELS' REPLY TO No. 16

DIE NEUE ZEIT, No. 13, 1891, P. 425

*In the Case of Brentano v. Marx*<sup>150</sup>

In my preface to the fourth edition of Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I,<sup>a</sup> I was obliged to report upon the course of Mr. Lujo Brentano's

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 35; see also this volume, pp. 164-69.



favourite anonymous campaign against Marx, a campaign based upon the charge that Marx had forged a quotation from a speech by Gladstone.

Mr. Brentano responded to this with a pamphlet *My Polemic with Karl Marx* by Lujo Brentano, Berlin, Walter und Apolant, 1890. I shall reply to this in his own coin.

In the meantime, No. 49 of the *Deutsches Wochenblatt*, December 4, 1890, carries a further note on this matter, which states:

“Obviously nobody is more qualified to settle this dispute about the wording of Gladstone’s speech than Gladstone himself. It is therefore of special interest that Gladstone, as a result of the republication of Brentano’s polemic with Marx, has addressed two letters to Brentano. On November 22 Gladstone wrote to Brentano: ‘You are completely correct, and Marx completely incorrect’, and on November 28: ‘I undertook no changes of any sort.’”<sup>a</sup>

What is this supposed to mean? *In what* “are you completely correct” and Marx “completely incorrect”? *In what* “have I undertaken no changes of any sort”? Why is Mr. Brentano’s message confined to these two short sentences?

Either Mr. Gladstone has not given his permission to publish the whole of the letters. This is then proof enough that they prove nothing.

Or else Mr. Gladstone wrote the letters in the first place for the public, and permitted Mr. Brentano to make what use he would of them. Then the publication *only* of these meaningless extracts proves even more strongly that Mr. Gladstone’s testimony in its entirety is unusable for Mr. Brentano, and therefore “bodged together” as above.

In order to know what the two sentences above are worth, we must have before us not only the two letters from Mr. Gladstone, but also the relevant letters from Mr. Brentano. And as long as the whole correspondence in this matter has not been published in the original language, the fragments above are completely insignificant to the question under dispute, and not worth the paper they are printed on.

*F. Engels*

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 175.—*Ed.*

[GREETINGS TO THE FRENCH WORKERS  
ON THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE]

London, March 17

Citizens and citizenesses,

It is twenty years ago today that working-class Paris rose as one man against the criminal attack of the bourgeois and the rurals, led by Thiers. These enemies of the proletariat trembled when they saw the workers of Paris armed and organised to defend their rights. Thiers thought to deprive them of the arms which they had used with glory against the foreign invasion and which they would use even more gloriously against the attacks of the Versailles mercenaries. To crush Paris in revolt the rurals and the bourgeois begged for and obtained the Prussians' assistance. After an heroic struggle, Paris was crushed by weight of numbers and disarmed.

For twenty years now the workers of Paris have been without arms, and it is the same everywhere: in all the large civilised countries the proletariat is deprived of the material means of defence. Everywhere it is the adversaries and exploiters of the working class who have armed forces under their exclusive control.

What has all this led to?

It means that today, when every able-bodied man serves in the army, this army increasingly reflects popular feelings and ideas, and this army, the great means of repression, is becoming less secure day by day: already the heads of all the big states foresee with terror the day when soldiers under arms will refuse to butcher their fathers and brothers. We saw it in Paris when the Tonkinois<sup>a</sup> had the audacity to claim the presidency of the French republic;

---

<sup>a</sup> Jules Ferry.—*Ed*

we see it today in Berlin, where Bismarck's successor<sup>a</sup> is asking the Reichstag for the means to strengthen obedience in the army with non-commissioned officers bought for money—because there are thought to be too many socialists amongst the N.C.O.s!<sup>151</sup>

When such things start to happen, when day starts to dawn in the army, the end of the old world is visibly approaching.

May destiny be fulfilled! May the bourgeoisie in its decadence abdicate or die, and long live the Proletariat! Long live the international social Revolution!

*F. Engels*

First published in *Le Socialiste*, No. 27,  
March 25, 1891

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> Leo von Caprivi.— *Ed.*

INTRODUCTION  
 [TO KARL MARX'S  
*THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE*] <sup>152</sup>

I did not anticipate that I would be asked to prepare a new edition of the Address of the General Council of the International on *The Civil War in France*, and to write an introduction to it. Therefore I can only touch briefly here on the most important points.

I am prefacing the longer work mentioned above by the two shorter Addresses of the General Council on the Franco-Prussian War.<sup>a</sup> In the first place, because the second of these, which itself cannot be fully understood without the first, is referred to in *The Civil War*. But also because these two Addresses, likewise drafted by Marx, are, no less than *The Civil War*, outstanding examples of the author's remarkable gift, first proved in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*,<sup>b</sup> for grasping clearly the character, the import and the necessary consequences of great historical events, at a time when these events are still in progress before our eyes or have only just taken place. And, finally, because today we in Germany are still having to endure the consequences which Marx predicted would follow from these events.

Has that which was declared in the first Address not come to pass: that if Germany's defensive war against Louis Bonaparte degenerated into a war of conquest against the French people, all the miseries that befell Germany after the so-called wars of independence<sup>153</sup> would revive again with renewed intensity?<sup>c</sup> Have we not had a further twenty years of Bismarck's rule, the

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 3-8 and 263-70.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 11, pp. 99-197.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 6.—*Ed.*

Exceptional Law and socialist-baiting taking the place of the prosecution of demagogues,<sup>154</sup> with the same arbitrary action of the police and with literally the same staggering interpretations of the law?<sup>155</sup>

And has not the prediction been proved to the letter, that the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine would “force France into the arms of Russia”,<sup>a</sup> and that after this annexation Germany must either become the avowed servant of Russia, or must, after some short respite, arm for a new war, and, moreover, “a war of races—a war with the combined Slavonian and Roman races”?<sup>b</sup> Has not the annexation of the French provinces driven France into the arms of Russia? Has not Bismarck for fully twenty years vainly wooed the favour of the tsar, wooed it with services even more lowly than those which little Prussia, before it became the “first Power in Europe”, was wont to lay at Holy Russia’s feet? And is there not every day still hanging over our heads the Damocles’ sword of war, on the first day of which all the chartered covenants of princes will be scattered like chaff; a war of which nothing is certain but the absolute uncertainty of its outcome; a race war which will subject the whole of Europe to devastation by fifteen or twenty million armed men, and which is not raging already only because even the strongest of the great military states shrinks before the absolute incalculability of its final result?

All the more is it our duty to make again accessible to the German workers these brilliant proofs, now half-forgotten, of the farsightedness of international working-class policy in 1870.

What is true of these two Addresses is also true of *The Civil War in France*. On May 28, the last fighters of the Commune succumbed to superior forces on the slopes of Belleville; and only two days later, on May 30, Marx read to the General Council the work in which the historical significance of the Paris Commune is delineated in short, powerful strokes, but with such trenchancy, and above all such truth as has never again been attained in all the mass of literature on this subject.

Thanks to the economic and political development of France since 1789, Paris has been placed for the last fifty years in such a position that no revolution could break out there without assuming a proletarian character, that is to say, without the proletariat, which had bought victory with its blood, advancing its own demands after victory. These demands were more or less

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 22, p. 267.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

unclear and even confused, corresponding to the state of development reached by the workers of Paris at the particular period, but in the last resort they all amounted to the abolition of the class antagonism between capitalists and workers. It is true that no one knew how this was to be brought about. But the demand itself, however indefinitely it still was couched, contained a threat to the existing order of society; the workers who put it forward were still armed; therefore, the disarming of the workers was the first commandment for the bourgeois, who were at the helm of the state. Hence, after every revolution won by the workers, a new struggle, ending with the defeat of the workers.

This happened for the first time in 1848. The liberal bourgeois of the parliamentary opposition held banquets for securing a reform of the franchise,<sup>156</sup> which was to ensure supremacy for their party. Forced more and more, in their struggle with the government, to appeal to the people, they had gradually to yield precedence to the radical and republican strata of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. But behind these stood the revolutionary workers, and since 1830 these had acquired far more political independence than the bourgeois, and even the republicans, suspected. At the moment of the crisis between the government and the opposition, the workers began street-fighting; Louis Philippe vanished, and with him the franchise reform; and in its place arose the republic, and indeed one which the victorious workers themselves designated as a "social" republic. No one, however, was clear as to what this social republic was to imply; not even the workers themselves. But they now had arms and were a power in the state. Therefore, as soon as the bourgeois republicans in control felt something like firm ground under their feet, their first aim was to disarm the workers. This took place by driving them into the insurrection of June 1848 by direct breach of faith, by open defiance and the attempt to banish the unemployed to a distant province. The government had taken care to have an overwhelming superiority of force. After five days' heroic struggle, the workers were defeated. And then followed a blood-bath among the defenceless prisoners, the like of which has not been seen since the days of the civil wars which ushered in the downfall of the Roman republic. It was the first time that the bourgeoisie showed to what insane cruelties of revenge it will be goaded the moment the proletariat dares to take its stand against the bourgeoisie as a separate class, with its own interests and demands. And yet 1848 was only child's play compared with the frenzy of the bourgeoisie in 1871.

Punishment followed hard at heel. If the proletariat was not yet able to rule France, the bourgeoisie could no longer do so. At least not at that period, when the greater part of it was still monarchically inclined, and it was divided into three dynastic parties<sup>157</sup> and a fourth, republican party. Its internal dissensions allowed the adventurer, Louis Bonaparte, to take possession of all the commanding points—army, police, administrative machinery—and on December 2, 1851, to explode the last stronghold of the bourgeoisie, the National Assembly.<sup>158</sup> The Second Empire began—the exploitation of France by a gang of political and financial adventurers, but at the same time also an industrial development such as had never been possible under the narrow-minded and timorous system of Louis Philippe, with the exclusive domination of only a small section of the big bourgeoisie. Louis Bonaparte took the political power from the capitalists under the pretext of protecting them, the bourgeois, from the workers, and on the other hand the workers from them; but in return his rule encouraged speculation and industrial activity—in a word, the insurgence and enrichment of the whole bourgeoisie to an extent hitherto unknown. To an even greater extent, it is true, corruption and mass thievery developed, clustering around the imperial court, and drawing their heavy percentages from this enrichment.

But the Second Empire was the appeal to French chauvinism, was the demand for the restoration of the frontiers of the First Empire, which had been lost in 1814, or at least those of the First Republic. A French empire within the frontiers of the old monarchy and, in fact, within the even more amputated frontiers of 1815—such a thing was impossible for any length of time. Hence the necessity for occasional wars and extensions of frontiers. But no extension of frontiers was so dazzling to the imagination of the French chauvinists as the extension to the German left bank of the Rhine. One square mile on the Rhine was more to them than ten in the Alps or anywhere else. Given the Second Empire, the demand for the restoration of the left bank of the Rhine, either all at once or piecemeal, was merely a question of time. The time came with the Austro-Prussian War of 1866<sup>159</sup>; cheated of the anticipated “territorial compensation” by Bismarck and by his own over-cunning, hesitant policy, there was now nothing left for Napoleon but war, which broke out in 1870 and drove him first to Sedan, and thence to Wilhelmshöhe.<sup>160</sup>

The necessary consequence was the Paris Revolution of September 4, 1870. The empire collapsed like a house of cards, and

the republic was again proclaimed. But the enemy was standing at the gates; the armies of the empire were either hopelessly encircled at Metz or held captive in Germany. In this emergency the people allowed the Paris deputies to the former legislative body to constitute themselves into a "Government of National Defence". This was the more readily conceded, since, for the purposes of defence, all Parisians capable of bearing arms had enrolled in the National Guard and were armed, so that now the workers constituted a great majority. But very soon the antagonism between the almost completely bourgeois government and the armed proletariat broke into open conflict. On October 31, workers' battalions stormed the town hall and captured part of the membership of the government. Treachery, the government's direct breach of its undertakings, and the intervention of some petty-bourgeois battalions set them free again, and in order not to occasion the outbreak of civil war inside a city besieged by a foreign military power, the former government was left in office.

At last, on January 28, 1871, starved Paris capitulated. But with honours unprecedented in the history of war. The forts were surrendered, the city wall stripped of guns, the weapons of the regiments of the line and of the Mobile Guard were handed over, and they themselves considered prisoners of war. But the National Guard kept its weapons and guns, and only entered into an armistice with the victors. And these did not dare enter Paris in triumph. They only dared to occupy a tiny corner of Paris, which, into the bargain, consisted partly of public parks, and even this they only occupied for a few days! And during this time they, who had maintained their encirclement of Paris for 131 days, were themselves encircled by the armed workers of Paris, who kept a sharp watch that no "Prussian" should overstep the narrow bounds of the corner ceded to the foreign conqueror. Such was the respect which the Paris workers inspired in the army before which all the armies of the empire had laid down their arms; and the Prussian Junkers, who had come to take revenge at the home of the revolution, were compelled to stand by respectfully, and salute precisely this armed revolution!

During the war the Paris workers had confined themselves to demanding the vigorous prosecution of the fight. But now, when peace had come after the capitulation of Paris,<sup>161</sup> now Thiers, the new supreme head of the government, was compelled to realise that the rule of the propertied classes—big landowners and capitalists—was in constant danger so long as the workers of Paris had arms in their hands. His first action was an attempt to disarm



them. On March 18, he sent troops of the line with orders to rob the National Guard of the artillery belonging to it, which had been constructed during the siege of Paris and had been paid for by public subscription. The attempt failed; Paris mobilised as one man for resistance, and war between Paris and the French Government sitting at Versailles was declared. On March 26 the Paris Commune was elected and on March 28 it was proclaimed. The Central Committee of the National Guard, which up to then had carried on the government, handed in its resignation to the Commune after it had first decreed the abolition of the scandalous Paris "Morality Police". On March 30 the Commune abolished conscription and the standing army, and declared the sole armed force to be the National Guard, in which all citizens capable of bearing arms were to be enrolled. It remitted all payments of rent for dwelling houses from October 1870 until April, the amounts already paid to be booked as future rent payments, and stopped all sales of articles pledged in the municipal loan office. On the same day the foreigners elected to the Commune were confirmed in office, because "the flag of the Commune is the flag of the World Republic".<sup>a</sup> On April 1 it was decided that the highest salary to be received by any employee of the Commune, and therefore also by its members themselves, was not to exceed 6,000 francs (4,800 marks). On the following day the Commune decreed the separation of the church from the state, and the abolition of all state payments for religious purposes as well as the transformation of all church property into national property; as a result of which, on April 8, the exclusion from the schools of all religious symbols, pictures, dogmas, prayers—in a word, "of all that belongs to the sphere of the individual conscience"<sup>b</sup>—was ordered and gradually put into effect.—On the 5th, in reply to the shooting, day after day, of captured Commune fighters by the Versailles troops, a decree was issued for the imprisonment of hostages, but it was never carried out.—On the 6th, the guillotine was brought out by the 137th battalion of the National Guard, and publicly burnt, amid great popular rejoicing.—On the 12th, the Commune decided that the Victory Column on the *Place Vendôme*, which had been cast from captured guns by Napoleon after the war of 1809, should be demolished as a symbol of chauvinism and

<sup>a</sup> "Rapport de la Commission des Élections", *Journal officiel de la République française*, No. 90, March 31, 1871.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Apparently, this is a quotation from the order of the delegate for education E. Vaillant of May 11, 1871, published in *Journal officiel de la République française*, No. 132, May 12, 1871.—*Ed.*

incitement to national hatred. This was carried out on May 16.—On April 16 it ordered a statistical tabulation of factories which had been closed down by the manufacturers, and the working out of plans for the operation of these factories by the workers formerly employed in them, who were to be organised in co-operative societies, and also plans for the organisation of these co-operatives in one great union.—On the 20th it abolished night work for bakers, and also the employment offices, which since the Second Empire had been run as a monopoly by creatures appointed by the police—labour exploiters of the first rank; these offices were transferred to the mayoralties of the twenty *arrondissements* of Paris.—On April 30 it ordered the closing of the pawnshops, on the ground that they were a private exploitation of the workers, and were in contradiction with the right of the workers to their instruments of labour and to credit.—On May 5 it ordered the razing of the Chapel of Atonement, which had been built in expiation of the execution of Louis XVI.

Thus from March 18 onwards the class character of the Paris movement, which had previously been pushed into the background by the fight against the foreign invaders, emerged sharply and clearly. As almost only workers, or recognised representatives of the workers, sat in the Commune, its decisions bore a decidedly proletarian character. Either these decisions decreed reforms which the republican bourgeoisie had failed to pass solely out of cowardice, but which provided a necessary basis for the free activity of the working class—such as the implementation of the principle that *in relation to the state*, religion is a purely private matter—or the Commune promulgated decrees which were in the direct interest of the working class and in part cut deeply into the old order of society. In a beleaguered city, however, it was possible to make at most a start in the realisation of all this. And from the beginning of May onwards all their energies were taken up by the fight against the armies assembled by the Versailles government in ever-growing numbers.

On April 7 the Versailles troops had captured the Seine crossing at Neuilly, on the western front of Paris; on the other hand, in an attack, on the southern front on the 11th they were repulsed with heavy losses by General Eudes. Paris was continually bombarded and, moreover, by the very people who had stigmatised as a sacrilege the bombardment of the same city by the Prussians. These same people now begged the Prussian government for the hasty return of the French soldiers taken prisoner at Sedan and Metz, in order that they might recapture Paris for them. From the

beginning of May the gradual arrival of these troops gave the Versailles forces a decided superiority. This already became evident when, on April 23, Thiers broke off the negotiations for the exchange, proposed by the Commune, of the Archbishop of Paris<sup>a</sup> and a whole number of other priests held as hostages in Paris, for only one man, Blanqui, who had twice been elected to the Commune but was a prisoner in Clairvaux. And even more from the changed language of Thiers; previously procrastinating and equivocal, he now suddenly became insolent, threatening, brutal. The Versailles forces took the redoubt of Moulin Saquet on the southern front, on May 3; on the 9th, Fort Issy, which had been completely reduced to ruins by gunfire; on the 14th, Fort Vanves. On the western front they advanced gradually, capturing the numerous villages and buildings which extended up to the city wall, until they reached the main defences; on the 21st, thanks to treachery and the carelessness of the National Guards stationed there, they succeeded in forcing their way into the city. The Prussians, who held the northern and eastern forts, allowed the Versailles troops to advance across the land north of the city, which was forbidden ground to them under the armistice, and thus to march forward, attacking on a wide front, which the Parisians naturally thought covered by the armistice, and therefore held only weakly. As a result of this, only a weak resistance was put up in the western half of Paris, in the luxury city proper; it grew stronger and more tenacious the nearer the incoming troops approached the eastern half, the working-class city proper. It was only after eight days' fighting that the last defenders of the Commune succumbed on the heights of Belleville and Menilmontant; and then the massacre of defenceless men, women and children, which had been raging all through the week on an increasing scale, reached its zenith. The breechloaders could no longer kill fast enough; the vanquished were shot down in hundreds by *mitrailleuse* fire. The "Wall of the Federals" at the Père Lachaise cemetery, where the final mass murder was consummated,<sup>162</sup> is still standing today, a mute but eloquent testimony to the frenzy of which the ruling class is capable as soon as the working class dares to stand up for its rights. Then, when the slaughter of them all proved to be impossible, came the mass arrests, the shooting of victims arbitrarily selected from the prisoners' ranks, and the removal of the rest to great camps where they awaited trial by courts-martial. The Prussian troops surround-

---

<sup>a</sup> Georges Darboy.—*Ed.*

ing the northeastern half of Paris had orders not to allow any fugitives to pass; but the officers often shut their eyes when the soldiers paid more obedience to the dictates of humanity than to those of the Supreme Command; particular honour is due to the Saxon army corps, which behaved very humanely and let through many who were obviously fighters for the Commune.

---

If today, after twenty years, we look back at the activity and historical significance of the Paris Commune of 1871, we shall find it necessary to make a few additions to the account given in *The Civil War in France*.

The members of the Commune were divided into a majority, the Blanquists, who had also been predominant in the Central Committee of the National Guard; and a minority, members of the International Working Men's Association, chiefly consisting of adherents of the Proudhon school of socialism. The great majority of the Blanquists were at that time socialists only by revolutionary, proletarian instinct; only a few had attained greater clarity on principles, through Vaillant, who was familiar with German scientific socialism. It is therefore comprehensible that in the economic sphere much was left undone which, according to our view today, the Commune ought to have done. The hardest thing to understand is certainly the holy awe with which they remained standing respectfully outside the gates of the Bank of France. This was also a serious political mistake. The bank in the hands of the Commune—this would have been worth more than ten thousand hostages. It would have meant the pressure of the whole of the French bourgeoisie on the Versailles government in favour of peace with the Commune. But what is still more wonderful is the correctness of much that nevertheless was done by the Commune, composed as it was of Blanquists and Proudhonists. Naturally, the Proudhonists were chiefly responsible for the economic decrees of the Commune, both for their praiseworthy and their unpraiseworthy aspects; as the Blanquists were for its political commissions and omissions. And in both cases the irony of history willed—as is usual when doctrinaires come to the helm—that both did the opposite of what the doctrines of their school prescribed.

Proudhon, the socialist of the small peasant and master-craftsman, regarded association with positive hatred. He said of it that there was more bad than good in it; that it was by nature

sterile, even harmful, because it was a fetter on the freedom of the worker; that it was a pure dogma, unproductive and burdensome, in conflict as much with the freedom of the worker as with economy of labour; that its disadvantages multiplied more swiftly than its advantages; that, as compared with it, competition, division of labour and private property were economic forces. Only in the exceptional cases—as Proudhon called them—of large-scale industry and large establishments, such as railways, was the association of workers in place. (See *General Idea of the Revolution*, 3rd sketch.<sup>163</sup>)

By 1871, large-scale industry had already so much ceased to be an exceptional case even in Paris, the centre of artistic handicrafts, that by far the most important decree of the Commune instituted an organisation of large-scale industry and even of manufacture which was not only to be based on the association of the workers in each factory, but also to combine all these associations in one great union; in short, an organisation which, as Marx quite rightly says in *The Civil War*, must necessarily have led in the end to communism,<sup>a</sup> that is to say, the direct opposite of the Proudhon doctrine. And, therefore, the Commune was the grave of the Proudhon school of socialism. Today this school has vanished from French working-class circles; here, among the Possibilists<sup>164</sup> no less than among the “Marxists”, Marx’s theory now rules unchallenged. Only among the “radical” bourgeoisie are there still Proudhonists.

The Blanquists fared no better. Brought up in the school of conspiracy, and held together by the strict discipline which went with it, they started out from the viewpoint that a relatively small number of resolute, well-organised men would be able, at a given favourable moment, not only to seize the helm of state, but also by a display of great, ruthless energy, to maintain power until they succeeded in sweeping the mass of the people into the revolution and ranging them round the small band of leaders. This involved, above all, the strictest, dictatorial centralisation of all power in the hands of the new revolutionary government. And what did the Commune, with its majority of these same Blanquists, actually do? In all its proclamations to the French in the provinces, it appealed to them to form a free federation of all French Communes with Paris, a national organisation which for the first time was really to be created by the nation itself. It was precisely the oppressing power of the former centralised government, army, political

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 22, p. 335.—*Ed.*

police, bureaucracy, which Napoleon had created in 1798 and which since then had been taken over by every new government as a welcome instrument and used against its opponents—it was precisely this power which was to fall everywhere, just as it had already fallen in Paris.

From the very outset the Commune was compelled to recognise that the working class, once come to power, could not go on managing with the old state machine; that in order not to lose again its only just conquered supremacy, this working class must, on the one hand, do away with all the old repressive machinery previously used against it itself, and, on the other, safeguard itself against its own deputies and officials, by declaring them all, without exception, subject to recall at any moment. What had been the characteristic attribute of the former state? Society had created its own organs to look after its common interests, originally through simple division of labour. But these organs, at whose head was the state power, had in the course of time, in pursuance of their own special interests, transformed themselves from the servants of society into the masters of society. This can be seen, for example, not only in the hereditary monarchy, but equally so in the democratic republic. Nowhere do “politicians” form a more separate and powerful section of the nation than precisely in North America. There, each of the two major parties which alternately succeed each other in power is itself in turn controlled by people who make a business of politics, who speculate on seats in the legislative assemblies of the Union as well as of the separate states, or who make a living by carrying on agitation for their party and on its victory are rewarded with positions. It is well known how the Americans have been trying for thirty years to shake off this yoke, which has become intolerable, and how in spite of it all they continue to sink ever deeper in this swamp of corruption. It is precisely in America that we see best how there takes place this process of the state power making itself independent in relation to society, whose mere instrument it was originally intended to be. Here there exists no dynasty, no nobility, no standing army, beyond the few men keeping watch on the Indians, no bureaucracy with permanent posts or the right to pensions. And nevertheless we find here two great gangs of political speculators, who alternately take possession of the state power, and exploit it by the most corrupt means and for the most corrupt ends—and the nation is powerless against these two great cartels of politicians, who are ostensibly its servants, but in reality dominate and plunder it.

Against this transformation of the state and the organs of the state from servants of society into masters of society—an inevitable transformation in all previous states—the Commune made use of two infallible means. In the first place, it filled all posts—administrative, judicial and educational—by election on the basis of universal suffrage of all concerned, subject to the right of recall at any time by the same electors. And, in the second place, all officials, high or low, were paid only the wages received by other workers. The highest salary paid by the Commune to anyone was 6,000 francs. In this way an effective barrier to place-hunting and careerism was set up, even apart from the binding mandates to delegates to representative bodies which were added besides.

This shattering [*Sprengung*] of the former state power and its replacement by a new and truly democratic one is described in detail in the third section of *The Civil War*. But it was necessary to dwell briefly here once more on some of its features, because in Germany particularly the superstitious belief in the state has been carried over from philosophy into the general consciousness of the bourgeoisie and even of many workers. According to the philosophical conception, the state is the “realisation of the idea”,<sup>a</sup> or the Kingdom of God on earth, translated into philosophical terms, the sphere in which eternal truth and justice is or should be realised. And from this follows a superstitious reverence for the state and everything connected with it, which takes root the more readily since people are accustomed from childhood to imagine that the affairs and interests common to the whole of society could not be looked after otherwise than as they have been looked after in the past, that is, through the state and its lucratively positioned officials. And people think they have taken quite an extraordinarily bold step forward when they have rid themselves of belief in hereditary monarchy and swear by the democratic republic. In reality, however, the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy; and at best an evil inherited by the proletariat after its victorious struggle for class supremacy, whose worst sides the victorious proletariat, just like the Commune, cannot avoid having to lop off at once as much as possible until such time as a generation reared in new, free social conditions is able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap heap.

---

<sup>a</sup> This refers to Hegel's *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, oder Naturrecht und Staatswissenschaft*.—Ed.

Of late, the German philistine<sup>165</sup> has once more been filled with wholesome terror at the words: Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

*London*, on the twentieth anniversary of the Paris Commune,  
March 18, 1891 *F. Engels*

First published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 2,  
No. 28, 1890-1891, and in the book:  
Marx, *Der Bürgerkrieg in Frankreich*, Ber-  
lin, 1891

Printed according to the book



[RE: THE SPANISH EDITION OF KARL MARX'S  
*THE POVERTY OF PHILOSOPHY*

(LETTER TO JOSE MESA)]<sup>166</sup>

London, March 24, 1891

My Dear Friend Mesa,

We were very pleased to hear from your letter of the 2nd of this month about the forthcoming publication of your translation of *The Poverty of Philosophy* by Marx. It goes without saying that we fully associate ourselves with this publication, which undoubtedly must have the most favourable effect on the development of socialism in Spain.

The Proudhonist theory, destroyed in its foundations by Marx's book, has probably disappeared from the face of the earth since the fall of the Paris "Commune". But it continues to furnish the arsenal from which the radical bourgeoisie and pseudo-socialists of Western Europe produce the phrases with which they lull the workers. And as the workers of these same countries have inherited from their predecessors similar Proudhonist phrases, it happens that this radical phraseology still finds an echo in many of them. This is what happens in France, where the only remaining Proudhonists are the radical bourgeoisie or Republicans who call themselves socialists. And, if I am not mistaken, you also have in your Cortes and in your newspapers some of these Republicans who call themselves socialists because they see in Proudhonist ideas a plausible way, and one within everyone's reach, of opposing true socialism, the rational and concise expression of the aspirations of the proletariat, a bourgeois socialism of bad faith.

Fraternal greetings.

*F. Engels*

First published, in Spanish, in: Carlos Marx, *Miseria de la filosofía*, Madrid, 1891

Printed according to the book, checked with the French rough manuscript

Translated from the Spanish

Published in English for the first time

[TO THE COMMITTEE  
FOR THE INTERNATIONAL MEETING  
FOR THE CLAIMS OF LABOUR]<sup>167</sup>

Dear citizens,

I deeply regret that I am unable to accept your kind invitation, which does me great honour, to attend your meeting of the 12th inst. I regret it all the more since I feel a particular attachment to your country after holding the position of secretary for Italy twenty years ago on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association.<sup>168</sup> Since then the International has disappeared in its official form; but in the spirit of solidarity with the working class of all countries it has always lived on; today it is more alive and more powerful than ever, so powerful that its old official form from 1864 to 1875 would no longer be able to contain the millions of European and American workers who are gathered around the red banner of the militant proletariat. I hope, as you do, that your meeting of April 12 will bring new columns of fighters into the great army of the worldwide proletariat; that it will contribute greatly to strengthening the bonds of solidarity which unite the Italian workers with their brothers beyond the Alps—French, German, Slav; and that it will finally mark a new stage in the emancipatory advance of the Italian proletariat.

We have made tremendous progress in the last twenty years; but there still remains much to be done before we can aspire to an immediate and certain victory. *Dunque, avanti, sempre avanti!*<sup>a</sup>

London, April 9, 1891

F. E.

First published in: K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol. XVI, Part II, 1936

Printed according to the rough manuscript

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> "Thus forward, always forward!"—*Ed.*

INTRODUCTION  
[TO KARL MARX'S  
WAGE LABOUR AND CAPITAL (1891 EDITION)]<sup>169</sup>

The following work appeared as a series of leading articles in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* from April 4, 1849 onwards. It is based on the lectures delivered by *Marx* in 1847 at the German Workers' Society in Brussels.<sup>170</sup> The work as printed remained a fragment; the words at the end of No. 269: "To be continued," remained unfulfilled in consequence of the events which just then came crowding one after another: the invasion of Hungary by the Russians, the insurrections in Dresden, Iserlohn, Elberfeld, the Palatinate and Baden,<sup>171</sup> which led to the suppression of the newspaper itself (May 19, 1849). The manuscript of the continuation was not found among *Marx's* papers after his death.<sup>172</sup>

*Wage Labour and Capital* has appeared in a number of editions as a separate publication in pamphlet form, the last being in 1884, by the Swiss Co-operative Press, Hottingen-Zurich. The editions hitherto published retained the exact wording of the original. The present new edition, however, is to be circulated in not less than 10,000 copies as a propaganda pamphlet, and so the question could not but force itself upon me whether under these circumstances *Marx* himself would have approved of an unaltered reproduction of the original.

In the forties, *Marx* had not yet finished his critique of political economy. This took place only towards the end of the fifties. Consequently, his works which appeared before the first part of *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859)<sup>a</sup> differ in some points from those written after 1859, and contain expressions and whole sentences which, from the point of view of the later works, appear unfortunate and even incorrect. Now, it is self-evident that in ordinary editions intended for the general public this earlier point of view also has its place, as a part of the intellectual development of the author, and that both author and public have an indisputable right to the unaltered reproduction of

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 29, pp. 257-417.—*Ed.*

these older works. And I should not have dreamed of altering a word of them.

