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Title page of Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy
The work* before us takes us back to a period which, although in time no more than a good generation behind us, has become as foreign to the present generation in Germany as if it were already a full century old. Yet it was the period of Germany's preparation for the Revolution of 1848; and all that has happened since then in our country has been merely a continuation of 1848, merely the execution of the testament of the revolution.

Just as in France in the eighteenth century, so in Germany in the nineteenth, a philosophical revolution ushered in the political collapse. But how different the two looked! The French were in open combat against all official science, against the Church and often also against the State; their writings were printed across the frontier, in Holland or England, while they themselves were often in jeopardy of imprisonment in the Bastille. On the other hand, the Germans were professors, State-appointed instructors of youth; their writings were recognised textbooks, and the system that rounded off the whole development—the Hegelian system—was even raised, as it were, to the rank of a royal Prussian philosophy of State! Was it possible that a revolution could hide behind these professors, behind their obscure, pedantic phrases, their ponderous, wearisome periods? Were not precisely those people who were then regarded as the representatives of the revolution, the liberals, the bitterest opponents of this befuddling philosophy? But what neither governments nor liberals saw was seen at least by one man as early as 1833, and this man was none other than Heinrich Heine.234

* Ludwig Feuerbach, by C. N. Starcke, Ph. D., Stuttgart, Ferd. Encke, 1885.
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Let us take an example. No philosophical proposition has earned more gratitude from narrow-minded governments and wrath from equally narrow-minded liberals than Hegel's famous statement:

“All that is real is rational; and all that is rational is real.” 235

That was blatantly a sanctification of the existing order of things, the philosophical benediction upon despotism, the police state, arbitrary justice, and censorship. And so it was understood by Frederick William III, and by his subjects. But according to Hegel certainly not everything that exists is also real, without further qualification. For Hegel the attribute of reality belongs only to that which is at the same time necessary:

“In the course of its development reality proves to be necessity.”

Any particular governmental measure—Hegel himself cites the example of “a certain tax regulation” 3—is therefore for him by no means real without qualification. That which is necessary, however, proves in the last resort to be also rational; and, applied to the Prussian state of that time, the Hegelian proposition, therefore, merely means: this state is rational, corresponds to reason, in so far as it [the state] is necessary; and if it nevertheless appears evil to us, but still, in spite of its evilness, continues to exist, then the evilness of the government is justified and explained by the corresponding evilness of the subjects. The Prussians of that day had the government that they deserved.

Now, according to Hegel, reality is, however, in no way an attribute predicatable of any given state of affairs, social or political, in all circumstances and at all times. On the contrary. The Roman Republic was real, but so was the Roman Empire which superseded it. In 1789 4 the French monarchy had become so unreal, that is to say, so robbed of all necessity, so irrational, that it had to be destroyed by the Great Revolution, of which Hegel always speaks with the greatest enthusiasm. In this case, therefore, the monarchy was the unreal and the revolution the real. And so, in the course of development, all that was previously real becomes unreal, loses its necessity, its right of existence, its rationality. And in the place of moribund reality comes a new, viable reality—

---


3 The words “which superseded it. In 1789” were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.— Ed.
peacefully if the old has enough common sense to go to its death without a struggle; forcibly if it resists this necessity. Thus the Hegelian proposition turns into its opposite through Hegelian dialectics itself: All that is real in the sphere of human history becomes irrational in the course of time, is therefore irrational by its very destination, is encumbered with irrationality from the outset; and everything which is rational in the minds of men is destined to become real, however much it may contradict existing apparent reality. In accordance with all the rules of the Hegelian method of thought, the proposition of the rationality of everything which is real is dissolved to become the other proposition: All that exists deserves to perish.\(^a\)

But precisely therein lay the true significance and the revolutionary character of Hegelian philosophy (to which, as the termination of the whole movement since Kant, we must here confine ourselves), that it once and for all dealt the death blow to the finality of all products of human thought and action. Truth, the cognition of which was the business of philosophy, was in the hands of Hegel no longer a collection of ready-made dogmatic statements, which, once discovered, had merely to be learned by heart. Truth now lay in the process of cognition itself, in the long historical development of science, which ascends from lower to ever higher levels of knowledge without ever reaching, by discovering so-called absolute truth, a point at which it can proceed no further, where it has nothing more to do than to sit back and gaze in wonder at the absolute truth to which it had attained. And what holds good for the realm of philosophical cognition holds good also for that of every other kind of cognition and also for practical action. Just as cognition is unable to reach a definitive conclusion in a perfect, ideal condition of humanity, so is history; a perfect society, a perfect "State", are things which can only exist in the imagination. On the contrary, all successive historical states are only transitory stages in the endless course of development of human society from the lower to the higher. Each stage is necessary, and therefore justified for the time and conditions to which it owes its origin. But in the face of new, higher conditions which gradually develop in its own womb, it loses its validity and justification. It must give way to a higher stage, which will also in its turn decay and perish. Just as the bourgeoisie by large-scale industry, competition and the world

\(^a\) A paraphrase of Mephistopheles' words from Goethe's *Faust*, Act I, Scene 3 ("Faust's Study").—Ed.
market dissolves in practice all stable time-honoured institutions, so this dialectical philosophy dissolves all conceptions of final, absolute truth and of absolute states of humanity corresponding to it. Against it [dialectical philosophy] nothing is final, absolute, sacred. It reveals the transitory character of everything and in everything; nothing can endure against it except the uninterrupted process of becoming and passing away, of ascending without end from the lower to the higher. And dialectical philosophy itself is nothing more than the mere reflection of this process in the thinking brain. It has, however, also a conservative side: it recognises that definite stages of cognition and society are justified for their time and circumstances; but only so far. The conservatism of this outlook is relative; its revolutionary character is absolute—the only absolute dialectical philosophy admits.

It is not necessary, here, to go into the question of whether this outlook is thoroughly in accord with the present state of natural science, which predicts a possible end for the earth itself and for its habitability a fairly certain one; which therefore recognises that for the history of mankind, too, there is not only an ascending but also a descending branch. At any rate we are still a considerable distance from the turning-point at which the historical course of society becomes one of descent, and we cannot expect Hegelian philosophy to be concerned with a subject which, in its time, natural science had not yet placed on the agenda at all.

But what really must be said here is this: that in Hegel the views developed above are not so sharply defined. They are a necessary conclusion from his method, but one which he himself never drew with such explicitness. And this, indeed, for the simple reason that he was compelled to make a system and, in accordance with traditional requirements, a system of philosophy must conclude with some sort of absolute truth. Therefore, however much Hegel, especially in his Logik, emphasises that this eternal truth is nothing but the logical, or, the historical, process itself, he nevertheless finds himself compelled to supply this process with an end, just because he has to bring his system to a termination at some point or other. In his Logik he can make this end a beginning again, since here the point of conclusion, the absolute idea—which is only absolute in so far as he has absolutely nothing to say about it—"alienates", that is, transforms itself into nature and comes to itself again later in the mind, that is, in thought and in history. But at the end of the whole philosophy a similar return to the beginning is possible only in one way. Namely, by conceiving the end of history as follows: mankind arrives at the cognition of this
selfsame absolute idea, and declares that this cognition of the
absolute idea is attained in Hegelian philosophy. In this way,
however, the whole dogmatic content of the Hegelian system is
declared to be absolute truth, in contradiction to his dialectical
method, which dissolves all that is dogmatic. Thus the revolutio-
nary side is smothered beneath the overgrowth of the conservative
side. And what applies to philosophical cognition applies also to
historical practice. Having, in the person of Hegel, reached the
point of working out the absolute idea, mankind must also in
practice have advanced so far that it can carry out this absolute
idea in reality. Hence the practical political demands of the
absolute idea on contemporaries should not be pitched too high.
And so we find at the conclusion of the Rechtsphilosophie that
the absolute idea is to be implemented in that monarchy based on
social estates which Frederick William III so persistently promised
his subjects to no avail, that is, in a limited and moderate, indirect
rule of the possessing classes suited to the petty-bourgeois German
conditions of that time; and, moreover, the necessity of the
nobility is demonstrated to us in a speculative fashion.

The inner necessities of the system are, therefore, of themselves
sufficient to explain why a thoroughly revolutionary method of
thinking produced an extremely tame political conclusion. As a
matter of fact, the specific form of this conclusion derives from
the fact that Hegel was a German, and like his contemporary
Goethe, had a bit of the philistine's tail dangling behind. Each of
them was an Olympian Zeus in his own sphere, yet neither of
them ever quite freed himself from German philistinism.

But all this did not prevent the Hegelian system from covering
an incomparably greater domain than any earlier system, nor from
developing in this domain a wealth of thought which is astounding
even today. The phenomenology of the mind (which one may call
a parallel to the embryology and palaeontology of the mind, a
development of individual consciousness through its different
stages, set in the form of an abbreviated reproduction of the
stages through which the consciousness of man has passed in the
course of history), logic, philosophy of nature, philosophy of the
mind, and the latter in turn elaborated in its separate, historical
subdivisions: philosophy of history, of law, of religion, history of

---

a The end of the sentence, from the words “and declares...”, was added by Engels
in the 1888 edition.— Ed.
b See G. W. F. Hegel, Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, Dritter Abschnitt.
“Der Staat”, §§ 301-320, S. 308-29.— Ed.
philosophy, aesthetics, etc.—in all these different historical fields Hegel worked to discover and demonstrate the pervading thread of development. And as he was not only a creative genius but also a man of encyclopaedic erudition, he played an epoch-making role in every sphere. It is self-evident that owing to the needs of the "system" he very often had to resort to those forced constructions about which his pygmean opponents make such a terrible fuss even today. But these constructions are only the frame and scaffolding of his work. If one does not loiter here needlessly, but presses on farther into the huge edifice, one finds innumerable treasures which still today retain their full value. With all philosophers it is precisely the "system" which is perishable; and for the simple reason that it springs from an imperishable need of the human mind—the need to overcome all contradictions. But if all contradictions are once for all disposed of, we shall have arrived at so-called absolute truth—world history will be at an end. And yet it has to continue, although there is nothing left for it to do—hence, a new, insoluble contradiction. Once we have realised—and in the long run no one has helped us to realise it more than Hegel himself—that the task of philosophy thus stated means nothing but the task that a single philosopher should accomplish that which can only be accomplished by the entire human race in its ongoing development—as soon as we realise that, it is the end of all philosophy in the hitherto accepted sense of the word. One leaves alone "absolute truth", which is unattainable along this path or by any single individual; instead, one pursues attainable relative truths along the path of the positive sciences, and the summation of their results by means of dialectical thinking. With Hegel philosophy comes to an end altogether: on the one hand, because in his system he sums up its whole development in the most splendid fashion; and on the other hand, because, even if unconsciously, he shows us the way out of the labyrinth of systems to real positive cognition of the world.

One can imagine what a tremendous effect this Hegelian system must have produced in the philosophy-tinged atmosphere of Germany. It was a triumphal procession which lasted for decades and which by no means came to a standstill on the death of Hegel. On the contrary, it was precisely from 1830 to 1840 that "Hegelianism" reigned most exclusively, and to a greater or lesser extent infected even its opponents. It was precisely in this period

---

\[a\] The words "even if unconsciously" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
that Hegelian views, consciously or unconsciously, most extensively penetrated the most diversified sciences and leavened even popular literature and the daily press, from which the average "educated consciousness" derives its mental pabulum. But this victory along the whole front was only the prelude to an internal struggle.

As we have seen, Hegel's doctrine, taken as a whole, left plenty of room to accommodate the most diverse practical party views. And in the theoretical Germany of that time, two things were practical above all; religion and politics. Whoever placed the emphasis on the Hegelian system could be fairly conservative in both spheres; whoever regarded the dialectical method as the main thing could belong to the most extreme opposition, both in religion and politics. Hegel himself, despite the fairly frequent outbursts of revolutionary wrath in his works, seemed on the whole to be more inclined to the conservative side. Indeed, his system had cost him much more "hard mental plugging" than his method. Towards the end of the thirties, the cleavage in the school became more and more apparent. The Left wing, the so-called Young Hegelians, in their fight with the pietist orthodox and the feudal reactionaries, abandoned bit by bit that philosophical-genteel reserve in regard to the burning questions of the day which up to that time had secured state toleration and even protection for their teachings. And when, in 1840, orthodox sanctimony and absolutist feudal reaction ascended the throne with Frederick William IV, open partisanship became unavoidable. The fight was still carried on with philosophical weapons, but no longer for abstract philosophical aids. It turned directly on the destruction of traditional religion and the existing state. And while in the Deutsche Jahrbücher the practical ends were still predominantly put forward in philosophical disguise, in the Rheinische Zeitung of 1842 the Young Hegelian school revealed itself directly as the philosophy of the aspiring radical bourgeoisie and used the meagre cloak of philosophy only to deceive the censors.

At that time, however, politics was a very thorny field, and hence the main fight came to be directed against religion; this fight, particularly since 1840, was indirectly also political. Strauss' Leben Jesu, published in 1835, had provided the initial impetus. The theory therein developed of the formation of the gospel myths was combated later by Bruno Bauer with proof that a whole series of evangelical stories had been invented by the authors themselves. The controversy between these two was carried on in the philosophical disguise of a battle between "self-consciousness"
and "substance". The question whether the miracle stories of the gospels came into being through unconscious traditional myth-creation within the bosom of the community or whether they were invented by the evangelists themselves was blown up into the question whether, in world history, "substance" or "self-consciousness" was the decisive operative force. Finally came Stirner, the prophet of contemporary anarchism—Bakunin has taken a great deal from him—and surpassed the sovereign "self-consciousness" by his sovereign "ego".a

We shall not go further into this aspect of the decomposition process of the Hegelian school. More important for us is the following: the bulk of the most determined Young Hegelians were, by the practical necessities of their fight against positive religion,236 driven back to Anglo-French materialism. This brought them into conflict with their school system. While materialism conceives nature as the sole reality, nature in the Hegelian system represents merely the "alienation" of the absolute idea, so to say, a degradation of the idea. At all events, thinking and its thought-product, the idea, is here the primary, nature the derivative, which only exists at all by the condescension of the idea. And in this contradiction they floundered as well or as ill as they could.

Then came Feuerbach's Wesen des Christenthums. With one blow it pulverised the contradiction, by plainly placing materialism on the throne again. Nature exists independently of all philosophy. It is the foundation upon which we human beings, ourselves products of nature, have grown up. Nothing exists outside nature and man, and the higher beings our religious fantasies have created are only the fantastic reflection of our own essence. The spell was broken; the "system" was exploded and cast aside, and the contradiction, shown to exist only in our imagination, was dissolved.—One must have experienced the liberating effect of this book for oneself to get an idea of it. Enthusiasm was universal: we were all Feuerbachians for a moment. How enthusiastically Marx greeted the new conception and how much—in spite of all critical reservations—he was influenced by it,b one may read in The Holy Family.

Even the shortcomings of the book contributed to its immediate effect. Its literary, sometimes even bombastic, style secured for it a large public and was at any rate refreshing after long years of

---

a M. Stirner, Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum.—Ed.
b The words "and how much he was influenced by it" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
abstract and abstruse Hegelianising. The same is true of its extravagant deification of love, which, coming after the now intolerable sovereign rule of “pure reason”, had its excuse, if not justification. But what we must not forget is that it was precisely these two weaknesses of Feuerbach that “true socialism”, which had been spreading like a plague in “educated” Germany since 1844, took as its starting-point, putting literary phrases in the place of scientific knowledge, the liberation of mankind by means of “love” in place of the emancipation of the proletariat through the economic transformation of production—in short, losing itself in the nauseous fine writing and ecstasies of love typified by Herr Karl Grün.

Another thing we must not forget is this: the Hegelian school had disintegrated, but Hegelian philosophy had not been overcome through criticism; Strauss and Bauer each took one of its sides and set it polemically against the other. Feuerbach broke through the system and simply discarded it. But a philosophy is not disposed of by the mere assertion that it is false. And so mighty a work as Hegelian philosophy, which had exercised so enormous an influence on the intellectual development of the nation, could not be disposed of by simply being ignored. It had to be “transcended” in its own sense, that is, in the sense that while its form had to be annihilated through criticism, the new content which had been won through it had to be saved. How this was brought about we shall see below.

But in the meantime the Revolution of 1848 thrust the whole of philosophy aside as unceremoniously as Feuerbach had thrust aside Hegel. And in the process Feuerbach himself was also pushed into the background.