It is another thing when the new edition is intended practically exclusively for propaganda among workers. In such a case Marx would certainly have brought the old presentation dating from 1849 into harmony with his new point of view. And I feel certain of acting as he would have done in undertaking *for this edition* the few alterations and additions which are required in order to attain this object in all essential points. I therefore tell the reader beforehand: this is not the pamphlet as Marx wrote it in 1849 but approximately as he would have written it in 1891. The actual text, moreover, is circulated in so many copies that this will suffice until I am able to reprint it again, unaltered, in a later complete edition.

My alterations all turn on one point. According to the original, the worker sells his *labour* to the capitalist for wages; according to the present text he sells his labour *power*. And for this alteration I owe an explanation. I owe it to the workers in order that they may see it is not a case here of mere juggling with words, but rather of one of the most important points in the whole of political economy. I owe it to the bourgeois, so that they can convince themselves how vastly superior the uneducated workers, for whom one can easily make comprehensible the most difficult economic analyses, are to our supercilious "educated people" to whom such intricate questions remain insoluble their whole life long.

Classical political economy took over from industrial practice the current conception of the manufacturer, that he buys and pays for the *labour* of his workers. This conception had been quite adequate for the business needs, the book-keeping and price calculations of the manufacturer. But, naively transferred to political economy, it produced there really wondrous errors and confusions.

Political economy observes the fact that the prices of all commodities, among them also the price of the commodity that it calls "labour", are continually changing; that they rise and fall as the result of the most varied circumstances, which often bear no relation whatever to the production of the commodities themselves, so that prices seem, as a rule, to be determined by pure chance. As soon, then, as political economy made its appearance as a science, one of its first tasks was to seek the law which was concealed behind this chance apparently governing the prices of commodities, and which, in reality, governed this very chance. Within the prices of commodities, continually fluctuating and

oscillating, now upwards and now downwards, political economy sought for the firm central point around which these fluctuations and oscillations turned. In a word, it started from the *prices* of commodities in order to look for the *value* of the commodities as the law controlling prices, the value by which all fluctuations in price are to be explained and to which finally they are all to be ascribed.

Classical political economy then found that the value of a commodity is determined by the labour contained in it, requisite for its production. With this explanation it contented itself. And we also can pause here for the time being. I will only remind the reader, in order to avoid misunderstandings, that this explanation has nowadays become totally inadequate. Marx was the first thoroughly to investigate the value-creating quality of labour and he discovered in so doing that not all labour apparently, or even really, necessary for the production of a commodity adds to it under all circumstances a magnitude of value which corresponds to the quantity of labour expended. If therefore today we say offhandedly with economists like Ricardo that the value of a commodity is determined by the labour necessary for its production, we always in so doing imply the reservations made by Marx. This suffices here; more is to be found in Marx's *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, 1859, and the first volume of *Capital*.<sup>a</sup>

But as soon as the economists applied this determination of value by labour to the commodity "labour", they fell into one contradiction after another. How is the value of "labour" determined? By the necessary labour contained in it. But how much labour is contained in the labour of a worker for a day, a week, a month, a year? The labour of a day, a week, a month, a year. If labour is the measure of all values, then indeed we can express the "value of labour" only in labour. But we know absolutely nothing about the value of an hour of labour, if we only know that it is equal to an hour of labour. This brings us not a hair's breadth nearer the goal; we keep on moving in a circle.

Classical political economy, therefore, tried another tack. It said: The value of a commodity is equal to its cost of production. But what is the cost of production of labour? In order to answer this question, the economists have to tamper a little with logic. Instead of investigating the cost of production of labour itself, which

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 29, pp. 269-92 and K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part I, Ch. I, Sections 1-3 (Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

unfortunately cannot be ascertained, they proceed to investigate the cost of production of the *worker*. And this can be ascertained. It varies with time and circumstance, but for a given state of society, a given locality and a given branch of production, it too is given, at least within fairly narrow limits. We live today under the domination of capitalist production, in which a large, ever-increasing class of the population can live only if it works for the owners of the means of production—the tools, machines, raw materials and means of subsistence—in return for wages. On the basis of this mode of production, the cost of production of the worker consists of that quantity of the means of subsistence—or their price in money—which, on the average, is necessary to make him capable of working, keep him capable of working, and to replace him, after his departure by reason of old age, sickness or death, with a new worker—that is to say, to propagate the working class in the necessary numbers. Let us assume that the money price of these means of subsistence averages three marks a day.

Our worker, therefore, receives a wage of three marks a day from the capitalist who employs him. For this, the capitalist makes him work, say, twelve hours a day, calculating roughly as follows:

Let us assume that our worker—a machinist—has to make a part of a machine which he can complete in one day. The raw material—iron and brass in the necessary previously prepared form—costs twenty marks. The consumption of coal by the steam engine, and the wear and tear of this same engine, of the lathe and the other tools which our worker uses represent for one day, and reckoned by his share of their use, a value of one mark. The wage for one day, according to our assumption, is three marks. This makes twenty-four marks in all for our machine part. But the capitalist calculates that he will obtain, on an average, twenty-seven marks from his customers in return, or three marks more than his outlay.

Whence came the three marks pocketed by the capitalist? According to the assertion of classical political economy, commodities are, on the average, sold at their values, that is, at prices corresponding to the amount of necessary labour contained in them. The average price of our machine part—twenty-seven marks—would thus be equal to its value, that is, equal to the labour embodied in it. But of these twenty-seven marks, twenty-one marks were values already present before our machinist began work. Twenty marks were contained in the raw materials, one mark in the coal consumed during the work, or in the machines

and tools which were used in the process and which were diminished in their efficiency to the value of this sum. There remain six marks which have been added to the value of the raw material. But according to the assumption of our economists themselves, these six marks can only arise from the labour added to the raw material by our worker. His twelve hours' labour has thus created a new value of six marks. The value of his twelve hours' labour would, therefore, be equal to six marks. And thus we would at last have discovered what the "value of labour" is.

"Hold on there!" cries our machinist. "Six marks? But I have received only three marks! My capitalist swears by all that is holy that the value of my twelve hours' labour is only three marks, and if I demand six he laughs at me. How do you make that out?"

If previously we got into a vicious circle with our value of labour, we are now properly caught in an insoluble contradiction. We looked for the value of labour and we have found more than we can use. For the worker, the value of the twelve hours' labour is three marks, for the capitalist it is six marks, of which he pays three to the worker as wages and pockets three for himself. Thus labour would have not one but two values and very different values into the bargain!

The contradiction becomes still more absurd as soon as we reduce to labour time the values expressed in money. During the twelve hours' labour a new value of six marks is created. Hence, in six hours three marks—the sum which the worker receives for twelve hours' labour. For twelve hours' labour the worker receives as an equivalent value the product of six hours' labour. Either, therefore, labour has two values, of which one is double the size of the other, or twelve equals six! In both cases we get pure nonsense.

Turn and twist as we will, we cannot get out of this contradiction, as long as we speak of the purchase and sale of labour and of the value of labour. And this also happened to the economists. The last offshoot of classical political economy, the Ricardian school, was wrecked mainly by the insolubility of this contradiction. Classical political economy had got into a blind alley. The man who found the way out of this blind alley was Karl Marx.

What the economists had regarded as the cost of production of "labour" was the cost of production not of labour but of the living worker himself. And what this worker sold to the capitalist was not his labour. "As soon as his labour actually begins," says Marx, "it has already ceased to belong to him; it can therefore no longer be

sold by him.”<sup>a</sup> At the most, he might sell his *future* labour, that is, undertake to perform a certain amount of work in a definite time. In so doing, however, he does not sell labour (which would first have to be performed) but puts his labour power at the disposal of the capitalist for a definite time (in the case of time-work) or for the purpose of a definite output (in the case of piece-work) in return for a definite payment: he hires out, or sells, his *labour power*. But this labour power is intergrown with his person and is inseparable from it. Its cost of production, therefore, coincides with his cost of production; what the economists called the cost of production of labour is really the cost of production of the worker and therewith of his labour power. And so we can go back from the cost of production of labour power to the *value* of labour power and determine the amount of socially necessary labour requisite for the production of labour power of a particular quality, as Marx has done in the chapter on the buying and selling of labour power (*Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter IV, Section 3).<sup>b</sup>

Now what happens after the worker has sold his labour power to the capitalist, that is, placed it at the disposal of the latter in return for a wage—day wage or piece wage—agreed upon beforehand? The capitalist takes the worker into his workshop or factory, where all the things necessary for work—raw materials, auxiliary materials (coal, dyes, etc.), tools, machines—are already to be found. Here the worker begins to drudge. His daily wage may be, as above, three marks—and in this connection it does not make any difference whether he earns it as day wage or piece wage. Here also we again assume that in the twelve hours the worker by his labour adds a new value of six marks to the raw materials used up, which new value the capitalist realises on the sale of the finished piece of work. Out of this he pays the worker his three marks; the other three marks he keeps for himself. If, now, the worker creates a value of six marks in twelve hours, then in six hours he creates a value of three marks. He has, therefore, already repaid the capitalist the counter-value of the three marks contained in his wages when he has worked six hours for him. After six hours' labour they are both quits, neither owes the other a pfennig.

“Hold on there!” the capitalist now cries. “I have hired the worker for a whole day, for twelve hours. Six hours, however, are only half a day. So go right on working until the other six hours

<sup>a</sup> Engels quotes from K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VI, Ch. XIX (see present edition, Vol. 35).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part II, Ch. VI (*ibid.*).—*Ed.*



are up—only then shall we be quits!” And, in fact, the worker has to comply with his contract “voluntarily” entered into, according to which he has pledged himself to work twelve whole hours for a labour product which costs six hours of labour.

It is just the same with piece wages. Let us assume that our worker makes twelve items of a commodity in twelve hours. Each of these costs two marks in raw materials and depreciation and is sold at two and a half marks. Then the capitalist, on the same assumptions as before, will give the worker twenty-five pfennigs per item; that makes three marks for twelve items, to earn which the worker needs twelve hours. The capitalist receives thirty marks for the twelve items; deduct twenty-four marks for raw materials and depreciation and there remain six marks, of which he pays three marks to the worker in wages and pockets three marks. It is just as above. Here, too, the worker works six hours for himself, that is, for replacement of his wages (half an hour in each of the twelve hours) and six hours for the capitalist.

The difficulty over which the best economists came to grief, so long as they started out from the value of “labour”, vanishes as soon as we start out from the value of “labour *power*” instead. In our present-day capitalist society, labour power is a commodity, a commodity like any other, and yet quite a peculiar commodity. It has, namely, the peculiar property of being a value-creating power, a source of value and, indeed, with suitable treatment, a source of more value than it itself possesses. With the present state of production, human labour power not only produces in one day a greater value than it itself possesses and costs; with every new scientific discovery, with every new technical invention, this surplus of its daily product over its daily cost increases, and therefore that portion of the labour day in which the worker works to produce the replacement of his day’s wage decreases; consequently, on the other hand, that portion of the labour day in which he has to *make a present* of his labour to the capitalist without being paid for it increases.

And this is the economic constitution of the whole of our present-day society: it is the working class alone which produces all values. For value is only another expression for labour, that expression whereby in our present-day capitalist society is designated the amount of socially necessary labour contained in a particular commodity. These values produced by the workers do not, however, belong to the workers. They belong to the owners of the raw materials, machines, tools and the reserve funds which allow these owners to buy the labour power of the working class.

From the whole mass of products produced by it, the working class, therefore, receives back only a part for itself. And as we have just seen, the other part, which the capitalist class keeps for itself and at most has to divide with the class of landowners, becomes larger with every new discovery and invention, while the part falling to the share of the working class (reckoned per head) either increases only very slowly and inconsiderably or not at all, and under certain circumstances may even fall.

But these discoveries and inventions which supersede each other at an ever-increasing rate, this productivity of human labour which rises day by day to an extent previously unheard of, finally give rise to a conflict in which the present-day capitalist economy must perish. On the one hand are immeasurable riches and a superfluity of products which the purchasers cannot cope with; on the other hand, the great mass of society proletarianised, turned into wage-workers, and precisely for that reason made incapable of appropriating for themselves this superfluity of products. The division of society into a small, excessively rich class and a large, propertyless class of wage-workers results in a society suffocating from its own superfluity, while the great majority of its members is scarcely, or even not at all, protected from extreme want. This state of affairs becomes daily more absurd and—more unnecessary. It *must* be abolished, it *can* be abolished. A new social order is possible in which the present class differences will have disappeared and in which—perhaps after a short transitional period involving some privation, but at any rate of great value morally—through the planned utilisation and extension of the already existing enormous productive forces of all members of society, and with uniform obligation to work, the means for existence, for enjoying life, for the development and employment of all bodily and mental faculties will be available in an equal measure and in ever-increasing fulness. And that the workers are becoming more and more determined to win this new social order will be demonstrated on both sides of the ocean by May the First, tomorrow, and by Sunday, May 3.<sup>173</sup>

*London, April 30, 1891*

*Frederick Engels*

First published as supplement to the *Vorwärts*, No. 109, May 13, 1891 and in the pamphlet: Karl Marx, *Lohnarbeit und Kapital*, Berlin, 1891

Printed according to the pamphlet

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION  
[OF *SOCIALISM: UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC*] <sup>174</sup>

My assumption that the contents of this publication will present little difficulty to our German workers has proven correct. At any rate, since March 1883, when it first appeared, three editions totaling 10,000 copies have been disposed of, and this under the operation of the now defunct Anti-Socialist Law<sup>175</sup>—which again illustrates how impotent police bans against a movement like that of the modern proletariat are.

Since the first edition various translations into foreign languages have also appeared: an Italian rendition by Pasquale Martignetti: *Il Socialismo Utopico e il Socialismo Scientifico*, Benvenuto, 1883; a Russian one: *Razvitie naucz'nago socializma*,<sup>a</sup> Geneva, 1884; a Danish one: *Socialismens Udvikling fra Utopi til Videnskab*, in *Socialistisk Bibliotek*, Vol. I, Copenhagen, 1885; a Spanish one: *Socialismo utópico y Socialismo científico*, Madrid, 1886, and a Dutch one: *De Ontwikkeling van het Socialisme van Utopie tot Wetenschap*, The Hague, 1886.

The present edition has undergone various slight alterations; more important additions have been made in only two places: in the first chapter on Saint-Simon, who was dealt with too briefly in comparison with Fourier and Owen, and towards the end of the third chapter on the new form of production, the “trusts”, which meanwhile has become important.<sup>176</sup>

London, May 12, 1891

*Frederick Engels*

First published in: Friedrich Engels, *Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*, Berlin, 1891

Printed according to the book

<sup>a</sup> Engels' transliteration.—Ed.

TO THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE FAMILY  
(BACHOFEN, McLENNAN, MORGAN)

[PREFACE TO THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION (1891)  
OF THE *ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY  
AND THE STATE*]<sup>177</sup>

The previous large editions of this work have been out of print now for almost six months and the publisher<sup>a</sup> has for some time past desired me to prepare a new edition. More urgent tasks have hitherto prevented me from doing so. Seven years have elapsed since the first edition appeared, and during this period our knowledge of the primitive forms of the family has made important progress. It was, therefore, necessary diligently to apply the hand to the work of amplification and improvement, particularly in view of the fact<sup>b</sup> that the proposed placing of the present text on stereotypes will make further changes on my part impossible for some time to come.

I have, therefore, submitted the whole text to a careful revision, and have made a number of additions, in which, I hope, due regard has been paid to the present state of science. Further, in the course of this preface, I give a brief review of the development of the history of the family from Bachofen to Morgan, principally because the English prehistoric school, which is tinged with chauvinism, continues to do its utmost to kill by silence the revolution Morgan's discoveries have made in conceptions of the history of primitive society, although it does not hesitate in the

---

<sup>a</sup> J. H. W. Dietz.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* the end of the sentence reads: "that the latest edition most commonly to be found in German socialist literature has very seldom been the subject of attention in other areas of the German book-trade, up to today."—*Ed.*

least to appropriate his results. Elsewhere, too, this English example is followed only too often.

My work has been translated into various languages. First into Italian: *L'origine della famiglia, della proprietà privata e dello stato*. Versione riveduta dall'autore, di Pasquale Martignetti. Benevento, 1885. Then Rumanian: *Originea familiei, proprietății, private și a statului*. Traducere de Joan Nădejde, in the Yassy periodical *Contemporanul*, September 1885 to May 1886. Further into Danish: *Familjens, Privatejendommens og Statens Oprindelse*. Dansk af Forfatteren gennemgaaet Udgave, besørget af Gerson Trier, Copenhagen, 1888. A French translation by Henri Ravé based on the present German edition is in the press.<sup>a</sup>

---

Until the beginning of the sixties there was no such thing as a history of the family. In this sphere historical science was still completely under the influence of the Five Books of Moses. The patriarchal form of the family, described there in greater detail than anywhere else, was not only implicitly accepted as the oldest form of the family, but also—after excluding polygamy—identified with the present-day bourgeois family, as if the family had really undergone no historical development at all. At most it was admitted that a period of promiscuous sexual relationships might have existed in primeval times.—To be sure, in addition to monogamy, Oriental polygamy and Indo-Tibetan polyandry were also known, but these three forms could not be arranged in any historical sequence and appeared disconnectedly alongside of each other. That among certain peoples of ancient times, and among some still existing savages, the line of descent was reckoned not from the father but from the mother and, therefore, the female lineage alone was regarded as valid; that among many peoples of today marriage within definite larger groups—not subjected to closer investigation at that time—is prohibited, and that this custom is to be met with in all parts of the world—these facts were indeed known and new examples were constantly being brought to light. But nobody knew what to do with them, and even in E. B. Tylor's *Researches into the Early History of Mankind, etc. etc.* (1865), they figure merely as "strange customs" along with the taboo in force among some savages

---

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to *L'Origine de la famille, de la propriété privée et de l'État*.—Ed.

against the touching of burning wood with iron tools, and similar religious bosh and nonsense.

The study of the history of the family dates from 1861, from the publication of Bachofen's *Das Mutterrecht*. In this work the author advances the following propositions: 1) that in the beginning humanity lived in a state of sexual promiscuity, which the author unhappily designates as hetaerism; 2) that such promiscuity excludes all certainty as regards paternity, that lineage, therefore, could be reckoned only through the female line—according to mother right—and that originally this was the case among all the peoples of antiquity; 3) that consequently women, who, as mothers, were the only definitely ascertainable parents of the younger generation, were treated with a high degree of consideration and respect, which, according to Bachofen's conception, was enhanced to the complete rule of women (gynaecocracy); 4) that the transition to monogamy, where the woman belongs exclusively to *one* man, implied the violation of a primeval religious injunction (that is, in actual fact, the violation of the ancient traditional right of the other men to the same woman), a violation which had to be atoned for, or the toleration of which had to be purchased, by surrendering the woman for a limited period of time.

Bachofen finds evidence in support of these propositions in countless passages of ancient classical literature, which he had assembled with extraordinary diligence. According to him, the evolution from "hetaerism" to monogamy, and from mother right to father right, takes place, particularly among the Greeks, as a consequence of the evolution of religious ideas, the intrusion of new deities, representatives of the new outlook, into the old traditional pantheon representing the old outlook, so that the latter is more and more driven into the background by the former. Thus, according to Bachofen, it is not the development of the actual conditions under which men live, but the religious reflection of these conditions of life in the minds of men that brought about the historical changes in the mutual social position of man and woman. Bachofen accordingly points to the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus as a dramatic depiction of the struggle between declining mother right and rising and victorious father right in the Heroic Age. Clytemnestra has slain her husband Agamemnon, just return from the Trojan War, for the sake of her lover Aegisthus; but Orestes, her son by Agamemnon, avenges his father's murder by slaying his mother. For this he is pursued by the Erinyes, the demonic defenders of mother right, according to which matricide is the most heinous and inexpiable of crimes. But Apollo, who through his oracle has incited Orestes to commit this deed, and

Athena, who is called in as arbiter—the two deities which here represent the new order, based on father right—protect him. Athena hears both sides. The whole controversy is briefly summarised in the debate which now ensues between Orestes and the Erinyes. Orestes declares that Clytemnestra is guilty of a double outrage; for in killing *her* husband she also killed *his* father. Why then have the Erinyes persecuted him and not Clytemnestra, who is much the greater culprit? The reply is striking:

“*Unrelated by blood* was she to the man that she slew.”<sup>a</sup>

The murder of a man not related by blood, even though he be the husband of the murderess, is expiable and does not concern the Erinyes. Their function is to avenge only murders among blood-relatives, and the most heinous of all these, according to mother right, is matricide. Apollo now intervenes in defense of Orestes. Athena calls upon the Areopagites—the Athenian jurors—to vote on the question. The votes for acquittal and for the conviction are equal. Then Athena, as President of the Court, casts her vote in favour of Orestes and acquits him. Father right has gained the day over mother right. The “gods of junior lineage”, as they are described by the Erinyes themselves, are victorious over the Erinyes, and the latter allow themselves finally to be persuaded to assume a new office in the service of the new order.

This new but absolutely correct interpretation of the *Oresteia* is one of the best and most beautiful passages in the whole book, but it shows at the same time that Bachofen himself believes in the Erinyes, Apollo and Athena at least as much as Aeschylus did in his day; he, in fact, believes that in the Heroic Age of Greece they performed the miracle of overthrowing mother right and replacing it by father right. Clearly, such a conception—which regards religion as the decisive lever in world history—must finally end in sheer mysticism. It is, therefore, an arduous and by no means always profitable task to wade through Bachofen’s bulky quarto volume. But all this does not detract from his merit as a pioneer, for he was the first to substitute for mere phrases about an unknown primitive condition of promiscuous sexual intercourse proof that ancient classical literature teems with traces of a condition that had in fact existed before monogamy among the Greeks and the Asiatics, in which not only a man had sexual intercourse with more than one woman, but a woman had sexual intercourse with more than one man, without

---

<sup>a</sup> Aeschylus, *Oresteia. Eumenides*.—Ed.

violating the established custom; that this custom did not disappear without leaving traces in the form of the limited surrender by which women were compelled to purchase their right to monogamian marriage; that descent, therefore, could originally be reckoned only in the female line, from mother to mother, that this exclusive validity of the female line persisted far into the time of monogamy with assured, or at least recognised, paternity; and that this original position of the mother as the sole certain parent of her children assured her, and thus women in general, a higher social status than they have ever enjoyed since. Bachofen did not express these propositions as clearly as this—his mystical outlook prevented him from doing so; but he proved that they were correct, and this, in 1861, meant a complete revolution.

Bachofen's bulky tome was written in German, that is, in the language of the nation which, at that time, interested itself less than any other in the prehistory of the present-day family. He, therefore, remained unknown. His immediate successor in this field appeared in 1865, without ever having heard of Bachofen.

This successor was J. F. McLennan, the direct opposite of his predecessor. Instead of the talented mystic, we have here the dry-as-dust lawyer; instead of exuberant poetic fancy, we have the plausible arguments of the advocate pleading his case. McLennan finds among many savage, barbarian and even civilised peoples of ancient and modern times a form of marriage in which the bridegroom, alone or accompanied by friends, has to feign to carry off the bride from her relatives by force. This custom must be the survival of a previous custom, whereby the men of one tribe acquired their wives from outside, from other tribes, by actually abducting them by force. How then did this "marriage by abduction" originate? As long as men could find sufficient women in their own tribe there was no occasion for it whatsoever. But quite as often we find that among undeveloped peoples certain groups exist (which round about 1865 were still often identified with the tribes themselves) within which marriage is forbidden, so that the men are obliged to secure their wives, and the women their husbands, from outside the group; while among others the custom prevails that the men of a certain group are compelled to find their wives only within their own group. McLennan calls the first type of group exogamous, and the second endogamous, and without further ado establishes a rigid antithesis between exogamous and endogamous "tribes". And although his own researches into exogamy bring under his very nose the fact that in many, if not most, or even all cases this antithesis exists only in his own imagination, he nevertheless makes it the



foundation of his entire theory. Accordingly, exogamous tribes may procure their wives only from other tribes; and in the state of permanent intertribal warfare that is characteristic of savagery, this, he believes, could be done only by abduction.

McLennan argues further: Whence this custom of exogamy? The conceptions of consanguinity and incest have nothing to do with it, for these are things which developed only much later. But the custom, widespread among savages, of killing female children immediately after birth, might. This custom created a superfluity of men in each individual tribe, the necessary and immediate sequel of which was the common possession of a woman by a number of men—polyandry. The consequence of this again was that the mother of a child was known, but the father was not, hence kinship was reckoned only in the female line to the exclusion of the male—mother right. And another consequence of the dearth of women within a tribe—a dearth mitigated but not overcome by polyandry—was precisely the systematic, forcible abduction of women of other tribes.

\* "...As exogamy and polyandry are referable to one and the same cause—a want of balance between the sexes—we are forced to regard all the exogamous races as having originally been polyandrous..."<sup>a</sup> Therefore, we must hold it to be beyond dispute that among exogamous races the first system of kinship was that which recognized blood-ties through mothers only."\* (McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, 1886, "Primitive Marriage", p. 124.)

McLennan's merit lies in having drawn attention to the general prevalence and great importance of what he terms exogamy. But he by no means *discovered* the existence of exogamous groups, and still less did he understand it. Apart from the earlier, isolated notes of many observers which served as McLennan's sources, Latham (*Descriptive Ethnology*, 1859) exactly and correctly described this institution among the Indian Magars<sup>178</sup> and declared that it was generally prevalent and existed in all parts of the world—a passage which McLennan himself quotes. And our Morgan, too, as far back as 1847, in his letters on the Iroquois (in the *American Review*), and in 1851 in *The League of the Iroquois* proved that it existed in this tribe, and described it correctly, whereas, as we shall see, McLennan's lawyer mentality caused far greater confusion on this subject than Bachofen's mystical fantasy did in the sphere of mother right. It is also to McLennan's credit that he recognised the system of tracing descent through mothers as the original one, although, as he himself admitted later, Bachofen anticipated him

<sup>a</sup> Engels' italics.—Ed.

in this. But here again he is far from clear; he speaks continually of "KINSHIP THROUGH FEMALES ONLY" and constantly applies this expression—correct for an earlier stage—also to later stages of development, where, although descent and inheritance are still exclusively reckoned in the female line, kinship is also recognised and expressed in the male line. This is the restricted outlook of the jurist, who creates a rigid legal term for himself and continues to apply it without modification to conditions which in the meantime have rendered it inapplicable.

In spite of its plausibility, McLennan's theory evidently did not seem to be too well founded even to the author himself. At least, he himself is struck by the fact that

\* "it is observable that the form of" (mock) "capture is now most distinctly marked and impressive just among those races which have *male*<sup>a</sup> kinship"\* (meaning descent through the male line) (p. 140).

And, again:

\* "It is a curious fact that nowhere now, that we are aware of, is infanticide a *system*<sup>b</sup> where exogamy and the earliest form of kinship co-exist"\* (p. 146).

Both these facts directly refute his interpretation, and he can oppose to them only new, still more intricate, hypotheses.

Nevertheless, in England his theory met with great approbation and evoked great response. McLennan was generally accepted there as the founder of the history of the family, and the most eminent authority in this field. His antithesis between exogamous and endogamous "tribes", notwithstanding the few exceptions and modifications admitted, remained nevertheless the recognised foundation of the prevailing view, and was the blinker which made any free survey of the field under investigation and, consequently, any definite progress, impossible. The overrating of McLennan, which became the vogue in England and, following the English fashion, elsewhere as well, makes it a duty to point out in contrast that the harm he caused with his completely erroneous antithesis between exogamous and endogamous "tribes" outweighs the good done by his researches.

Meanwhile, more and more facts soon came to light, which did not fit into his neat scheme. McLennan knew only three forms of marriage—polygamy, polyandry and monogamy. But once attention had been directed to this point, more and more proofs were discovered of the fact that among undeveloped peoples forms of marriage existed in which a group of men possessed a group of

<sup>a</sup> Engels' italics.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> McLennan's italics.—Ed.

women in common; and Lubbock (*The Origin of Civilisation*, 1870) acknowledged this COMMUNAL MARRIAGE to be a historical fact.

Immediately after, in 1871, Morgan appeared with new and, in many respects, conclusive material. He had become convinced that the peculiar system of kinship prevailing among the Iroquois was common to all the aborigines of the United States and was thus spread over a whole continent, although it conflicted directly with the degrees of kinship actually arising from the connubial system in force there. He thereupon prevailed on the American Federal Government to collect information about the kinship systems of the other peoples, on the basis of questionnaires and tables drawn up by himself; and he discovered from the answers: 1) that the American Indian system of kinship prevailed also among numerous tribes in Asia, and, in a somewhat modified form, in Africa and Australia; 2) that it was completely explained by a form of group marriage, now approaching extinction, in Hawaii and in other Australian islands; and 3) that, however, alongside this marriage form, a system of kinship prevailed in these same islands which could only be explained by a still earlier but now extinct form of group marriage. He published the collected data and his conclusions from them in his *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*, 1871, and thereby carried the discussion on to an infinitely wider field. Taking the systems of kinship as his starting-point, he reconstructed the forms of the family corresponding to them, and thereby opened up a new avenue of investigation and a more far-reaching retrospect into the prehistory of mankind. Were this method to be recognised as valid, McLennan's neat construction would be resolved into thin air.

McLennan defended his theory in a new edition of "Primitive Marriage" (*Studies in Ancient History*, 1876). While he himself very artificially constructs a history of the family out of sheer hypotheses, he demands of Lubbock and Morgan not only proofs for every one of their statements, but proofs of incontestable validity such as alone would be admitted in a Scottish court of law. And this is done by the man who, from the close relationship between one's mother's brother and one's sister's son among the Germans (Tacitus, *Germania*, c. 20), from Caesar's report that the Britons in groups of ten or twelve possessed their wives in common,<sup>a</sup> and from all the other reports of ancient writers concerning community of women among the barbarians, unhesitatingly concludes that polyandry was the rule among all these

---

<sup>a</sup> Caesar, *Gallic War*, V, XIV.—Ed.

peoples! It is like listening to counsel for the prosecution, who permits himself every license in preparing his own case, but demands the most formal and legally most valid proof for every word of counsel for the defence.

Group marriage is a pure figment of the imagination, he asserts, and thus falls back far behind Bachofen. Morgan's systems of kinship, he says, are nothing more than mere precepts on social politeness, proved by the fact that the Indians also address strangers, white men, as brother, or father. It is as if one were to argue that the terms father, mother, brother, sister are merely empty forms of address because Catholic priests and abbesses are likewise addressed as father and mother, and because monks and nuns, and even freemasons and members of English craft unions, in solemn session assembled, are addressed as brother and sister. In short, McLennan's defence was miserably weak.

One point, however, remained on which he had not been challenged. The antithesis between exogamous and endogamous "tribes" on which his whole system was founded not only remained unshaken, but was even generally accepted as the cornerstone of the entire history of the family. It was admitted that McLennan's attempt to explain this antithesis was inadequate and contradicted the very facts he himself had enumerated. But the antithesis itself, the existence of two mutually exclusive types of separate and independent tribes, one of which took its wives from within the tribe, while this was absolutely forbidden to the other—this passed as incontrovertible gospel truth. Compare, for example, Giraud-Teulon's *Origines de la famille* (1874) and even Lubbock's *Origin of Civilisation* (Fourth edition, 1882).

This is the point at which Morgan's chief work enters: *Ancient Society* (1877), the book upon which the present work is based. What Morgan only dimly surmised in 1871 is here developed with full comprehension. Endogamy and exogamy constitute no antithesis; up to the present no exogamous "tribes" have been brought to light anywhere. But at the time when group marriage still prevailed—and in all probability it existed everywhere at one time or other—the tribe consisted of a number of groups related by blood on the mother's side, gentes, within which marriage was strictly prohibited, so that although the men of a gens could, and as a rule did, take their wives from within their tribe, they had, however, to take them from outside their gens. Thus, while the gens itself was strictly exogamous, the tribe, embracing all the gentes, was as strictly endogamous. With this, the last remnants of McLennan's artificial structure definitely collapsed.