II

The great basic question of all, especially of latter-day, philosophy, is that concerning the relation of thinking and being. From very early times when men, still completely ignorant of the structure of their own bodies, and prompted by dream apparitions* came to believe that their thinking and sensation were not activities of their

* Among savages and lower barbarians the idea is still universal that the human forms which appear in dreams are souls which have temporarily left their bodies; the real man is, therefore, held responsible for acts committed by his dream apparition against the dreamer. Thus Im Thurn found this belief current, for example, among the Indians of Guiana in 1884.
bodies, but of a distinct soul which inhabits the body and leaves it
upon death—from this time men have been driven to reflect
about the relation between this soul and the outside world. If
upon death it left the body and lived on, there was no occasion to
ascribe another distinct death to it. Thus arose the idea of its
immortality, which at that stage of development appeared not at
all as a consolation but as a fate which it was pointless to fight, and
often enough, as among the Greeks, a positive misfortune. Not
religious desire for consolation, but the quandary arising from the
universal ignorance of what to do with this soul, once its existence
had been accepted, after the death of the body, led everywhere to
the tedious fancy of personal immortality. In quite a similar
manner the first gods arose through the personification of natural
forces. And as religions continued to take shape, these gods
assumed more and more an extramundane form, until finally by a
process of abstraction, I might almost say of distillation, occurring
naturally in the course of man’s intellectual development, out of
the many more or less limited and mutually limiting gods there
arose in the minds of men the idea of the one exclusive God of
the monotheistic religions.

Thus the question of the relation of thinking to being, of the
mind to nature—the paramount question of the whole of
philosophy—has, no less than all religion, its roots in the
narrow-minded and ignorant notions of savagery. But it was
possible to put forward this question for the first time in full
clarity to give it its full significance, only after humanity in Europe
had awakened from the long hibernation of the Christian Middle
Ages. The question of the position of thinking in relation to being,
a question which, by the way, had played a great part also in the
scholasticism of the Middle Ages, the question: which is primary,
mind or nature—that question, in relation to the Church, was
sharpened into this: Did God create the world or has the world
existed for all time?

Answers to this question split the philosophers into two great
camps. Those who asserted the primacy of the mind over nature
and, therefore, in the last instance, assumed world creation in
some form or other—and among the philosophers, e.g., Hegel,
this creation often becomes still more intricate and impossible than
in Christianity—comprised the camp of idealism. The others, who
regarded nature as primary, belong to the various schools of
materialism.

These two expressions, idealism and materialism, originally
signify nothing else but this; and here they are not used in any
other sense either. What confusion arises when some other meaning is put into them will be seen below.

But the question of the relation of thinking and being has yet another side: in what relation do our thoughts about the world surrounding us stand to this world itself? Is our thinking capable of cognition of the real world? Are we able in our ideas and notions of the real world to produce a correct reflection of reality? In the language of philosophy this question is called the question of the identity of thinking and being, and the overwhelming majority of philosophers answer it in the affirmative. In Hegel, for example, its affirmation is self-evident: for what we cognise in the real world is precisely its thought content—that which makes the world a gradual realisation of the absolute idea, which absolute idea has existed somewhere from eternity, independent of the world and before the world. But it is manifest without further proof that thinking can cognise a content which is from the outset a thought content. It is equally manifest that what is to be proved here is already tacitly contained in the premiss. But that in no way prevents Hegel from drawing the further conclusion from his proof of the identity of thinking and being that his philosophy, because it is correct for his thinking, is therefore the only correct one, and that the identity of thinking and being must prove its validity by mankind immediately translating his philosophy from theory into practice and transforming the whole world according to Hegelian principles. This is an illusion which he shares with well-nigh all philosophers.

In addition there is yet another set of philosophers—those who dispute the possibility of any cognition, or at least of an exhaustive cognition, of the world. Among them, of the more recent ones, we find Hume and Kant, and they have played a very important role in philosophical development. What is decisive in the refutation of this view has already been said by Hegel, as far as this was possible from an idealist standpoint. The materialist additions made by Feuerbach are more quick-witted than profound. The most telling refutation of this as of all other philosophical quirks is practice, namely, experimentation and industry. If we are able to prove the correctness of our conception of a natural phenomenon by bringing it about ourselves, producing it out of its conditions and making it serve our own purposes into the bargain, then the ungraspable Kantian “thing-in-itself” is finished. The chemical substances produced in the bodies of plants and animals remained just such “things-in-themselves” until organic chemistry began to produce them one after another, whereupon the “thing-in-itself”
became a thing for us, as, for instance, alizarin, the colouring matter of the madder, which we no longer trouble to grow in the madder roots in the field, but produce much more cheaply and simply from coal tar. For three hundred years the Copernican solar system was a hypothesis with a hundred, a thousand or ten thousand chances to one in its favour, but still always a hypothesis. But when Leverrier, by means of the data provided by this system, not only deduced that an unknown planet must exist, but also calculated the position in the heavens which this planet must necessarily occupy, and when Galle really found this planet, the Copernican system was proved. If, nevertheless, the Neo-Kantians are attempting to resurrect the Kantian conception in Germany and the agnostics that of Hume in England (where it never became extinct), this is, in view of their theoretical and practical refutation accomplished long ago, scientifically a regression and practically merely a shamefaced way of surreptitiously accepting materialism, while denying it before the world.

But during this long period from Descartes to Hegel and from Hobbes to Feuerbach, the philosophers were by no means impelled, as they thought they were, solely by the force of pure reason. On the contrary, what really pushed them forward most was the powerful and ever more rapidly onrushing progress of natural science and industry. Among the materialists this was plain on the surface, but the idealist systems also filled themselves more and more with a materialist content and attempted pantheistically to reconcile the antithesis between mind and matter. Thus, ultimately, the Hegelian system represents merely a materialism idealistically turned upside down in method and content.

It is, therefore, comprehensible that Starcke in his characterisation of Feuerbach first of all investigates the latter's position in regard to this fundamental question of the relation of thinking and being. After a short introduction, in which the views of the preceding philosophers, particularly since Kant, are described in unnecessarily ponderous philosophical language, and in which Hegel, by an all too formalistic adherence to certain passages of his works, gets far less than his due, there follows a detailed description of the course of development of Feuerbach's "metaphysics" itself, in the manner it arises from the sequence of this philosopher's relevant works. This description is industriously and lucidly elaborated; only, like the whole book, it is loaded with

---

a The words "and industry" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—*Ed.*
a ballast of philosophical phraseology by no means everywhere unavoidable, which is the more disturbing in its effect the less the author keeps to the manner of expression of one and the same school, or even of Feuerbach himself, and the more he interjects expressions of the most various tendencies, especially of those now rampant and calling themselves philosophical.

Feuerbach's evolution is that of a Hegelian—a never quite orthodox Hegelian, it is true—into a materialist; an evolution which at a certain stage gives rise to a complete break with the idealist system of his predecessor. With irresistible force Feuerbach is finally driven to the realisation that the Hegelian premundane existence of the "absolute idea", the "pre-existence of the logical categories" before the world existed, is nothing more than a fantastic remnant of the belief in the existence of an extramundane creator; that the material sensuously perceptible world to which we ourselves belong is the only reality; and that our consciousness and thinking, however suprasensuous they may seem, are the product of a material, bodily organ, the brain. Matter is not a product of the mind, but the mind itself is merely the highest product of matter. This is, of course, pure materialism. But, having got so far, Feuerbach stops short. He cannot overcome the habitual philosophical prejudice, prejudice not against the thing but against the name materialism. He says:

"To me materialism is the foundation of the edifice of human essence and knowledge; but to me it is not what it is to the physiologist, to the natural scientist in the narrower sense, for example, to Moleschott, and necessarily is from their standpoint and profession, namely, the edifice itself. Backwards I fully agree with the materialists; but not forwards." 239

Here Feuerbach lumps together the materialism that is a general world outlook resting upon a definite conception of the relation between matter and mind, and the special form in which this world outlook was expressed at a definite historical stage, namely, in the eighteenth century. More than that, he lumps it together with the shallow, vulgarised form in which the materialism of the eighteenth century continues to exist today in the heads of naturalists and doctors, the form in which it was preached on their tours in the fifties by Büchner, Vogt and Moleschott. But just as idealism underwent a series of stages of development, so also did materialism. With each epoch-making discovery even in the sphere of natural science it has to change its form; and history too having

---

a The words "namely, in the eighteenth century" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
been subjected to materialistic treatment, a new avenue of development has opened here as well.

The materialism of the last century was predominantly mechanical, because at that time, of all the natural sciences, only mechanics, and indeed only the mechanics of solid bodies—celestial and terrestrial—in short, the mechanics of gravity, had come to any certain conclusion. Chemistry at that time existed only in its infantile, phlogistic form. Biology still lay in swaddling clothes; plant and animal organisms had been only crudely examined and were explained as the result of purely mechanical causes. What the animal was to Descartes, man was to the materialists of the eighteenth century—a machine. This application exclusively of the standards of mechanics to processes of a chemical and organic nature—in which processes the laws of mechanics are, indeed, also valid, but are pushed into the background by other, higher laws—constitutes one specific, but at that time inevitable, limitation of classical French materialism.

The other specific limitation of this materialism lay in its inability to comprehend the world as a process, as matter undergoing uninterrupted historical development. This accorded with the state of the natural science of that time, and with the metaphysical, that is, anti-dialectical manner of philosophising connected with it. Nature, so much was known, was in eternal motion. But according to the ideas of that time, this motion turned just as eternally in a circle and therefore never moved from the spot; it produced the same results over and over again. This conception was at that time inevitable. The Kantian theory of the origin of the solar system had only been put forward and was still regarded merely as an oddity. The history of the evolution of the earth, geology, was still totally unknown, and the idea that the animate natural beings of today are the result of a long sequence of evolution from the simple to the complex could not at that time scientifically be put forward at all. The unhistorical view of nature was therefore inevitable. We have the less reason to reproach the philosophers of the eighteenth century on this account since the same thing is found in Hegel. According to him, nature, as a mere “alienation” of the idea, is incapable of evolution in time—capable only of extending its manifoldness in space, so that it displays simultaneously and side by side all the stages of evolution comprised in it, and is condemned to an eternal repetition of the

---

a The text below, up to the end of the paragraph, was added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
same processes. This absurdity of evolution in space, but outside of time—the fundamental condition of all evolution—Hegel imposes upon nature just at the very time when geology, embryology, the physiology of plants and animals, and organic chemistry were taking shape, and when everywhere on the basis of these new sciences brilliant presentiments of the subsequent theory of evolution were appearing (for instance, Goethe and Lamarck). But the system demanded it; hence the method, for the sake of the system, had to become untrue to itself.

This same unhistorical conception prevailed also in the domain of history. Here the struggle against the remnants of the Middle Ages captured the limelight. The Middle Ages were regarded as a mere interruption of history by a thousand years of universal barbarism. The great progress made in the Middle Ages—the extension of the domain of European civilisation, the viable great nations taking form there next to each other, and finally the enormous technical advances of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—all this was not seen. Thus a rational insight into the great historical coherence was made impossible, and history served at best as a collection of examples and illustrations for the use of philosophers.

The vulgarising pedlars, who dabbled in materialism in the Germany of the fifties in no way overcame this limitation of their teachers. All the advances of natural science which had been made in the meantime served them only as fresh evidence against the existence of a world creator, and, indeed, they did not in the least make it their business to develop the theory any further. Though idealism was stumped and was dealt a death-blow by the Revolution of 1848, it had the satisfaction of seeing that materialism had for the moment sunk to even greater depths. Feuerbach was unquestionably right when he refused to take responsibility for this materialism; only he should not have confounded the doctrines of these itinerant preachers with materialism in general.

Here, however, there are two things to be pointed out. First, even during Feuerbach's lifetime, natural science was still in that process of intense fermentation which has reached a clarifying, relative conclusion only during the last fifteen years. New data for cognition were acquired to a hitherto unheard-of extent, but the establishment of coherence, and thereby of order, in this chaos of

---

a The words "was stumped and" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
discoveries following closely upon each other’s heels, has only quite recently become possible. It is true that Feuerbach lived to see all three of the decisive discoveries—that of the cell, the transformation of energy and the theory of evolution named after Darwin. But how was the lonely philosopher in the country to sufficiently follow scientific developments in order to appreciate at their full value discoveries which natural scientists themselves at that time either still contested or did not know how to adequately exploit? The blame for this falls solely upon the wretched conditions in Germany, in consequence of which brooding eclectic flea-crackers had taken possession of the chairs of philosophy, while Feuerbach, who towered above them all, had to rusticate and go to seed in a little village. It is therefore not Feuerbach’s fault that the historical conception of nature, which has now become possible and has removed all the one-sidedness of French materialism, remained inaccessible to him.

Secondly, Feuerbach is quite correct in asserting that exclusively natural-scientific materialism is indeed

"the foundation of the edifice of human knowledge, but not the edifice itself".

For we live not only in nature but also in human society, and this also has its evolution and its science no less than nature. It was therefore a question of bringing the science of society, that is, the sum total of the so-called historical and philosophical sciences, into harmony with the materialist foundation, and of reconstructing it thereupon. But it did not fall to Feuerbach’s lot to do this. In spite of the “foundation”, he remained bound here by the traditional idealist fetters, a fact which he recognises in these words:

“Backwards I agree with the materialists, but not forwards.”

But it was Feuerbach himself who did not go “forwards” here, in the social domain, who did not get beyond his standpoint of 1840 or 1844. And this was again chiefly due to his reclusion, which compelled him—of all philosophers the most inclined to social intercourse—to produce thoughts out of his solitary head instead of in amicable and hostile encounters with other men of his calibre. Below we shall see in detail how much he remained an idealist in this sphere.

It need only be added here that Starcke looks for Feuerbach’s idealism in the wrong place.

“Feuerbach is an idealist; he believes in the progress of mankind” (p. 19). “The foundation, the substructure of the whole, remains nevertheless idealism. Realism for us is nothing more than a protection against aberrations, while we follow our
ideal trends. Are not compassion, love and enthusiasm for truth and justice ideal forces?” (p. VIII).

In the first place, idealism here means nothing but the pursuit of ideal goals. But these necessarily have to do with Kantian idealism at best, and its “categorical imperative”; however, Kant himself called his philosophy “transcendental idealism”; by no means because it dealt also with ethical ideals, but for quite other reasons, as Starcke will remember. The superstition that philosophical idealism revolves around a belief in ethical, that is, social, ideals, arose outside philosophy, among the German philistines, who learned by heart from Schiller’s poems the few morsels of philosophical culture they needed. No one has criticised more severely the impotent Kantian “categorical imperative”—impotent because it demands the impossible, and therefore never attains to any reality—no one has more cruelly derided the philistine passion for unrealisable ideals purveyed by Schiller than Hegel of all people, the perfect idealist (see, for example, his *Phänomenologie*).

In the second place, we simply cannot evade the fact that everything which motivates men must pass through their brains—even eating and drinking, which begins as a consequence of the sensation of hunger or thirst transmitted through the brain, and ends as a result of the sensation of satisfaction likewise transmitted through the brain. The influences of the external world upon man express themselves in his brain, are reflected therein as feelings, thoughts, impulses, volitions—in short, as “ideal tendencies”, and in this form become “ideal powers”. If, then, a man is to be deemed an idealist because he follows “ideal tendencies” and admits that “ideal powers” have an influence over him, then every person who is at all normally developed is a born idealist and how, in that case, can there be any materialists at all?

In the third place, the conviction that humanity, at least at the present moment, is moving on the whole in a progressive direction has absolutely nothing to do with the antagonism between materialism and idealism. The French materialists no less than the deists 241 Voltaire and Rousseau held this conviction to an almost fanatical degree, and often enough made the greatest personal sacrifices to it. If ever anybody dedicated his whole life to “enthusiasm for truth and justice”—using this phrase in the positive sense—it was Diderot, for instance. If, therefore, Starcke declares all this to be idealism, this merely proves that the word materialism, and the whole antagonism between the two trends, has lost all meaning for him here.

26*
The fact is that Starcke, although perhaps unconsciously, makes an unpardonable concession here to the traditional philistine prejudice against the word materialism resulting from its long-continued defamation by the priests. By the word materialism the philistine understands gluttony, drunkenness, lust of the eye, lust of the flesh, arrogance, cupidity, avarice, covetousness, profiteering and stock-exchange swindling—in short, all the filthy vices in which he himself indulges in private. By the word idealism he understands the belief in virtue, universal philanthropy and altogether a “better world”, of which he boasts to others but in which he himself believes at best only so long as he is having the blues or going through the bankruptcy consequent upon his customary “materialist” excesses. It is then that he sings his favourite song, What is man?—Half beast half angel.

For the rest, Starcke takes great pains to defend Feuerbach against the attacks and doctrines of the vociferous assistant professors who today go by the name of philosophers in Germany. For people who are interested in this afterbirth of classical German philosophy this is, of course, a matter of importance, for Starcke himself it may have appeared necessary. We will spare the reader this.

III

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

"The periods of humanity are distinguished only by religious changes. A historical movement is fundamental only when it is rooted in the hearts of men. The heart is not a form of religion, so that the latter should exist also in the heart; the heart is the essence of religion." (Quoted by Starcke, p. 168).a

According to Feuerbach, religion is the relation between human beings based on affection, on the heart, which relation until now has sought its truth in a fantastic mirror image of reality—in the mediation of one or many gods, the fantastic mirror images of human qualities—but now finds it directly and without any mediation in the love between “I” and “Thou”. Thus, in Feuerbach sex love ultimately becomes one of the highest forms, if not the highest form, of the practice of his new religion.

a L. Feuerbach, "Grundsätze der Philosophie. Notwendigkeit einer Veränderung".—Ed.
Now relations between human beings, based on affection, and especially between the two sexes, have existed as long as mankind. Sex love in particular has undergone a development and won a place during the last eight hundred years which has made it a compulsory pivot of all poetry during this period. The existing positive religions have limited themselves to the higher consecration of state-regulated sex love, that is, of the marriage laws, and they could all disappear tomorrow without changing in the slightest the practice of love and friendship. Thus the Christian religion in France, as a matter of fact, so completely disappeared in the years 1793-98 that even Napoleon could not re-introduce it without opposition and difficulty; and this without any need for a substitute, in Feuerbach’s sense, making itself felt in the interval.

Feuerbach’s idealism consists here in this: he does not simply accept people’s relations based on reciprocal inclination, such as sex love, friendship, compassion, self-sacrifice, etc., as what they are in themselves—without relating them back to a particular religion which to him, too, belongs to the past; but instead he asserts that they will attain their full value only when consecrated by the name of religion. The chief thing for him is not that these purely human relations exist, but that they shall be conceived of as the new, true religion. They are to have full value only after they have been marked with a religious stamp. Religion is derived from religare and meant originally a bond. Therefore, every bond between two people is a religion. Such etymological tricks are the last resort of idealist philosophy. Not what the word means according to the historical development of its actual use, but what it ought to mean according to its derivation, is what counts. And so sex love and sex bonds are apotheosised to a “religion”, merely in order that the word religion, which is so dear to idealist memories, may not disappear from the language. The Parisian reformers of the Louis Blanc trend used to speak in precisely the same way in the forties. They likewise were able to conceive of a man without religion only as a monster, and used to say to us: “Donc, l’athéisme c’est votre religion!”a If Feuerbach wishes to establish a true religion upon the basis of an essentially materialist conception of nature, that is the same as regarding modern chemistry as true alchemy. If religion can exist without its god, then alchemy can exist without its philosopher’s stone. By the way, there exists a very close connection between alchemy and religion. The philosopher’s stone has many godlike properties and the

---

a “Well, then atheism is your religion!”—Ed.
Egyptian-Greek alchemists of the first two centuries of our era had a hand in the development of Christian doctrines, as the facts given in Kopp and Berthelot have proved.\textsuperscript{a}

Decidedly false is Feuerbach's assertion that

"the periods of humanity are distinguished only by religious changes".

Great historical turning-points have been \textit{accompanied} by religious changes only so far as the three world religions which have existed up to the present, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam, are concerned.\textsuperscript{b} The old tribal and national religions, which arose spontaneously, did not proselytise and\textsuperscript{c} lost all their power of resistance as soon as the independence of the tribe or people was lost. For the Germans it was sufficient simply to have contact with the decaying Roman world empire and with its just adopted Christian world religion that accorded with its economic, political and ideological conditions. Only with these world religions, which arose more or less artificially, particularly Christianity and Islam, do we find that more general historical movements acquire a religious imprint. Even in regard to Christianity\textsuperscript{d} the religious stamp in revolutions of really universal significance is restricted to the first stages of the bourgeoisie's struggle for emancipation—from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century—and is to be accounted for not, as Feuerbach thinks, by the hearts of men and their religious needs, but by the entire previous history of the Middle Ages, which knew no other form of ideology than actual religion and theology. But when the bourgeoisie of the eighteenth century had strengthened enough to possess an ideology of its own, suited to its own class standpoint, it made its great and conclusive revolution, the French one, appealing exclusively to juristic and\textsuperscript{e} political ideas, and troubled itself with religion only in so far as it stood in its way. But it never occurred to it to put a new religion in place of the old one. Everyone knows how Robespierre failed in that.\textsuperscript{f}

\textsuperscript{a} See H. Kopp, \textit{Die Alchemie in älterer und neuerer Zeit} and M. Berthelot, \textit{Les origines de l'alchimie}.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} In the 1886 edition this sentence reads: "This holds good, even relatively, only so far as the three world religions which have existed up to the present, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam, are concerned—and only between them."—Ed.

\textsuperscript{c} The words "did not proselytise and" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{d} The words "in regard to Christianity" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{e} The words "juristic and" were added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{f} This sentence was added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
The possibility of purely human sentiments in our intercourse with other human beings has nowadays been sufficiently curtailed by the society in which we must live, which is based upon class antagonism and class rule. We have no reason to curtail it still more by exalting these sentiments to a religion. And similarly the understanding of the great historical class struggles has already been sufficiently obscured by current historiography, particularly in Germany, so that there is also no need for us to make such an understanding totally impossible by transforming the history of these struggles into a mere appendix of ecclesiastical history. Already here it becomes evident how far today we have moved beyond Feuerbach. His "finest passages" in glorification of this new religion of love are totally unreadable today.

The only religion which Feuerbach examines seriously is Christianity, the world religion of the Occident, based upon monotheism. He proves that the Christian God is only a fantastic reflection, a mirror image, of man. Now, this God is, however, himself the product of a protracted process of abstraction, the concentrated quintessence of the numerous earlier tribal and national gods. And accordingly man, whose image this God is, is also not a real man, but likewise the quintessence of the numerous real men, man in the abstract, therefore himself again a mental image. The same Feuerbach, who on every page preaches sensuousness, immersion in the concrete, in actuality, becomes thoroughly abstract as soon as he begins to talk of any other than mere sexual intercourse between human beings.

This intercourse presents him with only one aspect: morality. And here we are again struck by Feuerbach's astonishing poverty when compared with Hegel. The latter's ethics or doctrine of social ethics, is the philosophy of law and embraces: 1) abstract law; 2) morality; 3) social ethics under which again are comprised: the family, civil society and the state. Here the content is as realistic as the form is idealistic. Besides morality the whole sphere of law, economy, politics is included here. With Feuerbach it is just the reverse. In form he is realistic since he takes man as his point of departure; but there is absolutely no mention of the world in which this man lives; hence, this man remains always the same abstract man who occupied the field in the philosophy of religion. For this man is not born of woman; he emerged, as if from a chrysalis, from the god of the monotheistic religions. He therefore does not live in a real world historically come into being and historically determined. True, he has contact with other men; however, each one of them is just as much an abstraction as he...
himself. In the philosophy of religion we still had men and women at least, but in ethics even this last distinction disappears. Feuerbach, however, at long intervals makes such statements as:

"Man thinks differently in a palace and in a hut." a "If because of hunger, of misery, you have no stuff in your body, you likewise have no stuff for morality in your head, in your mind or heart." b "Politics must become our religion," c etc.

But Feuerbach knows absolutely nothing what to do with these maxims. They remain mere phrases, and even Starcke has to admit that for Feuerbach politics constituted an impassable frontier and the

"science of society, sociology, was terra incognita to him." d

He appears just as shallow, in comparison with Hegel, in his treatment of the antithesis of good and evil.

"One believes one is saying something great," Hegel remarks, "if one says that 'man is naturally good'. But one forgets that one says something far greater when one says 'man is naturally evil'." e

In Hegel evil is the form in which the motive force of historical development presents itself. Herein lies the twofold meaning that, on the one hand, each new advance necessarily appears as a heinous deed against what is sacred, as a rebellion against conditions, though old and moribund, yet sanctified by custom; and that, on the other hand, it is precisely the wicked passions of man—greed and lust for power—which, since the emergence of class antagonisms, have become levers of historical development—of which the history of feudalism and of the bourgeoisie, for example, constitutes singular continual proof. f But it does not occur to Feuerbach to investigate the historical role of moral evil. To him history is altogether an uncomfortable, uncanny domain. Even his dictum:

---

d C. N. Starcke, Ludwig Feuerbach, p. 280.— Ed.
e A summary of Hegel's ideas expressed mainly in his Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, §§ 18 and 139 and Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion, Part 3, II, 3.— Ed.
f The 1886 edition has "of which the history of feudalism and of the bourgeoisie provide the classical example".— Ed.
"Man as he sprang originally from nature was only a mere creature of nature, not man. Man is a product of man, of culture, of history"—with him even this dictum remains absolutely sterile.

What Feuerbach has to tell us about morality can, therefore, only be extremely meagre. The urge for bliss is innate in man, and must therefore form the basis of all morality. But the urge for bliss is subject to a double correction. First, by the natural consequences of our actions: after the intoxication comes the "hangover", and habitual excess is followed by illness. Second, by their social consequences: if we do not respect the same urge of other people for bliss they will defend themselves, and so interfere with our own urge for bliss. Consequently, in order to satisfy our urge, we must be in a position to correctly appreciate the results of our conduct and must likewise allow others an equal right to seek bliss. Rational self-restraint with regard to ourselves, and love—again and again love!—in our contact with others—these are the basic rules of Feuerbach’s morality; from them all others are derived. And neither the wisest utterances of Feuerbach nor the strongest eulogies of Starcké can hide the tenuity and banality of these few propositions.

Only very exceptionally, and by no means to his and other people’s profit, can an individual satisfy his urge for bliss by preoccupation with himself. Rather it requires preoccupation with the outside world, means to satisfy his needs, that is to say, food, an individual of the opposite sex, books, conversation, argument, activity, objects to use and work. Feuerbach’s morality either presupposes that these means and objects of satisfaction are given to every individual as a matter of course, or else it offers him only impracticable good advice and is, therefore, not worth a brass farthing to people who lack these means. And Feuerbach himself states this in plain terms:

"Man thinks differently in a palace and in a hut." "If because of hunger, of misery, you have no stuff in your body, you likewise have no stuff for morality in your head, in your mind or heart."

Do matters fare any better in regard to the equal right of others to satisfy their urge for bliss? Feuerbach poses this claim as absolute, as holding good for all times and circumstances. But since when has it been valid? Was there ever in antiquity between slaves and masters, or in the Middle Ages between serfs and barons, any talk about an equal right in the urge for bliss? Was not the urge for bliss of the oppressed class sacrificed ruthlessly

---

and "by right of law" to that of the ruling class?—Yes, that was indeed immoral; nowadays, however, equality of rights is recognised.—Recognised in words ever since and inasmuch as the bourgeoisie, in its fight against feudalism and in the development of capitalist production, was compelled to abolish all privileges of estate, that is, personal privileges, and to introduce the equality of all individuals before the law, first in the sphere of private law, then gradually also in the sphere of public law. But the urge for bliss lives only to a trivial extent on idealistic rights. To the greatest extent of all it lives on material means; and capitalist production takes care to ensure that the great majority of those with equal rights shall get only what is essential for bare existence. It scarcely has, therefore, more respect, if indeed at all, for the equal right to the urge for bliss of the majority than had slavery or serfdom. And are we better off in regard to the mental means of bliss, the educational means? Is not even "the school-master of Sadowa" 244 a mythical person?

More. According to Feuerbach's theory of morals the Stock Exchange is the highest temple of social ethics, provided only that one always speculates right. If my urge for bliss leads me to the Stock Exchange, and if there I correctly gauge the consequences of my actions so that only agreeable results and no disadvantages ensue, that is, if I always win, then I am fulfilling Feuerbach's precept. Moreover, I do not thereby interfere with the equal right of another person to pursue his bliss; for that other man went to the Exchange just as voluntarily as I did and in concluding the speculative transaction with me he has followed his urge for bliss as I have followed mine. If he loses his money, his action is ipso facto proved to have been unethical, because it was poorly calculated, and since I have given him the punishment he deserves, I can even slap my chest proudly, like a modern Rhadamanthus. Love, too, rules on the Stock Exchange, in so far as it is not simply a sentimental figure of speech, for each finds in others the satisfaction of his own urge for bliss, which is just what love ought to achieve and how it acts in practice. And if I gamble with correct prevision of the consequences of my operations, and therefore with success, I fulfil all the strictest injunctions of Feuerbachian morality—and become a rich man into the bargain. In other words, Feuerbach's morality is geared to contemporary capitalist society, little though Feuerbach himself might desire or imagine it.a

a This sentence was added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
But love!—yes, in Feuerbach love is everywhere and at all times the miracle-working god called on to help surmount all difficulties of practical life—and that in a society which is split into classes with diametrically opposite interests. At this point the last relic of its revolutionary character disappears from his philosophy, leaving only the old cant: Love one another—fall into each other’s arms without distinction as to sex or estate—a universal orgy of reconciliation!

In short, the Feuerbachian theory of morals fares like all its predecessors. It is designed to suit all times, all peoples and all conditions, and precisely for that reason it is never and nowhere applicable. Vis-à-vis the real world it remains as powerless as Kant’s categorical imperative. In reality every class, even every profession, has its own morality, and even this it violates whenever it can do so with impunity. And love, which is to unite all, manifests itself in wars, altercations, lawsuits, domestic broils, divorces and every possible exploitation of one by another.

Now how was it possible that the powerful impetus given by Feuerbach turned out to be so unfruitful for himself? For the simple reason that Feuerbach himself cannot find the way out of the realm of abstraction—for which he has a deadly hatred—into that of living reality. He clings fiercely to nature and man; but nature and man remain mere words to him. He is incapable of telling us anything definite either about real nature or real men. But from the abstract man of Feuerbach one arrives at real living men only when one considers them as participants in history. And that is what Feuerbach resisted, and therefore the year 1848, which he did not understand, meant to him merely the final break with the real world, withdrawal into solitude. The blame for this again falls chiefly on the conditions then obtaining in Germany, which condemned him to rot away miserably.

But the step which Feuerbach did not take had nevertheless to be taken. The cult of abstract man, which formed the kernel of Feuerbach’s new religion, had to be replaced by the science of real men and of their historical development. This further development of Feuerbach’s standpoint beyond Feuerbach was inaugurated by Marx in 1845 in *The Holy Family*.

IV

Strauss, Bauer, Stirner, Feuerbach—these were the offshoots of Hegelian philosophy, in so far as they did not abandon the field of
philosophy. Strauss, after his Leben Jesu and Dogmatik, produced only literary studies in philosophy and ecclesiastical history à la Renan. Bauer worked only in the field of the history of the origin of Christianity, though what he did here was important. Stirner remained an oddity, even after Bakunin blended him with Proudhon and labelled the blend "anarchism". Feuerbach alone was of significance as a philosopher. But not only did philosophy—claimed to soar above all individual sciences and to be the science of sciences, connecting them—remain to him an impassable barrier, an inviolable sacrament, but as a philosopher, too, he stopped halfway, was a materialist below and an idealist above. He could not cope with Hegel through criticism; he simply cast him aside as useless, while he himself, compared with the encyclopaedic wealth of the Hegelian system, achieved nothing positive beyond a bombastic religion of love and a meagre, impotent morality.

Out of the dissolution of the Hegelian school, however, there emerged still another tendency, the only one which has borne real fruit. And this tendency is essentially connected with the name of Marx.*

The departure from Hegelian philosophy was here too the result of a return to the materialist standpoint. That means it was resolved to comprehend the real world—nature and history—just as it presents itself to everyone who approaches it free from preconceived idealist quirks. It was decided mercilessly to sacrifice every idealist quirk which could not be brought into harmony with the facts conceived in their own, and not in a fantastic,

* Here I may be permitted to make a personal explanation. Lately repeated reference has been made to my share in this theory, and so I can hardly avoid saying a few words here to settle this point. I cannot deny that both before and during my forty years' collaboration with Marx I had a certain independent share in laying the foundations of the theory, and more particularly in its elaboration. But the greater part of its leading basic principles, especially in the realm of economics and history, and, above all, their final trenchant formulation, belongs to Marx. What I contributed—at any rate with the exception of my work in a few special fields—Marx could very well have done without me. What Marx accomplished I would not have achieved. Marx stood higher, saw further, and took a wider and quicker view than all the rest of us. Marx was a genius; we others were at best talented. Without him the theory would not be by far what it is today. It therefore rightly bears his name.

---

a A reference to the second part of D. Strauss' Die christliche Glaubenslehre... entitled Der materiale Inbegriff der christlichen Glaubenslehre (Dogmatik).—Ed.

b This sentence was added by Engels in the 1888 edition.—Ed.
interconnection. And materialism means nothing more than this. But here the materialistic world outlook was taken really seriously for the first time and was carried through consistently—at least in its basic features—in all relevant domains of knowledge.