Morgan, however, did not rest content with this. The gens of the American Indians served him further as a means of making the second decisive advance in the field of investigation he had entered upon. He discovered that the gens, organised according to mother right, was the original form out of which developed the later gens, organised according to father right, the gens as we find it among the civilised peoples of antiquity. The Greek and Roman gens, an enigma to all previous historians, was now explained by the Indian gens, and thus a new basis was found for the whole history of primitive society.

The rediscovery of the original mother-right gens as the stage preliminary to the father-right gens of the civilised peoples has the same significance for the history of primitive society as Darwin's theory of evolution has for biology, and Marx's theory of surplus value for political economy. It enabled Morgan to outline for the first time a history of the family, wherein at least the classical stages of development are, on the whole, provisionally established, as far as the material at present available permits. Clearly, this opens a new era in the treatment of the history of primitive society. The mother-right gens has become the pivot around which this entire science turns; since its discovery we know in which direction to conduct our researches, what to investigate and how to classify the results of our investigations. As a consequence, progress in this field is now much more rapid than before Morgan's book appeared.

Morgan's discoveries are now generally recognised, or rather appropriated, by prehistorians in England, too. But scarcely one of them will openly acknowledge that it is to Morgan that we owe this revolution in outlook. In England his book is hushed up as far as possible, and Morgan himself is dismissed with condescending praise for his *previous* work; the details of his exposition are eagerly picked on for criticism, while an obstinate silence reigns with regard to his really great discoveries. The original edition of *Ancient Society* is now out of print; in America there is no profitable market for books of this sort; in England, it would seem, the book was systematically suppressed, and the only edition of this epoch-making work still available in the book trade is—the German translation.

Whence this reserve, which it is difficult not to regard as a conspiracy of silence, particularly in view of the host of quotations given merely for politeness' sake and of other evidences of camaraderie, in which the writings of our recognised prehistorians abound? Is it perhaps because Morgan is an American, and it is

very hard for English prehistorians, despite their highly commendable diligence in the collection of material, to have to depend for the general viewpoint which determines the arrangement and grouping of this material, in short, for their ideas, upon two talented foreigners—Bachofen and Morgan? A German might be tolerated, but an American? Every Englishman waxes patriotic when faced with an American, amusing examples of which I have come across while I was in the United States.<sup>179</sup> To this must be added that McLennan was, so to speak, the officially proclaimed founder and leader of the English prehistoric school; that it was, in a sense, good form among prehistorians to refer only with the greatest reverence to his artificially constructed historical theory leading from infanticide, through polyandry and marriage by abduction, to the mother-right family; that the slightest doubt cast upon the existence of mutually wholly exclusive exogamous and endogamous “tribes” was regarded as rank heresy; so that Morgan, in thus resolving all these hallowed dogmas into thin air, was guilty of a kind of sacrilege. Moreover, he resolved them in such a way that he had only to state his case for it to become obvious at once; and the McLennan worshippers, hitherto confusedly staggering about between exogamy and endogamy, were almost driven to beating their foreheads and exclaiming: How could we have been so stupid as not to have discovered all this for ourselves long ago!

And, as though this were not crime enough to prohibit the official school from treating him with anything else but cold indifference, Morgan filled the cup to overflowing not only by criticising civilisation, the society of commodity production, the basic form of our present-day society, after a fashion reminiscent of Fourier, but also by speaking of a future transformation of society in words which Karl Marx might have used. He received his deserts, therefore, when McLennan indignantly charged him with having “a profound antipathy to the historical method”,<sup>a</sup> and when Professor Giraud-Teulon endorsed this view in Geneva as late as 1884. Was it not this same M. Giraud-Teulon, who, in 1874 (*Origines de la famille*), was still wandering helplessly in the maze of McLennan’s exogamy, from which it took Morgan to liberate him?

It is not necessary for me to deal here with the other advances which the history of primitive society owes to Morgan; a reference to what is needed will be found in the course of this book. During

---

<sup>a</sup> J. F. McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, London, 1876, p. 333.—Ed

the fourteen years that have elapsed since the publication of his chief work our material relating to the history of primitive human societies has been greatly augmented. In addition to anthropologists, travellers and professional prehistorians, students of comparative law have taken the field and have contributed new material and new points of view. As a consequence, some of Morgan's hypotheses pertaining to particular points have been shaken, or even become untenable. But nowhere have the newly-collected data led to the supplanting of his principal conceptions by others. In its main features, the order he introduced into the study of the history of primitive society holds good to this day. We can even say that it is finding increasingly general acceptance in the same measure as his authorship of this great advance is being concealed.\*

London, June 16, 1891

*Frederick Engels*

First published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 2, No. 41, 1890-1891, and in: Friedrich Engels, *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats*, Stuttgart, 1891

Printed according to the book, checked with the journal

\* On my return voyage from New York in September 1888 I met an ex-Congressman for Rochester constituency who had known Lewis Morgan. Unfortunately, he could tell me little about him. Morgan, he said, had lived in Rochester as a private citizen occupying himself only with his studies. His brother was a colonel in the army, and held a post in the War Department at Washington. Through the good offices of his brother, he had succeeded in interesting the government in his researches and in publishing a number of his works at public cost. This ex-Congressman said that he himself had also assisted in this while in Congress.

[MESSAGE OF GREETINGS  
TO THE SECOND AUSTRIAN PARTY CONGRESS]<sup>180</sup>

London, June 26, 1891

Dear Comrades,

Please accept my warmest thanks for your kind invitation to the Second Party Congress of the Austrian Social Democrats, and at the same time my regret that I shall not be able to attend in person; my best wishes for the successful course of your deliberations.

Since Hainfeld,<sup>181</sup> when the Austrian workers' party found its feet again, you have made enormous progress. This is the best guarantee that your present Congress will be the starting point for new and even more important victories.

The invincible inner strength possessed by our party is proved not only by its successes following swiftly one upon another, not only by the fact that it, as last year in Germany, has this year overcome the state of emergency in Austria.<sup>182</sup> It shows its strength far more by conquering obstacles in all countries, and accomplishing things where the other parties, recruited from the propertied classes, come helplessly to a halt. While the propertied classes of France and Germany feud with irreconcilable hatred, French and German proletarians work hand in hand. And while, around you in Austria, the propertied classes of the various crown lands lose the last remnants of the ability to rule in their blind national discord, your Second Party Congress will display the picture of an Austria which no longer knows national discord—the Austria of the workers.

*Frederick Engels*

First published in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, No. 27, July 3, 1891 and in the pamphlet, *Verhandlungen des zweiten österreichischen sozialdemokratischen Parteitages, abgehalten zu Wien am 28., 29. und 30. Juni 1891*, Vienna, 1891

Printed according to the newspaper, checked with the pamphlet  
Published in English for the first time





A CRITIQUE OF THE DRAFT  
SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PROGRAMME OF 1891<sup>183</sup>

Written between June 18 and 29, 1891

First published (without Appendix) in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1901-1902 and in full in: Marx and Engels, *Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol. XVI, Part II, Moscow, 1936

Printed according to the manuscript

The present draft<sup>184</sup> differs very favourably from the former programme.<sup>185</sup> The strong survivals of outmoded traditions—both the specific Lassallean and vulgar socialistic—have in the main been removed, and as regards its theoretical aspect the draft is, on the whole, based on present-day science and can be discussed on this basis.

It is divided into three sections: I. The Preamble, II. Political Demands, III. Demands for Measures of Protection for the Workers.

#### I. PREAMBLE IN TEN PARAGRAPHS

In general it suffers from the attempt to combine two things that are uncombinable: a programme and a *commentary* on the programme as well. The fear that a short, pointed exposition would not be intelligible enough, has caused explanations to be added, which make it verbose and drawn out. To my view the programme should be as short and precise as possible. No harm is done even if it contains the occasional foreign word, or a sentence whose full significance cannot be understood at first sight. Verbal exposition at meetings and written commentaries in the press take care of all that, and the short, precise phrase, once understood, takes root in the memory, and becomes a slogan, a thing that never happens with verbose explanations. Too much should not be sacrificed for the sake of popularity, and the mental ability and educational level of our workers should not be underestimated. They have understood much more difficult things than the

shortest, most concise programme can offer them; and if the period of the Anti-Socialist Law<sup>186</sup> has made more difficult, and here and there even prevented the spreading of comprehensive knowledge among the masses joining the movement, now that our propagandist literature can again be kept and read without risking trouble, lost time will soon be made up for under the old leadership.

I shall try to make this entire section somewhat shorter and if I succeed shall enclose it or send it on later. Now, I shall deal with the individual paragraphs numbered from 1 to 10.

*Paragraph 1.* “*The separation,*” etc., “mines, pits, quarries”—three words for the same thing; two should be deleted. I would leave *mines* (*Bergwerke*), which is a word used even in the most level parts of the country, and I would designate them all by this widely used term. I would, however, add “*railways and other means of communication*”.

*Paragraph 2.* Here I would insert: “In the hands of *their appropriators* (or *their owners*) the *social* means of labour are” and likewise below “dependence ... on the *owners* (or *appropriators*) of the means of labour”, etc.

It has already been said in para. 1 that these gentlemen have appropriated these things as “*exclusive* possession” and will simply need to be repeated here if one absolutely insists on introducing the word “monopolists”. Neither this nor the other word adds anything to the sense. And anything redundant in a programme weakens it.

“The means of labour *necessary* for the *existence* of society”

— these are precisely those that are at hand. Before the steam engine it was possible to do without it, now we couldn’t. Since all the means of labour are nowadays directly or indirectly—either by their design or because of the social division of labour—*social means of labour*, these words express what is available at every given moment sufficiently clearly, correctly and without any misleading associations.

If this conclusion is intended to correspond with the preamble of the Rules of the International, I should prefer it to correspond *completely*: “to social misery” (this is No. 1), “mental degradation and political dependence”.<sup>a</sup> Physical degradation is part of social misery and political *dependence* is a fact, while the *denial of political*

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, “General Rules of the International Working Men’s Association”, present edition, Vol. 23, p. 3.—*Ed*

2. h. 28. 1891. 1891. 1891.

Die erste Seite des Manuskripts zeigt den Anfang des Textes, der mit dem Datum '2. h. 28. 1891.' beginnt. Der Text ist in deutscher Sprache verfasst und behandelt die Kritik an dem Entwurf eines sozialdemokratischen Programms. Die Handschrift ist in cursive geschrieben und zeigt einige Korrekturen und Ergänzungen. Ein kleiner Zettel mit der Aufschrift '1891' ist rechts am Rand des Textes angebracht.

First page of F. Engels' manuscript  
*A Critique of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891*



*rights* is a declamatory phrase which is only *relatively* true and for this reason does not belong in the programme.

*Paragraph 3.* In my opinion the first sentence should be changed.

“Under the *domination* of the *individual owners*.”

First of all that which follows is an economic fact, which should be explained in economic terms. The expression “*domination* of the individual owners” creates the false impression that this has been caused by the *political* domination of that gang of robbers. Secondly, these individual owners include not only “capitalists and big landowners” (what does the “*bourgeoisie*” following here signify? Are they a third class of individual owners? Are the big landowners also “*bourgeois*”? And, once we have turned to the subject of big landowners, should we ignore the colossal survivals of feudalism, which give the whole filthy business of German politics its specific reactionary character?). *Peasants* and *petty bourgeois* too are “individual owners”, at least they still are today; but they do not appear anywhere in the programme and therefore the wording should make it clear that they are not included in the category of individual owners under discussion.

“The accumulation of the means of labour **and** of the wealth that has been created by the exploited.”

The “wealth” consists of 1. means of labour, 2. means of subsistence. It is therefore grammatically incorrect and illogical to mention one *part* of the wealth without the other and then refer to the total wealth, linking the two by **and**.

“...increases ... in the hands of the *capitalists* with growing speed”.

What has happened to the “big landowners” and the “*bourgeoisie*” mentioned above? If it is enough to speak only of capitalists here, it should be so above as well. If one wishes to specify, however, it is generally not enough to mention them alone.

“The number and the *misery* of the proletariat increase continuously.”

This is incorrect when put in such a categorical way. The organisation of the workers and their constantly growing resistance will possibly check the *increase of misery* to a certain extent. However, what *certainly* does increase is the *insecurity of existence*. I should insert this.

*Paragraph 4.*

“The planlessness rooted in the nature of capitalist private production”



needs considerable improvement. I am familiar with capitalist production as a social form, or an economic phase; capitalist *private* production being a *phenomenon* which in one form or another is encountered in that phase. What is capitalist *private* production? Production by *separate* entrepreneurs, which is increasingly becoming an exception. Capitalist production by *joint-stock companies* is no longer *private* production but production on behalf of many associated people. And when we pass on from joint-stock companies to trusts, which dominate and monopolise whole branches of industry, this puts an end not only to *private production* but also to *planlessness*. If the word "*private*" were deleted the sentence could pass.

"The ruin of broad layers of the population."

Instead of this declamatory phrase, which looks as though we still regret the ruin of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois, I should state the simple fact: "which by the ruin of the urban and rural middle classes, the petty bourgeois and small peasants, widen (or deepen) the chasm between the haves and have-nots".

The last two phrases repeat the same thing. In the Appendix to Section I, I give a draft amendment.<sup>a</sup>

*Paragraph 5.* Instead of "the causes" this should read "*its causes*", which is probably due to a slip of the pen.

*Paragraph 6.* "Mines, pits, quarries," see above, para. 1. "*Private production*," see above. I would say: "The transformation of present capitalist production on behalf of individuals or joint-stock companies into socialist production on behalf of society as a whole and according to a preconceived plan, a transformation, etc. ... which creates ... and by which alone can be achieved the emancipation of the working class and with it the emancipation of all members of society without exception."

*Paragraph 7.* I would say as in the Appendix to Section I.<sup>b</sup>

*Paragraph 8.* Instead of "class-conscious", which in our circles is an easily understood abbreviation, I would say the following to facilitate universal understanding and translation into foreign languages: "with workers conscious of their class position", or something like it.

*Paragraph 9.* Closing sentence: "... places ... and thereby concentrates in the same hands the power of economic exploitation and political oppression".

*Paragraph 10.* After "class rule" the words "and the classes

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 231.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.— *Ed.*

themselves" should be inserted. The abolition of classes is our basic demand, without which the abolition of class rule is economically inconceivable. Instead of "for equal rights for all", I suggest: "for equal rights and *equal duties* of all", etc. *Equal duties* are for us a particularly important addition to the bourgeois-democratic *equal rights* and do away with their specifically bourgeois meaning.

The closing sentence: "In their struggle ... are capable," would be better deleted. The imprecise wording "which are capable ... of improving the position of *the people* in general" (who is that?), can be taken to embrace everything, protective tariffs and free trade, guilds and freedom of enterprise, loans on landed security, exchange banks, compulsory vaccination and prohibition of vaccination, alcoholism and prohibition, etc., etc. What *should* be said here, has already been said earlier, and it is unnecessary to mention specifically that the demand for the whole includes every separate part, for this, to my mind, weakens the impact. If, however, this sentence is intended as a link to pass on to the individual demands, something resembling the following could be said: "Social Democracy fights for all demands *which help it approach this goal*" ("measures and arrangements" to be deleted as repetitious). Or else, which would be even better: to say directly what it is all about, i.e., that it is necessary to catch up with what the bourgeoisie has missed; I have included a closing sentence to this effect in Appendix I.<sup>a</sup> I consider this important in connection with my notes to the next section and to motivate the proposals put forward by me therein.

## II. POLITICAL DEMANDS

The political demands of the draft have one great fault. It *lacks* precisely what should have been said. If all the 10 demands were granted we should indeed have more diverse means of achieving our main political aim, but the aim itself would in no wise have been achieved. As regards the rights being granted to the people and their representatives, the imperial constitution is, strictly speaking, a copy of the Prussian constitution of 1850, a constitution whose articles are extremely reactionary and give the government all the real power, while the chambers are not even allowed to reject taxes; a constitution, which proved during the period of the conflict that the government could do anything it

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 232.— *Ed.*

liked with it.<sup>187</sup> The rights of the Reichstag are the same as those of the Prussian chamber and this is why Liebknecht called this Reichstag the fig-leaf of absolutism. It is an obvious absurdity to wish "to transform all the instruments of labour into common property" on the basis of this constitution and the system of small states sanctioned by it, on the basis of the "union" between Prussia and Reuss-Greiz-Schleiz-Lobenstein,<sup>188</sup> in which one has as many square miles as the other has square inches.

To touch on that is dangerous, however. Nevertheless, somehow or other, the thing has to be attacked. How necessary this is shown precisely at the present time by opportunism, which is gaining ground in a large section of the Social-Democratic press. Fearing a renewal of the Anti-Socialist Law, or recalling all manner of over-hasty pronouncements made during the reign of that law, they now want the party to find the present legal order in Germany adequate for putting through all party demands by peaceful means. These are attempts to convince oneself and the party that "present-day society is developing towards socialism" without asking oneself whether it does not thereby just as necessarily outgrow the old social order and whether it will not have to burst this old shell by force, as a crab breaks its shell, and also whether in Germany, in addition, it will not have to smash the fetters of the still semi-absolutist, and moreover indescribably confused political order. One can conceive that the old society may develop peacefully into the new one in countries where the representatives of the people concentrate all power in their hands, where, if one has the support of the majority of the people, one can do as one sees fit in a constitutional way: in democratic republics such as France and the U.S.A., in monarchies such as Britain, where the imminent abdication of the dynasty in return for financial compensation is discussed in the press daily and where this dynasty is powerless against the people. But in Germany where the government is almost omnipotent and the Reichstag and all other representative bodies have no real power, to advocate such a thing in Germany, when, moreover, there is no need to do so, means removing the fig-leaf from absolutism and becoming oneself a screen for its nakedness.

In the long run such a policy can only lead one's own party astray. They push general, abstract political questions into the foreground, thereby concealing the immediate concrete questions, which at the moment of the first great events, the first political crisis automatically pose themselves. What can result from this except that at the decisive moment the party suddenly proves

helpless and that uncertainty and discord on the most decisive issues reign in it because these issues have never been discussed? Must there be a repetition of what happened with protective tariffs, which were declared to be a matter of concern only to the bourgeoisie, not affecting the interests of the workers in the least, that is, a matter on which everyone could vote as he wished? Are not many people now going to the opposite extreme and are they not, in contrast to the bourgeoisie, who have become addicted to protective tariffs, rehashing the economic distortions of Cobden and Bright and preaching them as the purest socialism—the purest Manchesterism<sup>189</sup>? This forgetting of the great, the principal considerations for the momentary interests of the day, this struggling and striving for the success of the moment regardless of later consequences, this sacrifice of the future of the movement for its present, may be “honestly” meant, but it is and remains opportunism, and “honest” opportunism is perhaps the most dangerous of all!

Which are these ticklish, but very significant points?

*First.* If one thing is certain it is that our party and the working class can only come to power under the form of a democratic republic. This is even the specific form for the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the Great French Revolution has already shown. It would be inconceivable for our best people to become ministers under an emperor, as Miquel. It would seem that from a legal point of view it is inadvisable to include the demand for a republic directly in the programme, although this was possible even under Louis Phillippe in France, and is now in Italy. But the fact that in Germany it is not permitted to advance even a republican party programme openly, proves how totally mistaken is the belief that a republic, and not only a republic, but also communist society, can be established in a cosy, peaceful way.

However, the question of the republic could possibly be passed by. What, however, in my opinion should and could be included is the demand for *the concentration of all political power in the hands of the people's representatives*. That would suffice for the time being if it is impossible to go any further.

*Second.* The reconstitution of Germany. On the one hand, the system of small states must be abolished—just try to revolutionise society while there are the Bavarian-Württemberg reservation rights<sup>190</sup>—and the map of present-day Thuringia, for example, is such a sorry sight.<sup>191</sup> On the other hand, Prussia must cease to exist and must be broken up into self-governing provinces for the specific Prussianism to stop weighing on Germany. The system of

small states and Prussianism are the two sides of the antithesis now gripping Germany in a vice, in which one side must always serve as the excuse and justification for the existence of the other.

What should take its place? In my view, the proletariat can only use the form of the one and indivisible republic. In the gigantic territory of the United States, the federal republic is still, on the whole, a necessity, although in the Eastern states it is already becoming a hindrance. It would be a step forward in Britain where the two islands are peopled by four nations and in spite of a single Parliament three different systems of legislation already exist side by side. In little Switzerland, it has long been a hindrance, tolerable only because Switzerland is content to be a purely passive member of the European state system. For Germany, federalisation on the Swiss model would be an enormous step backward. Two points distinguish a union state from a completely unified state: first, that each member state, each canton, has its own civil and criminal legislative and judicial system, and, second, that alongside a popular chamber there is also a federal chamber in which each canton, whether large or small, votes as such. The first we have luckily overcome and we shall not be so childish as to reintroduce it, the second we have in the Bundesrat and we could do very well without it, since our "federal state" generally constitutes a transition to a unified state. The revolution of 1866 and 1870 must not be reversed from above but supplemented and improved by a movement from below.

So, then, a unified republic. But not in the sense of the present French Republic, which is nothing but the Empire established in 1799<sup>a</sup> without the Emperor.<sup>192</sup> From 1792 to 1799 each French department, each commune, enjoyed complete self-government on the American model, and this is what we too must have. How self-government is to be organised and how we can manage without a bureaucracy has been shown to us by America and the First French Republic, and is being shown even today by Australia, Canada and the other English colonies. And a provincial and communal self-government of this type is far freer than, for instance, Swiss federalism, under which, it is true, the canton is very independent in relation to the federation, but is also independent in relation to the district and the commune. The cantonal governments appoint the district governors and prefects, which is unknown in English speaking countries and which we

---

<sup>a</sup> Here and in the next sentence Engels mistakenly has 1798.—*Ed.*

want to abolish here as resolutely in the future as the Prussian Landräte and Regierungsräte.

Probably few of these points should be included in the programme. I mention them also mainly to describe the system in Germany where such matters cannot be discussed openly, and to emphasise the self-deception of those who wish to transform such a system in a legal way into communist society. Further, to remind the party executive that there are other important political questions besides direct legislation by the people and the gratuitous administration of justice without which we can also ultimately get by. In the generally unstable conditions these questions may become urgent at any time and what will happen then if they have not been discussed by us beforehand and no agreement has been reached on them?

However, what can be included in the programme and can, at least indirectly, serve as a hint of what may not be said directly is the following demand:

“Complete self-government in the provinces, districts and communes through officials elected by universal suffrage. The abolition of all local and provincial authorities appointed by the state.”

Whether or not it is possible to formulate other programme demands in connection with the points discussed above, I am less able to judge here than you can over there. But it would be desirable to debate these questions within the party before it is too late.

1. I fail to see the difference between “election rights and voting rights”, between “elections and voting” respectively. If such a distinction should be made, it should in any case be expressed more clearly or explained in a commentary appended to the draft.

2. “The right of the people to propose and reject” *what?* All laws or the decisions of the people’s representatives—this should be added.

5. Complete separation of the Church from the State. All religious communities without exception are to be treated by the state as private associations. They are to be deprived of any support from public funds and of all influence on public education. (They cannot be prohibited from forming their *own* schools out of their *own* funds and from teaching their own nonsense in them.)

6. In that case the point on the “secular character of the school” no longer arises, since it relates to the preceding paragraph.

8 and 9. Here I want to draw attention to the following: These points demand that the following should be taken over by the state: (1) *the bar*, (2) *medical services*, (3) *pharmaceutics, dentistry, midwifery, nursing*, etc., etc., and later the demand is advanced that workers' insurance become a state concern. Can all this be entrusted to Mr. von Caprivi? And is it compatible with the rejection of all state socialism, as stated above?

10. Here I should say: "Progressive ... tax to cover all expenditure of the state, district and community, insofar as taxes are required for it. Abolition of all indirect state and local taxes, duties, etc." The rest is a redundant commentary or motivation that tends to weaken the effect.

### III. ECONOMIC DEMANDS

To item 2. Nowhere more so than in Germany does the right of association require guarantees also from the *state*.

The closing phrase: "for the regulation", etc., should be added *as item 4* and be given a corresponding form. In this connection it should be noted that we would be taken in good and proper by labour chambers made up half of workers and half of entrepreneurs. For years to come the entrepreneurs would always have a majority, for only a single black sheep among the workers would be needed to achieve this. If it is not agreed upon that in cases of conflict *both halves* express *separate* opinions, it would be much better to have a chamber of entrepreneurs and *in addition an independent chamber of workers*.

In conclusion I should like to request that the draft be compared once more with the French programme,<sup>193</sup> where some things seem better precisely for Section III. Being pressed for time, I unfortunately cannot search for the Spanish programme,<sup>194</sup> which is also very good in many respects.

## APPENDIX TO SECTION I

1. "Pits, quarries" delete—"Railways and other means of communication."

2. In the hands of their appropriators (or their owners) the social means of labour have become means of exploitation. The economic subjugation of the worker by the appropriator of the means of labour, that is to say, of the means of livelihood, conditioned thereby, is the basis of slavery in all its forms: social misery, mental degradation and political dependence.

3. Under this exploitation the wealth created by the exploited is concentrated in the hands of the exploiters—the capitalists and big landowners—with growing speed; the distribution of the product of labour between the exploiters and exploited becomes ever more uneven, and the numbers and insecurity of the proletariat grow ever greater, etc.

4. "*Private*" (production) delete ... deteriorate, by the ruin of the urban and rural middle classes, the petty bourgeois and small peasants, widen (or deepen) the chasm between the haves and have-nots, make general insecurity the normal state of society and prove that the class of the appropriators of the social means of labour has lost the vocation and ability for economic and political leadership.

5. "its" causes.

6. ...and the transformation of capitalist production on behalf of individuals or joint-stock companies into socialist production on behalf of society as a whole and according to a preconceived plan, a transformation, for which capitalist society itself creates the material and spiritual conditions, and by which alone can be



achieved the emancipation of the working class and with it the emancipation of all members of society without exception.

7. The emancipation of the working class can be the work only of the working class itself. It is self-evident that the working class cannot leave its emancipation either to the capitalists and big landowners, its opponents and exploiters, or to the petty bourgeois and small peasants, who, being stifled by competition on the part of the big exploiters, have no choice but<sup>a</sup> to join either their ranks or those of the workers.

8. ...with workers conscious of their class position, etc.

9. ...places ... and thereby concentrates in the same hands the power of economic exploitation and political oppression of the workers.

10. ...class rule and the classes themselves<sup>b</sup> and for equal rights and equal duties of all without, etc. ... origin (delete end). In its struggle for ... mankind it is obstructed by Germany's backward political state. First and foremost, it has to conquer room for movement, to abolish the massive survivals of feudalism and absolutism, in short, to do the work which the German bourgeois parties were and still are too cowardly to carry out. Hence it has, at least at present, to include also such demands in its programme, which in other cultural countries have already been implemented by the bourgeoisie.

---

<sup>a</sup> The end of the sentence is written in pencil; crossed out is the following: "to cling to them or to sink into the ranks of the proletariat, and therefore either to oppose or to follow the working class".—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> The words "and the classes themselves" are written in pencil.—*Ed*

[THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS.  
THE SITUATION IN EUROPE

(FROM A LETTER TO PAUL LAFARGUE)]<sup>195</sup>

London, September 2, 1891

THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS

We have every reason to be satisfied with the Brussels Congress.

It was right to vote for the exclusion of the anarchists: that is where the old International broke off, that is where the new one resumes. It is quite simply the confirmation, nineteen years later, of the resolutions of the Hague Congress.<sup>196</sup>

No less important was the way the door was thrown wide open to the English TRADES UNIONS. The step which shows how well the situation has been understood. And the votes which tied the TRADES UNIONS to "the class struggle and the abolition of wage-labour" mean that it was not a concession on our part.

The Domela Nieuwenhuis incident has shown that the European workers have finally left behind the period of the domination of the resounding phrase, and that they are aware of the responsibilities incumbent on them: they are a class constituted as a party of "struggle", a party which reckons with "facts". And the facts are taking an increasingly revolutionary turn.

THE SITUATION IN EUROPE

In Russia there is already famine; in Germany there will be famine in a few months; the other countries will suffer less. This is why: the harvest deficit for 1891 is estimated at eleven and a half million hectolitres of wheat and between 87 and 100 million hectolitres of rye. The latter deficit will, therefore, mainly affect the two rye-consuming countries, Russia and Germany.

This guarantees us peace until the spring of 1892. Russia will not make a move before then; so, excepting some inconceivable foolishness on the part of Paris or Berlin, there will be no war.

On the other hand, will tsarism survive this crisis? I doubt it. There are too many rebel elements in the big cities, and particularly in St. Petersburg, for them not to attempt to seize this opportunity to depose that alcoholic Alexander III, or at the very least to place him under the control of a national assembly. Perhaps he himself will be forced to take the initiative in convening one. Russia—that is to say, the government and the

young bourgeoisie—has worked enormously hard to create a big national industry (see Plekhanov's article in the *Neue Zeit*<sup>a</sup>). This industry will be stopped dead in its tracks because the famine will close down its only market—the domestic market. The Tsar will see the results of making Russia a self-sufficient country independent of abroad: to the crisis in agriculture will be added an industrial crisis.

In Germany the government will decide too late, as usual, to abolish or suspend the duty on corn. That will break the protectionist majority in the Reichstag. The big landowners, the "rurals",<sup>197</sup> will no longer want to uphold the duties on industrial products, they will want to buy as cheaply as possible. So we shall probably see a repetition of what happened at the time of the vote on the Anti-Socialist Law<sup>198</sup>; a protectionist majority, by itself divided by conflicting interests arising out of the new situation, which finds it impossible to reach agreement on the details of a protectionist system. All the possible proposals being only minority ones; there will be either a reversion to the free trade system, which is just as impossible, or dissolution, with the old parties and the old majority unseated and replaced by a new free-trade majority opposed to the present government. That will mean the real, definitive end of the Bismarck period and of political stagnation in home affairs—I am not speaking here of our party but of parties which might "possibly" govern. There will be strife between the landed nobility and the bourgeoisie, and between the industrial bourgeoisie, which is protectionist, and the men of commerce and a fraction of the industrial bourgeoisie who are free traders. The stability of the administration and of domestic politics will be shattered, in short there will be movement, struggle, life, and our party will reap all the rewards. And if events take this turn, our party will be able to come to power round about 1898.

There we have it! I do not speak of the other countries because the agricultural crisis does not affect them so severely. But if this crisis in agriculture were to unleash in England the industrial crisis which we have been awaiting for twenty-five years... Then we'll see!

*F. Engels*

First published in *Le Socialiste*, No. 51,  
September 12, 1891

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Translated from the French

Published in English in full for the  
first time

---

<sup>a</sup> G. Plechanow, "Die sozialpolitische Zustände Rußlands im Jahre 1890", *Die Neue Zeit*, Nos. 47-52, Vol. 2, 1890-91.—*Ed.*

**SOCIALISM IN GERMANY** <sup>199</sup>

Written: main text—in October 1891, introduction and conclusion to the German translation—in January 1892

First published in *Almanach du Parti Ouvrier pour 1892*, Lille, 1891 (without introduction and conclusion), and in full in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 1, No. 19, 1891-1892

Signed: *Fr. Engels*

Printed: main text according to *Almanach du Parti Ouvrier pour 1892*, checked with *Die Neue Zeit*; introduction and conclusion according to *Die Neue Zeit*

Translated from the French and German

The following is the translation of an article which I wrote in French at the request of our Parisian friends for the *Almanach du Parti Ouvrier pour 1892*. I owe it to the French—as well as the German—socialists to publish it in German. To the French, because it must be known in Germany how openly it is possible to discuss with them the circumstances in which German socialists would undoubtedly take part in a war, even against France, and how free *these* Frenchmen are from the chauvinism and vengefulness which all the bourgeois parties, from the monarchists to the radicals, display in all their glory. To the Germans, because they are entitled to hear from me at first hand what I have been telling the French about them.