Hegel was not simply put aside. On the contrary, his revolutionary side, described above, the dialectical method was taken up. But in its Hegelian form this method was no use. According to Hegel, dialectics is the self-development of the concept. The absolute concept does not only exist—unknown where—from eternity, it is also the actual living soul of the whole existing world. It develops into itself through all the preliminary stages which are treated at length in Logik and which are all included in it. Then it “alienates” itself by changing itself into nature, where, without consciousness of itself, disguised as the necessity of nature, it goes through a new development and finally comes again to self-consciousness in man. This self-consciousness then elaborates itself again in history from the crude form until finally the absolute concept again comes to itself completely in Hegelian philosophy. According to Hegel, therefore, the dialectical development apparent in nature and history, that is, the causal interconnection of the progressive movement from the lower to the higher, which asserts itself through all zigzag movements and temporary retrogressions, is only a copy of the self-movement of the concept going on from eternity, no one knows where, but at all events independently of any thinking human brain. This ideological perversion had to be done away with. We comprehended the concepts in our heads once more materialistically—as images of real things instead of regarding the real things as images of some or other stage of the absolute concept. Thus dialectics reduced itself to the science of the general laws of motion, both of the external world and of human thinking—two sets of laws which are identical in substance, but differ in their expression in so far as the human mind can apply them consciously, while in nature and also up to now for the most part in human history, these laws assert themselves unconsciously, in the form of external necessity, in the midst of an endless series of apparent accidents. Thereby the dialectic of concepts itself became merely the conscious reflection of the dialectical motion of the real world and thus the Hegelian dialectic was placed upon its head; or rather, turned off its head, on which it was standing, and placed upon its feet. And this materialist dialectic, which for years was our best means of labour and our sharpest weapon, was, remarkably enough, rediscovered not only
by us but also, independently of us and even of Hegel, by a German worker, Joseph Dietzgen.*

In this way, however, the revolutionary side of Hegelian philosophy was again taken up and at the same time freed from the idealist trimmings which with Hegel had prevented its consistent execution. The great basic thought that the world is not to be comprehended as a complex of ready-made things, but as a complex of processes, in which the apparently stable things, no less than their mental images in our heads, the concepts, go through uninterrupted change of coming into being and passing away, in which, for all apparent accidentality and despite all temporary retrogression, a progressive development asserts itself in the end—this great fundamental thought has, especially since the time of Hegel, so thoroughly permeated ordinary consciousness that in this generality it is now scarcely ever contradicted. But to acknowledge this fundamental thought in words and to apply it in reality in detail to each domain of investigation are two different things. If, however, investigation always proceeds from this standpoint, the demand for final solutions and eternal truth ceases once and for all; one is always conscious of the necessary limitation of all acquired knowledge, of the fact that it is conditioned by the circumstances in which it was acquired. On the other hand, one no longer permits oneself to be impressed by the antitheses, unsuperable for the still common old metaphysics, between true and false, good and bad, identical and different, necessary and accidental. One knows that these antitheses have only a relative validity; that that which is now recognised as true has also its hidden false side which will later manifest itself, just as that which is now recognised as false has also its true side by virtue of which it was previously regarded as true. One knows that what is maintained to be necessary is composed of sheer accidents and that the allegedly accidental is the form behind which necessity hides itself—and so on.

The old method of investigation and thinking which Hegel calls "metaphysical", which preferred to investigate things as given, as fixed and stable, a method the relics of which still strongly haunt people's minds, had a great deal of historical justification in its day. It was necessary first to examine things before it was possible to examine processes. One had first to know what any particular thing was before one could observe the changes it was undergoing. And such was the case with natural science. The old metaphysics,

* See Das Wesen der Kopfarbeit, von einem Handarbeiter, Hamburg, Meißner.
which accepted things as *faits accomplis*, arose from a natural science which investigated dead and living things as *faits accomplis*. But when this investigation had progressed so far that it became possible to take the decisive step forward, that is, to pass on to the systematic investigation of the changes which these things undergo in nature itself, then the death knell of the old metaphysics struck in the realm of philosophy too. And in fact, while natural science up to the end of the last century was predominantly a collecting science, a science of *faits accomplis*, in our century it is essentially a *systematising* science, a science of the processes, of the origin and development of these things and of the interconnection which binds all these natural processes into one great whole. Physiology, which investigates the processes occurring in plant and animal organisms; embryology, which deals with the development of individual organisms from germ to maturity; geology, which traces the gradual formation of the earth's surface—all these are the offspring of our century.

But, above all, there are three great discoveries which have advanced our knowledge of the interconnection of natural processes by leaps and bounds:

First, the discovery of the cell as the unit from whose multiplication and differentiation the whole plant and animal body develops, so that not only is the development and growth of all higher organisms recognised to proceed according to a single general law, but also, in the capacity of the cell to change, the way is pointed out by which organisms can change their species and thus go through a more than individual development.

Second, the transformation of energy, which has demonstrated to us that all the so-called forces operative in the first instance in inorganic nature—mechanical force and its complement, so-called potential energy, heat, radiation (light, or radiant heat), electricity, magnetism and chemical energy—are different forms of manifestation of universal motion, which pass into one another in definite proportions so that in place of a certain quantity of one which disappears, a certain quantity of another makes its appearance and thus the whole motion of nature is reduced to this incessant process of transformation from one form into another. Finally, the proof which Darwin first developed in coherent form that the stock of organic products of nature surrounding us today,
including man, is the product of a long process of evolution from a few originally unicellular germs, and that these in turn arose from protoplasm or albumen, which came into existence by chemical means.

Thanks to these three great discoveries and the other immense advances in natural science, we have now arrived at the point where we can demonstrate the interconnection between the processes in nature not only in particular spheres but also the interconnection of these particular spheres as a whole, and so can present in an approximately systematic form a clear picture of the coherence in nature by means of the facts provided by empirical natural science itself. To furnish this overall picture was formerly the task of so-called philosophy of nature. It could do this only by putting in place of the real but as yet unknown interconnections ideational, fancied ones, filling in the missing facts by mental images and bridging the actual gaps merely in imagination. In the course of this procedure it conceived many brilliant ideas and foreshadowed many later discoveries, but it also produced a considerable amount of nonsense, which indeed could not have been otherwise. Today, when one needs to comprehend the results of natural science only dialectically, that is, in the sense of their own interconnection, in order to arrive at a "system of nature" sufficient for our time; when the dialectical character of this interconnection is forcing itself against their will even into the metaphysically trained minds of the natural scientists, today the philosophy of nature is definitively discarded. Every attempt at resurrecting it would be not only superfluous but a step backwards.

But what is true of nature, which is hereby recognised also as a historical process of development, is likewise true of the history of society in all its branches and of the totality of all sciences which occupy themselves with things human (and divine). Here, too, the philosophy of history, of law, of religion, etc., has consisted in the substitution of an interconnection fabricated in the mind of the philosopher for the real interconnection demonstrable in events; has consisted in the comprehension of history as a whole, as well as in its separate parts, as the gradual implementation of ideas—and naturally always only the pet ideas of the philosopher himself. According to this, history worked unconsciously but of necessity towards a certain ideal goal set in advance—as, for example, in Hegel, towards the implementation of his absolute idea—and the unshakeable trend towards this absolute idea formed the inner interconnection of the events in history. A new mysterious providence—unconscious or gradually coming into
consciousness—was thus put in the place of the real, still unknown interconnection. Here, therefore, just as in the realm of nature, it was necessary to do away with these fabricated, artificial interconnections by the discovery of the real ones—a task which ultimately amounts to the discovery of the general laws of motion which assert themselves as the ruling ones in the history of human society.

In one point, however, the history of the development of society turns out to be essentially different from that of nature. In nature—in so far as we ignore man's reverse action upon nature—there are only blind, unconscious agencies acting upon one another, out of whose interplay the general law comes into operation. Of all that happens—whether in the innumerable apparent accidents observable upon the surface, or in the ultimate results which confirm the regularity inherent in these accidents—nothing happens as a consciously desired aim. In the history of society, on the contrary, the actors are all endowed with consciousness, are men acting with deliberation or passion, working towards definite goals; nothing happens without a deliberate intention, without a desired aim. But this distinction, important as it is for historical investigation, particularly of individual epochs and events, cannot alter the fact that the course of history is governed by innate general laws. For here, too, on the whole, in spite of the consciously desired aims of all individuals, accident apparently reigns on the surface. What is desired happens but rarely; in the majority of instances the numerous desired ends cross and conflict with one another, or these ends themselves are from the outset impracticable or the means of attaining them are insufficient. Thus the conflicts of innumerable individual wills and individual actions in the domain of history lead to a state of affairs quite similar to that prevailing in the realm of unconscious nature. The ends of the actions are desired, but the results which actually follow from these actions are not desired; or when they do seem to correspond to the desired end, they ultimately have consequences quite other than those desired. Historical events thus appear on the whole to be likewise governed by chance. But wherever on the surface chance holds sway, it is always governed by inner, hidden laws and these laws only have to be discovered.

Men make their own history, whatever its outcome may be, in that each person follows his own consciously desired end, and it is precisely the result of these many wills operating in different directions and of their manifold effects upon the world outside
that constitutes history. Thus it is also a question of what the many individuals desire. The will is determined by passion or deliberation. But the levers which immediately determine passion or deliberation are of very different kinds. In part they may be external objects, in part ideal motives, ambition, “enthusiasm for truth and justice”, personal hatred or even purely individual whims of all kinds. But, on the one hand, we have seen that the many individual wills active in history for the most part produce results quite other than those desired—often quite the opposite; that their motives, therefore, in relation to the total result are likewise of only secondary importance. On the other hand, the question also arises: What driving forces in turn stand behind these motives? What are the historical causes which transform themselves into these motives in the minds of the actors?

The old materialism never asked itself this question. Its conception of history, as far as it has one at all, is therefore essentially pragmatic; it judges everything according to the motives of the action; it divides men who act in history into noble and ignoble and then finds that as a rule the noble are defrauded and the ignoble are victorious. Hence, it follows for the old materialism that nothing very edifying is to be got from the study of history, and for us that in the realm of history the old materialism becomes untrue to itself because it takes the ideal driving forces which operate there as ultimate causes, instead of investigating what is behind them, what are the driving forces of these driving forces. The inconsistency does not lie in the fact that ideal driving forces are recognised, but in the investigation not being carried further back from these into their motive causes. On the other hand, the philosophy of history, particularly as represented by Hegel, recognises that the ostensible and also the actually operating motives of men who act in history are by no means the ultimate causes of historical events; that behind these motives are other motive powers, which have to be explored. But it does not seek these powers in history itself, it imports them rather from outside, from philosophical ideology, into history. Hegel, for example, instead of explaining the history of Ancient Greece out of its own inner coherence, simply maintains that it is nothing more than the bringing out of “forms of beautiful individuality”, the realisation of a “work of art” as such. He says much in this connection about the Ancient Greeks that is fine and profound,
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a G. W. F. Hegel, Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte, Zweiter Teil, Zweiter Abschnitt.—Ed.
but that does not prevent us today from refusing to be palmed off with such an explanation, which is mere empty talk.

When, therefore, it is a question of investigating the driving powers which—consciously or unconsciously, and indeed very often unconsciously—lie behind the motives of men who act in history and which constitute the real ultimate driving forces of history, then it is not a question so much of the motives of single individuals, however eminent, as of those motives which set in motion great masses, whole peoples, and again whole classes of the people in each people; and even this, not momentarily, giving rise to the transient flaring up of a straw-fire which quickly dies down, but to lasting action resulting in a great historical transformation. Ascertaining the driving causes which in this context, in the minds of the acting masses and their leaders—the so-called great men—are reflected as conscious motives, clearly or unclearly, directly or in ideological, even sanctified form—that is the only way which can put us on the track of the laws holding sway in history as a whole, as well as in particular periods and in particular countries. Everything which sets men in motion must pass through their minds; but what form it takes in the mind depends very much upon the circumstances. The workers have by no means become reconciled to capitalist machine industry now that they no longer simply break the machines to pieces, as they did as recently as 1848 on the Rhine.

But while in all earlier periods the investigation of these driving causes of history was almost impossible—on account of the complicated and concealed interconnections with their effects—our present period has so far simplified these interconnections that it has been possible to solve the riddle. Since the establishment of large-scale industry, that is, at least since the European peace of 1815, it has been no longer a secret to any man in England that the whole political struggle there turned on the claims to supremacy of two classes: the Landed Aristocracy and the bourgeoisie (Middle Class). In France, with the return of the Bourbons, the same fact was perceived, the historians of the Restoration period, from Thierry to Guizot, Mignet and Thiers, speak of it everywhere as the key to the understanding of French history since the Middle Ages. And since 1830 the working class, the proletariat, has been recognised in both countries as a third competitor for power. Conditions had become so simplified that
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*a In the original this English term is given in parentheses after its German equivalent.—Ed.
one would have had to close one's eyes deliberately not to see in the fight of these three great classes and in the conflict of their interests the driving force of modern history—at least in the two most advanced countries.

But how had these classes come into existence? If it was possible at first glance still to ascribe the origin of the large, formerly feudal landed property—at least in the first instance—to political causes, to seizure by force, this could not be done in regard to the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Here the origin and development of two great classes was seen to lie clearly and palpably in purely economic causes. And it was just as clear that in the struggle between landed proprietors and the bourgeoisie, no less than in the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the matter at issue was, first and foremost, economic interests, which were to be secured using political power merely as a means. Bourgeoisie and proletariat both arose in consequence of a change in the economic conditions, more precisely, in the mode of production. The transition, first from guild handicrafts to manufacture, and then from manufacture to large-scale industry with steam and mechanical power, had caused the development of these two classes. At a certain stage the new forces of production set in motion by the bourgeoisie—in the first place the division of labour and the combination of many workers performing individual operations in one manufactory handling all stages of production—and the conditions and requirements of exchange, developed through these forces of production, became incompatible with the existing order of production handed down through history and sanctified by law, that is to say, incompatible with the privileges of the guild and the numerous other personal and local privileges (which were just as numerous fetters for the unprivileged estates) of the feudal order of society. The forces of production represented by the bourgeoisie rebelled against the order of production represented by the feudal landlords and the guild-masters. The result is well known: the feudal fetters were smashed, gradually in England, at one blow in France. In Germany the process is not yet finished. But just as, at a definite stage of its development, manufacture came into conflict with the feudal order of production, so large-scale industry has even now come into conflict with the bourgeois order of production established in its place. Tied down by this order, by the narrow limits of the capitalist mode of production, this industry produces,
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on the one hand, an ever-increasing proletarianisation of the great mass of the people, and on the other hand, an ever greater volume of unsaleable products. Overproduction and mass destitution, each the cause of the other—that is the absurd contradiction which is its outcome, and which of necessity calls for the productive forces to be unfettered by means of a change in the mode of production.

In modern history at least it is, therefore, proved that all political struggles are class struggles, and all struggles by classes for emancipation, despite their necessarily political form—for every class struggle is a political struggle—a—turn ultimately on the question of economic emancipation. Therefore, here at least, the state—the political order—is the subordinate factor and civil society—the realm of economic relations—the decisive element. The traditional conception, to which Hegel, too, pays homage, saw in the state the determining element, and in civil society the element determined by it. Appearances correspond to this. As all the driving forces of the actions of any individual person must pass through his brain, and transform themselves into motives of his will in order to set him into action, so also all the needs of civil society—no matter which class happens to be the ruling one—must pass through the will of the state in order to attain general validity in the form of laws. That is the formal aspect of the matter which is self-evident. The question arises, however, as to the content of this merely formal will—of the individual as well as of the state—and whence this content is derived. Why is just this willed and not something else? If we enquire into this, we discover that in modern history the will of the state is, on the whole, determined by the changing needs of civil society, by the supremacy of this or that class, in the last resort, by the development of the productive forces and relations of exchange.

But if even in our modern era, with its gigantic means of production and communication, the state is not an independent domain with independent development, but one whose existence as well as development is to be explained in the last resort by the economic conditions of life of society, then this must be still more true of all earlier times when the production of the material life of man was not yet carried on with these abundant auxiliary aids, and when, therefore, the necessity of such production must have exercised a still greater rule over men. If the state even today, in the era of large-scale industry and railways, is on the whole only
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the reflection, in concentrated form, of the economic needs of the class controlling production, then this must have been much more the case in an epoch when each generation of men had to spend a far greater part of its aggregate lifetime satisfying its material needs, and was therefore much more dependent on them than we are today. An examination of the history of earlier periods, as soon as it deals seriously with this aspect, most abundantly confirms this. But, of course, this cannot be gone into here.

If the state and public law are determined by economic relations, so, too, of course is private law, which indeed in essence only sanctions the existing economic relations between individuals which are normal in the given circumstances. The form in which this occurs can, however, vary considerably. It is possible, as happened in England, in harmony with the whole of national development, to retain to a large extent the forms of the old feudal laws and give them a bourgeois content; in fact, directly reading a bourgeois meaning into the feudal name. But, also, as happened in continental Western Europe, Roman Law, the first world law of a commodity-producing society, with its unsurpassably fine elaboration of all the essential legal relations of simple commodity owners (of buyers and sellers, creditors and debtors, contracts, obligations, etc.), can be taken as the foundation. In which case, for the benefit of a still petty-bourgeois and semi-feudal society it can either be reduced to the level of such a society simply through judicial practice (common law) or else, with the help of allegedly enlightened, moralising jurists, it can be worked into a special code of law to correspond with such a social level—a code which in these circumstances will be a bad one even from the legal standpoint (for instance, Prussian common law). In which case, however, after a great bourgeois revolution, it is also possible to work out upon the basis of this same Roman Law such a classic legal code of bourgeois society as the French Code civil. If, therefore, bourgeois legal rules merely express the economic conditions of life in society in legal form, then they can do so well or badly according to circumstances.