It goes without saying—but let me make it quite clear once again—that in this article I speak purely in my own name and not in the name of the German party. The only ones entitled to do this are the elected bodies, representatives and delegates of this party. And, in addition, the international position which I have attained after fifty years' work prevents me from acting as the representative of any particular national socialist party as opposed to another, although it does not prevent me from recalling that I am a German and being proud of the position which our German workers were the first to win for themselves through struggle.

## I

German socialism made its appearance well before 1848. At that time there were two independent tendencies. Firstly, a workers' movement, a branch of French working-class communism, a

movement which, as one of its phases, produced the utopian communism of Weitling. Secondly, a theoretical movement, emerging from the collapse of the Hegelian philosophy; this movement, from its origins, was dominated by the name of Marx. The *Communist Manifesto* of January 1848 marks the fusion of these two tendencies, a fusion made complete and irrevocable in the furnace of revolution, in which everyone, workers and philosophers alike, shared equally the personal cost.<sup>a</sup>

After the defeat of the European revolution in 1849, socialism was reduced in Germany to a secret existence. It was not until 1862 that Lassalle, a fellow student of Marx, again raised the socialist banner. But it was no longer the bold socialism of the *Manifesto*; what Lassalle demanded in the interest of the working class was cooperative production assisted by state credit; a reproduction of the programme of the Parisian workers affiliated before 1848 to the *National* of Marrast,<sup>b</sup> of the programme proposed by the *pure republicans*, as the alternative to Louis Blanc's Organisation of Labour.<sup>200</sup> Lassallean socialism was, as we can see, very moderate. Nevertheless, its appearance on the scene marks the starting point of the second phase of socialism in Germany; for Lassalle's talent, spirit and indomitable energy succeeded in creating a workers' movement to which everything that had roused the German proletariat<sup>c</sup> over the last ten years was attached by links positive or negative, amicable or hostile.<sup>201</sup>

Could, then, pure Lassalleanism on its own fulfil the socialist aspirations of the nation that had produced the *Manifesto*? It proved impossible. Therefore, thanks mainly to the efforts of Liebknecht and Bebel, a workers' party was soon formed which loudly proclaimed the principles of 1848.<sup>202</sup> Then, in 1867, three years after the death of Lassalle, Marx's *Capital* appeared. The decline of Lassalleanism as such dates from this day. Increasingly the theories of *Capital* became the common property of all the German socialists, Lassalleans and others. More than once entire groups of Lassalleans went over en masse, drums beating and banners flying, to Bebel's and Liebknecht's<sup>d</sup> new party, called the Eisenach party. As this party continued to grow in strength, there was soon all-out hostility between the Lassalleans and their rivals;

<sup>a</sup> The German translation reads "showed honorably what they are worth" instead of "shared equally the personal cost".— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text there follows "organ of pure Republicans".— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German has "the German proletariat had made independently" instead of "had roused the German proletariat".— *Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German text the words "Bebel's and Liebknecht's" are omitted.— *Ed.*

they fought with cudgels precisely at the moment when there was no longer any real difference between the combatants, when the principles, arguments, and even the methods of the struggle of one side were in all essentials identical with those of the other.

At this point the presence in the Reichstag of deputies from the two socialist factions imposed on them the necessity of joint action. When confronted with bourgeois deputies,<sup>a</sup> the ridiculous nature of this traditional hostility was obvious. The situation became intolerable. Then in 1875 the two factions merged.<sup>203</sup> Since then the brother-enemies have continued to form a family united in harmony. If there was the slightest chance of a split, Bismarck himself undertook to eliminate it when, in 1878, he placed German socialism beyond the pale of the law with his notorious exceptional law.<sup>204</sup> The hammer blows of shared persecution completed the work of forging Lassalleans and Eisenachers into a homogeneous mass. Today, whilst the socialist party publishes an official edition of Lassalle's works,<sup>205</sup> it is removing from its programme, with the aid of the former Lassalleans, the last remaining traces of Lassalleanism as such.<sup>206</sup>

Need I recount in detail the vicissitudes, the struggles, the setbacks and the triumphs which have accompanied the career of the German party? Represented by two deputies<sup>b</sup> and one hundred thousand votes from 1866, when universal suffrage opened up to it the doors of the Reichstag, today it has 35 deputies and a million-and-a-half voters, a figure which none of the other parties reached in the elections of 1890.<sup>207</sup> Eleven years passed as an outlaw and in a state of siege have resulted in a quadrupling of its strength, to make it the strongest party in Germany. In 1867 the bourgeois deputies<sup>c</sup> were able to regard their socialist colleagues as strange creatures that had arrived from another planet; today, whether they like it or not, they have to regard them as the avant-garde of the power to come. The socialist party which overthrew Bismarck, the party which after eleven years of struggle has broken the Anti-Socialist Law; the socialist party, which like a rising tide overflows all the dikes, invading towns and countryside, even in the most reactionary Vendées<sup>d</sup>—this party today has reached the point where it is

<sup>a</sup> Instead of "bourgeois deputies" the German text reads "the parties of order".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German text reads "deputies of the parties of order" instead of "bourgeois deputies".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German text reads "agricultural districts" instead of "Vendées".—*Ed.*



possible to determine the date when it will come to power almost by mathematical calculation.

The number of socialist votes was:

|               |         |               |           |
|---------------|---------|---------------|-----------|
| In 1871 ..... | 101,927 | In 1884 ..... | 549,990   |
| In 1874 ..... | 351,670 | In 1887 ..... | 763,128   |
| In 1877 ..... | 493,447 | In 1890 ..... | 1,427,298 |

Since the last elections the government has done its best to push the mass of people towards socialism; it has prosecuted associations and strikes; it has upheld, even in the present scarcity, import tariffs which make the bread and meat of the poor more expensive in order to benefit the big landowners. So at the elections in 1895 we can count on two and a half million votes at least, which will increase by 1900 to three and a half to four million out of ten million registered voters,<sup>a</sup> a figure which will appear curiously "*fin de siècle*" to our bourgeois.

Facing this compact and steadily growing mass of socialists there are only the divided bourgeois parties. In 1890 the conservatives (two factions combined) received 1,377,417 votes; the national liberals 1,177,807; the progressists (radicals)<sup>b</sup> 1,159,915; the Catholics<sup>c</sup> 1,342,113.<sup>208</sup> There we have a situation in which one solid party able to muster two and a half million votes will be strong enough to force any government to capitulate.

But the votes of the electors are far from constituting the main strength of German socialism. In our country you do not become a voter until the age of twenty-five, but at twenty you are a soldier. Moreover, since it is precisely the younger generation which provides the party with most of its recruits, it follows that the German army is becoming more and more infected with socialism. Today we have one soldier in five, in a few years' time we shall have one in three, by 1900 the army, hitherto the most outstandingly Prussian element in Germany, will have a socialist majority. That is coming about as if by fate. The Berlin government can see it happening just as clearly as we can, but it is powerless. The army is slipping away from it.

How many times have the bourgeois called on us to renounce the use of revolutionary means for ever, to remain within the law, now that the exceptional law has been dropped and one law has

<sup>a</sup> The words "out of ten million registered voters" are omitted in the German text.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text has "the German liberal-minded" instead of "progressists (radicals)".— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German text reads "Centre" instead of "Catholics".— *Ed.*

been re-established for all, including the socialists? Unfortunately we are not in a position to oblige *messieurs les bourgeois*. Be that as it may, for the time being it is not we who are being destroyed by legality.<sup>209</sup> It is working so well for us that we would be mad to spurn it as long as the situation lasts. It remains to be seen whether it will be the bourgeois and their government who will be the first to turn their back on the law in order to crush us by violence. That is what we shall be waiting for. You shoot first, *messieurs les bourgeois!*<sup>210</sup>

No doubt they will be the first ones to fire. One fine day the German bourgeois and their government, tired of standing with their arms folded, witnessing the ever increasing advances of socialism, will resort to illegality and violence. To what avail? With force it is possible to crush a small sect, at least in a restricted space but there is no force in the world which can wipe out a party of two million men<sup>a</sup> spread out over the entire surface-area of a large empire. Counter-revolutionary violence<sup>b</sup> will be able to slow down the victory of socialism by a few years; but only in order to make it all the more complete when it comes.

## II

All the above was said with the reservation that Germany will be able to pursue its economic and political development in peace. A war would change all that. And war is liable to break out at any moment.

Everyone knows what war means today. It would be Russia and France on one side; Germany, Austria and perhaps Italy on the other. Socialists in all these countries, conscripted whether they like it or not, will be forced to do battle against one another: what will the German *socialist* party do in such a case?<sup>c</sup>

The German empire is a monarchy with semi-feudal institutions, but dominated ultimately by the economic interests of the bourgeoisie. Thanks to Bismarck this empire has committed some grave blunders. Its domestic policy, a policy of harassment and meanness based on the police, unworthy of the government of a great nation, has earned it the scorn of all the bourgeois liberal

<sup>a</sup> The German text reads "over two or three million men" instead of "two million men".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text has "the temporary superiority of counter-revolutionary forces" instead of "counter-revolutionary violence".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German text there follows: "What will become of it?"—*Ed.*

countries; its foreign policy has excited the distrust, if not the hatred, of all its neighbours. With the violent annexation of Alsace-Lorraine the German government rendered any reconciliation with France impossible for a long time to come; without gaining any real advantage itself it has made Russia the arbiter of Europe. This is so evident that the day after Sedan<sup>211</sup> the General Council of the International was able to predict the situation in Europe as it is today. In its address of September 9, 1870 it said: "Do the Teuton patriots really believe that liberty and peace will be guaranteed to Germany by forcing France into the arms of Russia? If the fortune of her arms, the arrogance of success, and dynastic intrigue lead Germany to a dismemberment of France, there will then only remain two courses open to her. She must at all risks become the avowed tool of Russian aggrandisement, or, after some short respite, make again ready for another 'defensive' war, not one of those new-fangled 'localised' wars but a war of races, a war with the combined Slavonian and Roman races."<sup>a</sup>

There is no doubt: in relation to this German empire, the French republic as it is now represents revolution, the bourgeois revolution, to be sure, but still revolution. But the instant this republic places itself under the orders of the Russian tsar it is a different matter entirely. Russian tsarism is the enemy of all the Western nations, even of the bourgeois of these nations. By invading Germany, the tsarist hordes would be bringing slavery instead of liberty, destruction instead of development, degradation instead of progress. Arm in arm with Russia, France cannot bring a single liberating idea to Germany; the French general who spoke to the Germans about the republic would make Europe and America laugh. It would mean the abdication of France's revolutionary role<sup>b</sup>; it would mean permitting Bismarck's empire to pose as the representative of Western progress against the barbarism of the East.

But behind official Germany there is the German socialist party, the party to which belongs the future, the imminent future of the country. The moment this party comes to power it will neither be able to exercise it nor to retain it without making good the injustices committed by its predecessors towards the other nationalities. It will have to prepare for the restoration of Poland,

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, *Second Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War*, present edition, Vol. 22, p. 267.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text has "its entire revolutionary role in history" instead of "France's revolutionary role".—*Ed.*

so shamefully betrayed today by the French bourgeoisie; it will have to appeal to northern Schleswig and to Alsace-Lorraine<sup>212</sup> freely to decide their own political future. All these questions will thus be resolved effortlessly, and in the near future, if Germany is left to itself. Between a socialist France and a socialist Germany there can be no Alsace-Lorraine question; the case will be settled in the twinkling of an eye. It is a matter, then, of waiting another ten years or so. The French, English and German proletariat is still awaiting deliverance; could not the patriots of Alsace-Lorraine wait? Is there any reason to devastate a continent and to subjugate it, ultimately, to the tsarist knout? Is the game worth the candle?

In the event of war first Germany, then France would be the main battleground; these two countries in particular will pay the cost in devastation. And there is more. This war will be distinguished from the outset by a series of betrayals between allies unequalled in the annals of diplomatic betrayal to date; France or Germany, or both, will be the main victims. It is therefore almost certain that neither of these countries will provoke an open conflict in view of the risks they would be running. But Russia, protected by its geographical position and by its economic situation against the more disastrous consequences of a series of defeats—official Russia alone could find it in its interests to unleash such a terrible war; it is Russia who will be pressing for war. In any case, given the present political situation, the odds are ten to one that at the first sound of cannon on the Vistula the French armies will march on the Rhine.

Then Germany will be fighting for its very existence. If victorious it will find nothing to annex.

To the East as well as to the West it will only find provinces speaking foreign tongues; it has enough of those already. Beaten, crushed between the French hammer and the Russian anvil it will have to cede Old Prussia and the Polish provinces to Russia, Schleswig to Denmark, and the entire left bank of the Rhine to France. Even if France refused to accept, its ally would impose this conquest on it; *what Russia needs more than anything else is a cause of permanent enmity between France and Germany.*<sup>a</sup> Reconcile these two great countries and that is the end of Russian supremacy in Europe. Dismembered in this way, Germany would be unable to play its part in Europe's civilising mission<sup>b</sup>; reduced to the role

<sup>a</sup> In the German text there follows: "eternal apple of discord".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text the end of this phrase after the words "would be unable" is given as follows: "to play the part befitting it in the historical development of Europe".—*Ed.*

imposed on it by Napoleon after Tilsit it could not live except by preparing for a new war of national rehabilitation. But in the meanwhile it would be the humble tool of the Tsar,<sup>a</sup> who would not fail to make use of it—against France.

What will become of the German socialist party in such circumstances? It goes without saying that neither the Tsar nor the French bourgeois republicans nor the German government itself would let pass such a good opportunity to crush the sole party which, for them, constitutes the enemy. We have seen how Thiers and Bismarck extended their hands to each other over the ruins of the Paris Commune<sup>213</sup>; we would then see the Tsar, Constans, Caprivi (or their successors) embracing one another over the corpse of German socialism.

But the German socialist party, thanks to the efforts and the unceasing sacrifices of more than thirty years, has attained a position that none of the other socialist parties in Europe occupies: a position which guarantees it political power in a short while. Socialist Germany occupies in the international working-class movement the most advanced, the most honourable and the most responsible outpost; it is its duty to defend this outpost against all.<sup>b</sup>

Now, if the victory of the Russians over Germany means the crushing of socialism in this country, what will be the duty of the German socialists with regard to this eventuality? Should they passively endure the events that are threatening them with extinction, abandon the post they have conquered and for which they are answerable to the world proletariat without putting up a fight?

Obviously not. In the interest of the European revolution they are obliged to defend all the positions that have been won, not to capitulate to the enemy from without any more than to the enemy within; and they cannot accomplish that except by fighting Russia and its allies, whoever they may be, to the bitter end. If the French republic placed itself at the service of His Majesty the Tsar, Autocrat of all the Russias, the German socialists would fight it with regret, but they would fight it all the same. The French republic may represent vis-à-vis the German empire the bourgeois revolution. But vis-à-vis the republic of the Constanses, the Rouviers and even the Clemenceaus, especially vis-à-vis the republic that is

---

<sup>a</sup> Alexander III.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text reads “against every attack to the last man” instead of “against all”.—*Ed.*

working for the Russian Tsar, German socialism represents the proletarian revolution.

A war in which Russians and Frenchmen invaded Germany would be, for Germany, a war to the death, in which, in order to ensure its national existence, it would have to resort to the most revolutionary means. The present government, certainly, would not unleash revolution, unless it were forced to. But there is a strong party which would force it to, or if necessary replace it: the socialist party.

We have not forgotten the marvellous example which France gave us in 1793.<sup>214</sup> The centenary of '93 is approaching. If the Tsar's thirst for conquest and the chauvinist impatience of the French bourgeoisie stop the victorious but peaceful march of the German socialists, the latter are ready, you may be sure, to prove that the German proletarians of today are not unworthy of the French sans-culottes of a hundred years ago, and that 1893 will equal 1793. And then the soldiers of Constans, on setting foot on German soil, will be greeted with the song<sup>a</sup>:

What, would foreign hordes  
Lay down the law in our homes?

Let us sum up. Peace ensures the victory of the German socialist party in some ten years' time; war offers it either victory in two or three years, or complete ruin, at least for the next fifteen to twenty years. In this position the German socialists would have to be mad to prefer the all-or-nothing of war to the certain victory which peace offers them. There is more. No socialist, of whatever country, can desire victory by war, either by the present German government or by the French bourgeois republic; even less by the Tsar, which would be tantamount to the subjugation of Europe. That is why socialists everywhere demand that peace be maintained. But if war is to break out nonetheless, one thing is certain. This war, in which fifteen to twenty million armed men would slaughter one another and devastate Europe as it has never been devastated before—this war would either lead to the immediate triumph of socialism, or it would lead to such an upheaval in the old order of things, it would leave behind it everywhere such a heap of ruins, that the old capitalist society would become more impossible than ever, and the social revolution, set back by ten or fifteen years, would only be all the more radical and more rapidly implemented.

---

<sup>a</sup> Rouget de Lisle, *Marseillaise*.—Ed.

\* \* \*

That, then, was the article from the French workers' calendar. It was written in the late summer, when the heads of the French bourgeoisie were still flushed with the champagne-induced inebriation of Kronstadt,<sup>215</sup> and the great manoeuvres on the battle area of 1814 between the Seine and the Marne had brought patriotic enthusiasm to a head. At that time France—the France that expresses itself in the big press and the parliamentary majority—was indeed ripe for more or less unlimited stupidity in the service of Russia, and the eventuality of war moved into the foreground as a possibility. And in order, should it become a reality, to prevent any last minute misunderstanding between the French and German socialists, I considered it necessary to make it clear to the former what in my opinion the necessary attitude of the latter should be with regard to such a war.

But then a powerful check was imposed on the Russian war-monger. First came the news of harvest failure at home, with every reason to expect a famine. Then came the failure of the Paris loan,<sup>216</sup> signifying the final collapse of Russian state credit. The four hundred million marks were, it was said, oversubscribed many times; but when the Paris bankers sought to palm off the bonds onto the public, all their attempts failed; the esteemed subscribers had to dispose of their good securities in order to cover these bad ones—and to such an extent that the other large European stock exchanges were also forced down by these mass sales; the new “Russians” sank several per cent below their issue price—in short, there was such a crisis that the Russian government had to take back a hundred and sixty millions worth of bonds and only received cover for two hundred and forty instead of four hundred million. At this the proclamation of a further Russian attempt to get credit—this time for all of eight hundred million marks—which had been gaily crowed out to the world, fell through miserably. And at the same time it also became plain that French capital has no “patriotism” at all, but it does have—however much it may beat the drum in the press—a salutary fear of war.

Since then the failure of the harvest has indeed developed into a famine, and such a famine as we in Western Europe have not seen on this scale for a long time, such as rarely occurs even in India, the typical country for such calamities, indeed such as barely ever reached this height in the holy Russia of earlier times, when there were still no railways. How does this come about? How can it be explained?

Very simply. The Russian famine is not the result of a mere failure of the harvest, it is a part of the tremendous social revolution which Russia has been undergoing since the Crimean War; it is simply the transformation of the chronic sufferings linked with this revolution into acute sufferings brought about by this bad harvest.

Old Russia went irrevocably to its grave the day when Tsar Nicholas, despairing of himself and of old Russia, took poison.<sup>217</sup> On its ruins the Russia of the bourgeoisie is being built.

The beginnings of a bourgeoisie were already present at that time. Partly bankers and import merchants—mostly Germans and German Russians or their descendants—partly Russians who had risen through domestic trading, but particularly schnapps pedlars and army suppliers who had grown rich at the expense of the state and people, and also a few manufacturers. From now on this bourgeoisie, particularly the industrial bourgeoisie, was literally cultivated by means of massive government aid, by subsidies, premiums, and protective tariffs that were gradually raised to the utmost.<sup>218</sup> The immeasurable Russian Empire was supposed to become a production area sufficient unto itself, which could dispense with imports from abroad entirely or almost entirely. And it is to ensure not only that the domestic market should continually grow, but also that the products of warmer climes should be produced inside the country itself, that there is this steady striving for conquests in the Balkan peninsula and in Asia, with Constantinople and British India respectively as the ultimate goals. This is the secret, the economic basis of the drive for expansion that is so rife among the Russian bourgeoisie, the branch that leads south-west being called Pan-Slavism.<sup>219</sup>

However, the serfdom of the peasants was absolutely inconsistent with such industrial plans. It fell in 1861. But how! The Prussian abolition of servitude and statute labour carried out slowly between 1810 and 1851<sup>220</sup> was taken as a model; but everything was to be settled in a few years. Consequently, in order to break the resistance of the big landowners and “serf”-owners, concessions had to be made to them which were quite different from those granted by the Prussian state and its corrupt officials to the gracious landlords of their day. And as for corruptibility, the Prussian bureaucrat was nothing but a babe-in-arms compared with the Russian *tshinownik*.<sup>a</sup> Thus it was that in the partition of the land the nobility received the

---

<sup>a</sup> Engels' transliteration of the Russian word meaning “a civil servant”.—*Ed.*



lion's share, and as a rule the land made fertile by the labour of many generations of peasants, while the peasants received only the minimum necessary for subsistence, and even this was generally allotted to them in poor wasteland. Common forest and common grazing went to the landlord; if the peasant wished to use them—and without them he could not exist—he had to pay the landlord for it.

To ensure, however, that both landed nobility and peasants were ruined as quickly as possible, the nobility was given the capitalised redemption sum in state bonds from the government in a lump sum, while the peasants had to pay the redemption price in long-term instalments. As was only to be expected, the nobility for the most part squandered the money received immediately, while the peasant, facing what was, for someone in his position, enormous payments, was suddenly hurled out of a subsistence economy into a money economy.

The Russian peasant, who previously had hardly had to make any money payments excepting relatively low taxes, is now supposed not only to live off the smaller and poorer plot allotted to him and, after the abolition of the free wood and free grazing on common land, feed his livestock through the winter and improve his plot—but also to pay increased taxes as well as the annual redemption instalment, and in cash too. He was thus placed in a position in which he could neither live nor die. On top of this there was the competition of the newly developed large-scale industry, which deprived him of the market for his domestic industry—domestic industry was the main source of money for countless Russian peasants—or, where this was not yet quite the case, delivered up this domestic industry to the mercy of the merchant, i. e. the middleman, the Saxon entrepreneur or the English SWEATERS, thus turning the peasants engaged in domestic industry into nothing less than the slaves of capital. In short, anyone curious to know how the Russian peasants have been abused over the last thirty years need only look up the chapter on the “Creation of the Home Market” (Chapter 24, Section 5) in the first volume of Marx's *Capital*.<sup>a</sup>

The ravages wrought among the peasants by the transition from a subsistence economy to a money economy—this chief means of producing the home market for industrial capital—are depicted in a classic manner by Boisguillebert and Vauban from the example

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VIII, Chapter XXX (see present edition, Vol. 35).—Ed.

of France under Louis XIV.<sup>a</sup> But what occurred then is child's play compared with what is happening in Russia. Firstly the scale is three or four times larger, and secondly the revolutionisation of the conditions of production, in whose service this transition is being forced on the peasants, is infinitely more thorough-going. The French peasant was slowly dragged into the sphere of manufacture, the Russian peasant is being swept overnight into the tornado of large-scale industry. If manufacture felled peasants with the flint-lock, large-scale industry is carrying out the job with a repeating-rifle.

This was the position when the failure of the harvest in 1891 exposed at a stroke the entire upheaval and its consequences, which had been quietly taking place for years but had remained invisible to the European philistine. This position was such that the first bad harvest was bound to turn into a national crisis. And now there is a crisis that will not be mastered for years to come. In the face of a famine like this every government is powerless, but particularly the Russian, which expressly trains its officials in thieving. Since 1861 the old communist customs and institutions of the Russian peasants have partly been undermined by economic developments, partly destroyed systematically by the government. The old communist community has disintegrated, or is in the process of so doing, but at the very moment when the individual peasant is being placed on his own feet, the ground is removed from under them. Is it any wonder that last autumn winter-corn was sown in extremely few districts? And where it was sown the weather ruined most of it. Is it any wonder that the main instrument of the peasant, the beast of burden, first had nothing to eat itself and then, for this irrefutable reason, was eaten by the peasant himself? Is it any wonder that the peasant is leaving house and home and fleeing to the cities, vainly looking for work but unfailingly bringing typhoid with him?

In a word: here we have before us not an isolated famine but an immense crisis prepared by a prolonged, quiet economic revolution and merely rendered acute by the failure of the harvest. This acute crisis, however, is assuming in its turn a chronic form and threatens to stay for years. Economically it is accelerating the dissolution of the old communist peasant community, the enrichment of the village usurers (the *kulaki*) and their transformation into big landowners, and the transfer of the landed

---

<sup>a</sup> See P. Boisguillebert, *Le D tail de la France* and S. Vauban, *Projet d'une d me royale*. In: *Economistes financiers du XVIII<sup>e</sup> si cle*.—Ed.

property of the nobility and the peasants into the hands of the new bourgeoisie.

For Europe it means peace for the time being. Russian war-mongering is paralysed for a good many years to come. Instead of millions of soldiers falling on the battlefields, millions of Russian peasants are dying of starvation. But its effects as far as Russian despotism is concerned remain to be seen.

[TO THE EDITORS OF THE *VOLKSFREUND*] <sup>221</sup>

London, November 13, 1891

My dear comrades,

Accept my heartiest thanks for your friendly invitation to the tenth anniversary celebrations for the *Volksfreund*. Unfortunately I shall be unable to come myself, since my work on the third volume of Marx's *Capital*, which must finally be published, keeps me here. These lines must represent me.

I can however congratulate you heartily on this momentous occasion. I know what it costs to keep alive a militant Social Democratic paper like the *Volksfreund* for ten years under the Austrian press and police laws, and I know too, at least in general, the sacrifices which have had to be made to do this. *That* you have succeeded despite everything is all the more praiseworthy as the Austrian press laws, drafted in realisation that by and large the organs of the *propertied* classes are not dangerous, appear to aim at ruining or taming the workers' papers by pressure upon their *financial resources*. And therefore, if the workers of Brünn have managed, despite this financial pressure, to maintain their paper for ten years without in any way denying their banner, this is once again proof of the tenacity and readiness for sacrifice which is to be found today only amongst the workers.

I cannot end this letter without expressing once again my pleasure that, while young Czech <sup>222</sup> and old German bourgeois are everywhere at loggerheads, the Czech and German workers are fighting united, shoulder to shoulder, for the liberation of the entire proletariat.

Once again, heartiest thanks and best wishes from your old

*Fr. Engels*

First published in the *Volksfreund*,  
No. 22, November 25, 1891

Printed according to the newspaper, checked with the rough manuscript

Published in English for the first time

[THE COVERING LETTER TO THE STATEMENT TO THE]  
EDITOR, *DAILY CHRONICLE* OFFICE

Dear Sir

For the sake of historical truth I request you to insert the enclosed reply<sup>a</sup> to one of the most infamous slanders ever concocted.<sup>b</sup>

I regret that the *Daily Chronicle* which has done such good service to the working class in England should allow its correspondents abroad to spread calumnious reports about Continental working class movements and their leaders.<sup>c</sup>

Yours faithfully

Written on November 17, 1891

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol.  
XXVIII, Moscow, 1940

Reproduced from the rough manu-  
script

Published in English for the first  
time

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 253.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "The Case of M. Lafargue", *The Daily Chronicle*, No. 9261, November 17, 1891.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The following sentence is crossed out: "Your Paris correspondent seems to be jealous of your Berlin one, about whose true character I believe you have been some time ago told the truth."—*Ed.*

## THE LATE MADAM KARL MARX

THE EDITOR OF *THE DAILY CHRONICLE*

Sir,—In your issue of this morning your Paris correspondent, amongst other inaccuracies concerning the family of my late friend Karl Marx, states that after the Commune the French Minister of Justice ordered the arrest of M. Paul Lafargue, recently elected deputy at Lille.<sup>a</sup> He then continues—

“Madam Karl Marx is said at this time to have revealed the whereabouts of a depôt of arms to the authorities, on condition that her son-in-law should not be molested. M. Lafargue then passed the Spanish frontier.”

Mrs. Aveling, the daughter of Mrs. Marx, being for the moment absent from London, the duty of repelling the above-mentioned accusation against her mother devolves upon me. The facts are these:—M. Lafargue, while staying with his wife<sup>b</sup> and his two sisters-in-law<sup>c</sup> at Bagnères-de-Luchon, was informed of his impending arrest by a friendly Republican police-officer. He escaped the same day into Spain, passing the Pyrenées on horseback.<sup>223</sup> Mrs. Marx, who was then in London, therefore could not, even if she had been so minded, interfere on his behalf by betraying to the French Government anything whatever. The whole story of the pretended depôt of arms is a mere fable, invented to blacken the memory of a woman whose noble and self-sacrificing nature was utterly incapable of a mean action.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant.

*Frederick Engels*

122, Regent's-park-road, N.W., Nov. 17.

First published in *The Daily Chronicle*,  
No. 9269, November 26, 1891

Reproduced from the newspaper,  
checked with the rough manu-  
script

<sup>a</sup> “The Case of M. Lafargue”, *The Daily Chronicle*, No. 9261, November 17, 1891.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> Laura Lafargue.—*Ed*

<sup>c</sup> Jenny and Eleanor Marx.—*Ed*

TO THE CHOIR CLUB OF THE COMMUNIST  
[GERMAN] WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY<sup>224</sup>

TOTTENHAM STREET

122, Regent's Park Road, N.W.  
November 28, 1891

Dear Comrades,

Mrs. Kautsky has just informed me that my friend Lessner has told her you intend to bring me musical greetings this evening on my seventy-first birthday. However I had already arranged to spend the evening with a friend,<sup>a</sup> and since others will be coming too, it is absolutely impossible to reverse my plans now; very regretfully, I shall not be able to be at home this evening.

I am therefore obliged, dear comrades, to convey to you by letter my most sincere thanks for your so kind and honourable offer, and at the same time my regrets that I was not informed earlier of your plans. Both Marx and I were always opposed to all public tributes to individuals, except in a case where a greater purpose could be served; and most particularly against such tributes as would centre around ourselves in our lifetime. Had I had the slightest indication that such an honour was planned for me, I would have hurried to request, humbly but most urgently, that the singers should refrain from carrying out their intention. To my regret I only learned of this today, and being so reluctantly faced with the necessity of frustrating your plans, as well meaning and honourable as they are, I can only best make amends by assuring you that the few years I may expect to survive at the outside, and the whole strength of which I still dispose, I shall continue to devote unstintingly to our great cause, as I have done

---

<sup>a</sup> Eleanor Marx-Aveling.—*Ed.*

for nearly fifty years now—the cause of the international proletariat.

Sincerely yours,

*Frederick Engels*

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol. XXVIII,  
Moscow, 1940

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Published in English in full for the  
first time



TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST [GERMAN]  
WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY<sup>225</sup>

[London] 122, Regent's Park Road  
December 1, 1891

Many thanks for your greetings on my 71st birthday.

Yours sincerely,  
*F. Engels*

First published in *Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, No. 10, Berlin, 1970

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

PREFACE [TO THE 1892 ENGLISH EDITION  
OF *THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING-CLASS*  
IN ENGLAND IN 1844]<sup>226</sup>

The book, an English translation of which is here republished, was first issued in Germany in 1845. The author, at that time, was young, twenty-four years of age, and his production bears the stamp of his youth with its good and its faulty features, of neither of which he feels ashamed. It was translated into English, in 1886, by an American lady, Mrs. F. Kelley Wischnewetzky, and published in the following year in New York. The American edition being as good as exhausted, and having never been extensively circulated on this side of the Atlantic, the present English copyright edition is brought out with the full consent of all parties interested.