The state presents itself to us as the first ideological power over man. Society creates for itself an organ for the safeguarding of its common interests against internal and external attacks. This organ is the state power. Hardly come into being, this organ makes itself independent vis-à-vis society; and, indeed, all the more so, the
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more it becomes the organ of a particular class, the more it directly enforces the rule of that class. The fight of the oppressed class against the ruling class necessarily becomes a political fight, a fight first of all against the political rule of this class. Consciousness of the connection between this political struggle and its economic foundation becomes dulled and can be lost altogether. While this is not wholly the case with the participants, it almost always happens with the historians. Of the ancient sources on the struggles within the Roman Republic only Appian tells us clearly and distinctly what was ultimately at issue—namely, landed property.\(^a\)

But once the state has become an independent power vis-à-vis society, it immediately produces a further\(^b\) ideology. It is among professional politicians, theorists of public law and jurists of private law that the connection with economic facts gets well and truly lost. Since in each particular case the economic facts must assume the form of juristic motives in order to receive legal sanction; and since, in so doing, consideration has, of course, to be given to the whole legal system already in operation, the juristic form is, in consequence, made everything and the economic content nothing. Public law and private law are treated as separate spheres, each having its own independent historical development, each being capable of, and needing, a systematic presentation by the consistent elimination of all innate contradictions.

Still higher ideologies, that is, such as are still further removed from the material, economic basis, take the form of philosophy and religion. Here the connection between conceptions and their material conditions of existence becomes more and more complicated, more and more obscured by intermediate links. But the connection exists. Just as the whole Renaissance period, from the middle of the fifteenth century, was an essential product of the towns and, therefore, of the burghers, so also was the subsequently newly awakened philosophy. Its content was in essence only the philosophical expression of the thoughts corresponding to the development of the small and middle burghers into a big bourgeoisie. Among the last century's Englishmen and Frenchmen who in many cases were just as much political economists as philosophers, this is clearly evident; and we have proved it above in regard to the Hegelian school.

Let us now in addition deal only briefly with religion, since this

\(^a\) See Appian of Alexandria, *The Roman History*, Books 13-17.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The 1886 edition has "another".—*Ed.*
stands furthest away from material life and seems to be most alien to it. Religion arose in very primitive times from erroneous, primitive conceptions by men about their own nature and external nature surrounding them. Every ideology, however, once it has arisen, develops in connection with the given concept-material, and develops this material further; otherwise it would not be an ideology, that is, occupation with thoughts as with independent entities, developing independently and subject only to their own laws. That the material conditions of life of the persons inside whose heads this thought process goes on in the last resort determine the course of this process remains of necessity unknown to these persons, for otherwise all ideology would be finished. These original religious notions, therefore, which in the main are common to each group of kindred peoples, develop, after the group separates, in a manner peculiar to each people, according to the conditions of life falling to their lot. For a number of groups of peoples, and particularly for the Aryans (so-called Indo-Europeans), this process has been demonstrated in detail by comparative mythology. The gods thus fashioned among each people were national gods, whose domain extended no farther than the national territory which they were to protect; on the other side of its frontiers other gods held undisputed sway. They could continue to exist, in the imagination, only as long as the nation existed; they fell with its fall. The Roman world empire, the economic conditions of whose origin we do not need to examine here, brought about this downfall of the old nationalities. The old national gods declined, even those of the Romans, which also were geared to suit only the narrow confines of the city of Rome. The need to complement the world empire by means of a world religion was clearly revealed in the attempts made to provide in Rome recognition and altars for all the foreign gods that were to the slightest degree respectable, alongside the indigenous ones. But a new world religion is not to be made in this fashion, by imperial decrees. The new world religion, Christianity, had already quietly come into being, out of a mixture of generalised Oriental, particularly Jewish, theology, and vulgarised Greek, particularly Stoic, philosophy. What it originally looked like has yet to be laboriously discovered, since its official form, as it has been handed down to us, is merely that in which it became the state religion, to which purpose it was adapted by the Council of Nicaea. The fact that it became the state religion in as little as 250 years suffices to show that it was the religion corresponding to the conditions of the time. In the Middle Ages,
in the same measure as feudalism developed, Christianity grew into its religious counterpart, with a corresponding feudal hierarchy. And when the burghers began to thrive, there developed, in opposition to feudal Catholicism, the Protestant heresy, which first appeared in Southern France, among the Albigenses, at the time the cities there were in their heyday. The Middle Ages had attached to theology all the other forms of ideology—philosophy, politics, jurisprudence—and made them subdivisions of theology. It thereby constrained every social and political movement to take on a theological form. The sentiments of the masses, fed exclusively on religion, had to have their own interests presented to them in a religious guise in order to create a great turbulence. And just as the burghers from the beginning produced an appendage of propertyless urban plebeians, day labourers and servants of all kinds, belonging to no recognised social estate, precursors of the later proletariat, so likewise a heresy soon became divided into a moderate burgher heresy and a revolutionary plebeian one, the latter an abomination even to the burgher heretics.

The ineradicableness of the Protestant heresy corresponded to the invincibility of the rising burghers. When these burghers had become sufficiently strengthened, their struggle against the feudal nobility, which till then had been predominately local, began to assume national dimensions. The first great campaign occurred in Germany—the so-called Reformation. The burghers were neither powerful enough nor sufficiently developed to be able to unite under their banner the remaining rebellious estates—the plebeians of the towns, the lower nobility and the peasants in the countryside. The nobles were the first to be defeated; the peasants rose in a revolt which formed the climax of the whole revolutionary movement; the cities left them in the lurch, and thus the revolution succumbed to the armies of the sovereigns, who swept the board. Thenceforward Germany disappears for three centuries from among the countries playing an independent active part in history. But beside the German Luther there had appeared the Frenchman Calvin. With true French acuity he put the bourgeois character of the Reformation in the forefront, republicanised and democratised the Church. While the Lutheran Reformation in Germany degenerated and reduced the country to rack and ruin, the Calvinist Reformation served as a banner for the republicans in Geneva, in Holland and in Scotland, freed
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Holland from Spain and from the German Empire and provided the ideological costume for the second act of the bourgeois revolution, which was taking place in England. Here Calvinism stood the test as the true religious disguise of the interests of the contemporary bourgeoisie and on this account did not attain full recognition when the revolution ended in 1689 in a compromise between part of the nobility and the bourgeoisie. The English Established Church was reconstituted; but not in its earlier form, as a Catholicism with the king for its pope, being, instead, strongly Calvinised. The old Established Church had celebrated the merry Catholic Sunday and had fought against the dull Calvinist one. The new, bourgeois Church introduced the latter, which adorns England to this day.

In France, the Calvinist minority was suppressed in 1685 and either Catholicised or driven out of the country. But what was the good? Already at that time the freethinker Pierre Bayle was hard at work, and in 1694 Voltaire was born. The forcible measures of Louis XIV only made it easier for the French bourgeoisie to carry through its revolution in the irreligious, exclusively political form which alone was suited to a developed bourgeoisie. Instead of Protestants, freethinkers took their seats in the national assemblies. Christianity had thus entered into its final stage. It had become incapable of continuing to serve any progressive class as the ideological garb of its aspirations. It became more and more the exclusive possession of the ruling classes and they use it as a mere means of government, to keep the lower classes within certain bounds. Moreover, each of the different classes uses its own appropriate religion: the landed Junkers—Catholic Jesuitism or Protestant orthodoxy; the liberal and radical bourgeoisie—rationalism; and it makes no difference whether these gentlemen themselves believe in their respective religions or not.

We see, therefore: religion, once formed, always contains traditional material, just as in all ideological domains tradition constitutes a great conservative force. But the changes which this material undergoes spring from class relations, that is to say, from the economic relations of the people who carry out these changes. And here that is sufficient.

In the above it could only be a question of giving a general outline of the Marxian conception of history, at most with a few illustrations as well. The proof must be derived from history itself; and in this regard I may be permitted to say that it has been sufficiently provided in other writings. This conception, however,
puts an end to philosophy in the realm of history, just as the
dialectical conception of nature makes all philosophy of nature as
unnecessary as it is impossible. It is no longer a question anywhere
of inventing interconnections from out of our brains, but of
discovering them in the facts. For philosophy, having been
expelled from nature and history, there remains only the realm of
pure thought, so far as anything is left of it: the theory of the laws
of the thought process itself, logic and dialectics.

* * *

With the revolution of 1848, "educated" Germany said farewell
to theory and went over to the field of practice. Small-scale
production and manufacture, based upon manual labour, were
superseded by real large-scale industry. Germany again appeared
on the world market. The new little German Empire abolished
at least the most flagrant of the abuses with which this
development had been obstructed by the system of petty states, the
relics of feudalism, and bureaucratic management. But to the
same degree that speculation abandoned the philosopher's study
in order to erect its temple in the Stock Exchange, educated
Germany lost the great aptitude for theory which had been the
glory of Germany in the days of its deepest political humiliation—
the aptitude for purely scientific investigation, irrespective of
whether the result obtained was applicable in practice or not,
advise to the police or not. Official German natural science, it is
true, kept abreast of the times, particularly in the field of
specialised research. But even the American journal Science rightly
remarks that the decisive advances in the sphere of the com-
prehensive correlation of particular facts and their generalisation
into laws are now being made much more in England, instead of
in Germany, as used to be the case. And in the sphere of the
historical sciences, philosophy included, the old reckless zeal for
theory has now well and truly disappeared, along with classical
philosophy. Inane eclecticism and an obsessive concern for career
and income, down to the most vulgar tuft-hunting, have taken its
place. The official representatives of these sciences have become the
undisguised ideologists of the bourgeoisie and the existing
state—but at a time when both stand in open antagonism to the
working class.

Only among the working class does the German aptitude for
theory remain unimpaired. Here it cannot be exterminated. Here
there is no concern for careers, for profiteering, or for gracious patronage from above. On the contrary, the more ruthlessly and disinterestedly science proceeds the more it finds itself in harmony with the interests and aspirations of the workers. The new tendency, which recognised that the key to the understanding of the whole history of society lies in the history of the development of labour, from the outset addressed itself preferentially to the working class and here found the response which it neither sought nor expected from official science. The German working-class movement is the heir to German classical philosophy.
The book which is herewith submitted to the English-speaking public in its own language, was written rather more than forty years ago. The author, at the 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. That it is now translated into English, is not in any way due to his initiative. Still he may be allowed to say a few words, "to show cause" why this translation should not be prevented from seeing the light of day.

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 recognized 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 characterize its early stages. The petitifogging 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 practiced 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 repeal of the Corn-laws,\textsuperscript{251} the discovery of the Californian and Australian gold-fields,\textsuperscript{252} the almost complete crushing-out of domestic handweaving in India, the increasing access to the Chinese market, the rapid multiplication of railways and steam-ships all over the world, and other minor causes have given to English manufacturing industry such a colossal development, 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 moralized. 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 practicing 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\textsuperscript{253} 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 favor of the giant-capitalist in his competition with his less favored 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 labor-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 labor 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 civilized society into a few 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 labor-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, small-pox 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" has disappeared and the "Seven Dials" 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. 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.

\footnote{See Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes. England and Wales. 1885.—Ed.}
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—-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; but 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 truck system in full blossom, and the cottage-system, in rural districts, made use of by the "bosses" as a means of domination over the workers. At this very moment I am receiving the American papers with accounts of the great strike of 12,000 Pennsylvanian coal-miners in the Connellsville district, and I seem but to read my own description of the North of England colliers' strike of 1844. The same cheating of the work-people 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.

There were two circumstances which for a long time prevented the unavoidable consequences of the Capitalist system from showing themselves in the full glare of day in America. These were the easy access to the ownership of cheap land, and the influx of immigration. They allowed, for many years, the great mass of the native American population to "retire" in early manhood from wage-labor and to become farmers, dealers, or employers of labor, while the hard work for wages, the position of a proletarian for life, mostly fell to the lot of immigrants. But America has outgrown this early stage. The boundless backwoods have disappeared, and the still more boundless prairies are fast and faster passing from the hands of the Nation and the States into those of private owners. The great safety-valve against the
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a See present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 579-80.—Ed.
formation of a permanent proletarian class has practically ceased to act. A class of life-long and even hereditary proletarians exists at this hour in America. A nation of sixty millions striving hard to become—and with every chance of success, too—the leading manufacturing nation of the world—such a nation cannot permanently import its own wage-working class; not even if immigrants pour in at the rate of half a million a year. The tendency of the Capitalist system towards the ultimate splitting-up of society into two classes, a few millionaires on the one hand, and a great mass of mere wage-workers on the other, this tendency, though constantly crossed and counteracted by other social agencies, works nowhere with greater force than in America; and the result has been the production of a class of native American wage-workers, who form, indeed, the aristocracy of the wage-working class as compared with the immigrants, but who become conscious more and more every day of their solidarity with the latter and who feel all the more acutely their present condemnation to life-long wage-toil, because they still remember the bygone days, when it was comparatively easy to rise to a higher social level. Accordingly the working class movement, in America, has started with truly American vigor, and as on that side of the Atlantic things march with at least double the European speed, we may yet live to see America take the lead in this respect too.

I have not attempted, in this translation, to bring the book up to date, 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 the translation came upon me too suddenly to admit of my undertaking such a work. And secondly, the first volume of "Das Kapital", by Karl Marx, an English translation of which is about to appear, 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 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, 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 stand-point" 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 sheeps' clothing.

The recurring period of the great industrial crises 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 revolutions 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 ardor 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 German 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." It gives at the same time a short outline of the history of the English working class during these forty years.

London, February 25, 1886

Frederick Engels


Reproduced from the book

---

See this volume, pp. 295-301.—*Ed.*
This evening, at the same time as you, and with you, the workers of the Two Worlds celebrate the anniversary of the most glorious and most tragic stage of proletarian evolution. In 1871, for the first time in its history, the working class seized political power in a major capital. It was, alas! but a dream. Caught between the mercenaries of the former French Empire on one side and the Prussians on the other, the Commune was soon strangled in an unparalleled massacre which will never be forgotten. Victorious, reaction knew no bounds; socialism seemed to have been drowned in blood, and the proletariat doomed to slavery forever.

Fifteen years have elapsed since that defeat. In all this time, in every country, the powers-that-be, in the service of the owners of land and capital, have not shunned any means to eradicate the last remaining intentions of working class revolt. And what have they achieved?

Look around you. Revolutionary working-class socialism, more alive than ever, is today a force before which governments everywhere tremble, the French radicals as well as Bismarck, the stock-exchange kings of America just as the Tsar of all the Russians.

That is not all.

We have arrived at the point where all our adversaries, whatever they do, are working for us in spite of themselves.

They believed they had killed the International. Yet at the present moment the international union of the proletariat, the revolutionary brotherhood between the workers of different countries, is a thousand times stronger, more widespread than it
was before the Commune. The International no longer needs an organisation in the proper sense; it lives and grows through the spontaneous and heartfelt cooperation of the workers of Europe and America.

In Germany Bismarck has exhausted every means, even the foulest, in order to crush the working-class movement. Result: before the Commune he was faced with four socialist deputies; his persecutions have led to the election of twenty-five today. And the German proletariat is laughing at the Grand Chancellor who could not have made better revolutionary propaganda if he were paid for it.

In France they have imposed on you voting by list, this bourgeois election method *par excellence*, deliberately invented to ensure the election of lawyers, journalists and other political adventurers, the spokesmen of capital. And what has it done for the bourgeoisie, this poll of the rich? It has created in the heart of the French parliament a revolutionary socialist workers' party whose mere appearance on the scene was sufficient to throw the ranks of all the bourgeois parties into disarray.

This is where we are now. Every event turns out in our favour. The most calculated measures to arrest the progress of the proletariat serve only to speed its victorious march. The enemy itself is fighting for us, is condemned to fight for us. And it has done so much and done it so well that on this day, the 18 March 1886, the same cry emerges from thousands of workers' throats, from the proletarian miners of California and Aveyron to the convict miners of Siberia:

"Long live the Commune! Long live the international union of workers!"

Written on March 15, 1886
First published in *Le Socialiste*, No. 31, March 27, 1886

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
As a report of an interview with me by one of its correspondents has appeared in the Missouri Republican, I have the following remarks to make:

It is true that Mr. McEnnis visited me as representative of this newspaper and put various questions to me, but promising on his honour not to send a line of it for print without first submitting it to me. Instead of doing that he never turned up again. I therefore declare herewith that I must refuse each and every responsibility for his publication, all the more so as I had the opportunity to satisfy myself that, because he lacked the necessary background knowledge, Mr. McEnnis, even with the best of wills, is hardly in a position to understand my statements correctly.