For the American edition, a new Preface<sup>a</sup> and an Appendix<sup>b</sup> were written in English by the author. The first had little to do with the book itself; it discussed the American Working-Class Movement of the day, and is, therefore, here omitted as irrelevant; the second—the original preface—is largely made use of in the present introductory remarks.

The state of things described in this book belongs to-day in many respects to the past, as far as England is concerned. Though not expressly stated in our recognised treatises, it is still a law of modern Political Economy that the larger the scale on which capitalistic production is carried on, the less can it support the petty devices of swindling and pilfering which characterise its early stages. The pettifogging business tricks of the Polish Jew, the representative in Europe of commerce in its lowest stage, those

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 434-42.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 399-405.—*Ed.*

tricks that serve him so well in his own country, and are generally practised there, he finds to be out of date and out of place when he comes to Hamburg or Berlin; and again the commission agent who hails from Berlin or Hamburg, Jew or Christian, after frequenting the Manchester Exchange for a few months, finds out that in order to buy cotton-yarn or cloth cheap, he, too, had better drop those slightly more refined but still miserable wiles and subterfuges which are considered the acme of cleverness in his native country. The fact is, those tricks do not pay any longer in a large market, where time is money, and where a certain standard of commercial morality is unavoidably developed, purely as a means of saving time and trouble. And it is the same with the relation between the manufacturer and his "hands".

The revival of trade, after the crisis of 1847, was the dawn of a new industrial epoch. The repeal of the Corn Laws<sup>227</sup> and the financial reforms subsequent thereon gave to English industry and commerce all the elbow-room they had asked for. The discovery of the Californian and Australian gold-fields followed in rapid succession. The colonial markets developed at an increasing rate their capacity for absorbing English manufactured goods. In India millions of hand-weavers were finally crushed out by the Lancashire power-loom. China was more and more being opened up. Above all, the United States—then, commercially speaking, a mere colonial market, but by far the biggest of them all—underwent an economic development astounding even for that rapidly progressive country. And, finally, the new means of communication introduced at the close of the preceding period—railways and ocean steamers—were now worked out on an international scale; they realised actually what had hitherto existed only potentially, a world-market. This world-market, at first, was composed of a number of chiefly or entirely agricultural countries grouped around one manufacturing centre—England—which consumed the greater part of their surplus raw produce, and supplied them in return with the greater part of their requirements in manufactured articles. No wonder England's industrial progress was colossal and unparalleled, and such that the status of 1844 now appears to us as comparatively primitive and insignificant. And in proportion as this increase took place, in the same proportion did manufacturing industry become apparently moralised. The competition of manufacturer against manufacturer by means of petty thefts upon the workpeople did no longer pay. Trade had outgrown such low means of making money; they were not worth while practising for the manufacturing millionaire, and

served merely to keep alive the competition of smaller traders, thankful to pick up a penny wherever they could. Thus the truck system was suppressed, the Ten Hours' Bill<sup>228</sup> was enacted, and a number of other secondary reforms introduced—much against the spirit of Free Trade and unbridled competition, but quite as much in favour of the giant-capitalist in his competition with his less favoured brother. Moreover, the larger the concern, and with it the number of hands, the greater the loss and inconvenience caused by every conflict between master and men; and thus a new spirit came over the masters, especially the large ones, which taught them to avoid unnecessary squabbles, to acquiesce in the existence and power of Trades Unions, and finally even to discover in strikes—at opportune times—a powerful means to serve their own ends. The largest manufacturers, formerly the leaders of the war against the working-class, were now the foremost to preach peace and harmony. And for a very good reason. The fact is that all these concessions to justice and philanthropy were nothing else but means to accelerate the concentration of capital in the hands of the few, for whom the niggardly extra extortions of former years had lost all importance and had become actual nuisances; and to crush all the quicker and all the safer their smaller competitors who could not make both ends meet without such perquisites. Thus the development of production on the basis of the capitalistic system has of itself sufficed—at least in the leading industries, for in the more unimportant branches this is far from being the case—to do away with all those minor grievances which aggravated the workman's fate during its earlier stages. And thus it renders more and more evident the great central fact that the cause of the miserable condition of the working-class is to be sought, not in these minor grievances, but *in the capitalistic system itself*. The wage-worker sells to the capitalist his labour-force for a certain daily sum. After a few hours' work he has reproduced the value of that sum; but the substance of his contract is, that he has to work another series of hours to complete his working-day; and the value he produces during these additional hours of surplus labour is surplus value which costs the capitalist nothing but yet goes into his pocket. That is the basis of the system which tends more and more to split up civilised society into a few Rothschilds and Vanderbilts, the owners of all the means of production and subsistence, on the one hand, and an immense number of wage-workers, the owners of nothing but their labour-force, on the other. And that this result is caused, not by this or that secondary grievance, but by the system

itself—this fact has been brought out in bold relief by the development of Capitalism in England since 1847.

Again, the repeated visitations of cholera, typhus, smallpox, and other epidemics have shown the British bourgeois the urgent necessity of sanitation in his towns and cities, if he wishes to save himself and family from falling victims to such diseases. Accordingly, the most crying abuses described in this book have either disappeared or have been made less conspicuous. Drainage has been introduced or improved, wide avenues have been opened out athwart many of the worst “slums” I had to describe. “Little Ireland” had disappeared, and the “Seven Dials” are next on the list for sweeping away.<sup>229</sup> But what of that? Whole districts which in 1844 I could describe as almost idyllic have now, with the growth of the towns, fallen into the same state of dilapidation, discomfort, and misery. Only the pigs and the heaps of refuse are no longer tolerated. The bourgeoisie have made further progress in the art of hiding the distress of the working-class. But that, in regard to their dwellings, no substantial improvement has taken place is amply proved by the Report of the Royal Commission “on the Housing of the Poor”, 1885.<sup>a</sup> And this is the case, too, in other respects. Police regulations have been plentiful as blackberries; but they can only hedge in the distress of the workers, they cannot remove it.

But while England has thus outgrown the juvenile state of capitalist exploitation described by me, other countries have only just attained it. France, Germany, and especially America, are the formidable competitors who at this moment—as foreseen by me in 1844<sup>b</sup>—are more and more breaking up England’s industrial monopoly. Their manufactures are young as compared with those of England, but increasing at a far more rapid rate than the latter; and, curious enough, they have at this moment arrived at about the same phase of development as English manufacture in 1844. With regard to America, the parallel is indeed most striking. True, the external surroundings in which the working-class is placed in America are very different, but the same economical laws are at work, and the results, if not identical in every respect, must still be of the same order. Hence we find in America the same struggles for a shorter working-day, for a legal limitation of the working-time, especially of women and children in factories; we find the

---

<sup>a</sup> See *Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes. England and Wales, 1885.—Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 579-80.—*Ed.*

truck system in full blossom, and the cottage system,<sup>230</sup> in rural districts, made use of by the “bosses” as a means of domination over the workers. When I received, in 1886, the American papers with accounts of the great strike of 12,000 Pennsylvanian coal-miners in the Connellsville district,<sup>231</sup> I seemed but to read my own description of the North of England colliers’ strike of 1844.<sup>a</sup> The same cheating of the workpeople by false measure; the same truck system; the same attempt to break the miners’ resistance by the capitalists’ last, but crushing, resource, the eviction of the men out of their dwellings, the cottages owned by the companies.

I have not attempted, in this translation, to bring the book up to date, or to point out in detail all the changes that have taken place since 1844. And for two reasons: Firstly, to do this properly, the size of the book must be about doubled; and, secondly, the first volume of *Das Kapital*, by Karl Marx, an English translation of which is before the public,<sup>232</sup> contains a very ample description of the state of the British working class, as it was about 1865, that is to say, at the time when British industrial prosperity reached its culminating point. I should, then, have been obliged again to go over the ground already covered by Marx’s celebrated work.

It will be hardly necessary to point out that the general theoretical standpoint of this book—philosophical, economical, political—does not exactly coincide with my standpoint of to-day. Modern international Socialism, since fully developed as a science, chiefly and almost exclusively through the efforts of Marx, did not as yet exist in 1844. My book represents one of the phases of its embryonic development; and as the human embryo, in its early stages, still reproduces the gill-arches of our fish-ancestors, so this book exhibits everywhere the traces of the descent of Modern Socialism from one of its ancestors, German philosophy. Thus great stress is laid on the dictum that Communism is not a mere party doctrine of the working class, but a theory compassing the emancipation of society at large, including the capitalist class, from its present narrow conditions. This is true enough in the abstract, but absolutely useless, and sometimes worse, in practice. So long as the wealthy classes not only do not feel the want of any emancipation, but strenuously oppose the self-emancipation of the working class, so long the social revolution will have to be prepared and fought out by the working class alone. The French bourgeois of 1789,<sup>b</sup> too, declared the emancipation of the

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 540-47.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The reference is to the French Revolution.—*Ed.*

bourgeoisie to be the emancipation of the whole human race; but the nobility and clergy would not see it; the proposition—though for the time being, with respect to feudalism, an abstract historical truth—soon became a mere sentimentalism, and disappeared from view altogether in the fire of the revolutionary struggle. And to-day, the very people who, from the “impartiality” of their superior standpoint, preach to the workers a Socialism soaring high above their class interests and class struggles, and tending to reconcile in a higher humanity the interests of both the contending classes—these people are either neophytes, who have still to learn a great deal, or they are the worst enemies of the workers—wolves in sheep’s clothing.

The recurring period of the great industrial crisis is stated in the text as five years. This was the period apparently indicated by the course of events from 1825 to 1842. But the industrial history from 1842 to 1868 has shown that the real period is one of ten years; that the intermediate revulsions were secondary and tended more and more to disappear. Since 1868 the state of things has changed again, of which more anon.

I have taken care not to strike out of the text the many prophecies, amongst others that of an imminent social revolution in England, which my youthful ardour induced me to venture upon. The wonder is, not that a good many of them proved wrong, but that so many of them have proved right, and that the critical state of English trade, to be brought on by Continental and especially American competition, which I then foresaw—though in too short a period—has now actually come to pass. In this respect I can, and am bound to, bring the book up to date, by placing here an article which I published in the London *Commonweal* of March 1, 1885, under the heading: “England in 1845 and in 1885.”<sup>233</sup> It gives at the same time a short outline of the history of the English working class during these forty years, and is as follows:

“Forty years ago England stood face to face with a crisis, solvable to all appearances by force only. The immense and rapid development of manufactures had outstripped the extension of foreign markets and the increase of demand. Every ten years the march of industry was violently interrupted by a general commercial crash, followed, after a long period of chronic depression, by a few short years of prosperity, and always ending in feverish over-production and consequent renewed collapse. The capitalist class clamoured for Free Trade in corn,<sup>234</sup> and threatened to enforce it by sending the starving population of the

towns back to the country districts whence they came, to invade them, as John Bright said, not as paupers begging for bread, but as an army quartered upon the enemy.<sup>a</sup> The working masses of the towns demanded their share of political power—the People's Charter<sup>235</sup>; they were supported by the majority of the small trading class, and the only difference between the two was whether the Charter should be carried by physical or by moral force. Then came the commercial crash of 1847 and the Irish famine, and with both the prospect of revolution.

“The French Revolution of 1848 saved the English middle class. The Socialistic pronunciamentos of the victorious French workmen frightened the small middle class of England and disorganised the narrower, but more matter-of-fact movement of the English working class. At the very moment when Chartism was bound to assert itself in its full strength, it collapsed internally before even it collapsed externally, on the 10th of April, 1848.<sup>236</sup> The action of the working class was thrust into the background. The capitalist class triumphed along the whole line.

“The Reform Bill of 1831<sup>237</sup> had been the victory of the whole capitalist class over the landed aristocracy. The repeal of the Corn Laws was the victory of the manufacturing capitalist not only over the landed aristocracy, but over those sections of capitalists, too, whose interests were more or less bound up with the landed interest—bankers, stock-jobbers, fund-holders, etc. Free Trade meant the readjustment of the whole home and foreign, commercial and financial policy of England in accordance with the interests of the manufacturing capitalists—the class which now represented the nation. And they set about this task with a will. Every obstacle to industrial production was mercilessly removed. The tariff and the whole system of taxation were revolutionised. Everything was made subordinate to one end, but that end of the utmost importance to the manufacturing capitalist: the cheapening of all raw produce, and especially of the means of living of the working class; the reduction of the cost of raw material, and the keeping down—if not as yet the *bringing down*—of wages. England was to become the ‘workshop of the world’<sup>238</sup>; all other countries were to become for England what Ireland already was—markets for her manufactured goods, supplying her in return with raw materials and food. England, the great manufacturing centre of an agricultural world, with an

---

<sup>a</sup> The statement was made apparently not by Bright but by his followers. See *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 71, No. 141, 1843, p. 273.—*Ed.*



ever-increasing number of corn and cotton-growing Irelands revolving around her, the industrial sun. What a glorious prospect!

“The manufacturing capitalists set about the realisation of this their great object with that strong common sense and that contempt for traditional principles which has ever distinguished them from their more narrow-minded compeers on the Continent. Chartism was dying out. The revival of commercial prosperity, natural after the revulsion of 1847 had spent itself, was put down altogether to the credit of Free Trade. Both these circumstances had turned the English working class, politically, into the tail of the ‘great Liberal Party’, the party led by the manufacturers. This advantage, once gained, had to be perpetuated. And the manufacturing capitalists, from the Chartist opposition, not to Free Trade, but to the transformation of Free Trade into the one vital national question, had learnt, and were learning more and more, that the middle class can never obtain full social and political power over the nation except by the help of the working class. Thus a gradual change came over the relations between both classes. The Factory Acts,<sup>239</sup> once the bugbear of all manufacturers, were not only willingly submitted to, but their expansion into acts regulating almost all trades was tolerated. Trades Unions, hitherto considered inventions of the devil himself, were now petted and patronised as perfectly legitimate institutions, and as useful means of spreading sound economical doctrines amongst the workers. Even strikes, than which nothing had been more nefarious up to 1848, were now gradually found out to be occasionally very useful, especially when provoked by the masters themselves, at their own time. Of the legal enactments, placing the workman at a lower level or at a disadvantage with regard to the master, at least the most revolting were repealed. And, practically, that horrid ‘People’s Charter’ actually became the political programme of the very manufacturers who had opposed it to the last. ‘The Abolition of the Property Qualification’ and ‘Vote by Ballot’ are now the law of the land. The Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884<sup>240</sup> make a near approach to ‘universal suffrage’, at least such as it now exists in Germany; the Redistribution Bill now before Parliament creates ‘equal electoral districts’—on the whole not more unequal than those of Germany; ‘payment of members’, and shorter, if not actually ‘annual Parliaments’, are visibly looming in the distance—and yet there are people who say that Chartism is dead.

“The Revolution of 1848, not less than many of its predecessors,

has had strange bedfellows and successors. The very people who put it down have become, as Karl Marx used to say, its testamentary executors.<sup>241</sup> Louis Napoleon had to create an independent and united Italy, Bismarck had to revolutionise Germany and to restore Hungarian independence, and the English manufacturers had to enact the People's Charter.

"For England, the effects of this domination of the manufacturing capitalists were at first startling. Trade revived and extended to a degree unheard of even in this cradle of modern industry; the previous astounding creations of steam and machinery dwindled into nothing compared with the immense mass of productions of the twenty years from 1850 to 1870, with the overwhelming figures of exports and imports, of wealth accumulated in the hands of capitalists and of human working power concentrated in the large towns. The progress was indeed interrupted, as before, by a crisis every ten years, in 1857 as well as in 1866; but these revulsions were now considered as natural, inevitable events, which must be fatalistically submitted to, and which always set themselves right in the end.

"And the condition of the working class during this period? There was temporary improvement even for the great mass. But this improvement always was reduced to the old level by the influx of the great body of the unemployed reserve, by the constant superseding of hands by new machinery, by the immigration of the agricultural population, now, too, more and more superseded by machines.

"A permanent improvement can be recognised for two 'protected' sections only of the working class. Firstly, the factory hands. The fixing by Act of Parliament of their working-day within relatively rational limits has restored their physical constitution and endowed them with a moral superiority, enhanced by their local concentration. They are undoubtedly better off than before 1848. The best proof is that, out of ten strikes they make, nine are provoked by the manufacturers in their own interests, as the only means of securing a reduced production. You can never get the masters to agree to work 'short time', let manufactured goods be ever so unsaleable; but get the work-people to strike, and the masters shut their factories to a man.

"Secondly, the great Trades Unions. They are the organisations of those trades in which the labour of *grown-up men* predominates, or is alone applicable. Here the competition neither of women and children nor of machinery has so far weakened their organised strength. The engineers, the carpenters and joiners, the brick-

layers, are each of them a power, to that extent that, as in the case of the bricklayers and bricklayers' labourers, they can even successfully resist the introduction of machinery. That their condition has remarkably improved since 1848 there can be no doubt, and the best proof of this is in the fact that for more than fifteen years not only have their employers been with them, but they with their employers, upon exceedingly good terms. They form an aristocracy among the working class; they have succeeded in enforcing for themselves a relatively comfortable position, and they accept it as final. They are the model working-men of Messrs. Leone Levi & Giffen, and they are very nice people indeed nowadays to deal with, for any sensible capitalist in particular and for the whole capitalist class in general.

"But as to the great mass of working-people, the state of misery and insecurity in which they live now is as low as ever, if not lower. The East End of London is an ever-spreading pool of stagnant misery and desolation, of starvation when out of work, and degradation, physical and moral, when in work. And so in all other large towns—abstraction made of the privileged minority of the workers; and so in the smaller towns and in the agricultural districts. The law which reduces the *value* of labour-power to the value of the necessary means of subsistence, and the other law which reduces its *average price*, as a rule, to the minimum of those means of subsistence, these laws act upon them with the irresistible force of an automatic engine which crushes them between its wheels.

"This, then, was the position created by the Free Trade policy of 1847, and by twenty years of the rule of the manufacturing capitalists. But then a change came. The crash of 1866 was, indeed, followed by a slight and short revival about 1873; but that did not last. We did not, indeed, pass through the full crisis at the time it was due, in 1877 or 1878; but we have had, ever since 1876, a chronic state of stagnation in all dominant branches of industry. Neither will the full crash come; nor will the period of longed-for prosperity to which we used to be entitled before and after it. A dull depression, a chronic glut of all markets for all trades, that is what we have been living in for nearly ten years. How is this?

"The Free Trade theory was based upon one assumption: that England was to be the one great manufacturing centre of an agricultural world. And the actual fact is that this assumption has turned out to be a pure delusion. The conditions of modern industry, steam-power and machinery, can be established wherever

there is fuel, especially coals. And other countries besides England—France, Belgium, Germany, America, even Russia—have coals. And the people over there did not see the advantage of being turned into Irish pauper farmers merely for the greater wealth and glory of English capitalists. They set resolutely about manufacturing, not only for themselves, but for the rest of the world; and the consequence is that the manufacturing monopoly enjoyed by England for nearly a century is irretrievably broken up.

“But the manufacturing monopoly of England is the pivot of the present social system of England. Even while that monopoly lasted, the markets could not keep pace with the increasing productivity of English manufacturers; the decennial crises were the consequence. And new markets are getting scarcer every day, so much so that even the Negroes of the Congo are now to be forced into the civilisation attendant upon Manchester calicos, Staffordshire pottery, and Birmingham hardware. How will it be when Continental, and especially American, goods flow in in ever-increasing quantities—when the predominating share, still held by British manufacturers, will become reduced from year to year? Answer, Free Trade, thou universal panacea.

“I am not the first to point this out. Already in 1883, at the Southport meeting of the British Association,<sup>242</sup> Mr. Inglis Palgrave, the President of the Economic section, stated plainly that

‘the days of great trade profits in England were over, and there was a pause in the progress of several great branches of industrial labour. *The country might almost be said to be entering the non-progressive state.*’<sup>a</sup>

“But what is to be the consequence? Capitalist production *cannot* stop. It must go on increasing and expanding, or it must die. Even now the mere reduction of England’s lion’s share in the supply of the world’s markets means stagnation, distress, excess of capital here, excess of unemployed workpeople there. What will it be when the increase of yearly production is brought to a complete stop?

“Here is the vulnerable place, the heel of Achilles, for capitalistic production. Its very basis is the necessity of constant expansion, and this constant expansion now becomes impossible. It ends in a deadlock. Every year England is brought nearer face to face with the question: either the country must go to pieces, or capitalist production must. Which is it to be?

---

<sup>a</sup> *Report of the Fifty-Third Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; held at Southport in September 1883*, pp. 608-09.—Ed.

“And the working class? If even under the unparalleled commercial and industrial expansion, from 1848 to 1868, they have had to undergo such misery; if even then the great bulk of them experienced at best but a temporary improvement of their condition, while only a small, privileged, ‘protected’ minority was permanently benefited, what will it be when this dazzling period is brought finally to a close; when the present dreary stagnation shall not only become intensified, but this, its intensified condition, shall become the permanent and normal state of English trade?”

“The truth is this: during the period of England’s industrial monopoly the English working class have, to a certain extent, shared in the benefits of the monopoly. These benefits were very unequally parcelled out amongst them; the privileged minority pocketed most, but even the great mass had, at least, a temporary share now and then. And that is the reason why, since the dying-out of Owenism, there has been no Socialism in England. With the breakdown of that monopoly, the English working class will lose that privileged position; it will find itself generally—the privileged and leading minority not excepted—on a level with its fellow-workers abroad. And that is the reason why there will be Socialism again in England.”

To this statement of the case, as that case appeared to me in 1885, I have but little to add. Needless to say that to-day there is indeed “Socialism again in England”, and plenty of it—Socialism of all shades: Socialism conscious and unconscious, Socialism prosaic and poetic, Socialism of the working class and of the middle class, for, verily, that abomination of abominations, Socialism, has not only become respectable, but has actually donned evening dress and lounges lazily on drawing-room *causeuses*. That shows the incurable fickleness of that terrible despot of “society”, middle-class public opinion, and once more justifies the contempt in which we Socialists of a past generation always held that public opinion. At the same time we have no reason to grumble at the symptom itself.

What I consider far more important than this momentary fashion among bourgeois circles of affecting a mild dilution of Socialism, and even more than the actual progress Socialism has made in England generally, that is the revival of the East End of London. That immense haunt of misery is no longer the stagnant pool it was six years ago. It has shaken off its torpid despair, has returned to life, and has become the home of what is called the “New Unionism”, that is to say, of the organisation of the great mass of “unskilled” workers. This organisation may to a great

extent adopt the form of the old Unions of “skilled” workers but it is essentially different in character. The old Unions preserve the traditions of the time when they were founded, and look upon the wages system as a once-for-all established, final fact, which they at best can modify in the interest of their members. The new Unions were founded at a time when the faith in the eternity of the wages system was severely shaken; their founders and promoters were Socialists either consciously or by feeling; the masses, whose adhesion gave them strength, were rough, neglected, looked down upon by the working-class aristocracy; but they had this immense advantage, that *their minds were virgin soil*, entirely free from the inherited “respectable” bourgeois prejudices which hampered the brains of the better situated “old” Unionists. And thus we see now these new Unions taking the lead of the working-class movement generally, and more and more taking in tow the rich and proud “old” Unions.

Undoubtedly, the East Enders have committed colossal blunders; so have their predecessors, and so do the doctrinaire Socialists who pooh-pooh them. A large class, like a great nation, never learns better or quicker than by undergoing the consequences of its own mistakes. And for all the faults committed in past, present and future, the revival of the East End of London remains one of the greatest and most fruitful facts of this *fin de siècle*, and glad and proud I am to have lived to see it.

January 11th, 1892

*F. Engels*

First published in the book: *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844*, London, 1892

Reproduced from the book

# CRITICA SOCIALE

RIVISTA QUINDICINALE

di studi sociali, politici, filosofici e letterari

Nel Regno: Anno L. 8 - Semestre L. 4 - AN'Estero: Anno L. 10 - Semestre L. 5,50

Lettere, vaglia, cartoline-copia all'Ufficio di CRITICA SOCIALE: MILANO: Portici Galleria V. E., 23 (3° piano int.)  
PER MILANO gli abbonamenti si ricevono anche presso la Libreria Fratelli Dumolard: Corso V. E., 21.

Anno 8 - N. 4.

La rivista non si vende a numeri separati.

Milano, 16 febbraio 1892.

## REPLY TO THE HONOURABLE GIOVANNI BOVIO<sup>243</sup>

In an article in *La Tribuna* of February 2 this year, the honourable Giovanni Bovio reproaches the Italian Republican parliamentary deputies, who have latterly gone over to the royalist camp, for treating too scornfully the question of the form of government. This does not affect me directly. What does affect me is that he deals with my article on German socialism (*Critica Sociale*, January 16, 1892)<sup>a</sup> making the same reproach against the German socialists in general and against me in particular. This is what he says on the matter<sup>b</sup>:

"Thus we can see the error of those socialists who, with Frederick Engels, speak of the imminent coming to power of socialism and do not specify what kind of power. Engels even established with mathematical arguments (and numbers have for some time seemed to me a good argument in history) the not too distant year in which the socialist party will become the majority in the German parliament. So far so good. And then?

"—It will take power.

"—Even better. But what power? Will it be monarchic, or republican, or will it go back to Weitling's utopia, superseded by the *Communist Manifesto* of January 1848?

"—The forms make no difference to us.

"—Really?... But you cannot speak of power except where the form is made concrete. You can say that the new substance, the new idea, will of itself create the form, produce it from deep within itself, but you cannot, you must not, dispense with the problem."

To this I reply that I do not accept in the slightest the honourable Mr. Bovio's interpretation.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 237-41.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The following quotations are given in Italian in the original.—*Ed.*

For a start, I have never said the socialist party will become the majority and then proceed to take power. On the contrary, I have expressly said that the odds are ten to one that our rulers, well before that point arrives, will use violence against us, and this would shift us from the terrain of majority to the terrain of revolution. But let us pass over this.

“It will take power. But what power? Will it be monarchic, or republican, or will it go back to Weitling’s utopia, superseded by the *Communist Manifesto* of January 1848?”

Here I must permit myself the use of one of the honourable Mr. Bovio’s own expressions. He must really be a “man of the cloister” if he has the slightest doubt about the nature of this power.

All of governmental, aristocratic and bourgeois Germany reproaches our friends in the Reichstag for being republicans and revolutionaries.

Marx and I, for forty years, repeated ad nauseam that for us the democratic republic is the only political form in which the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class can first be universalised and then culminate in the decisive victory of the proletariat.

The honourable Mr. Bovio is surely not so naive as to believe that an emperor of Germany would draw his ministers from the socialist party and that, if he so desired, he would accept the conditions—implying abdication—without which those ministers could not count on the support of their party? But it is true that his fear of seeing us “go back to Weitling’s utopia” gives me a fairly exalted estimate of my interlocutor’s naivety.

Or does the honourable Mr. Bovio, in referring to Weitling, mean to imply that the German socialists attribute no more importance to the social form than to the political form? Again he would be mistaken. He should be well enough acquainted with German socialism to know that it demands the socialisation of all the means of production. How can this economic revolution be accomplished? That will depend on the circumstances in which our party seizes power, on the moment at which and the manner in which that occurs. As Bovio says:

“the new substance, the new idea, will of itself create the form, produce it from deep within itself”.

Meanwhile, if tomorrow, by some accident, our party were called to power, I know perfectly well what I would propose as a programme of action.



“The forms make no difference to us.”?

I should like to point out that it was neither I nor any other German socialist who said that, or anything of the kind, but the honourable Mr. Bovio and he alone. I should certainly like to know by what right he attributes such “*sciocchezza*”<sup>a</sup> to us.

For the rest, if the honourable Mr. Bovio had waited for and read the second half of my article (*Critica Sociale*, February 1),<sup>b</sup> perhaps he would not have taken the trouble of confusing the German revolutionary socialists with the Italian royalist Republicans.

February 6, 1892

*Frederick Engels*

First published in *Critica Sociale*, No. 4,  
February 16, 1892

Printed according to the manu-  
script, checked with the journal

Translated from the French and  
Italian

---

<sup>a</sup> Rubbish.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 241-45.—*Ed.*

PREFACE [TO THE POLISH EDITION (1892)  
OF THE *MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY*]<sup>244</sup>

The fact that a new Polish edition of the *Communist Manifesto* has become necessary gives rise to various thoughts.

First of all, it is noteworthy that of late the *Manifesto* has become an index, as it were, of the development of large-scale industry on the European continent. In proportion as large-scale industry expands in a given country, the demand grows among the workers of that country for enlightenment regarding their position as the working class in relation to the possessing classes, the socialist movement spreads among them and the demand for the *Manifesto* increases. Thus, not only the state of the labour movement but also the degree of development of large-scale industry can be measured with fair accuracy in every country by the number of copies of the *Manifesto* circulated in the language of that country.

Accordingly, the new Polish edition indicates a decided progress of Polish industry. And there can be no doubt whatever that this progress since the previous edition<sup>a</sup> published ten years ago has actually taken place. The Kingdom of Poland, Congress Poland,<sup>245</sup> has become the big industrial region of the Russian Empire. Whereas Russian large-scale industry is scattered sporadically—a part round the Gulf of Finland, another in the centre (Moscow and Vladimir), a third along the coasts of the Black and Azov seas, and still others elsewhere—Polish industry has been packed into a relatively small area and enjoys both the advantages and the disadvantages arising from such concentration. The competing Russian manufacturers acknowledge the advantages when they demanded protective tariffs against Poland,<sup>246</sup> in spite of their

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifest Komunistyczny 1847 r.*—Ed.

ardent desire to transform the Poles into Russians. The disadvantages—for the Polish manufacturers and the Russian government—are manifest in the rapid spread of socialist ideas among the Polish workers and in the growing demand for the *Manifesto*.

But the rapid development of Polish industry, outstripping that of Russia, is in its turn a new proof of the inexhaustible vitality of the Polish people and a new guarantee of its impending national restoration. And the restoration of an independent strong Poland is a matter which concerns not only the Poles but all of us. A sincere international collaboration of the European nations is possible only if each of these nations is fully autonomous in its own house. The Revolution of 1848, which under the banner of the proletariat, after all, merely let the proletarian fighters do the work of the bourgeoisie, secured the independence of Italy, Germany and Hungary, among other things, through Louis Bonaparte and Bismarck, its testamentary executors; but Poland, which since 1792 had done more for the revolution than all these three together, was left to its own resources when it succumbed in 1863 to a tenfold greater Russian force. The nobility could neither maintain nor regain Polish independence; today, to the bourgeoisie, this independence is, to say the least, immaterial. Nevertheless, it is a necessity for the harmonious collaboration of the European nations.<sup>a</sup> It can be gained only by the young Polish proletariat, and in its hands it is secure. For the workers of all the rest of Europe need the independence of Poland just as much as the Polish workers themselves.

*F. Engels*

London, February 10, 1892

First published in *Przedświt*, No. 35, February 27, 1892 and in: K. Marx i F. Engels, *Manifest Komunistyczny*, London, 1892

Printed according to the manuscript, checked with the Polish edition of 1892

---

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is omitted in the Polish edition.—*Ed.*

[GREETINGS TO THE FRENCH WORKERS  
ON THE OCCASION OF THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE PARIS COMMUNE]

London, March 17, 1892

Citizens and citizenesses,

Twenty-one years ago today the people of Paris raised the red flag, in defiance of both the French tricolour flying at Versailles and the German tricolour flying over the forts occupied by the Prussians.

The red flag was the Paris proletariat rising to a height from which conquerors and conquered alike disappeared.

What constitutes the historic grandeur of the Commune is its eminently international character. It is the bold challenge which it made to every sentiment of bourgeois chauvinism. The proletariat of all countries was not mistaken. Let the bourgeois celebrate their July 14 or their September 22.<sup>247</sup> The holiday of the proletariat, everywhere and always, will be March 18.

Hence the vile slanders which the vile bourgeoisie has heaped on the tomb of the Commune. But hence, also, the International Association of Working Men, which alone dared to identify itself from the very first day with the Paris insurgents and, until the last day and thereafter, with the defeated proletarians. It is true that where the Commune succumbed, the International was not able to survive: to the cry of "At the Communards!" it was smashed from one end of Europe to the other.

Well! Twenty-one years have passed since the recapture of the cannons on the hill of Montmartre.<sup>a</sup> The children born in 1871 have now reached their majority, and thanks to the stupidity of the ruling classes they are *soldiers*, learning to handle arms, the art

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 184.—*Ed.*

of organising themselves and defending themselves, gun in hand. The Commune which they claimed to have killed, the International which they imagined they had wiped out forever, are here in our midst, alive and twenty times more powerful than in 1871. Those responding to our call have grown from hundreds into thousands, and from thousands into millions. The union of the world proletariat, which the First International was able to predict and prepare, is today a reality. And, what is more, the sons of the Prussian soldiers who occupied the forts surrounding the Paris of the Commune in 1871 are today fighting in their millions in the front line, side by side with the sons of the Communards; for the complete and lasting liberation of the working class.

Long live the Commune!

Long live the International Social Revolution!

*Fred. Engels*

First published in *Le Socialiste*, No. 79,  
March 26, 1892

Printed according to the news-  
paper, checked with the rough  
manuscript

Translated from the French

[PREFACE TO THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION  
OF KARL MARX'S *THE POVERTY OF PHILOSOPHY*]<sup>248</sup>

For the second edition I have only to remark that the name wrongly written Hopkins in the French text (on page 45<sup>a</sup>) has been replaced by the correct name Hodgskin and that in the same place the date of the work of William Thompson has been corrected to 1824.<sup>b</sup> It is to be hoped that this will appease the bibliographical conscience of Professor Anton Menger.

*Frederick Engels*

London, March 29, 1892

First published in: Karl Marx, *Das Elend der Philosophie*, Stuttgart, 1892

Printed according to the book

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 138.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> W. Thompson, *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth Most Conducive to Human Happiness*.—*Ed.*

INTRODUCTION TO THE ENGLISH EDITION (1892)  
OF *SOCIALISM: UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC*<sup>249</sup>

The present little book is, originally, a part of a large whole. About 1875, Dr. E. Dühring, *privatdocent* at Berlin University, suddenly and rather clamorously announced his conversion to socialism, and presented the German public not only with an elaborate socialist theory, but also with a complete practical plan for the reorganisation of society. As a matter of course, he fell foul of his predecessors; above all, he honoured Marx by pouring out upon him the full vials of his wrath.

This took place about the time when the two sections of the Socialist Party in Germany—Eisenachers and Lassalleans<sup>250</sup>—had just effected their fusion, and thus obtained not only an immense increase of strength, but, what was more, the faculty of employing the whole of this strength against the common enemy. The Socialist Party in Germany was fast becoming a power. But to make it a power, the first condition was that the newly-conquered unity should not be imperilled. And Dr. Dühring openly proceeded to form around himself a sect, the nucleus of a future separate party. It thus became necessary to take up the gauntlet thrown down to us, and to fight out the struggle whether we liked it or not.

This, however, though it might not be an overdiffficult, was evidently a long-winded, business. As is well known, we Germans are of a terribly ponderous *Gründlichkeit*, radical profundity or profound radicality, whatever you may like to call it. Whenever any one of us expounds what he considers a new doctrine, he has first to elaborate it into an all-comprising system. He has to prove that both the first principles of logic and the fundamental laws of the universe had existed from all eternity for no other purpose than to ultimately lead to this newly-discovered, crowning theory.

# SOCIALISM

## UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC

*Presented by F. A. Sorge  
London 24/9/52 F. Engels*

Half-title of the English edition  
of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*  
presented by Engels to F. A. Sorge



**SOCIALISM**  
**UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC**

BY

**FREDERICK ENGELS**

*TRANSLATED BY EDWARD AVELING*

*D.Sc., Fellow of University College, London*

WITH A SPECIAL INTRODUCTION BY THE AUTHOR



LONDON :  
SWAN SONNENSCHNEIN & CO.  
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1892

Title page of the English edition  
of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*

And Dr. Dühring, in this respect, was quite up to the national mark. Nothing less than a complete *System of Philosophy*, mental, moral, natural, and historical; a complete *System of Political Economy and Socialism*; and, finally, a *Critical History of Political Economy*<sup>a</sup>—three big volumes in octavo, heavy extrinsically and intrinsically, three army corps of arguments mobilised against all previous philosophers and economists in general, and against Marx in particular—in fact, an attempt at a complete “revolution in science”—these were what I should have to tackle. I had to treat of all and every possible subject, from the concepts of time and space to Bimetallism<sup>251</sup>; from the eternity of matter and motion to the perishable nature of moral ideas; from Darwin’s natural selection to the education of youth in a future society. Anyhow, the systematic comprehensiveness of my opponent gave me the opportunity of developing, in opposition to him, and in a more connected form than had previously been done, the views held by Marx and myself on this great variety of subjects. And that was the principal reason which made me undertake this otherwise ungrateful task.

My reply was first published in a series of articles in the Leipzig *Vorwärts*, the chief organ of the socialist party, and later on as a book: *Herrn Eugen Dühring’s Umwälzung der Wissenschaft* (*Mr. E. Dühring’s Revolution in Science*), a second edition of which appeared in Zurich, 1886.

At the request of my friend, Paul Lafargue, now representative of Lille in the French Chamber of Deputies, I arranged three chapters of this book as a pamphlet, which he translated and published in 1880, under the title: *Socialisme utopique et socialisme scientifique*.<sup>252</sup> From this French text Polish and Spanish editions were prepared. In 1883, our German friends brought out the pamphlet in the original language. Italian, Russian, Danish, Dutch, and Roumanian translations, based upon the German text, have since been published. Thus, with the present English edition, this little book circulates in ten languages. I am not aware that any other socialist work, not even our *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 or Marx’s *Capital*, has been so often translated. In Germany it has had four editions of about 20,000 copies in all.

The Appendix, “The Mark”, was written with the intention of spreading among the German Socialist Party some elementary

<sup>a</sup> This refers to E. Dühring’s books: *Cursus der Philosophie als streng wissenschaftlicher Weltanschauung und Lebensgestaltung*; *Cursus der National- und Socialökonomie einschliesslich der Hauptpunkte der Finanzpolitik*; *Kritische Geschichte der Nationalökonomie und der Socialismus*.—Ed.

knowledge of the history and development of landed property in Germany. This seemed all the more necessary at a time when the assimilation by that party of the working people of the towns was in a fair way of completion, and when the agricultural labourers and peasants had to be taken in hand. This appendix has been included in the translation, as the original forms of tenure of land common to all Teutonic tribes, and the history of their decay, are even less known in England than in Germany. I have left the text as it stands in the original, without alluding to the hypothesis recently started by Maxim Kovalevsky, according to which the partition of the arable and meadow lands among the members of the Mark was preceded by their being cultivated for joint-account by a large patriarchal family community embracing several generations (as exemplified by the still existing South Slavonian Zadruga), and that the partition, later on, took place when the community had increased, so as to become too unwieldy for joint-account management.<sup>a</sup> Kovalevsky is probably quite right, but the matter is still *sub judice*.<sup>b</sup>

The economic terms used in this work, as far as they are new, agree with those used in the English edition of Marx's *Capital*.<sup>253</sup> We call "production of commodities" that economic phase where articles are produced not only for the use of the producers, but also for purposes of exchange; that is, *as commodities*, not as use values. This phase extends from the first beginnings of production for exchange down to our present time; it attains its full development under capitalist production only, that is, under conditions where the capitalist, the owner of the means of production, employs, for wages, labourers, people deprived of all means of production except their own labour-power, and pockets the excess of the selling price of the products over his outlay. We divide the history of industrial production since the Middle Ages into three periods: (1) handicraft, small master craftsmen with a few journeymen and apprentices, where each labourer produces the complete article; (2) manufacture, where greater numbers of workmen, grouped in one large establishment, produce the complete article on the principle of division of labour, each workman performing only one partial operation, so that the product is complete only after having passed successively through the hands of all; (3) modern industry, where the product is produced by machinery driven by power, and where the work of

<sup>a</sup> Engels refers to M. M. Kovalevsky's works: *Tableau des origines et de l'évolution de la famille et de la propriété* and *Первобытное право*, I, «Родъ».—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Under consideration.—Ed.

the labourer is limited to superintending and correcting the performances of the mechanical agent.<sup>a</sup>

I am perfectly aware that the contents of this work will meet with objection from a considerable portion of the British public. But if we Continentals had taken the slightest notice of the prejudices of British "respectability";<sup>b</sup> we should be even worse off than we are. This book defends what we call "historical materialism", and the word materialism grates upon the ears of the immense majority of British readers. "Agnosticism" might be tolerated, but materialism is utterly inadmissible.

And yet the original home of all modern materialism, from the seventeenth century onwards, is England.<sup>c</sup>

"Materialism is the natural-born son of Great Britain. Already the British schoolman, Duns Scotus, asked, 'whether it was impossible for matter to think?'

"In order to effect this miracle, he took refuge in God's omnipotence, *i.e.*, he made theology preach materialism. Moreover, he was a nominalist.<sup>254</sup> Nominalism, the first form of materialism, is chiefly found among the English schoolmen.

"The real progenitor of English materialism is Bacon. To him natural philosophy is the only true philosophy, and physics based upon the experience of the senses is the chiefest part of natural philosophy. Anaxagoras and his *homoiomeriae*,<sup>255</sup> Democritus and his atoms, he often quotes as his authorities. According to him the senses are infallible and the source of all knowledge. All science is based on experience, and consists in subjecting the data furnished by the senses to a rational method of investigation. Induction, analysis, comparison, observation, experiment, are the principal forms of such a rational method. Among the qualities inherent in matter, motion is the first and foremost, not only in the form of mechanical and mathematical motion, but chiefly in the form of an impulse, a vital spirit, a tension—or a 'qual', to use a term of Jakob Böhme's\*—of matter.<sup>d</sup>

"In Bacon, its first creator, materialism still occludes within itself

\* "Qual" is a philosophical play upon words. Qual literally means torture, a pain which drives to action of some kind; at the same time the mystic Böhme puts

<sup>a</sup> The beginning of the Introduction up to the words "the mechanical agent" is omitted in *Die Neue Zeit*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* there follows: "i.e. British philistines".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Further on Engels quotes a lengthy passage from *The Holy Family* (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 127-29). Substantial differences between the text in *Die Neue Zeit* and Engels' translation into English are given in footnotes.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* there follows the sentence omitted in the English edition: "The

the germs of a many-sided development. On the one hand, matter, surrounded by a sensuous, poetic glamour, seems to attract man's whole entity by winning smiles. On the other, the aphoristically formulated doctrine pullulates with inconsistencies imported from theology.

"In its further evolution, materialism becomes one-sided. Hobbes is the man who systematises Baconian materialism. Knowledge based upon the senses loses its poetic blossom, it passes into the abstract experience of the mathematician<sup>b</sup>; geometry is proclaimed as the queen of sciences. Materialism takes to misanthropy. If it is to overcome its opponent, misanthropic, fleshless spiritualism, and that on the latter's own ground, materialism has to chastise its own flesh and turn ascetic. Thus, from a sensual, it passes into an intellectual entity; but thus, too, it evolves all the consistency, regardless of consequences, characteristic of the intellect.

"Hobbes, as Bacon's continuator, argues thus: if all human knowledge is furnished by the senses, then our concepts and ideas are but the phantoms, divested of their sensual forms, of the real world. Philosophy can but give names to these phantoms. One name may be applied to more than one of them. There may even be names of names. It would imply a contradiction if, on the one hand, we maintained that all ideas had their origin in the world of sensation, and, on the other, that a word was more than a word; that besides the beings known to us by our senses, beings which are one and all individuals, there existed also beings of a general, not individual, nature. An unbodily substance is the same absurdity as an unbodily body. Body, being, substance, are but different terms for the same reality. *It is impossible to separate thought from matter that thinks.* This matter is the substratum of all changes going on in the world. The word infinite is meaningless, unless it states that our mind is capable of performing an endless

into the German word something of the meaning of the Latin *qualitas*; his "qual" was the activating principle arising from, and promoting in its turn, the spontaneous development of the thing, relation, or person subject to it, in contradistinction to a pain inflicted from without.<sup>a</sup>

---

primary forms of matter are the living, individualising forces of being inherent in it and producing the distinctions between the species."—*Ed.*

<sup>a</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* this note was omitted by Engels.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* continues with the following: "Physical motion is sacrificed to mechanical or mathematical motion."—*Ed.*

process of addition. Only material things being perceptible to us, we cannot know anything about the existence of God. My own existence alone is certain. Every human passion is a mechanical movement which has a beginning and an end. The objects of impulse are what we call good. Man is subject to the same laws as nature. Power and freedom are identical.

“Hobbes had systematised Bacon without, however, furnishing a proof for Bacon’s fundamental principle, the origin of all human knowledge from the world of sensation. It was Locke who, in his *Essay on the Human Understanding*, supplied this proof.<sup>a</sup>”

“Hobbes had shattered the theistic prejudices of Baconian materialism; Collins, Dodwell, Coward, Hartley, Priestley similarly shattered the last theological bars that still hemmed in Locke’s sensationalism. At all events, for practical materialists, Theism<sup>256</sup> is but an easy-going way of getting rid of religion.”\*

Thus Karl Marx wrote about the British origin of modern materialism. If Englishmen nowadays do not exactly relish the compliment he paid their ancestors, more’s the pity. It is none the less undeniable that Bacon, Hobbes, and Locke are the fathers of that brilliant school of French materialists which made the eighteenth century, in spite of all battles on land and sea won over Frenchmen by Germans and Englishmen, a pre-eminently French century, even before that crowning French Revolution, the results of which we outsiders, in England as well as in Germany, are still trying to acclimatise.

There is no denying it. About the middle of this century, what struck every cultivated foreigner who set up his residence in England, was, what he was then bound to consider the religious bigotry and stupidity of the English respectable middle class. We, at that time, were all materialists, or, at least, very advanced freethinkers, and to us it appeared inconceivable that almost all educated people in England should believe in all sorts of impossible miracles, and that even geologists like Buckland and Mantell should contort the facts of their science so as not to clash too much with the myths of the book of Genesis; while, in order to find people who dared to use their own intellectual faculties with regard to religious matters, you had to go amongst the uneducated, the “great unwashed”, as they were then called, the working people, especially the Owenite Socialists.

\* Marx and Engels, *Die heilige Familie*, Frankfurt a. M., 1845, pp. 201-04.

<sup>a</sup> J. Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*.—Ed.

But England has been “civilised” since then. The exhibition of 1851<sup>257</sup> sounded the knell of English insular exclusiveness. England became gradually internationalised—in diet, in manners, in ideas; so much so that I begin to wish that some English manners and customs had made as much headway on the Continent as other continental habits have made here. Anyhow, the introduction and spread of salad-oil (before 1851 known only to the aristocracy) has been accompanied by a fatal spread of continental scepticism in matters religious, and it has come to this, that agnosticism, though not yet considered “the thing” quite as much as the Church of England, is yet very nearly on a par, as far as respectability goes, with Baptism, and decidedly ranks above the Salvation Army. And I cannot help believing that under these circumstances it will be consoling to many who sincerely regret and condemn this progress of infidelity to learn that these “new-fangled notions” are not of foreign origin, are not “made in Germany”, like so many other articles of daily use, but are undoubtedly Old English, and that their British originators two hundred years ago went a good deal further than their descendants now dare to venture.

What, indeed, is agnosticism, but, to use an expressive Lancashire term,<sup>a</sup> “shamefaced” materialism? The agnostic’s conception of Nature is materialistic throughout. The entire natural world is governed by law, and absolutely excludes the intervention of action from without. But, he adds, we have no means either of ascertaining or of disproving the existence of some Supreme Being beyond the known universe. Now, this might hold good at the time when Laplace, to Napoleon’s question, why in the great astronomer’s *Mécanique céleste*<sup>b</sup> the Creator was not even mentioned, proudly replied: “*Je n’avais pas besoin de cette hypothèse.*”<sup>c</sup> But nowadays, in our evolutionary conception of the universe, there is absolutely no room for either a Creator or a Ruler; and to talk of a Supreme Being shut out from the whole existing world, implies a contradiction in terms, and, as it seems to me, a gratuitous insult to the feelings of religious people.

Again, our agnostic admits that all our knowledge is based upon the information imparted to us by our senses. But, he adds, how do we know that our senses give us correct representations of the

---

<sup>a</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* the phrase “to use an expressive Lancashire term” is omitted.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This refers to P. S. Laplace, *Traité de mécanique céleste.*—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> “I had no need of this hypothesis.”—*Ed.*

objects we perceive through them? And he proceeds to inform us that, whenever he speaks of objects or their qualities, he does in reality not mean these objects and qualities, of which he cannot know anything for certain, but merely the impressions which they have produced on his senses. Now, this line of reasoning seems undoubtedly hard to beat by mere argumentation. But before there was argumentation, there was action. *Im Anfang war die That.*<sup>a</sup> And human action had solved the difficulty long before human ingenuity invented it. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. From the moment we turn to our own use these objects, according to the qualities we perceive in them, we put to an infallible test the correctness or otherwise of our sense-perceptions. If these perceptions have been wrong, then our estimate of the use to which an object can be turned must also be wrong, and our attempt must fail. But if we succeed in accomplishing our aim, if we find that the object does agree with our idea of it, and does answer the purpose we intended it for, then that is positive proof that our perceptions of it and of its qualities, *so far*, agree with reality outside ourselves. And whenever we find ourselves face to face with a failure, then we generally are not long in making out the cause that made us fail; we find that the perception upon which we acted was either incomplete and superficial, or combined with the results of other perceptions in a way not warranted by them—what we call defective reasoning.<sup>b</sup> So long as we take care to train and to use our senses properly, and to keep our action within the limits prescribed by perceptions properly made and properly used, so long we shall find that the result of our action proves the conformity of our perceptions with the objective nature of the things perceived. Not in one single instance, so far, have we been led to the conclusion that our sense-perceptions, scientifically controlled, induce in our minds ideas respecting the outer world that are, by their very nature, at variance with reality, or that there is an inherent incompatibility between the outer world and our sense-perceptions of it.

But then come the Neo-Kantian agnostics and say: We may correctly perceive the qualities of a thing, but we cannot by any sensible or mental process grasp the thing-in-itself. This “thing-in-itself” is beyond our ken. To this Hegel, long since, has replied: If

---

<sup>a</sup> “In the beginning was the deed” (see Goethe, *Faust*, Part I, Scene 3, “Faust’s Study”).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* the words “what we call defective reasoning” are omitted.—*Ed.*



you know all the qualities of a thing, you know the thing itself; nothing remains but the fact that the said thing exists without us; and when your senses have taught you that fact, you have grasped the last remnant of the thing-in-itself, Kant's celebrated unknowable *Ding an sich*. To which it may be added that in Kant's time our knowledge of natural objects was indeed so fragmentary that he might well suspect, behind the little we knew about each of them, a mysterious "thing-in-itself". But one after another these ungraspable things have been grasped, analysed and, what is more, *reproduced* by the giant progress of science; and what we can produce, we certainly cannot consider as unknowable. To the chemistry of the first half of this century organic substances were such mysterious objects; now we learn to build them up one after another from their chemical elements without the aid of organic processes. Modern chemists declare that as soon as the chemical constitution of no matter what body is known, it can be built up from its elements. We are still far from knowing the constitution of the highest organic substances, the albuminous bodies; but there is no reason why we should not, if only after centuries, arrive at that knowledge and, armed with it, produce artificial albumen. But if we arrive at that, we shall at the same time have produced organic life, for life, from its lowest to its highest forms, is but the normal mode of existence of albuminous bodies.

As soon, however, as our agnostic has made these formal mental reservations, he talks and acts as the rank materialist he at bottom is. He may say that, as far as *we* know, matter and motion, or as it is now called, energy, can neither be created nor destroyed, but that we have no proof of their not having been created at some time or other. But if you try to use this admission against him in any particular case, he will quickly put you out of court. If he admits the possibility of spiritualism *in abstracto*, he will have none of it *in concreto*. As far as we know and can know, he will tell you there is no Creator and no Ruler of the universe; as far as we are concerned, matter and energy can neither be created nor annihilated; for us, mind is a mode of energy, a function of the brain; all we know is that the material world is governed by immutable laws, and so forth. Thus, as far as he is a scientific man, as far as he *knows* anything, he is a materialist; outside his science, in spheres about which he knows nothing, he translates his ignorance into Greek and calls it agnosticism.

At all events, one thing seems clear: even if I was an agnostic, it is evident that I could not describe the conception of history sketched out in this little book as "historical agnosticism".

Religious people would laugh at me, agnostics would indignantly ask, was I going to make fun of them? And thus I hope even British respectability<sup>a</sup> will not be overshocked if I use, in English as well as in so many other languages, the term "historical materialism", to designate that view of the course of history which seeks the ultimate cause and the great moving power of all important historic events in the economic development of society, in the changes in the modes of production and exchange, in the consequent division of society into distinct classes, and in the struggles of these classes against one another.

This indulgence will perhaps be accorded to me all the sooner if I show that historical materialism may be of advantage even to British respectability.<sup>b</sup> I have mentioned the fact that about forty or fifty years ago, any cultivated foreigner settling in England was struck by what he was then bound to consider the religious bigotry and stupidity of the English respectable middle class. I am now going to prove that the respectable English middle class of that time was not quite as stupid as it looked to the intelligent foreigner. Its religious leanings can be explained.

When Europe emerged from the Middle Ages, the rising middle class<sup>c</sup> of the towns constituted its revolutionary element. It had conquered a recognised position within medieval feudal organisation, but this position, also, had become too narrow for its expansive power. The development<sup>d</sup> of the middle class, the *bourgeoisie*, became incompatible with the maintenance of the feudal system; the feudal system, therefore, had to fall.

But the great international centre of feudalism was the Roman Catholic Church. It united the whole of feudalised Western Europe, in spite of all internal wars, into one grand political system, opposed as much to the schismatic Greeks as to the Mohammedan countries. It surrounded feudal institutions with the halo of divine consecration. It had organised its own hierarchy on the feudal model, and, lastly, it was itself by far the most powerful feudal lord, holding, as it did, full one-third of the soil of the Catholic world. Before profane feudalism could be

---

<sup>a</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* there follow the words: "which in German is called philistinism".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* the words "the respectability of the British philistine" are substituted for "British respectability".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> From here on and up to the paragraph beginning with the words "The new starting-point" (p. 292 of this volume), Engels' terms "middle class" and "bourgeoisie" are translated as "Bürgerthum" in *Die Neue Zeit*.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit*: "The free development".—*Ed.*

successfully attacked in each country and in detail, this, its sacred central organisation, had to be destroyed.

Moreover, parallel with the rise of the middle class went on the great revival of science; astronomy, mechanics, physics, anatomy, physiology, were again cultivated. And the bourgeoisie, for the development of its industrial production, required a science which ascertained the physical properties of natural objects and the modes of action of the forces of Nature. Now up to then science had but been the humble handmaid of the Church, had not been allowed to overstep the limits set by faith, and for that reason had been no science at all. Science rebelled against the Church; the bourgeoisie could not do without science, and, therefore, had to join in the rebellion.

The above, though touching but two of the points where the rising middle class was bound to come into collision with the established religion, will be sufficient to show, first, that the class most directly interested in the struggle against the pretensions of the Roman Church was the bourgeoisie; and second, that every struggle against feudalism, at that time, had to take on a religious disguise, had to be directed against the Church in the first instance. But if the universities and the traders of the cities started the cry, it was sure to find, and did find, a strong echo in the masses of the country people, the peasants, who everywhere had to struggle for their very existence with their feudal lords, spiritual and temporal.

The long<sup>a</sup> fight of the bourgeoisie against feudalism culminated in three great, decisive battles.

The first was what is called the Protestant Reformation in Germany. The war-cry raised against the Church by Luther was responded to by two insurrections of a political nature: first, that of the lower nobility under Franz von Sickingen (1523), then the great Peasants' War, 1525.<sup>258</sup> Both were defeated, chiefly in consequence of the indecision of the parties most interested, the burghers of the towns—an indecision into the causes of which we cannot here enter. From that moment the struggle degenerated into a fight between the local princes and the central power,<sup>b</sup> and ended by blotting out Germany, for two hundred years, from the politically active nations of Europe. The Lutheran Reformation produced a new creed indeed, a religion adapted to absolute

<sup>a</sup> Instead of "long" *Die Neue Zeit* has "great".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Instead of "central power" *Die Neue Zeit* has "imperial central power".—*Ed.*

monarchy. No sooner were the peasants of North-East Germany converted to Lutheranism than they were from freemen reduced to serfs.

But where Luther failed, Calvin won the day. Calvin's creed was one fit for the boldest of the bourgeoisie of his time. His predestination doctrine was the religious expression of the fact that in the commercial world of competition success or failure does not depend upon a man's activity or cleverness, but upon circumstances uncontrollable by him. It is not of him that willeth or of him that runneth, but of the mercy of unknown superior economic powers; and this was especially true at a period of economic revolution, when all old commercial routes and centres were replaced by new ones, when India and America were opened to the world, and when even the most sacred economic articles of faith—the value of gold and silver—began to totter and to break down. Calvin's church constitution was thoroughly democratic and republican; and where the kingdom of God was republicanised, could the kingdoms of this world remain subject to monarchs, bishops and lords? While German Lutheranism became a willing tool in the hands of princes,<sup>a</sup> Calvinism founded a republic in Holland, and active republican parties in England, and, above all, Scotland.

In Calvinism, the second great bourgeois upheaval found its doctrine ready cut and dried. This upheaval took place in England. The middle class of the towns brought it on, and the yeomanry<sup>b</sup> of the country districts fought it out. Curiously enough, in all the three great bourgeois risings,<sup>c</sup> the peasantry furnishes the army that has to do the fighting; and the peasantry is just the class that, the victory once gained, is most surely ruined by the economic consequences of that victory. A hundred years after Cromwell, the yeomanry of England had almost disappeared. Anyhow, had it not been for that yeomanry and for the *plebeian* element in the towns,<sup>d</sup> the bourgeoisie alone would never have fought the matter out to the bitter end, and would never have brought Charles I to the scaffold. In order to secure even those

<sup>a</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has "petty princes" instead of "princes".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has "the middle peasantry (yeomanry)" instead of "yeomanry".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has "bourgeois revolutions" instead of "bourgeois rising".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* the rest of the sentence reads as follows: "the matter would have never been fought out to the bitter end and Charles I brought to the scaffold."—*Ed.*

conquests of the bourgeoisie that were ripe for gathering at the time, the revolution had to be carried considerably further—exactly as in 1793 in France and in 1848 in Germany. This seems, in fact, to be one of the laws of evolution of bourgeois society.

Well, upon this excess of revolutionary activity there necessarily followed the inevitable reaction which in its turn went beyond the point where it might have maintained itself.<sup>a</sup> After a series of oscillations, the new centre of gravity was at last attained and became a new starting-point. The grand period of English history, known to respectability<sup>b</sup> under the name of “the Great Rebellion”, and the struggles succeeding it, were brought to a close by the comparatively puny event<sup>c</sup> entitled by Liberal historians, “the Glorious Revolution”.<sup>259</sup>

The new starting-point was a compromise between the rising middle class<sup>d</sup> and ex-feudal landowners. The latter, though called, as now, the aristocracy, had been long since on the way which led them to become what Louis Philippe in France became at a much later period, “the first bourgeois of the kingdom”. Fortunately for England, the old feudal barons had killed one another during the Wars of the Roses.<sup>260</sup> Their successors, though mostly scions of the old families, had been so much out of the direct line of descent that they constituted quite a new body, with habits and tendencies far more bourgeois than feudal. They fully understood the value of money, and at once began to increase their rents by turning hundreds of small farmers out and replacing them by sheep. Henry VIII, while squandering the Church lands, created fresh bourgeois landlords by wholesale; the innumerable confiscations of estates, regranted to absolute or relative upstarts, and continued during the whole of the seventeenth century, had the same result. Consequently, ever since Henry VII, the English “aristocracy”, far from counteracting the development of industrial production, had, on the contrary, sought to indirectly profit thereby; and there had always been a section of the great landowners willing, from economical or political reasons, to co-operate with the leading men of the financial and industrial bourgeoisie. The compromise of 1689 was, therefore, easily accomplished. The political spoils of

---

<sup>a</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has “beyond its goal” instead of “beyond the point where it might have maintained itself”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has “philistinism” instead of “respectability”.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* there follows “of 1689”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Here and below the term “middle class” is translated in *Die Neue Zeit* as “bourgeoisie” and as “middle class”, “middle estate”.—*Ed.*

“pelf and place”<sup>a</sup> were left to the great landowning families, provided the economic interests of the financial, manufacturing, and commercial middle class were sufficiently attended to. And these economic interests were at that time powerful enough to determine the general policy of the nation. There might be squabbles about matters of detail, but, on the whole, the aristocratic oligarchy knew too well that its own economic prosperity was irretrievably bound up with that of the industrial and commercial middle class.

From that time, the bourgeoisie was a humble, but still a recognised component of the ruling classes of England. With the rest of them, it had a common interest in keeping in subjection the great working mass of the nation. The merchant or manufacturer himself stood in the position of master, or, as it was until lately called, of “natural superior” to his clerks, his workpeople, his domestic servants. His interest was to get as much and as good work out of them as he could; for this end they had to be trained to proper submission. He was himself religious; his religion had supplied the standard under which he had fought the king and the lords; he was not long in discovering the opportunities this same religion offered him for working upon the minds of his natural inferiors, and making them submissive to the behests of the masters it had pleased God to place over them. In short, the English bourgeoisie now had to take a part in keeping down the “lower orders”, the great producing mass of the nation, and one of the means employed for that purpose was the influence of religion.

There was another fact that contributed to strengthen the religious leanings of the bourgeoisie. That was the rise of materialism in England. This new<sup>b</sup> doctrine not only shocked the pious feelings of the middle class; it announced itself as a philosophy only fit for scholars and cultivated men of the world, in contrast to religion which was good enough for the uneducated masses, including the bourgeoisie. With Hobbes it stepped on the stage as a defender of royal prerogative and omnipotence; it called upon absolute monarchy to keep down that *puer robustus sed malitiosus*,<sup>261</sup> to wit, the people. Similarly, with the successors of Hobbes, with Bolingbroke, Shaftesbury, etc., the new deistic form of materialism remained an aristocratic, esoteric doctrine, and,

---

<sup>a</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has “posts, sinecure and high salary” instead of “pelf and place”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* there follows the word “irreligious”.—*Ed.*

therefore, hateful to the middle class both for its religious heresy and for its anti-bourgeois political connections. Accordingly, in opposition to the materialism and deism of the aristocracy, those Protestant sects which had furnished the flag and the fighting contingent against the Stuarts, continued to furnish the main strength of the progressive middle class, and form even today the backbone of "the Great Liberal Party".