London

Frederick Engels

Written on April 29, 1886
First published in the New Yorker Volkszeitung, No. 162, July 8, 1886

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
The French Republican Government seem resolved to show in every possible way that they are quite as much the Government of the capitalists as any of their predecessors. Not content with siding with the Mining Company in Decazeville, they now come out even stronger in Lyons. There is a strike at a glass-works there; a few knobsticks continue working, and are lodged inside the works for safety's sake. When the furniture of one of them—a German anarchist of the name of Litner—was removed to the works, the strikers followed it, hooting. No sooner was the cart with the furniture inside and the gates closed, than shots were fired from the windows upon the people outside—revolver-bullets, and buckshot flying about in every direction, and wounding about thirty people. The crowd of course dispersed. Now the police and the judicial authorities interfered. But not to arrest the capitalist and his retainers who had fired—oh no! they arrested a number of the strikers for interfering with the freedom of labour! This affair coming on at this very moment, has caused immense excitement in Paris. Decazeville has swelled the Socialist votes in Paris from 30,000 to above 100,000, and the effect of this murderous affair on the La Malotier Gray at Lyons will be greater still.

F. E.

Written between May 8 and 14, 1886
First published in *The Commonweal*, No. 18, May 15, 1886

a Should read "La Mulatier".—Ed.
In March 1879\textsuperscript{a} Disraeli sent four armour-plated ships into the Bosporus; their presence alone was sufficient to halt the Russians' triumphal march on Constantinople and to break the Treaty of San Stefano. The Peace of Berlin regulated the situation in the Orient for some time.\textsuperscript{266} Bismarck managed to bring about an accord between the Russian Government and Austrian Government. Austria was to dominate behind the scenes in Serbia, whereas Bulgaria and Rumelia were to be abandoned to the overwhelming influence of Russia. This allowed one to predict that if, later on, Bismarck permitted the Russians to take Constantinople, he was reserving Salonica and Macedonia for Austria.

But what is more, Austria was given Bosnia too, just as in 1794 Russia had abandoned the greater part of Poland proper to the Prussians and Austrians, only to take it back in 1814.\textsuperscript{267} Bosnia was a permanent drain on Austria, a bone of contention between Hungary and Western Austria, and above all it was proof to Turkey that the Austrians, just like the Russians, were preparing for it the same fate that Poland had suffered. Henceforth Turkey could have no confidence in Austria: an important victory for Russian government policy.

Serbia had Slavophile, and hence Russophile, tendencies; but since its emancipation it has drawn all its means of bourgeois development from Austria. Young people go to study in the

\textsuperscript{a} Engels' letter has "winter of 1879". The erroneous date was preserved in the article. The English squadron entered the Sea of Marmara (not the Bosporus) in February 1878.—\textit{Ed.}
Austrian universities; the bureaucratic system, the code, the court procedure, the schools—everything has been copied from the Austrian models. It was natural. But Russia had to prevent this imitation in Bulgaria; it did not wish to pull Austria's chestnuts out of the fire. So Bulgaria was organised as a Russian satrapy. The administration, the officers and the non-commissioned officers, the staff, in fact the entire system were Russian: the Battenberg who was bestowed on it was the cousin of Alexander III.

The domination of the Russian Government, at first direct and then indirect, was sufficient to stifle in less than four years all Bulgarian sympathy for Russia, though it had been great and enthusiastic. The population grew increasingly fractious in the face of the insolence of their "liberators"; and even Battenberg, a man without any political ideas, with a pliant character, who sought merely to serve the Tsar but clamoured for esteem, became more and more intractable.

Meanwhile, things were developing in Russia: by taking severe action the government was able to disperse the Nihilists and break up their organisation for a time. But that was not enough, it needed some support in public opinion, it needed to turn minds away from the contemplation of the growing social and political ills at home; finally, what it needed was a little patriotic phantasmagoria. Under Napoleon III the left bank of the Rhine had served to deflect revolutionary passions towards the exterior; similarly, the Russian Government showed a troubled and restless people the conquest of Constantinople, the "deliverance" of Slavs oppressed by the Turks and their unification into one great federation under Russian tutelage. But it was not sufficient to evoke this phantasmagoria—it was necessary to do something to translate it into the sphere of reality.

Circumstances were favourable. The annexation of Alsace and Lorraine had sown seeds of discord between France and Germany which seemed bound to neutralise these two powers. Austria on her own could not stand up to Russia, because its most effective weapon, the appeal to the Poles, would always be held in the scabbard by Prussia. And the occupation, the theft, of Bosnia was an Alsace between Austria and Turkey. Italy was offered most, that is with regard to Russia, who offered it Trentino and Istria, along with Dalmatia and Tripoli. And England? The peace-loving Russophile Gladstone had listened to the tempting words of Russia; he had occupied Egypt, in a time of peace, which guaranteed England a perpetual quarrel with France and, in addition, ensured the impossibility of an alliance between the Turks
and the English, who had just robbed them by appropriating a Turkish fief, Egypt. Moreover, the Russian preparations in Asia were sufficiently far advanced to give the English plenty of trouble in the Indies in the event of war. Never before had the Russians been presented with so many chances: their diplomacy was triumphing all along the line.

The rebellion of the Bulgarians against Russian despotism provided the opportunity to enter into the fray. In the summer of 1885 they dangled before the eyes of the Bulgarians and the Rumelians the possibility of this union promised by the peace of San Stefano and destroyed by the Treaty of Berlin. They were told that if they threw themselves once again into the arms of Russia the liberator the Russian Government would fulfil its mission by bringing about this union; but to achieve this the Bulgarians had to start by chasing out Battenberg. The latter was warned in time; unusually for him he acted promptly and vigorously; he brought about, for his own ends, this union which Russia hoped to make against him. 270 From this moment there was relentless warfare between him and the Tsar.

To begin with, this war was waged slyly and indirectly. Louis Bonaparte's splendid doctrine, whereby when a hitherto scattered people such as Italy or Germany was united and attained nationhood, the other states such as France were entitled to territorial compensation, was revived for the small states of the Balkans. Serbia swallowed the bait and declared war on the Bulgarians; Russia triumphed by making this war, instigated in its own interests, appear in the eyes of the world to be under the auspices of Austria, who dared not prevent it for fear of seeing the Russian side coming to power in Serbia. For its part, Russia threw the Bulgarian army into confusion by recalling all the Russian officers, that is to say the entire general staff and all the senior officers, including the battalion commanders.

But contrary to all expectations the Bulgarians, without their Russian officers, and fighting two against three, beat the Serbs hands down and won the respect and admiration of an astonished Europe. These victories were due to two things. Firstly, Alexander of Battenberg, although a weak politician, is a good soldier; he waged the war as he had learnt from the Prussian school, while the Serbs followed the strategy and tactics of their Austrian models. So it was a second edition of the 1866 campaign in Bohemia. 271 Moreover, the Serbs had lived for sixty years under a bureaucratic Austrian regime which, without giving them a powerful bourgeoisie and an independent peasantry (the peasants
are already all mortgaged), had ruined and disorganised the remains of collectivism of the gens which had been their strength in their battles with the Turks. Amongst the Bulgarians, on the other hand, these primitive institutions had been left intact by the Turks—which explains their superior gallantry.

So, a further setback for the Russians; they had to begin from scratch. Slavophile chauvinism, stoked up as a counter-weight to the revolutionary element, was growing day by day and already becoming a threat to the government. The Tsar goes off to Crimea; and the Russian newspapers announce that he is about to do something great; he tries to attract the Sultan by showing him his old allies (Austria and England) betraying and despoiling him, with France following suit and at the mercy of Russia. But the Sultan turns a deaf ear and the enormous armaments of Western and Southern Russia remain idle for the time being.

The Tsar returns from Crimea (last June). But meanwhile the chauvinist tide rises, and the government, unable to repress this aggressive movement, is increasingly dragged along behind it; so much so that it is necessary to allow the mayor of Moscow\(^a\) to speak publicly about the conquest of Constantinople in his address to the Tsar.\(^b\) The press, under the influence and the protection of the generals, says openly that it expects from the Tsar an energetic operation against Austria and Germany, who are hindering him, and the government lacks the courage to silence it. Slavophile chauvinism is more powerful than the Tsar, he will have to give way\(^c\) for fear of revolution, the Slavophiles would ally with the constitutionalists, with the nihilists,\(^273\) and finally with all malcontents.

The dire financial plight complicates the situation. Nobody is willing to lend to this government which, from 1870 to 1875, borrowed 1 billion 750,000 francs from London and which threatens the peace of Europe. Two or three years ago Bismarck facilitated a loan of 375 million francs in Germany; but this has long since been swallowed up; and without Bismarck’s signature the Germans will not hand over a farthing. But this signature cannot be obtained without humiliating conditions. The manufacture of warrants at home has produced too much, the silver rouble

\(^a\) N. A. Alexeyev.—Ed.
\(^b\) See “Morning Post: Wednesday, May 14”, Novoye Vremya, No. 3666, May 15 (27), 1886.—Ed.
\(^c\) The rest of the paragraph is missing in Engels’ letter; instead it says: “or else—the Slavophiles would rebel”.—Ed.
is worth 4 frs, the paper rouble 2 frs 20. Armaments cost no end of money.

In the end it is necessary to act.—Success in the direction of Constantinople, or revolution.—Giers goes to see Bismarck and explains the situation to him; he understands it very well. Out of consideration for Austria he would have liked to hold back the government of the Tsar, whose insatiability worries him. But revolution in Russia means the fall of the Bismarck regime. Without Russia, the great reserve army of reaction, the domination by the Prussian squirearchy, would not last a single day. Revolution in Russia would change the situation in Germany immediately; it would destroy at a stroke this blind faith in Bismarck's omnipotence which secures him the cooperation of the ruling classes; it would bring revolution in Germany to a head.

Bismarck, who knows that the existence of Tsarism is the basis of his whole system, would hurry to Vienna to inform his friends that in the face of such danger it is no longer the time to dwell on questions of *amour-propre*; that it is necessary to allow the Tsar some semblance of triumph, and that it is in the interests of Austria and Germany, as they well realise, that they should bow before Russia. Moreover, if the Austrians insist on meddling in Bulgaria's affairs he would wash his hands of them; they would see what would happen. Kalnoky gives way, Alexander Battenberg is sacrificed, and Bismarck runs off to carry the news to Giers in person.

Unfortunately the Bulgarians display unexpected political skill and energy, intolerable in a Slav nation "delivered by holy Russia". Battenberg is arrested by night, but the Bulgarians arrest the conspirators, appoint a government that is capable, energetic and incorruptible, qualities completely intolerable in a nation that is scarcely liberated; they recall Battenberg; the latter displays all his spinelessness and takes flight. But the Bulgarians are incorrigible. With or without Battenberg they resist the sovereign orders of the Tsar and compel the heroic Kaulbars to make a fool of himself in front of the whole of Europe.²⁷⁴

Imagine the fury of the Tsar. Having forced Bismarck to submit, broken the Austrian resistance, he sees himself pulled up short by this tiny people of yesteryear which owes its "independence" to him or his father, and refuses to realise that this independence means nothing more than blind obedience to the orders of the "liberator". The Greeks and the Serbs were
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² Alexander II.—*Ed.*
ungrateful; but the Bulgarians are really overdoing it. Fancy taking their independence seriously! What a crime!

To save himself from revolution the poor Tsar is obliged to take another step forward. But every step becomes more dangerous, because it is only taken at the risk of a European war, which Russian diplomacy has always sought to avoid. It is certain that if there is direct intervention by the Russian government in Bulgaria and if it leads to further complications, the moment will come when the hostility between Russian and Austrian interests will break out into the open. It will then be impossible to localise the war—it will become general. Given the honesty of the rogues who govern Europe, it is impossible to predict how the two camps will form up. Bismarck is quite capable of siding with the Russians against the Austrians if he can see no other way of delaying the revolution in Russia. But it is more likely that if war breaks out between Russia and Austria, Germany will come to the aid of the latter in order to prevent its complete annihilation.

While waiting for spring, for the Russians will not be able to mount a major winter campaign on the Danube before April, the Tsar is working to lure the Turks into his net, and the treason of Austria and England towards Turkey are making the task easier for him. His goal is to occupy the Dardanelles and thus to transform the Black Sea into a Russian lake; to turn it into an inaccessible shelter for the organisation of powerful fleets which would emerge to dominate what Napoleon called a “French lake”, the Mediterranean. But he has not managed it yet, although his supporters in Sofia have betrayed his secret thought.

This is the situation. In order to escape a revolution in Russia the Tsar needs Constantinople; Bismarck hesitates, he would like to find the means to avoid one eventuality as well as the other.

* * *

And France?

The patriotic French, who have been dreaming of revenge for sixteen years, believe there is nothing more natural than to grasp any opportunity which may present itself. But for our party the matter is not so simple; nor is it any simpler for Messieurs the chauvinists. A war of revenge, conducted with the alliance and under the aegis of Russia, could lead to a revolution or a counter-revolution in France. In the eventuality of a revolution which brought the socialists to power, the Russian alliance would
collapse. First, the Russians would immediately make peace with Bismarck to fling themselves with the Germans on revolutionary France. Then France would not bring the socialists to power in order to prevent by a war a revolution in Russia. But this eventuality is hardly likely; the monarchist counter-revolution is more so. The Tsar wants the restoration of the Orléans, his intimate friends, the only government which offers him the conditions of a good and solid alliance. Once the war was under way, good use would be made of the monarchist officers to prepare it. At the slightest partial defeat, and there would be some, the cry would go up that it is the fault of the Republic, that in order to win victories and to obtain the full cooperation of Russia, a stable, monarchist government is needed, in other words Philippe VII\textsuperscript{a}; the monarchist generals would act feebly so as to be able to blame their lack of success on the Republican government; and there you are—the monarchy is back. With Philippe VII restored, the kings and emperors will reach immediate agreement and instead of devouring one another they will divide Europe up, swallowing the small states. With the French Republic dead, a new congress of Vienna would be held where, perhaps, the sins of the French republicans and socialists would be used as a pretext to deny France Alsace-Lorraine, either in part or entirely; and the princes would mock the republicans for having been so naive as to believe in the possibility of a true alliance between Tsarism and the Republic.

Moreover, is it true that General Boulanger is saying to anyone who will listen to him, “A war is necessary to prevent the social revolution”? If it is true, may it serve as a warning to the socialist party. This fine Boulanger has boastful airs, for which as a soldier he may be forgiven, but they give a poor idea of his political sense. He is not the one who will save the Republic. Between the socialists and the Orleanists\textsuperscript{275} it is possible that he will reach an arrangement with the latter if they assure him of the Russian alliance. In any case, the bourgeois republicans in France are in the same position as the Tsar; they see the spectre of social revolution looming up ahead of them, and they know but one means of salvation: war.

In France, Russia and Germany events are turning out so well for us that, for the time being, we can only desire the continuation of the status quo. If revolution broke out in Russia it would create a set of most favourable conditions. A general war would, on the other hand, propel us into the realm of the unforeseen. Revolution in Russia and Germany would be delayed; our party in

\textsuperscript{a} Louis Philippe Albert d’Orléans, count of Paris.—\textit{Ed.}
Germany would meet the fate of the Commune of 1871. Without a doubt events will finish by turning in our favour; but what a waste of time, what sacrifices, what new obstacles to surmount.

The forces in Europe which are pushing towards a war are powerful. The Prussian military system, adopted everywhere, requires twelve to sixteen years for its complete development; after this interval the reserve lists are filled with men who are experienced in handling arms. These twelve to sixteen years have elapsed everywhere; everywhere there are twelve to sixteen year groups which have passed through the army. So everywhere people are ready, and the Germans have no special advantage on their side. That is to say: this war which is threatening us would throw ten million soldiers into the field of battle. And old William is probably going to die. Bismarck will see his position shaken, more or less, and perhaps he will push for war as a means of hanging on. Indeed, the Stock Exchange everywhere believes in war as soon as the old man has breathed his last.

If there is a war, it will be with the sole aim of preventing revolution: in Russia to forestall the common action of all the malcontents, Slavophiles, constitutionalists, nihilists, peasants; in Germany to keep Bismarck in office; in France to drive back the victorious movement of the socialists and restore the monarchy.

Between French socialists and German socialists there is no Alsace question. The German socialists know only too well that the annexations of 1871, against which they have always protested, have been the main focus of Bismarck's reactionary politics, both at home and abroad. The socialists of the two countries have an equal interest in preserving the peace; it is they who will pay all the costs of the war.

F. Engels

Written on October 25, 1886
First published in Le Socialiste, No. 63, November 6, 1886
Death has torn another hole in the ranks of the champions of the proletarian revolution. Johann Philipp Becker died in Geneva on December 7.

Born at Frankenthal in the Bavarian Palatinate in 1809, he took part in the political movement of his native region back in the 1820s, when little more than a child. When this movement became republican in character in the early 1830s, after the July Revolution, Becker was one of its most active and stalwart supporters. Several times arrested, brought before a jury and acquitted, when reaction triumphed he eventually had to flee. He went to Switzerland, settled in Biel and took Swiss citizenship. He did not remain idle there, either. He was involved not only in the affairs of the German workingmen's associations and the revolutionary endeavours of the German, Italian and European refugees in general, but also in the struggle of the Swiss democrats for control of the individual cantons. It will be recalled that this struggle was waged by means of a series of armed raids on the aristocratic and clerical cantons, particularly in the early 1840s. Becker was implicated to a greater or lesser extent in most of these "coup s" and was finally sentenced to ten years' banishment from his home canton of Berne on this account. These minor campaigns eventually culminated in the Sonderbund War of 1847. Becker, who was an officer in the Swiss Army, took up his post and, during the march on Lucerne, led the advance guard of the division to which he was assigned.