In the meantime materialism passed from England to France, where it met and coalesced with another materialistic school of philosophers, a branch of Cartesianism.<sup>262</sup> In France, too, it remained at first an exclusively aristocratic doctrine. But soon its revolutionary character asserted itself. The French materialists did not limit their criticism to matters of religious belief; they extended it to whatever scientific tradition or political institution they met with; and to prove the claim of their doctrine to universal application, they took the shortest cut, and boldly applied it to all subjects of knowledge in the giant work after which they were named—the *Encyclopédie*. Thus, in one or the other of its two forms—avowed materialism or deism—it became the creed of the whole cultured youth of France; so much so that, when the great Revolution broke out, the doctrine hatched by English Royalists gave a theoretical flag to French Republicans and Terrorists, and furnished the text for the Declaration of the Rights of Man.<sup>263</sup>

The great French Revolution was the third uprising of the bourgeoisie, but the first that had entirely cast off the religious cloak, and was fought out on undisguised political lines; it was the first, too, that was really fought out up to the destruction of one of the combatants, the aristocracy, and the complete triumph of the other, the bourgeoisie. In England the continuity of pre-revolutionary and post-revolutionary institutions, and the compromise between landlords and capitalists, found its expression in the continuity of judicial precedents and in the religious preservation of the feudal forms of the law. In France the Revolution constituted a complete breach with the traditions of the past; it cleared out the very last vestiges of feudalism, and created in the *Code Civil*<sup>264</sup> a masterly adaptation of the old Roman law—that almost perfect expression of the juridical relations corresponding to the economic stage called by Marx the production of commodities—to modern capitalistic conditions; so masterly that this French revolutionary code still serves as a model for reforms of the law of property in all other countries, not excepting England. Let us, however, not forget that if English law continues

to express the economic relations of capitalistic society in that barbarous feudal language which corresponds to the thing expressed, just as English spelling corresponds to English pronunciation—*vous écrivez Londres et vous prononcez Constantinople*,<sup>a</sup> said a Frenchman—that same English law is the only one which has preserved through ages, and transmitted to America and the Colonies, the best part of that old Germanic personal freedom, local self-government and independence from all interference but that of the law courts, which on the Continent has been lost during the period of absolute monarchy, and has nowhere been as yet fully recovered.

To return to our British bourgeois. The French Revolution gave him a splendid opportunity, with the help of the continental monarchies, to destroy French maritime commerce, to annex French colonies, and to crush the last French pretensions to maritime rivalry. That was one reason why he fought it. Another was that the ways of this revolution went very much against his grain. Not only its “execrable” terrorism, but the very attempt to carry bourgeois rule to extremes. What should the British bourgeois do without his aristocracy, that taught him manners, such as they were, and invented fashions for him—that furnished officers for the army, which kept order at home, and the navy, which conquered colonial possessions and new markets abroad? There was indeed a progressive minority of the bourgeoisie, that minority whose interests were not so well attended to under the compromise; this section, composed chiefly of the less wealthy middle class, did sympathise with the Revolution,<sup>265</sup> but it was powerless in Parliament.

Thus, if materialism became the creed of the French Revolution, the God-fearing English bourgeois held all the faster to his religion. Had not the reign of terror in Paris proved what was the upshot, if the religious instincts of the masses were lost? The more materialism spread from France to neighbouring countries, and was reinforced by similar doctrinal currents, notably by German philosophy, the more, in fact, materialism and free thought generally became, on the Continent, the necessary qualifications of a cultivated man, the more stubbornly the English middle class stuck to its manifold religious creeds. These creeds might differ from one another, but they were, all of them, distinctly religious, Christian creeds.

---

<sup>a</sup> “You write London, but pronounce Constantinople.”—*Ed.*



While the Revolution ensured the political triumph of the bourgeoisie in France, in England Watt, Arkwright, Cartwright, and others initiated an industrial revolution, which completely shifted the centre of gravity of economic power. The wealth of the bourgeoisie increased considerably faster than that of the landed aristocracy. Within the bourgeoisie itself, the financial aristocracy, the bankers, etc., were more and more pushed into the background by the manufacturers. The compromise of 1689, even after the gradual changes it had undergone in favour of the bourgeoisie, no longer corresponded to the relative position of the parties to it. The character of these parties, too, had changed; the bourgeoisie of 1830 was very different from that of the preceding century. The political power still left to the aristocracy, and used by them to resist the pretensions of the new industrial bourgeoisie, became incompatible with the new economic interests. A fresh struggle with the aristocracy was necessary; it could end only in a victory of the new economic power. First, the Reform Act<sup>266</sup> was pushed through, in spite of all resistance, under the impulse of the French Revolution of 1830. It gave to the bourgeoisie a recognised and powerful place in Parliament. Then the Repeal of the Corn Laws, which settled, once for all, the supremacy of the bourgeoisie, and especially of its most active portion, the manufacturers, over the landed aristocracy. This was the greatest victory of the bourgeoisie; it was, however, also the last it gained in its own exclusive interest. Whatever triumphs it obtained later on, it had to share with a new social power, first its ally, but soon its rival.

The industrial revolution had created a class of large manufacturing capitalists, but also a class—and a far more numerous one—of manufacturing workpeople. This class gradually increased in numbers, in proportion as the industrial revolution seized upon one branch of manufacture after another, and in the same proportion it increased in power. This power it proved as early as 1824, by forcing a reluctant Parliament to repeal the acts forbidding combinations of workmen.<sup>267</sup> During the Reform agitation, the working men constituted the Radical wing of the Reform party; the Act of 1832 having excluded them from the suffrage, they formulated their demands in the People's Charter,<sup>268</sup> and constituted themselves, in opposition to the great bourgeois Anti-Corn Law party,<sup>269</sup> into an independent party, the Chartists, the first working men's party of modern times.

Then came the continental revolutions of February and March, 1848, in which the working people played such a prominent part,

and, at least in Paris, put forward demands which were certainly inadmissible from the point of view of capitalist society. And then came the general reaction. First the defeat of the Chartists on the 10th April, 1848, then the crushing of the Paris working men's insurrection in June of the same year, then the disasters of 1849 in Italy, Hungary, South Germany, and at last the victory of Louis Bonaparte over Paris, 2nd December, 1851. For a time, at least, the bugbear of working-class pretensions was put down, but at what cost! If the British bourgeois had been convinced before of the necessity of maintaining the common people in a religious mood, how much more must he feel that necessity after all these experiences? Regardless of the sneers of his continental compeers, he continued to spend thousands and tens of thousands, year after year, upon the evangelisation of the lower orders; not content with his own native religious machinery, he appealed to Brother Jonathan, the greatest organiser in existence of religion as a trade, and imported from America revivalism, Moody and Sankey, and the like<sup>270</sup>; and, finally, he accepted the dangerous aid of the Salvation Army, which revives the propaganda of early Christianity, appeals to the poor as the elect, fights capitalism in a religious way, and thus fosters an element of early Christian class antagonism, which one day may become troublesome to the well-to-do people who now find the ready money for it.

It seems a law of historical development that the bourgeoisie can in no European country get hold of political power—at least for any length of time—in the same exclusive way in which the feudal aristocracy kept hold of it during the Middle Ages. Even in France, where feudalism was completely extinguished, the bourgeoisie, as a whole, has held full possession of the Government for very short periods only. During Louis Philippe's reign, 1830-48, a very small portion of the bourgeoisie ruled the kingdom; by far the larger part were excluded from the suffrage by the high qualification. Under the Second Republic, 1848-51, the whole bourgeoisie ruled, but for three years only; their incapacity brought on the Second Empire. It is only now, in the Third Republic, that the bourgeoisie as a whole have kept possession of the helm for more than twenty years; and they are already showing lively signs of decadence. A durable reign of the bourgeoisie has been possible only in countries like America, where feudalism was unknown, and society at the very beginning started from a bourgeois basis. And even in France and America, the successors of the bourgeoisie, the working people, are already knocking at the door.

In England, the bourgeoisie never held undivided sway. Even the victory of 1832 left the landed aristocracy in almost exclusive possession of all the leading Government offices. The meekness with which the wealthy middle class submitted to this, remained inconceivable to me until the great Liberal manufacturer, Mr. W. A. Forster, in a public speech implored the young men of Bradford to learn French, as a means to get on in the world, and quoted from his own experience how sheepish he looked when, as a Cabinet Minister, he had to move in society where French was, at least, as necessary as English! The fact was, the English middle class of that time were, as a rule, quite uneducated upstarts, and could not help leaving to the aristocracy those superior Government places where other qualifications were required than mere insular narrowness and insular conceit, seasoned by business sharpness.\* Even now the endless newspaper debates about middle-class education show that the English middle class does not yet consider itself good enough for the best education, and looks to something more modest. Thus, even after the Repeal of the Corn Laws, it appeared a matter of course that the men who had carried the day, the Cobdens, Brights, Forsters, etc., should remain excluded from a share in the official government of the country, until twenty years afterwards, a new Reform Act<sup>271</sup> opened to them the door of the Cabinet. The English bourgeoisie are, up to the present day, so deeply penetrated by a sense of their social inferiority that they keep up, at their own expense and that of the nation, an ornamental caste of drones to represent the nation worthily at all state functions; and they consider themselves

\* And even in business matters, the conceit of national chauvinism is but a sorry adviser. Up to quite recently, the average English manufacturer considered it derogatory from an Englishman to speak any language but his own, and felt rather proud than otherwise of the fact that "poor devils" of foreigners settled in England and took off his hands the trouble of disposing of his products abroad. He never noticed that these foreigners, mostly Germans, thus got command of a very large part of British foreign trade, imports and exports, and that the direct foreign trade of Englishmen became limited, almost entirely, to the colonies, China, the United States, and South America. Nor did he notice that these Germans traded with other Germans abroad, who gradually organised a complete network of commercial colonies all over the world. But when Germany, about forty years ago, seriously began manufacturing for export, this network served her admirably in her transformation in so short a time, from a corn-exporting into a first-rate manufacturing country. Then, about ten years ago, the British manufacturer got frightened, and asked his ambassadors and consuls how it was that he could no longer keep his customers together. The unanimous answer was: (1) You don't learn your customer's language but expect him to speak your own; (2) You don't even try to suit your customer's wants, habits, and tastes, but expect him to conform to your English ones.

highly honoured whenever one of themselves is found worthy of admission into this select and privileged body, manufactured, after all, by themselves.

The industrial and commercial middle class had, therefore, not yet succeeded in driving the landed aristocracy completely from political power when another competitor, the working class, appeared on the stage. The reaction after the Chartist movement and the continental revolutions, as well as the unparalleled extension of English trade from 1848 to 1866 (ascribed vulgarly to Free Trade alone, but due far more to the colossal development of railways, ocean steamers and means of intercourse generally), had again driven the working class into the dependency of the Liberal party, of which they formed, as in pre-Chartist times, the Radical wing. Their claims to the franchise, however, gradually became irresistible; while the Whig leaders of the Liberals “funked”, Disraeli showed his superiority by making the Tories seize the favorable moment and introduce household suffrage<sup>a</sup> in the boroughs, along with a redistribution of seats. Then followed the ballot; then in 1884 the extension of household suffrage to the counties and a fresh redistribution of seats, by which electoral districts were to some extent equalised.<sup>272</sup> All these measures considerably increased the electoral power of the working class, so much so that in at least 150 to 200 constituencies that class now furnishes the majority of voters. But parliamentary government is a capital school for teaching respect for tradition; if the middle class look with awe and veneration upon what Lord John Manners playfully called “our old nobility”, the mass of the working people then looked up with respect and deference to what used to be designated as “their betters”, the middle class. Indeed, the British workman, some fifteen years ago, was the model workman, whose respectful regard for the position of his master, and whose self-restraining modesty in claiming rights for himself, consoled our German economists of the Katheder-Socialist school<sup>273</sup> for the incurable communistic and revolutionary tendencies of their own working men at home.

But the English middle class—good men of business as they are—saw farther than the German professors. They had shared their power but reluctantly with the working class. They had learnt, during the Chartist years, what that *puer robustus sed malitiosus*, the people, is capable of. And since that time, they had

---

<sup>a</sup> In *Die Neue Zeit* there follows: “which was extended to every lease-holder”.—*Ed.*

been compelled to incorporate the better part of the People's Charter in the Statutes of the United Kingdom. Now, if ever, the people must be kept in order by moral means, and the first and foremost of all moral means of action upon the masses is and remains—religion. Hence the parsons' majorities on the school boards, hence the increasing self-taxation of the bourgeoisie for the support of all sorts of revivalism,<sup>a</sup> from ritualism<sup>274</sup> to the Salvation Army.

And now came the triumph of British respectability<sup>b</sup> over the free thought and religious laxity of the continental bourgeois. The workmen of France and Germany had become rebellious. They were thoroughly infected with socialism, and, for very good reasons, were not at all particular as to the legality of the means by which to secure their own ascendency. The *puer robustus*, here, turned from day to day more *malitiosus*. Nothing remained to the French and German bourgeoisie as a last resource but to silently drop their free thought, as a youngster, when sea-sickness creeps upon him, quietly drops the burning cigar he brought swaggeringly on board; one by one, the scoffers turned pious in outward behaviour, spoke with respect of the Church, its dogmas and rites, and even conformed with the latter as far as could not be helped. French bourgeois dined *maigre*<sup>c</sup> on Fridays, and German ones sat out long Protestant sermons in their pews on Sundays. They had come to grief with materialism. "*Die Religion muss dem Volk erhalten werden*,"—religion must be kept alive for the people—that was the only and the last means to save society from utter ruin. Unfortunately for themselves, they did not find this out until they had done their level best to break up religion for ever. And now it was the turn of the British bourgeois to sneer and to say: "Why, you fools, I could have told you that two hundred years ago!"

However, I am afraid neither the religious stolidity of the British, nor the *post festum* conversion of the continental bourgeois will stem the rising proletarian tide. Tradition is a great retarding force, is the *vis inertiae* of history, but, being merely passive, is sure to be broken down; and thus religion will be no lasting safeguard to capitalist society. If our juridical, philosophical, and religious ideas are the more or less remote offshoots of the economical relations prevailing in a given society, such ideas

<sup>a</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has "for the use of all possible means of pious demagogy" instead of "for the support of all sorts of revivalism".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Die Neue Zeit* has "British respectable philistinism" instead of "British respectability".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Without meat or milk.—*Ed.*

cannot, in the long run, withstand the effects of a complete change in these relations. And, unless we believe in supernatural revelation, we must admit that no religious tenets will ever suffice to prop up a tottering society.

In fact, in England too, the working people have begun to move again. They are, no doubt, shackled by traditions of various kinds. Bourgeois traditions, such as the widespread belief that there can be but two parties, Conservatives and Liberals, and that the working class must work out its salvation by and through the great Liberal Party. Working men's traditions, inherited from their first tentative efforts at independent action, such as the exclusion, from ever so many old Trade Unions, of all applicants who have not gone through a regular apprenticeship; which means the breeding by every such union, of its own blacklegs. But for all that the English working class is moving, as even Professor Brentano has sorrowfully had to report to his brother Katheder-Socialists.<sup>a</sup> It moves, like all things in England, with a slow and measured step, with hesitation here, with more or less unfruitful, tentative attempts there; it moves now and then with an over-cautious mistrust of the name of Socialism, while it gradually absorbs the substance; and the movement spreads and seizes one layer of the workers after another. It has now shaken out of their torpor the unskilled labourers of the East End of London, and we all know what a splendid impulse these fresh forces have given it in return. And if the pace of the movement is not up to the impatience of some people, let them not forget that it is the working class which keeps alive the finest qualities of the English character, and that, if a step in advance is once gained in England, it is, as a rule, never lost afterwards. If the sons of the old Chartists, for reasons explained above, were not quite up to the mark, the grandsons bid fair to be worthy of their forefathers.

But the triumph of the European working class does not depend upon England alone. It can only be secured by the co-operation of, at least, England, France, and Germany. In both the latter countries the working-class movement is well ahead of England. In Germany it is even within measurable distance of success. The progress it has there made during the last twenty-five years is unparalleled. It advances with ever-increasing velocity. If the German middle class have shown themselves lamentably deficient in political capacity, discipline, courage, energy, and

<sup>a</sup> This refers to L. Brentano's writings dealing with British trade unions: *Die Arbeitergilden der Gegenwart*. Vol. 2: *Zur Kritik der englischen Gewerkvereine*. See also this volume, pp. 95-176.—*Ed.*

perseverance, the German working class have given ample proof of all these qualities. Four hundred years ago, Germany was the starting-point of the first upheaval of the European middle class; as things are now, is it outside the limits of possibility that Germany will be the scene, too, of the first great victory of the European proletariat?

*F. Engels*

*April 20th, 1892*

First published in: Frederick Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, London, 1892 and in the author's translation into German, with some deletions, in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 1, Nos. 1 and 2, 1892-1893

Reproduced from the book, checked with *Die Neue Zeit*

•

TO THE THIRD AUSTRIAN PARTY CONGRESS  
IN VIENNA

London, May 31, 1892

Dear Comrades,

I thank you for your friendly invitation to your twice-banned party congress, which, it is to be hoped, will now take place.<sup>275</sup> Although I shall not be able to attend your sessions as guest, I am happy to take the opportunity of sending the assembled Austrian comrades my greetings and a confirmation of my lively interest. We here, who enjoy a freedom of movement unknown on the entire Continent, certainly can appreciate that, despite the many limitations of their field of manoeuvre, the Austrian workers have captured the glorious position they now occupy. And I can assure you that here, in the motherland of large-scale industry, the workers' cause progresses; and this is the most significant and gratifying feature of today that, look where we will, everywhere the workers are on their irresistible march forward.

Your old

*Frederick Engels*

First published in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*,  
No. 24, June 10, 1892

Printed according to the news-  
paper, checked with the manu-  
script

Published in English for the first  
time





their hydrogen is replaced by other simple or complex substances; these are the paraffins, the best known of which are to be found in petroleum, and from which are derived alcohols, fatty acids, ether, etc. We owe our knowledge about these paraffins today mainly to Schorlemmer. He investigated the existing substances belonging to the paraffin series, separated each one from the others, and produced many of them for the first time in pure form; others, which should have existed theoretically but were not yet known in practice, he discovered and also produced. Thus he became one of the founders of the scientific organic chemistry of today.

Apart from this speciality of his, however, he also devoted a great deal of attention to what is called theoretical chemistry, i.e. to the basic laws of this science, and the way it fits in with related sciences, that is to say physics and physiology. He was particularly capable in this field. He was probably the only important scientist of his time who did not disdain learning from Hegel, at that period despised by many, but esteemed by himself. And rightly so. Anybody who wants to achieve anything in the field of theoretical integrated science must regard natural phenomena not as invariable magnitudes, as most do, but as variable and in a state of flux. And this may be most easily learned, even today, from Hegel.

When I got to know Schorlemmer at the beginning of the sixties—within a short time Marx and I became intimately acquainted with him—he often visited me with a bruised and battered face. The paraffins are no playthings, these often still unknown bodies exploded in his hands all the time, and he thus acquired a number of honourable injuries. It was only due to his glasses that he did not lose his sight.

At that time he was already a complete Communist, and all he had to learn from us were the economic grounds for a conviction he had gained long ago. Once he became familiar through us with the progress made by the workers' movement in the various countries, he always followed these events with great interest; but in particular the movement in Germany, after it advanced beyond the first stage of pure Lassalleanism. After I moved to London at the end of 1870, the greater part of our lively correspondence was concerned with the sciences and party affairs.

To that date Schorlemmer, despite his world-wide reputation, had remained in Manchester, a man of very modest status. This now changed. In 1871 he was proposed as a member of the ROYAL SOCIETY, the English Academy of Sciences, and immediately elected, which does not often happen; in 1874 Owens College finally

established a new professorship in organic chemistry, specially for him, and soon after the University of Glasgow made him an honorary doctor. But these public honours made absolutely no difference to him. He was the soul of modesty, since his modesty was based upon a correct assessment of his own worth. For this reason he regarded these honours as self-evident, and therefore immaterial.

He regularly spent his holidays in London with Marx and myself, except for the time he spent in Germany. Four years ago he accompanied me on a "whirlwind trip" to America.<sup>278</sup> But his health was undermined even then; in 1890 we were still able to travel to Norway and the North Cape, but in 1891 his health collapsed at the beginning of a joint journey we attempted,<sup>279</sup> and after this he never came to London again. From February this year he was almost entirely confined to the house, and from May to his bed; on June 27 he succumbed to cancer of the lung.

It was the lot even of this man of science to experience in person the effects of the Anti-Socialist Law.<sup>280</sup> Six or seven years ago he travelled from Switzerland to Darmstadt. Around this time a trunk full of the *Sozialdemokrat* from Zurich had fallen into the hands of the police somewhere. Who could the smuggler be other than the Social Democratic professor? After all, in the eyes of the police a chemist is a scientifically trained smuggler. So there were raids on the homes of his mother and his brother; but the professor was in Höchst. Immediate telegrams: a domiciliary search there too, in which something quite unexpected was found—an English passport. After the promulgation of the Anti-Socialist Law Schorlemmer had had himself naturalised in England. This English passport stopped the police in their tracks; they shied away from diplomatic complications with England. So the upshot was a big scandal in Darmstadt, which was worth at least 500 votes to us at the next election.

In the name of the Party Executive I laid upon the grave of our true friend and comrade a wreath with a red streamer inscribed: "FROM THE EXECUTIVE OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF GERMANY".

London, July 1, 1892

*Frederick Engels*

First published in the *Vorwärts*, No. 153,  
July 3, 1892 (supplement)

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

[PREFACE TO THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION (1892)  
OF *THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING-CLASS*  
IN ENGLAND]<sup>281</sup>

The book herewith again made available to the German public first appeared in the summer of 1845. Both in its strengths and in its weaknesses it bears the stamp of the author's youth. At the time, I was twenty-four; today, I am thrice as old, and as I reread this early work I find I need not be ashamed of it on any count. So I have no intention of somehow obliterating this stamp of youthfulness. I am presenting my work to the reader again, unchanged. I have only worded more precisely a few not entirely clear passages and added, here and there, a brief footnote, marked with the present date (1892).

As for the fate of this book, I will only mention that an English translation of it (by Mrs. Florence Kelley-Wischnewetzky) came out in New York in 1887 and was also published by Swan Sonnenschein & Co. in London in 1892. The preface to the American edition<sup>282</sup> underlies that to the English one,<sup>a</sup> and the latter in its turn underlies the present German preface. Modern large-scale industry makes the economic conditions in all the countries affected uniform to such an enormous extent that I hardly need tell the German reader anything different from what I tell the American or English.

The state of things described in this book belongs today in many respects, to the past, as far as England is concerned. Though not expressly stated in our recognised treatises, it is still a law of modern political economy that the larger the scale on which capitalistic production is carried on, the less can it support the petty devices of swindling and pilfering which characterise its early

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 257-69.—*Ed.*

stages. The pettifogging business tricks of the Polish Jew, the representative in Europe of commerce in its lowest stage, those tricks that serve him so well in his own country, and are generally practised there, fail him once he comes to Hamburg or Berlin; and, again, the commission agent who hails from Berlin or Hamburg, Jew or Christian, after frequenting the Manchester Exchange, finds out that in order to buy cotton yarn or cloth cheap, he, too, had better drop those slightly more refined but still miserable wiles and subterfuges which are considered the acme of cleverness in his native country. Of course, with the progress of large-scale industry a great deal has supposedly changed in Germany too, and a bad odour now attaches, particularly since the industrial Jena of Philadelphia,<sup>283</sup> even to the time-honoured German principle: People will be nothing but pleased if we first send them good samples and then bad goods. The fact is, those tricks do not pay any longer in a large market, where time is money, and where a certain standard of commercial morality is unavoidably developed not because of any considerations of virtue, but purely as a means of saving time and trouble. And exactly the same has taken place in England with the relation between the manufacturer and his "hands".

The revival of trade, after the crisis of 1847, was the dawn of a new industrial epoch. The repeal of the Corn Laws<sup>284</sup> and the financial reforms subsequent thereon gave to English industry and commerce all the elbow-room they had asked for. The discovery of the Californian and Australian goldfields followed in rapid succession. The colonial markets developed at an increasing rate their capacity for absorbing English manufactured goods. In India millions of handweavers were finally crushed out by the Lancashire power-loom. China was more and more being opened up. But most important of all, America was developing at a rate unprecedented even for that country of tremendous progress; and America, it will be recalled, was then merely a colonial market, indeed the largest of all, i.e., a country supplying raw materials and importing industrial products, notably from England.

And, finally, the new means of communication introduced at the close of the preceding period—railways and ocean steamers—were now worked out on an international scale; they realised actually what had hitherto existed only potentially, a *world-market*. This world-market, at the time, was still composed of a number of chiefly or entirely agricultural countries grouped around one manufacturing centre—England—which consumed the greater part of their surplus raw produce, and supplied them in return

THE CONDITION  
OF THE  
WORKING-CLASS IN ENGLAND  
IN 1844

*WITH PREFACE WRITTEN IN 1892*

BY  
FREDERICK ENGELS

*TRANSLATED BY FLORENCE KELLEY WISCHNEWETZKY*



LONDON  
SWAN SONNENSCHNEIN & CO.  
PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1892

Title page of the English edition  
of *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844*

To his dear Tully  
London 12/3/42 John General

Reverse of the title page  
of *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844*  
presented by Engels to Eleanor Marx-Aveling

with the greater part of their requirements in manufactured articles. No wonder, therefore, that England's industrial progress was colossal and unparalleled, and such that the status of 1844 now appears to us as comparatively insignificant, almost primitive.

And in proportion as this increase took place, in the same proportion did manufacturing industry become apparently moralised. The competition of manufacturer against manufacturer by means of petty thefts upon the workpeople did no longer pay. Trade had outgrown such low means of making money; the manufacturing millionaire had to know better than waste his time on petty tricks of this kind. Such practices were good enough, at best, for small fry in need of money, who had to snap up every penny in order not to succumb to competition. Thus the TRUCK SYSTEM was suppressed, the Ten-Hours' Bill<sup>285</sup> was enacted, and a number of other secondary reforms introduced—much against the spirit of Free Trade and unbridled competition, but quite as much in favour of the giant-capitalist in his competition with his less favoured brother.

Moreover, the larger the concern, and with it the number of workers, the greater the loss and inconvenience caused by every conflict with the workers and thus a new spirit came over the manufacturers, especially the largest ones, which taught them to avoid unnecessary squabbles, to acquiesce in the existence and power of TRADES UNIONS, and finally even to discover in strikes—at opportune times—a powerful means to serve their own ends. The largest manufacturers, formerly the leaders of the war against the working class, were now the foremost to preach peace and harmony. And for a very good reason.

All these concessions to justice and philanthropy were nothing else but means to accelerate the concentration of capital in the hands of the few and crushing the smaller competitors, who could not survive without extra receipts of this sort. To these few, the petty accessory extortions of earlier years had not only lost all significance but had turned, as it were, into hindrances to large-scale business. Thus the development of production on the basis of the capitalistic system has of itself sufficed—at least in the leading industries, for in the more unimportant branches this is far from being the case—to do away with all those minor grievances which aggravated the workman's fate during its earlier years. And thus it renders more and more evident the great central fact that the cause of the miserable condition of the working class is to be sought, not in these minor grievances, but in *the capitalistic system itself*. The worker sells to the capitalist his



labour-force for a certain daily sum. After a few hours' work he has reproduced the value of that sum; but the substance of his contract is, that he has to work another series of hours to complete his working-day; and the value he produces during these additional hours of surplus labour is surplus value, which costs the capitalist nothing, but yet goes into his pocket. That is the basis of the system which tends more and more to split up civilised society into a few Rothschilds and Vanderbilts, the owners of all the means of production and subsistence, on the one hand, and an immense number of wage-workers, the owners of nothing but their labour-force, on the other. And that this result is caused, not by this or that secondary grievance, but by the system itself—this fact has been brought out in bold relief by the development of capitalism in England.

Again, the repeated visitations of cholera, typhus, smallpox, and other epidemics have shown the British bourgeois the urgent necessity of sanitation in his towns and cities, if he wishes to save himself and family from falling victims to such diseases. Accordingly, the most crying abuses described in this book have either disappeared or have been made less conspicuous. Drainage has been introduced or improved, wide avenues have been opened out athwart many of the worst "slums". "Little Ireland" had disappeared, and the "SEVEN DIALS"<sup>286</sup> are next on the list for sweeping away. But what of that? Whole districts which in 1844 I could describe as almost idyllic have now, with the growth of the towns, fallen into the same state of dilapidation, discomfort, and misery. Only the pigs and the heaps of refuse are no longer tolerated. The bourgeoisie have made further progress in the art of hiding the distress of the working class. But that, in regard to their dwellings, no substantial improvement has taken place is amply proved by the Report of the Royal Commission "ON THE HOUSING OF THE POOR", 1885.<sup>a</sup> And this is the case, too, in other respects. Police regulations have been plentiful as blackberries; but they can only hedge in the distress of the workers, they cannot remove it.

But while England has thus outgrown the juvenile state of capitalist exploitation described by me, other countries have only just attained it. France, Germany, and especially America, are the formidable competitors who, at this moment—as foreseen by me

---

<sup>a</sup> See *Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes. England and Wales, 1885.*—Ed.

in 1844—are more and more breaking up England's industrial monopoly. Their manufactures are young as compared with those of England, but increasing at a far more rapid rate than the latter; and they have at this moment arrived at about the same phase of development as English manufacture in 1844. With regard to America, the parallel is indeed most striking. True, the external surroundings in which the working class is placed in America are very different, but the same economical laws are at work, and the results, if not identical in every respect, must still be of the same order. Hence we find in America the same struggles for a shorter working-day, for a legal limitation of the working-time, especially of women and children in factories; we find the TRUCK SYSTEM in full blossom, and the COTTAGE SYSTEM,<sup>287</sup> in rural districts, made use of by the "BOSSES", the capitalists and their agents, as a means of domination over the workers. When I received, in 1886, the American papers with accounts of the great strike of 12,000 Pennsylvanian coal-miners in the Connellsville district,<sup>288</sup> I seemed but to read my own description of the North of England colliers' strike of 1844.<sup>a</sup> The same cheating of the workpeople by false measure; the same TRUCK SYSTEM; the same attempt to break the miners' resistance by the capitalists' last, but crushing, resource—the eviction of the men out of their dwellings, the cottages owned by the companies.

Neither here nor in the English editions did I try to update the book, i.e. to list one by one the changes that have taken place since 1844. I did not do it for two reasons. Firstly, I would have had to double the volume of the book. And secondly, Volume One of Marx's *Capital* gives a detailed description of the condition of the British working class for about 1865, i.e. the time when Britain's industrial prosperity had reached its peak. I would therefore have had to repeat what Marx says.

It will be hardly necessary to point out that the general theoretical standpoint of this book—philosophical, economical, political—does not exactly coincide with my standpoint of to-day. Modern international socialism, since fully developed as a science, chiefly and almost exclusively through the efforts of Marx, did not as yet exist in 1844. My book represents one of the phases of its embryonic development; and as the human embryo, in its early stages, still reproduces the gill-arches of our fish-ancestors, so this book exhibits everywhere the traces of the descent of modern

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 540-47.—*Ed.*

socialism from one of its ancestors, German classical philosophy. Thus great stress is laid on the dictum that communism is not a mere party doctrine of the working class, but a theory compassing the emancipation of society at large, including the capitalist class, from its present narrow conditions. This is true enough in the abstract, but absolutely useless, and sometimes worse, in practice. So long as the wealthy classes not only do not feel the want of any emancipation, but strenuously oppose the self-emancipation of the working class, so long the social revolution will have to be prepared and fought out by the working class alone. The French bourgeois of 1789,<sup>a</sup> too, declared the emancipation of the bourgeoisie to be the emancipation of the whole human race; but the nobility and clergy would not see it; the proposition—though for the time being, with respect to feudalism, an abstract historical truth—soon became a mere sentimentalism, and disappeared from view altogether in the fire of the revolutionary struggle. And to-day, the very people who, from the “impartiality” of their superior standpoint, preach to the workers a socialism soaring high above their class interests and class struggles—these people are either neophytes, who have still to learn a great deal, or they are the worst enemies of the workers—wolves in sheep’s clothing.

The recurring period of the great industrial crisis is stated in the text as five years. This was the period apparently indicated by the course of events from 1825 to 1842. But the industrial history from 1842 to 1868 has shown that the real period is one of ten years; that the intermediate revulsions were secondary, and had been increasingly disappearing from 1842 onwards. Since 1868 the state of things has changed again, of which more anon.