The February Revolution of 1848 broke out; there ensued attempts to republicnise Baden by means of campaigns by volunteer corps. When Hecker launched his campaign, Becker
formed a refugees legion but was not able to get to the border until Hecker had already been pushed back. This legion, most members of which were subsequently interned in France, provided the nucleus for some of the best units in the armies of the Palatinate and Baden in 1849.

When the republic was proclaimed in Rome in the spring of 1849, Becker sought to form an auxiliary corps from this legion to fight on the side of Rome. He went to Marseilles, set up the officer cadre and took steps to gather together the troops. But, as we well know, the French Government was preparing to suppress the Roman republic and bring back the Pope. It went without saying that the French Government prevented the auxiliaries from coming to the aid of its Roman adversaries. Becker, who had already hired a ship, was informed in no uncertain terms that she would be sent to the bottom as soon as she made any move to leave harbour.

Revolution then broke out in Germany. Becker immediately hurried to Karlsruhe; the legion followed, and later took part in the struggle under Böning’s leadership, while another section of the old legion of 1848, trained by Willich in Besançon, formed the nucleus of Willich’s voluntary corps. Becker was appointed head of the entire Baden people’s militia, that is to say, all troops except troops of the line, and at once set about organising it. He immediately came up against the government, which was dominated by the reactionary bourgeoisie, and its leader, Brentano. His orders were countermanded, his requests for arms and equipment left unheeded or turned down flat. The attempt on June 6 to intimidate the government by a show of revolutionary armed strength, an attempt in which Becker was a major participant, proved indecisive; but Becker and his troops were then sent post-haste from Karlsruhe to the Neckar to face the enemy.

There the battle had already started in a small way, and the decisive moment was rapidly approaching. With his volunteers and militiamen, Becker occupied the Odenwald forest. Without artillery and cavalry he was obliged to waste his few troops holding this extensive and awkward area, and not enough was left at his disposal to mount an attack. Nonetheless, on June 15 he relieved, in a brilliantly fought action, his Hanau Gymnasts, who had been surrounded in Hirschhorn Castle by Peucker’s imperial troops.

---

29-1243

---

a Pius IX.— Ed.
When Mieroslawski became commander-in-chief of the revolutionary army, Becker was given command of the 5th Division—nothing but militiamen and infantry—with orders to resist Peucker's corps, which outnumbered Becker's division by at least 6 to 1. But shortly afterwards came the crossing of the Rhine by the first Prussian corps at Germersheim, Mieroslawski's countermove and the defeat at Waghäusel on June 21. Becker occupied Heidelberg; the second Prussian corps under Gröben advanced from the north, from the northeast came Peucker's corps, each more than 20,000 strong, while to the southwest were Hirschfeld's Prussians, likewise more than 20,000 strong. And then the refugees from Waghäusel—the entire Baden army, both troops of the line and militiamen—poured into Heidelberg to make an enormous detour through the mountains and rejoin the road to Karlsruhe and Rastatt, which was blocked to them in the plain.

Becker was supposed to cover this retreat—with his newly recruited, untrained troops and as usual without cavalry or artillery. At 8 p.m. on the 22nd, after allowing the refugees an adequate start, he marched from Heidelberg to Neckargemünd, where he rested for a few hours. Arriving on the 23rd at Sinsheim, where he again gave his troops a few hours' rest in battle formation in the face of the enemy, he reached Eppingen the same evening, and on the 24th he marched via Bretten to Durlach, arriving at 8 p.m. only to become tangled up again in the disorderly retreat of the now united Palatinate-Baden army. Here Becker was also given command of the remnants of the Palatinate troops, and was now expected not only to cover Mieroslawski's retreat but also to hold Durlach long enough for Karlsruhe to be evacuated. As always, he was again left without any artillery, since the artillery assigned to him had already marched off.

Becker hastily fortified Durlach as well as he could, and was attacked the very next morning (June 25) on three sides by two Prussian divisions and Peucker's imperial troops. He not only repulsed all the attacks but also launched several counter-attacks, although he had only small arms to pit against the enemy's artillery fire, and after four hours' fighting withdrew in perfect order, unchecked by the columns despatched to outflank him, after receiving word that Karlsruhe had been evacuated and his mission accomplished.

This must be the most brilliant episode in the entire Baden-Palatinate campaign. With men most of whom had only been in the army for 2-3 weeks and who as completely raw recruits had
been given a perfunctory training by improvised officers and NCOs and hardly had a trace of discipline, Becker carried out, as the rearguard of the beaten and half-dispersed armies, a march of more than 80 kilometres (or 11 German miles\textsuperscript{a}) in 48 hours, starting straight away with a night march, bringing them right through the enemy to Durlach in a fit state to offer the Prussians, the next morning, one of the few engagements of the campaign in which the battle objective of the revolutionary army was achieved in full. It was an achievement that would do credit to experienced troops and in the case of such young soldiers is extremely rare and praiseworthy.

Having reached the Murg, Becker came to a halt with his division east of Rastatt and played an honourable part in the battles of June 29 and 30. The outcome is well known: the enemy, six times superior in strength, marched round the position through the territory of Württemberg and then rolled it back from the right flank. The campaign was now formally settled and ended of necessity with the withdrawal of the revolutionary army to Swiss territory.

Until then Becker had acted basically as an ordinary democratic republican; but from now on he went considerably further. Closer acquaintance with the German “pure republicans”, particularly the south German ones, and his experience in the 1849 revolution demonstrated to him that the matter would have to be tackled differently in future. The strong proletarian sympathies that Becker had entertained since his youth now assumed a more tangible form; he had realised that while the bourgeoisie always formed the core of the reactionary parties, only the proletariat could form the core of a genuinely revolutionary force. The communist by sentiment became a conscious communist.

Once again he attempted to set up a voluntary corps; it was in 1860, after Garibaldi’s victorious march on Sicily. He travelled from Geneva to Genoa to make the preparations in collaboration with Garibaldi. But Garibaldi’s rapid progress and the intervention of the Italian Army, which was to secure the fruits of victory for the monarchy, brought the campaign to an end. Meanwhile, there were widespread expectations of another war with Austria next year. It is common knowledge that Russia sought to use Louis Napoleon and Italy to consummate the Russian revenge on Austria, which had remained incomplete in 1859. The Italian Government sent a high-ranking officer from the general staff to

\textsuperscript{a} The German geographical mile=7.42 km.—Ed.
see Becker in Genoa, offering him the rank of colonel in the Italian Army, a splendid salary and an allowance, and command over a legion to be formed by him in the war that was expected, provided he agreed to make propaganda in Germany for Italy and against Austria. But the proletarian Becker turned the offer down; the service of princes was not for him.

That was his last attempt as a volunteer. Soon after, the International Workingmen’s Association was established, and Becker was among its founders; he was present at the famous meeting in St. Martin’s Hall that saw the birth of the International.\textsuperscript{282} He organised the German and native workers of Romance Switzerland, founded the \textit{Vorbote} as the group’s journal, attended all the congresses of the International and was in the vanguard of the struggle against the Bakuninist anarchists of the Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste\textsuperscript{283} and the Swiss Jura.

After the disintegration of the International there was less opportunity for Becker to play a public role. But he always remained, nevertheless, in the midst of the working-class movement and continued to exert his influence on its development through his extensive correspondence and by virtue of the many visits he received in Geneva. In 1882 he played host to Marx for a day, and as recently as this September the 77-year-old undertook a journey through the Palatinate and Belgium to London and Paris, during which I had the pleasure of having him to stay for a fortnight and talking over old times and new with him. And scarcely two months later the telegraph brings news of his death!

Becker was a rare kind of man. He can be epitomised in a nutshell: \textit{hale and hearty}. In body and mind he was hale and hearty to the end. A giant of a man, of tremendous physical strength and handsome with it, he had developed his untutored, but far from uncultivated mind, thanks to a fortunate disposition and healthy activity, as harmoniously as his body. He was one of the few men who, to do the right thing, only need to follow their own instinct. That was why it was so easy for him to keep pace with every development in the revolutionary movement and to stand in the front rank in his seventy-eighth year as fresh as when he was eighteen. The boy who had played with cossacks passing through in 1814 and seen Sand (who stabbed Kotzebue to death) executed in 1820, advanced further and further from the vague oppositional figure of the 1820s and was still fully abreast of the movement in 1886. Yet he was no gloomy timeserver like most of the “serrrious” republicans of 1848, but a true son of the gay Palatinate, full of life and as fond of wine, women and song as the
next man. Having grown up in the land of the *Nibelungenlied*\(^{284}\) around Worms, he still looked like one of the figures from our old epic, even in old age: light-hearted yet sardonic, calling to his opponent between sword blows, composing popular ballads if there was no one to beat—this, and no other ways, is how Volker the Fiddler must have looked!

But his greatest talent was undoubtedly military. In Baden he accomplished much more than anyone else. While the other officers, raised in the school of standing armies, found outlandish, almost unmanageable soldier material here, Becker had learned all his organisational skill, tactics and strategy in the outrageous school of the Swiss militia. A people's army was nothing strange to him, its inevitable shortcomings nothing new. Where others despaired or raged, Becker remained calm and found one solution after another; he knew how to handle his men, cheering them up with a jest, and finally had them in his hand. Many a Prussian general of 1870 might envy him the march from Heidelberg to Durlach with a division of almost nothing but untrained recruits, who still remained capable of going straight into battle and giving a good account of themselves. And in the same engagement he threw into battle the hitherto intractable Palatinate troops that had been assigned to him, and even got them to attack in open country. In Becker we have lost the only German revolutionary general we had.

He was a man who took part, with distinction, in the freedom struggles of three generations.

But the workers will honour his memory as one of their best!

London, December 9, 1886

*Frederick Engels*

First published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, No. 51, December 17, 1886

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English in full for the first time
The following work is a reprint of three articles which I wrote in 1872 for the Leipzig Volksstaat. Just at that time the French milliards came pouring down on Germany; public debts were paid off, fortresses and barracks built, stocks of weapons and war matériel renewed; the available capital no less than the volume of money in circulation was suddenly enormously increased, and all this just at a time when Germany was entering the world arena not only as a "united empire", but also as a great industrial country. These milliards lent young large-scale industry a powerful upswing, and it was they above all that brought about the short period of prosperity, rich in illusions, which followed the war, and immediately afterwards, in 1873-74 the great crash by which Germany proved itself to be an industrial country capable of holding its own on the world market.

The period in which an old civilised country makes such a transition from manufacture and small-scale production to large-scale industry, a transition, moreover, accelerated by such favourable circumstances, is at the same time predominantly a period of "housing shortage". On the one hand, masses of rural workers are suddenly drawn into the big towns, which develop into industrial centres; on the other hand, the concept applied in building these older towns no longer accords with the conditions needed for the new large-scale industry and the corresponding traffic; streets are widened and new ones cut through, and railways are run right across them. At the very time when workers are streaming into the towns in masses, workers' dwellings are pulled down wholesale.

a See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 317-91.—Ed.
Hence the sudden housing shortage for the workers and for the small traders and small manufacturing businesses, which depend on the workers for their custom. In towns which grew up from the outset as industrial centres, this housing shortage is as good as unknown; for instance, Manchester, Leeds, Bradford, Barmen-Elberfeld. On the other hand, in London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna it took on an acute form at the time, and has, for the most part, continued to exist in a chronic form.

It was therefore precisely this acute housing shortage, this symptom of the industrial revolution taking place in Germany, which filled the press of the day with treatises on the "housing question" and gave rise to all sorts of social quackery. A series of such articles also found their way into the Volksstaat. The anonymous author, who revealed himself later on as A. Mülberger, M. D. of Württemberg, considered the opportunity a favourable one for enlightening the German workers, by means of this question, on the miraculous effects of Proudhon's social panacea.\(^a\) When I expressed my astonishment to the editors at the acceptance of these peculiar articles, I was challenged to answer them, and this I did (see Part I: How Proudhon Solves the Housing Question). This series of articles was soon followed by a second series, in which I examined the philanthropic bourgeois view of the question, on the basis of a work by Dr. Emil Sax \(^b\) (Part II: How the Bourgeoisie Solves the Housing Question). After a rather long pause Dr. Mülberger did me the honour of replying to my articles,\(^c\) and this compelled me to make a rejoinder (Part III: Supplement on Proudhon and the Housing Question), whereby both the polemic and also my special occupation with this question came to an end. That is the genesis of these three series of articles, which have also appeared as a separate reprint in pamphlet form. The fact that a new reprint has now become necessary I owe undoubtedly to the benevolent solicitude of the German imperial government which, by prohibiting the work, tremendously increased its sale, as usual, and I hereby take this opportunity of expressing my respectful thanks to it.\(^286\)

I have revised the text for this new edition, inserted a few additions and notes, and have corrected a small economic error in

\(^a\) [A. Mülberger,] "Die Wohnungsfrage", Der Volksstaat, Nos 10-13, 15, 19, February 3, 7, 10, 14, 21 and March 6, 1872.—Ed.
\(^b\) E. Sax, Die Wohnungszustände der arbeitenden Classen und ihre Reform, Vienna, 1869.—Ed.
\(^c\) A. Mülberger, "Zur Wohnungsfrage (Antwort an Friedrich Engels von A. Mülberger)", Der Volksstaat, No. 86, October 26, 1872.—Ed.
the first part, as my opponent, Dr. Mülberger, unfortunately failed to discover it.

During this revision it came home to me what gigantic progress the international working-class movement has made during the past fourteen years. At that time it was still a fact that "for twenty years the workers speaking Romance languages have had no other mental pabulum than the works of Proudhon" and at a pinch, the still more one-sided version of Proudhonism presented by the father of "anarchism", Bakunin, who regarded Proudhon as "the schoolmaster of us all", notre maître à nous tous. Although the Proudhonists in France were only a small sect among the workers, they were still the only ones who had a definitely formulated programme and who under the Commune were able to take over the leadership in the economic field. In Belgium, Proudhonism reigned unchallenged among the Walloon workers, and in Spain and Italy, with a few isolated exceptions, everything in the working-class movement which was not anarchist was decidedly Proudhonist. And today? In France, Proudhon has been completely discarded among the workers and retains supporters only among the radical bourgeois and petty bourgeois, who as Proudhonists also call themselves "socialists", but against whom the most energetic fight is carried on by the socialist workers. In Belgium, the Flemings have ousted the Walloons from the leadership of the movement, deposed Proudhonism and greatly raised the level of the movement. In Spain, as in Italy, the anarchist high tide of the seventies has receded and washed away with it the remnants of Proudhonism. While in Italy the new party is still in process of clarification and formation, in Spain the small nucleus, which as the Nueva Federación Madrileña remained loyal to the General Council of the International, has developed into a strong party, which—as can be seen from the republican press itself—is destroying the influence of the bourgeois republicans on the workers far more effectively than its noisy anarchist predecessors were ever able to do. Among Latin workers the forgotten works of Proudhon have been replaced by Capital, the Communist Manifesto and a number of other works of the Marxian school, and Marx's main demand—the seizure of all the means of production in the name of society by a proletariat risen to absolute political power—is now the demand of the whole revolutionary working class in the Latin countries as well.

---

a See present edition, Vol. 23, p. 334.—Ed.
b Ibid., p. 369.—Ed.
If therefore Proudhonism has been finally supplanted among the workers of the Latin countries as well, if it—in accordance with its real destination—only serves French, Spanish, Italian and Belgian bourgeois radicals as an expression of their bourgeois and petty-bourgeois cravings, why then return to it today? Why combat anew a dead opponent by reprinting these articles?

First of all, because these articles do not confine themselves to a mere polemic against Proudhon and his German deputies. As a consequence of the division of labour that existed between Marx and myself, it fell to me to present our views in the periodical press, and, therefore, particularly in the fight against opposing views, in order that Marx should have time for the elaboration of his great main work. This made it necessary for me to present our views for the most part in a polemical form, in opposition to other views. Here too. Parts One and Three contain not only a critique of the Proudhonist conception of the question, but also a presentation of our own conception.

Secondly, Proudhon played much too significant a role in the history of the European working-class movement for him to fall into oblivion without more ado. Refuted theoretically and discarded practically, he remains of historical interest. Anyone who occupies himself in any detail with modern socialism must also acquaint himself with the “surmounted standpoints” of the movement. Marx’s *Poverty of Philosophy* appeared several years before Proudhon put forward his practical proposals for social reform. Here Marx could only discover in embryo and criticise Proudhon’s exchange bank. From this angle, therefore, his work is supplemented by the present one, imperfectly enough, sad to say. Marx would have done it all much better and far more convincingly.