I have taken care not to strike out of the text the many prophecies, amongst others that of an imminent social revolution in England, which my youthful ardour induced me to venture upon. The wonder is, not that a good many of these prophecies proved wrong, but that so many of them have proved right, and that the critical state of English trade, to be brought on by Continental and especially American competition, which I then foresaw—though in too short a period—has now actually come to pass. In this respect I am bound to bring the book up to date, by placing here an article which appeared in the London *Commonweal*

---

<sup>a</sup> Engels refers to the French Revolution.—*Ed.*

of March 1, 1885, in English and in *Neue Zeit* in June of the same year (Issue 6) in German.<sup>289</sup>

“Forty years ago England stood face to face with a crisis, solvable to all appearances by force only. The immense and rapid development of manufactures had outstripped the extension of foreign markets and the increase of demand. Every ten years the march of industry was violently interrupted by a general commercial crash, followed, after a long period of chronic depression, by a few short years of prosperity, and always ending in feverish over-production and consequent renewed collapse. The capitalist class clamoured for Free Trade in corn,<sup>290</sup> and threatened to enforce it by sending the starving population of the towns back to the country districts whence they came, to invade them, as John Bright said, not as paupers begging for bread, but as an army quartered upon the enemy.<sup>a</sup> The working masses of the towns demanded their share of political power—the People’s Charter<sup>291</sup>; they were supported by the majority of the small trading class, and the only difference between the two was whether the Charter should be carried by physical or by moral force. Then came the commercial crash of 1847 and the Irish famine, and with both the prospect of revolution.

“The French Revolution of 1848 saved the English middle class. The Socialistic pronunciamentos of the victorious French workmen frightened the small middle class of England and disorganised the narrower, but more matter-of-fact movement of the English working class. At the very moment when Chartism was bound to assert itself in its full strength, it collapsed internally before even it collapsed externally, on the 10th of April, 1848.<sup>292</sup> The action of the working class was thrust into the background. The capitalist class triumphed along the whole line.

“The Reform Bill of 1831<sup>293</sup> had been the victory of the whole capitalist class over the landed aristocracy. The repeal of the Corn Laws was the victory of the *manufacturing* capitalist not only over the landed aristocracy, but over those sections of capitalists, too, whose interests were more or less bound up with the landed interest—bankers, stockjobbers, fundholders, etc. Free Trade meant the readjustment of the whole home and foreign, commercial and financial policy of England in accordance with the interests of the manufacturing capitalists—the class which now

---

<sup>a</sup> These words belong apparently not to Bright but to his adherents. See *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 71, No. 141, p. 273.—*Ed.*

represented the nation. And they set about this task with a will. Every obstacle to industrial production was mercilessly removed. The tariff and the whole system of taxation were revolutionised. Everything was made subordinate to one end, but that end of the utmost importance to the manufacturing capitalist: the cheapening of all raw produce, and especially of the means of living of the working class; the reduction of the cost of raw material, and the keeping down—if not as yet the bringing down—of wages. England was to become the 'workshop of the world'<sup>294</sup>; all other countries were to become for England what Ireland already was—markets for her manufactured goods, supplying her in return with raw materials and food. England, the great manufacturing centre of an agricultural world, with an ever-increasing number of corn and cotton-growing Irelands revolving around her, the industrial sun. What a glorious prospect!

"The manufacturing capitalists set about the realisation of this their great object with that strong common sense and that contempt for traditional principles which has ever distinguished them from their more narrow-minded compeers on the Continent. Chartism was dying out. The revival of commercial prosperity, natural after the revulsion of 1847 had spent itself, was put down altogether to the credit of Free Trade. Both these circumstances had turned the English working class, politically, into the tail of the 'great Liberal Party', the party led by the manufacturers. This advantage, once gained, had to be perpetuated. And the manufacturing capitalists, from the Chartist opposition, not to Free Trade, but to the transformation of Free Trade into the one vital national question, had learnt, and were learning more and more, that the middle class can never obtain full social and political power over the nation except by the help of the working class. Thus a gradual change came over the relations between both classes. The Factory Acts,<sup>295</sup> once the bugbear of all manufacturers, were not only willingly submitted to, but their expansion into acts regulating almost all trades was tolerated. Trades Unions, hitherto considered inventions of the devil himself, were now petted and patronised as perfectly legitimate institutions, and as useful means of spreading sound economical doctrines amongst the workers. Even strikes, than which nothing had been more nefarious up to 1848, were now gradually found out to be occasionally very useful, especially when provoked by the masters themselves, at their own time. Of the legal enactments, placing the workman at a lower level or at a disadvantage with regard to the master, at least the most revolting were repealed. And, practically, that

horrid People's Charter actually became the political programme of the very manufacturers who had opposed it to the last. *The Abolition of the Property Qualification and Vote by Ballot* are now the law of the land. The Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884<sup>296</sup> make a near approach to *universal suffrage*, at least such as it now exists in Germany; the Redistribution Bill now before Parliament creates *equal electoral districts*—on the whole not more unequal than those of France or Germany; *payment of members*, and shorter, if not actually *annual Parliaments*, are visibly looming in the distance—and yet there are people who say that Chartism is dead.

“The Revolution of 1848, not less than many of its predecessors, has had strange bedfellows and successors. The very people who put it down have become, as Karl Marx used to say, its testamentary executors.<sup>297</sup> Louis Napoleon had to create an independent and united Italy, Bismarck had to revolutionise Germany and to restore Hungarian independence, and the English manufacturers had to enact the People's Charter.

“For England, the effects of this domination of the manufacturing capitalists were at first startling. Trade revived and extended to a degree unheard of even in this cradle of modern industry; the previous astounding creations of steam and machinery dwindled into nothing compared with the immense mass of productions of the twenty years from 1850 to 1870, with the overwhelming figures of exports and imports, of wealth accumulated in the hands of capitalists and of human working power concentrated in the large towns. The progress was indeed interrupted, as before, by a crisis every ten years, in 1857 as well as in 1866; but these revulsions were now considered as natural, inevitable events, which must be fatalistically submitted to, and which always set themselves right in the end.

“And the condition of the working-class during this period? There was temporary improvement even for the great mass. But this improvement always was reduced to the old level by the influx of the great body of the unemployed reserve, by the constant superseding of hands by new machinery, by the immigration of the agricultural population, now, too, more and more superseded by machines.

“A permanent improvement can be recognised for two ‘protected’ sections only of the working class. Firstly, the factory hands. The fixing by Act of Parliament of their working-day within relatively rational limits has restored their physical constitution and endowed them with a moral superiority, enhanced by their local concentration. They are undoubtedly better off than

before 1848. The best proof is that, out of ten strikes they make, nine are provoked by the manufacturers in their own interests, as the only means of securing a reduced production. You can never get the masters to agree to work 'short time', let manufactured goods be ever so unsaleable; but get the workpeople to strike, and the masters shut their factories to a man.

"Secondly, the great Trades Unions. They are the organisations of those trades in which the labour of *grown-up men* predominates, or is alone applicable. Here the competition neither of women and children nor of machinery has so far weakened their organised strength. The engineers, the carpenters and joiners, the bricklayers, are each of them a power, to that extent that, as in the case of the bricklayers and bricklayers' labourers, they can even successfully resist the introduction of machinery. That their condition has remarkably improved since 1848 there can be no doubt, and the best proof of this is in the fact that for more than fifteen years not only have their employers been with them, but they with their employers, upon exceedingly good terms. They form an aristocracy among the working class; they have succeeded in enforcing for themselves a relatively comfortable position, and they accept it as final. They are the model working men of Messrs. Leone Levi & Giffen (and also the worthy Lujó Brentano), and they are very nice people indeed nowadays to deal with, for any sensible capitalist in particular and for the whole capitalist class in general.

"But as to the great mass of working people, the state of misery and insecurity in which they live now is as low as ever, if not lower. The East End of London is an everspreading pool of stagnant misery and desolation, of starvation when out of work, and degradation, physical and moral, when in work. And so in all other large towns—abstraction made of the privileged minority of the workers; and so in the smaller towns and in the agricultural districts. The law which reduces the value of labour-power to the value of the necessary means of subsistence, and the other law which reduces its average price, as a rule, to the minimum of those means of subsistence, these laws act upon them with the irresistible force of an automatic engine which crushes them between its wheels.

"This, then was the position created by the Free Trade policy of 1847, and by twenty years of the rule of the manufacturing capitalists. But then a change came. The crash of 1866 was, indeed, followed by a slight and short revival about 1873; but that did not last. We did not, indeed, pass through the full crisis at the

time it was due, in 1877 or 1878; but we have had, ever since 1876, a chronic state of stagnation in all dominant branches of industry. Neither will the full crash come; nor will the period of longed-for prosperity to which we used to be entitled before and after it. A dull depression, a chronic glut of all markets for all trades, that is what we have been living in for nearly ten years. How is this?

“The Free Trade theory was based upon one assumption: that England was to be the one great manufacturing centre of an agricultural world. And the actual fact is that this assumption has turned out to be a pure delusion. The conditions of modern industry, steam-power and machinery, can be established wherever there is fuel, especially coals. And other countries besides England—France, Belgium, Germany, America, even Russia—have coals. And the people over there did not see the advantage of being turned into Irish pauper farmers merely for the greater wealth and glory of English capitalists. They set resolutely about manufacturing, not only for themselves, but for the rest of the world; and the consequence is that the manufacturing monopoly enjoyed by England for nearly a century is irretrievably broken up.

“But the manufacturing monopoly of England is the pivot of the present social system of England. Even while that monopoly lasted, the markets could not keep pace with the increasing productivity of English manufacturers; the decennial crises were the consequence. And new markets are getting scarcer every day, so much so that even the Negroes of the Congo are now to be forced into the civilisation attendant upon Manchester calicos, Staffordshire pottery, and Birmingham hardware. How will it be when Continental, and especially American, goods flow in in ever-increasing quantities—when the predominating share, still held by British manufacturers, will become reduced from year to year? Answer, Free Trade, thou universal panacea.

“I am not the first to point this out. Already in 1883, at the Southport meeting of the British Association,<sup>298</sup> Mr. Inglis Palgrave, the President of the Economic section, stated plainly that

“the days of great trade profits in England were over, and there was a pause in the progress of several great branches of industrial labour. *The country might almost be said to be entering the non-progressive state*’.<sup>a</sup>

“But what is to be the consequence? Capitalist production *cannot* stop. It must go on increasing and expanding, or it must die. Even

<sup>a</sup> *Report of the Fifty-Third Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; held at Southport in September 1883, pp. 608-09.—Ed.*



now the mere reduction of England's lion's share in the supply of the world's markets means stagnation, distress, excess of capital here, excess of unemployed workpeople there. What will it be when the increase of yearly production is brought to a complete stop?

"Here is the vulnerable place, the heel of Achilles, for capitalistic production. Its very basis is the necessity of constant expansion, and this constant expansion now becomes impossible. It ends in a deadlock. Every year England is brought nearer face to face with the question: either the country must go to pieces, or capitalist production must. Which is it to be?

"And the working class? If even under the unparalleled commercial and industrial expansion, from 1848 to 1868, they have had to undergo such misery; if even then the great bulk of them experienced at best but a temporary improvement of their condition, while only a small, privileged, 'protected' minority was permanently benefited, what will it be when this dazzling period is brought finally to a close; when the present dreary stagnation shall not only become intensified, but this, its intensified condition, shall become the permanent and normal state of English trade?

"The truth is this: during the period of England's industrial monopoly the English working class have, to a certain extent, shared in the benefits of the monopoly. These benefits were very unequally parcelled out amongst them; the privileged minority pocketed most, but even the great mass had, at least, a temporary share now and then. And that is the reason why, since the dying-out of Owenism, there has been no Socialism in England. With the breakdown of that monopoly, the English working class will lose that privileged position; it will find itself generally—the privileged and leading minority not excepted—on a level with its fellow-workers abroad. And that is the reason why there will be Socialism again in England."

So I wrote in 1885. In the Preface to the English edition written on January 11, 1892 I continued:

"To this statement of the case, as that case appeared to me in 1885, I have but little to add. Needless to say that to-day there is indeed 'Socialism again in England', and plenty of it—Socialism of all shades: Socialism conscious and unconscious, Socialism prosaic and poetic, Socialism of the working class and of the middle class, for, verily, that abomination of abominations, Socialism, has not only become respectable, but has actually donned evening dress and lounges lazily on drawing-room *causeuses*. That shows the incurable fickleness of that terrible despot of 'society', middle-class public

opinion, and once more justifies the contempt in which we Socialists of a past generation always held that public opinion. At the same time we have no reason to grumble at the symptom itself.

“What I consider far more important than this momentary fashion among bourgeois circles of affecting a mild dilution of Socialism, and even more than the actual progress Socialism has made in England generally, that is the revival of the East End of London. That immense haunt of misery is no longer the stagnant pool it was six years ago. It has shaken off its torpid despair, has returned to life, and has become the home of what is called the ‘New Unionism’, that is to say, of the organisation of the great mass of ‘unskilled’ workers. This organisation may to a great extent adopt the form of the old Unions of ‘skilled’ workers but it is essentially different in character. The old Unions preserve the traditions of the time when they were founded, and look upon the wages system as a once-for-all established, final fact, which they at best can modify in the interest of their members. The new Unions were founded at a time when the faith in the eternity of the wages system was severely shaken; their founders and promoters were Socialists either consciously or by feeling; the masses, whose adhesion gave them strength, were rough, neglected, looked down upon by the working-class aristocracy; but they had this immense advantage, that *their minds were virgin soil*, entirely free from the inherited ‘respectable’ bourgeois prejudices which hampered the brains of the better situated ‘old’ Unionists. And thus we see now these new Unions taking the lead of the working-class movement generally, and more and more taking in tow the rich and proud ‘old’ Unions.

“Undoubtedly, the East Enders have committed colossal blunders; so have their predecessors, and so do the doctrinaire Socialists who pooh-pooh them. A large class, like a great nation, never learns better or quicker than by undergoing the consequences of its own mistakes. And for all the faults committed in past, present and future, the revival of the East End of London remains one of the greatest and most fruitful facts of this *fin de siècle*, and glad and proud I am to have lived to see it.”

Since I wrote the above, six months ago, the English working-class movement has again made a good step forward. The parliamentary elections which took place a few days ago gave both the official parties, Conservative as well as Liberal, notice in due form that from now on one and the other will have to reckon with a third party, the workers’ party. This workers’ party is now only

in the process of formation; its elements are still engaged in shaking off traditional prejudices of all kinds—bourgeois, old trade-unionist, indeed, even doctrinaire-socialist—in order to be able to get together at last on ground common to all of them. And yet the instinct to unite which they followed was already so strong that it produced election results hitherto unheard-of in England. In London two workers<sup>a</sup> have stood for election, and openly as Socialists at that; the Liberals did not dare to put up one of theirs against them, and the two Socialists have won by an overwhelming and unexpected majority. In Middlesbrough a workers' candidate<sup>b</sup> has stood against a Liberal and a Conservative and been elected in the teeth of both; on the other hand, the new workers' candidates who allied themselves with the Liberals have been hopelessly defeated, with the exception of a single one. Among those who so far have been called workers' representatives, that is, those who are forgiven their quality of workers because they themselves would willingly drown it in the ocean of their liberalism, the most significant representative of the old Unionism, Henry Broadhurst, has suffered a striking defeat because he declared himself against the eight-hour day. In two Glasgow, one Salford, and several other constituencies, independent workers' candidates stood against candidates of the two old parties; they were beaten, but so were the Liberal candidates. Briefly, in a number of large-town and industrial constituencies the workers have resolutely severed all connections with the two old parties and thus achieved direct or indirect successes such as they had never scored in any election so far. And the joy on this account among the workers is boundless. For the first time they have seen and felt what they can do when they make use of their electoral rights in the interest of their class. The superstitious belief in the "great Liberal Party" which had kept a hold on the English workers for nearly forty years has been destroyed. They have seen by striking examples that they, the workers, are the decisive force in England if only they have the will and know their own will; and the 1892 elections have been the beginning of that knowledge and that will. The workers' movement on the Continent will see to the rest: the Germans and the French, who are already so strongly represented in parliaments and local councils, will keep the spirit of emulation of the English sufficiently high by further successes. And if in the not very distant future it turns out that this new parliament can get

---

<sup>a</sup> James Keir Hardie and John Burns.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> John Havelock Wilson.—*Ed.*

nowhere with Mr. Gladstone, nor Mr. Gladstone with this parliament, the English workers' party will surely be sufficiently constituted to put an early end to the seesaw game of the two old parties which have been succeeding each other in power and thereby perpetuating bourgeois rule.

*F. Engels*

*London*, July 21, 1892

First published in: F. Engels, *Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England*, second edition, Stuttgart, 1892

Printed according to the book  
Published in English in full for the  
first time

[ON CERTAIN PECULIARITIES  
IN ENGLAND'S ECONOMIC  
AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT]<sup>299</sup>

Owing to its eternal compromises, the kind of gradual, peaceful political development that takes place in England gives rise to a situation full of contradictions; because of its overwhelming advantages this situation can be practically tolerated within certain limits, but its logical absurdities cause much anguish to the thinking mind. Hence, the need of all "state-supporting" parties for a theoretical cloak, a justification, which, naturally, can be provided only through sophisms, distortions, and *enfin* by dubious tricks. Thus, a literature is being cultivated in the political field that repeats all the wretched hypocrisy and untruthfulness of theological apologetics, and which also transplants the theological intellectual vices to a mundane soil. Thus the soil of the specific liberal hypocrisy is fertilised, sown and cultivated by the Conservatives themselves. And thus is theological apologetics offered an argument, produced by ordinary minds, which it lacks in other lands. What of it if the facts related in the gospel and the dogmas preached in the New Testament in general contradict each other? Does that make them untrue? The English Constitution contains many more inconsistencies and constantly contradicts itself, but continues to exist and, hence, is true!

September 12, 1892

---

The absence of crises since 1868 is also due to the expansion of the world market, which distributes the surplus English, respectively European, capital in transport investment, etc., *throughout the world* and also among a whole mass of other *branches* of

investment. This has made a crisis impossible owing to excessive speculation in railways, banking, etc., or in specifically American investments, or in *Indian* trade, but small crises, such as the Argentinian,<sup>300</sup> have become possible for the past three years. But all this proves that a *giant crisis* is in the making.

Written on September 12, 1892

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol. XVI,  
Part II, Moscow, 1936

[TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL  
OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS'  
PARTY OF SPAIN]<sup>301</sup>

Dear Comrades,

The English Trade Union Congress, meeting in Glasgow, adopted at its session of September 8th a resolution which the socialists of the European continent will hardly be able to ignore.

The Zurich Committee which, in conformity with the Brussels 1891 resolutions, was entrusted with the preparations for the next congress of the International in 1893, sent a letter of invitation to the Trade Union Congress. Despite the repeated complaints of the secretary of the Gas Union, Comrade Will Thorne, during three days of the proceedings, this letter was neither produced nor read to the Congress, which as a result never had an opportunity to express its opinion about the Zurich invitation.

Finally, Matkin proposed a motion that the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress<sup>302</sup> should be entrusted with the convening of an international congress to discuss and pass a resolution on an international legal eight-hour working day.

Comrade Parnell (who went to the Paris congress of 1889) and Comrade Quelch replied that two international workers' congresses had already been called for 1893, one to meet in Zurich, the other in Chicago<sup>303</sup>; that the Zurich provisional committee had invited the Trade Union Congress to participate in the Zurich congress, and that instead of calling a third congress the invitation to the Zurich congress should be accepted.

In reply, the representatives of the old conservative unions stated that the Zurich and Chicago congresses had not been convened by the English Trade Unions; that the workers on the Continent were badly organised and weak compared to the

English, and that it was inappropriate for the English to make themselves responsible for all the WILD THEORIES of continental socialism, etc. etc. Only then was the invitation of our Zurich Committee read out.

In the end the Zurich Committee was turned down by 189 votes against 97, and the proposal to summon "immediately" an international congress to discuss and pass a resolution on the international legal eight-hour working day was approved.

These two votes constitute an offence directed against the organised and socialist proletariat of the whole European Continent. Let us hope that the most advanced sectors of the English proletariat who, while being socialists at *heart*, are still frightened of the *name* and have been taken in by the old conservatives; that these more intelligent and bolder elements will be able to make amends for the mistake at the next congress.

Meanwhile it seems appropriate that the continental workers save their dignity in the face of the insult contained in the said resolutions, and this is why I have informed our friends in France and Germany of the events in Glasgow, hoping that they will agree on what line of action to follow; as the French comrades will be celebrating their Marseilles congress<sup>304</sup> in a few days, they will be able to make a first reply to the Trade Union Congress.

But in my capacity as ex-secretary for Spain on the General Council of the old International of glorious memory, I believe it my duty to communicate to the Spanish National Council an event which concerns the Spanish comrades no less than those of other countries.

Greetings and social revolution.

Written on September 16, 1892

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol. XXIX,  
Moscow, 1946

Printed according to the rough  
manuscript

Translated from the Spanish

Published in English for the first  
time



[ADDENDA TO THE BIOGRAPHY]<sup>305</sup>

- 1) Secretary for Italy, Spain and Portugal on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association.
- 2) New edition of *Condition*<sup>a</sup> (1892).
- 3) *Ludwig Feuerbach*<sup>b</sup> etc. Stuttgart, 1888.

Written after October 7, 1892

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 50,  
Moscow, 1981

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working-Class in England*.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> F. Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*.—Ed.

THE AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION<sup>306</sup>

The ancient world was dominated by *Fatum*, *Heimarmene*, inescapable mysterious fate. These were the names given by the Greeks and Romans to that impalpable omnipotence which frustrated all human will and effort, which led all human deeds to results quite other than those intended, that irresistible force which has since then been called providence, predestination, etc. This mysterious force has slowly taken on a more palpable form, and for this we may thank the rule of the bourgeoisie and capital, the first system of class rule which seeks to find clarity about the causes and conditions of its own existence, thus opening the door to the recognition of the inevitability of its own imminent fall. Fate, providence—that we know now—consists of the economic conditions under which production and exchange take place, and these combine today in the *world market*.

And this is the importance of the American presidential election, that it is an event of the first order on the world market.

Four years ago I published an essay on protective tariffs and free trade, in Boston in English and in Stuttgart in German.<sup>a</sup> Here I demonstrated that England's industrial monopoly could not be reconciled with the economic development of the other civilised countries; that the protective tariffs introduced in America since the Civil War<sup>307</sup> showed Americans' will to shake off the yoke of this monopoly; that thanks to the gigantic natural resources and the intellectual and moral talents of the American race this target has already been reached, and the customs barrier has become in America, no less than in Germany, a fetter to industry. And then I

<sup>a</sup> F. Engels, "Protection and Free Trade".—*Ed.*

wrote: If America introduces free trade, then it will beat England on the world market in ten years.

Very well. The presidential election of November 8, 1892 has opened the way for free trade. The protective tariff in the form devised by MacKinley had become an unbearable fetter; the nonsensical price increase for all imported raw materials and foodstuffs, which affected the price of many domestic products, had largely closed world markets to American products, while the home market suffered a glut of American industrial products. In fact, in the past few years the protective tariff only served to ruin the small producers under the pressure of the large producers combined in cartels and trusts, and to surrender the market and thus the consuming nation to exploitation by the latter, that is to say the organised monopoly. America can only escape from this permanent domestic industrial crisis caused by the protective tariff by opening itself up to the world market, and for this it must emancipate itself from the protective tariff, at least in its present nonsensical form. The total turn-about of public opinion demonstrated by the election shows that it is determined to do this. Once established on the world market, America—*like*, and *through* England—will irresistibly be driven further along the path of free trade.

And then we shall experience an industrial battle as never before. On all markets English products, particularly textiles and iron goods, will have to fight with American products, and finally lose. Even now American cottons and linens chase the English from the field. Would you like to know who performed the miracle of converting in one short year the cotton operatives of Lancashire from furious opponents to enthusiastic advocates of the legal eight-hour day? Refer to the *Neue Zeit*, No. 2 of October this year, p. 56, where you can see how American cottons and linens are displacing the English step by step on the domestic market, how English imports have, since 1881, never reached the American, and in 1891 only amounted to about one third of the latter.<sup>308</sup> And China is, beside India, much the main market for these textiles.

This is renewed proof that with the turn of the century all relations are shifting. Transfer the centre of gravity of the textile and iron industries from England to America, and England will become either a second Holland, whose bourgeoisie live on their former greatness, and whose proletariat shrivels, or—it will reorganise itself along socialist lines. The first is not possible, the English proletariat will not put up with it, it is far too numerous and developed for this. Only the second remains. *The fall of protective tariffs in America means the ultimate victory of socialism in England.*

And Germany? Back in 1878 it won a position on the world market, which it is now losing step by step thanks to its foolish protective tariff policy—will it insist upon continuing obstinately to close for itself the path to the world market by taxing raw materials and foodstuffs, even against its American competitors, who will throw themselves into things quite differently from the English competition hitherto? Will the German bourgeoisie have the understanding and courage to follow the example set by America, or will it, lethargic as hitherto, wait until American industry, grown all-powerful, forcibly breaks the tariff-cartel between the Junkers and the large-scale manufacturers<sup>309</sup>? And will the government and the bourgeoisie finally realise how marvellously clumsily this precise moment has been chosen to crush the economic forces of Germany with new and prohibitive military burdens, when it should be entering into industrial competition with the most youthfully strong nation in the world, which has easily paid off its colossal war debt in a few years, and whose government does not know what to do with the tax income?

The German bourgeoisie have—perhaps for the last time—the opportunity finally to perform a great deed. One hundred to one they are too narrow-minded and too cowardly to utilise this opportunity for anything except to prove that once and for all their time is up.

Written between November 9 and 15, 1892

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Vorwärts*, No. 269,  
November 16, 1892

Signed: *Frederick Engels*

MARX, HEINRICH KARL,<sup>310</sup>

was born in Trier on May 5, 1818, the son of the lawyer and later counsellor of justice Heinrich Marx, who, as is shown by the baptismal certificate of his son, converted with his family from Judaism to Protestantism in 1824. After concluding his preparatory education at Trier Gymnasium, Karl Marx studied from 1835 in Bonn and then in Berlin, first law and later philosophy, attaining his *Dr. Phil.* in Berlin in 1841 with a dissertation on the philosophy of Epicurus.<sup>a</sup> In the same year he moved to Bonn in order to qualify as a lecturer, but the obstacles which the government laid in the path of his friend *Bruno Bauer*, officially there as lecturer in theology, which culminated in Bauer's removal from the university, soon made it clear to him that there was no room for him at a Prussian university.—This was the time when the younger elements of the radical bourgeoisie of the Rhineland, tinged with Young Hegelianism, urged, in agreement with the liberal leaders *Camphausen* and *Hansemann*, the publication of a big opposition paper in Cologne; Marx and Bauer were also consulted as capable main contributors. A concession—necessary at that time—was quietly obtained by a devious route, and the *Rheinische Zeitung* appeared on January 1, 1842. Marx contributed lengthy articles from Bonn for the new paper; foremost among these were: a critique of proceedings in the Rhine Province Assembly, a study of the situation of the peasant vintners on the Mosel, and another on wood theft and the relevant legislation.<sup>b</sup> In

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, "Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> K. Marx, "Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly. First Article. Debates on Freedom of the Press and Publication of the Proceedings of the Assembly of the Estates"; "Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly. Third Article. Debates on the Law on Thefts of Wood"; "Justification of the Correspondent from the Mosel".—*Ed.*

Marx's works

- 1/ Bekantmachung der Cyberschen Philosophie
- 2/ Gedächtnisrede über Friedrich Hegel, gehalten am 14. April 1840
- 3/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 4/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 5/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 6/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 7/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 8/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 9/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 10/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 11/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 12/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 13/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 14/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 15/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 16/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 17/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 18/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 19/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 20/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 21/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 22/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen
- 23/ die in Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Italien, Spanien, Portugal, Griechenland, und in den Niederlanden, seit 1815 bis 1840, stattgefundenen Revolutionen



October 1842 he took over the management of the paper and moved to Cologne. From this point the paper adopted a sharply oppositional character. But the management was so adroit that despite first double censorship, and then triple censorship, imposed upon the paper (first the ordinary censor, then the Regierungspräsident, and finally a Mr. von Saint-Paul dispatched *ad hoc* from Berlin), the government found this sort of newspaper hard to deal with and therefore decided to forbid further publication of the paper as of April 1, 1843. Marx's resignation from the editorial board<sup>312</sup> on this date bought a three months' stay of execution, but then the paper was finally suppressed.

Marx then decided to move to Paris where *Arnold Ruge* also wished to turn, following the suppression of the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* at about the same time. But first in Kreuznach he married Jenny von Westphalen, sweetheart of his youth, to whom he had been engaged since the beginning of his university days. The young couple reached Paris in the autumn of 1843, and here Marx and Ruge published the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, a journal of which only the first issue appeared; a continuation failed, partly because of the insuperable difficulties of circulating it secretly in Germany, and partly because of the differences of principle which very soon became apparent between the two editors. *Ruge* remained tied up with Hegelian philosophy and political radicalism, while Marx threw himself into the study of political economy, the French socialists, and the history of France. The result was his conversion to socialism. In September 1844, Fr. Engels visited Marx in Paris for a few days: the two had been in correspondence since their joint work on the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, and their collaboration, which only ended with the death of Marx, dates from this point. The first fruit of this collaboration was a polemical pamphlet against *Bruno Bauer*, with whom they had likewise parted ways on principles in the course of the disintegration of the Hegelian school: *The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism. Against Bruno Bauer and Company*, Frankfurt a. M., 1845.

Marx helped to edit a small German weekly called *Vorwärts!*, published in Paris, which poured biting scorn on the wretchedness of the German absolutism and sham constitutionalism of the time. This prompted the Prussian Government to demand that Guizot's ministry expel Marx from France. It was agreed: in early 1845 Marx moved to Brussels, and Engels arrived there soon afterwards. Here Marx published *The Poverty of Philosophy. Answer to the "Philosophy of Poverty" by M. Proudhon*, Brussels and Paris, 1847,



and also "Speech on the Question of Free Trade", Brussels, 1848. In addition he wrote occasional articles for the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung*. In January 1848 he drew up, together with Engels, the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* on the instructions of the Central Authority of the Communist League, a secret propaganda society which Marx and Engels had joined in the spring of 1847.<sup>313</sup> The *Manifesto* has since appeared in innumerable authorised and unauthorised German editions and been translated into nearly all European languages.

On the outbreak of the 1848 February Revolution, which brought about popular movements in Brussels too, Marx was arrested and expelled from Belgium; in the meantime the Provisional Government of the French Republic had invited him to come back to Paris, so he returned there.

At first in Paris he and his friends took a stand against the game of forming legions, which gave the majority in the new government a simple means of ridding themselves of the "tiresome" foreign workers. It was clear that such openly organised Belgian, German, etc., legions would only be able to march across the frontiers into a well-organised trap, and this was indeed the case. Marx and the other leaders of the Communist League obtained for about four hundred unemployed Germans the same travel allowance as the legionaries, so that they too could return to Germany.

In April Marx went to Cologne, and on July 1 the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was published there under his management; it appeared for the last time on May 19 the following year. The editors were either threatened with judicial arrest, or with expulsion as non-Prussians. The latter fate befell Marx, who during his time in Brussels had taken his release from the Prussian state. During the existence of the paper he had to appear twice before the Jury, on February 7, 1849 because of a press misdemeanour, and on the 8th on charges of incitement to armed resistance to the government (at the time of the tax refusal, November 1848); both times he was acquitted.<sup>314</sup>

After the paper had been suppressed Marx returned to Paris, but after the demonstration of June 13<sup>315</sup> he was faced with the choice of either allowing himself to be interned in Brittany or of turning his back on France once again. He naturally chose the latter and moved to London, where he now finally established his residence.

In London he published: the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, Hamburg, 1850, of which six issues appeared.