And finally, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois socialism is strongly represented in Germany down to this very hour. On the one hand, by armchair socialists and philanthropists of all sorts, among whom the wish to turn the workers into owners of their dwellings still plays a great role and with regard to whom, therefore, my work is still appropriate. On the other hand, a certain petty-bourgeois socialism finds representation in the Social-Democratic Party itself, and even in the ranks of the Reichstag group. This is done in the following way: while the fundamental views of modern socialism and the demand for the transformation of all the means of production into social property are recognised as justified, their accomplishment is declared possible only in the distant, and for all practical purposes,
unforeseeable future. Thus, for the present one has to rely on mere social patchwork, and sympathy can be shown, according to circumstances, even with the most reactionary efforts for what is known as the “uplifting of the labouring class”. The existence of such a tendency is quite inevitable in Germany, the land of philistinism par excellence, particularly at a time when industrial development is uprooting this deeply rooted philistinism forcibly and on a mass scale. The tendency is quite harmless to the movement, in view of the wonderful common sense of our workers, which has stood the test so magnificently precisely during the past eight years of struggle against the Anti-Socialist Law, the police and the judges. But it is necessary clearly to realise that such a tendency exists. And if this tendency subsequently takes on a firmer shape and more defined contours, as is necessary and even desirable, it will have to go back to its predecessors for the formulation of its programme, and in doing so it will hardly be able to overlook Proudhon.

The essence of both the big-bourgeois and petty-bourgeois solutions of the “housing question” is that the worker should own his dwelling. However, this is a point which has been shown in a very peculiar light by the industrial development of Germany during the past twenty years. In no other country do there exist so many wage labourers who own not only their dwellings but also a garden or field as well. Besides these there are numerous others who hold house and garden or field as tenants, having in fact fairly secure possession. Rural domestic industry combined with gardening or small-scale agriculture forms the broad basis of Germany’s new large-scale industry. In the West the workers are for the most part owners, in the East chiefly tenants, of their homesteads. We find this combination of domestic industry with gardening and agriculture, and therefore with a secure dwelling, not only wherever hand weaving still fights against the mechanical loom: in the Lower Rhineland and in Westphalia, in the Saxon Erzgebirge and in Silesia, but also wherever domestic industry of any sort has established itself as a rural occupation, as, for instance, in the Thuringian Forest and in the Rhön area. At the time of the discussion of the tobacco monopoly, it was revealed to what great extent cigar making too was being carried on as a rural domestic industry. Wherever distress spreads among the small peasants, as for instance a few years ago in the Eifel area, the bourgeois press immediately raises a call for the introduction of a suitable domestic industry as the only remedy. And in fact both the growing plight of the German allotment peasants and the general situation of German
industry urge a continual extension of rural domestic industry. This is a phenomenon peculiar to Germany. Only very exceptionally do we find anything similar in France; for instance, in the regions of silk cultivation. In England, where there are no small peasants, rural domestic industry rests on the work of the wives and children of the agricultural day-labourers. Only in Ireland can we observe the rural domestic industry of garment making being carried on, as in Germany, by real peasant families. We are not, of course, concerned here with Russia and other countries not represented on the industrial world market.

Thus, as regards industry there exists today a state of affairs in large parts of Germany which appears at first glance to resemble that which prevailed generally before the introduction of machinery. However, this is so only at first glance. The rural domestic industry of earlier times, combined with gardening and agriculture, was, at least in the countries in which industry was developing, the basis of a tolerable and, here and there, even comfortable material situation for the working class, but at the same time the basis of its intellectual and political insignificance. The hand-made product and its cost determined the market price, and owing to the infinitesimal labour productivity compared with the present day, the sales markets as a rule grew faster than the supply. This held good at about the middle of the last century for England, and partly for France, particularly in the textile industry. In Germany which was at that time only just recovering from the devastation of the Thirty Years' War and working its way up under most unfavourable circumstances, the situation was, however, quite different. The only domestic industry producing for the world market there, linen weaving, was so oppressed by taxes and feudal dues that it did not raise the peasant weavers above the very low level of the rest of the peasantry. Nevertheless, at that time the rural industrial worker enjoyed a certain guaranteed existence.

With the introduction of machinery all this changed. Prices were now determined by the machine-made product, and the wage of the domestic industrial worker fell with this price. However, the worker had to accept it or look for other work, and he could not do that without becoming a proletarian, that is, without giving up his little house, garden and field, whether owned or rented. Only in the rarest cases was he ready to do this. And thus the gardening and agriculture of the old rural hand weavers became the cause by virtue of which the struggle of the hand loom against the mechanical loom was everywhere so protracted and has not yet
been fought to conclusion in Germany. In this struggle it was demonstrated for the first time, especially in England, that the same circumstance which had previously served as a basis of comparative prosperity for the worker—the fact that he owned his means of production—had now become a hindrance and a misfortune for him. In industry the mechanical loom defeated his hand loom, and in agriculture large-scale cultivation got the better of his small-scale cultivation. However, while the collective labour of many and the application of machinery and science became the social rule in both fields of production, he was chained to the antiquated method of individual production and hand labour by his little house, garden, field and hand loom. The possession of house and garden was now worth much less than complete freedom of movement. No factory worker would have changed places with the slowly but surely starving rural hand weaver.

Germany appeared late on the world market. Our large-scale industry dates from the forties; it owed its first upswing to the revolution of 1848, and was able to develop fully only after the revolutions of 1866 and 1870 had cleared at least the worst political obstacles out of its way. But it found the world market occupied to a large extent. The articles of mass consumption were supplied by England and the elegant luxury articles by France. Germany could not beat the former in price or the latter in quality. For the moment, therefore, nothing else remained but, following the beaten path of German production up to that time, to wedge its way into the world market with articles which were too petty for the English and too shoddy for the French. However, the favourite German custom of cheating, by first sending good samples and afterwards inferior articles, soon met with sufficiently severe punishment on the world market and was pretty well abandoned. On the other hand, the competition of overproduction gradually forced even the respectable English onto the downward path of quality deterioration and so gave an advantage to the Germans, who are matchless in this sphere. And thus we finally came to possess a large-scale industry and to play a role on the world market. But our large-scale industry works almost exclusively for the home market (with the exception of the iron industry, which produces far beyond the limits of home demand), and our mass export consists of a tremendous number of small articles, for which large-scale industry provides at most the necessary semi-manufactures, while the small articles themselves are supplied chiefly by rural domestic industry.
And here is seen in all its glory the "blessing" of house and landownership for the modern worker. Nowhere, hardly excepting even the Irish domestic industries, are such infamously low wages paid as in the German domestic industries. Competition permits the capitalist to deduct from the price of labour power that which the family earns from its own little garden or field. The workers are compelled to accept any piece rates offered them, because otherwise they would get nothing at all and they could not live from the products of their agriculture alone, and because, on the other hand, it is precisely this agriculture and landownership which chains them to the spot and prevents them from looking around for other employment. This is the reason which maintains Germany’s capacity to compete on the world market in a whole number of small articles. The whole profit is derived from a deduction from normal wages and the whole surplus value can be presented to the purchaser. That is the secret of the extraordinary cheapness of most German export articles.

It is this circumstance more than any other which keeps the wages and the living conditions of the German workers also in other industrial fields below the level of the West European countries. The dead weight of such prices for labour, kept traditionally far below the value of labour power, depresses also the wages of the urban workers, and even of the workers in the cities, below the value of labour power; and this all the more so as poorly paid domestic industry has taken the place of the old handicrafts in the towns as well, and here too depresses the general level of wages.

Here we see clearly that what at an earlier historical stage was the basis of relative well-being for the workers, namely, the combination of agriculture and industry, the ownership of house, garden and field, and guarantee of a dwelling place, is becoming today, under the rule of large-scale industry, not only the most terrible shackle to the worker, but the greatest misfortune for the whole working class, the basis for an unprecedented depression of wages below their normal level, and that not only for separate branches of enterprise and districts, but for the whole country. No wonder the big and petty bourgeoisie, who live and grow rich on these abnormal deductions from wages, are enthusiastic over rural industry and home-owning workers, and they regard the introduction of new domestic industries as the sole remedy for all rural distress!

That is one side of the matter, but it also has its reverse side. Domestic industry has become the broad basis of the German
export trade and therefore of the whole of large-scale industry. Due to this it is spread over wide areas of Germany and is extending still further by the day. The ruin of the small peasant, inevitable ever since his industrial domestic labour for his own use was destroyed by cheap ready-made clothing and machined products, as was his animal husbandry, and hence his manure production, by the dissolution of the mark system, the common mark and compulsory crop rotation—this ruin forcibly drives the small peasant, having fallen victim to the usurer, into the arms of modern domestic industry. Like the ground rent of the landowner in Ireland, the interest of the mortgage usurer in Germany cannot be paid from the yield of the soil but only from the wages of the industrial peasant. However, with the expansion of domestic industry one peasant area after another is being dragged into the present-day industrial movement. It is this revolutionising of the rural districts by domestic industry which is spreading the industrial revolution in Germany over a far wider territory than was the case in England and France. It is the comparatively low level of our industry which makes its extension in area all the more necessary. This explains why in Germany, in contrast to England and France, the revolutionary working-class movement has spread so tremendously over the greater part of the country instead of being confined exclusively to urban centres. And this in turn explains the tranquil, certain and irresistible progress of the movement. In Germany it is perfectly clear that a victorious rising in the capital and in the other big cities will be possible only when the majority of the smaller towns and a great part of the rural districts as well have become ripe for revolutionary change. Given anything like normal development, we shall never be in a position to win working-class victories like those of the Parisians in 1848 and 1871, but for just that reason we shall also not suffer defeats of the revolutionary capital by the reactionary province, such as Paris suffered in both cases. In France the movement always originated in the capital; in Germany it originated in the areas of large-scale industry, of manufacture and of domestic industry; the capital was conquered only later. Therefore, perhaps in future too, the initiative will continue to rest with the French, but the decisive struggle can be fought out only in Germany.

Now, this rural domestic industry and manufacture, which due to its expanse has become the decisive branch of German production and is thus revolutionising the German peasantry more and more, is itself, however, only the preliminary stage of a further revolutionary change. As Marx has already proved
(Capital, Vol. I, 3rd edition, pp. 484-95a), at a certain stage of development the hour of downfall owing to machinery and factory production will sound for it also. And this hour would appear to be at hand. But the destruction of rural domestic industry and manufacture by machinery and factory production means in Germany the destruction of the livelihood of millions of rural producers, the expropriation of almost half the German small peasantry; the transformation, not only of domestic industry into factory production, but also of peasant farming into large-scale capitalist agriculture, and of small landed property into big estates—an industrial and agricultural revolution in favour of capital and big landownership at the cost of the peasants. Should it be Germany’s fate to undergo also this transformation while still under the old social conditions, it will unquestionably be the turning point. If the working class of no other country has taken the initiative by that time, Germany will certainly strike first, and the peasant sons of the “glorious army” will bravely lend assistance.

And with this the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois utopia, which would give each worker the ownership of his little house and thus chain him in semi-feudal fashion to his particular capitalist, takes on a very different complexion. As its materialisation there appears the transformation of all the small rural house-owners into industrial domestic workers; the destruction of the old isolation and, with it, of the political insignificance of the small peasants, who are dragged into the “social turmoil”; the expansion of the industrial revolution over the rural areas and thus the transformation of the most stable and conservative class of the population into a nursery for revolutionaries; and, as the culmination of it all, the expropriation of the peasants engaged in home industry by machinery, which drives them forcibly into insurrection.

We can readily allow the bourgeois-socialist philanthropists the private enjoyment of their ideal so long as they continue in their public function as capitalists to implement it in this inverted fashion, for the greater good of the social revolution.

London, January 10, 1887

Frederick Engels

First published in Der Sozialdemokrat, Nos. 3 and 4, January 15 and 22, 1887 and in the book: F. Engels, Zur Wohnungsfrage, Hottingen-Zurich, 1887

* See present edition, Vol. 35, Ch. XIII, 8 (e).—Ed.

Printed according to the book
THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION
OF THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASS IN ENGLAND

Ten months have elapsed since, at the translator’s wish, I wrote the Appendix to this book; and during these ten months, a revolution has been accomplished in American society such as, in any other country, would have taken at least ten years. In February 1886, American public opinion was almost unanimous on this one point; that there was no working class, in the European sense of the word, in America;* that consequently no class struggle between workmen and capitalists, such as tore European society to pieces, was possible in the American Republic; and that, therefore, Socialism was a thing of foreign importation which could never take root on American soil. And yet, at that moment, the coming class struggle was casting its gigantic shadow before it in the strikes of the Pennsylvania coal miners,296 and of many other trades, and especially in the preparations, all over the country, for the great Eight Hours’ movement which was to come

* An English translation of the book I had written in 1844 was justified precisely by the fact that industrial conditions in present-day America coincide almost entirely with those in the England of the forties, that is those described by myself. How much this is the case is evinced by the articles on “The Labor Movement in America” by Edward and Eleanor Marx-Aveling in the London monthly Time of March, April, May and June. I take all the greater pleasure in referring to these excellent articles in that it gives me an opportunity to simultaneously rebuff the miserable slander about Aveling which the Executive of the Socialist Labor Party of America has so foolishly transmitted around the world.295 [Note by Engels for the 1887 offprint.]
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a Florence Kelley-Wischnewetzky.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 399-405.—Ed.
c In the original mistakenly “1885”.—Ed.
off, and did come off, in the May following. That I then duly appreciated these symptoms, that I anticipated a working class movement on a national scale, my "Appendix" shows; but no one could then foresee that in such a short time the movement would burst out with such irresistible force, would spread with the rapidity of a prairie-fire, would shake American society to its very foundations.

The fact is there, stubborn and indisputable. To what an extent it had struck with terror the American ruling classes, was revealed to me, in an amusing way, by American journalists who did me the honor of calling on me last summer; the "new departure" had put them into a state of helpless fright and perplexity. But at that time the movement was only just on the start; there was but a series of confused and apparently disconnected upheavals of that class which, by the suppression of negro slavery and the rapid development of manufactures, had become the lowest stratum of American society. Before the year closed, these bewildering social convulsions began to take a definite direction. The spontaneous, instinctive movements of these vast masses of working people, over a vast extent of country, the simultaneous outburst of their common discontent with a miserable social condition, the same everywhere and due to the same causes, made them conscious of the fact, that they formed a new and distinct class of American society; a class of—practically speaking—more or less hereditary wage-workers, proletarians. And with true American instinct this consciousness led them at once to take the next step towards their deliverance: the formation of a political workingmen's party, with a platform of its own, and with the conquest of the Capitol and the White House for its goal. In May the struggle for the Eight Hours' working-day, the troubles in Chicago, Milwaukee, etc., the attempts of the ruling class to crush the nascent uprising of Labor by brute force and brutal class-justice; in November the new Labor Party organized in all great centres, and the New York, Chicago and Milwaukee elections. May and November have hitherto reminded the American bourgeoisie only of the payment of coupons of U.S. bonds; henceforth May and November will remind them, too, of the dates on which the American working class presented their coupons for payment.

In European countries, it took the working class years and years before they fully realized the fact that they formed a distinct and,

---

a The German has: "...would even now shake American society to its foundations".— Ed.
under the existing social conditions, a permanent class of modern society; and it took years again until this class-consciousness led them to form themselves into a distinct political party, independent of, and opposed to, all the old political parties formed by the various sections of the ruling classes. On the more favored soil of America, where no mediaeval ruins bar the way, where history begins with the elements of modern bourgeois society as evolved in the seventeenth century, the working class passed through these two stages of its development within ten months.

Still, all this is but a beginning. That the laboring masses should feel their community of grievances and of interests, their solidarity as a class in opposition to all other classes; that in order to give expression and effect to this feeling, they should set in motion the political machinery provided for that purpose in every free country—that is the first step only. The next step is to find the common remedy for these common grievances, and to embody it in the platform of the new Labor Party. And this—the most important and the most difficult step in the movement—has yet to be taken in America.

A new party must have a distinct positive platform; a platform which may vary in details as circumstances vary and as the party itself develops, but still one upon which the party, for the time being, is agreed. So long as such a platform has not been worked out, or exists but in a rudimentary form, so long the new party, too, will have but a rudimentary existence; it may exist locally but not yet nationally; it will be a party potentially but not actually.

That platform, whatever may be its first initial shape, must develop in a direction which may be determined beforehand. The causes that brought into existence the abyss between the working class and the Capitalist class are the same in America as in Europe; the means of filling up that abyss, are equally the same everywhere. Consequently, the platform of the American proletariat will in the long run coincide as to the ultimate end to be attained, with the one which, after sixty years of dissensions and discussions, has become the adopted platform of the great mass of the European militant proletariat. It will proclaim, as the ultimate end, the conquest of political supremacy by the working class, in order to effect the direct appropriation of all means of production—land, railways, mines, machinery, etc.—by society at large, to be worked in common by all for the account and benefit of all.

---
a Instead of "opposed to", we find in the German edition "hostile to".—*Ed.*
b Instead of "in the long run", the German edition has "as the movement continues to develop".—*Ed.*
But if the new American party, like all political parties everywhere, by the very fact of its formation aspires to the conquest of political power, it is as yet far from agreed upon what to do with that power when once attained.\(^a\) In New York and the other great cities of the East, the organization of the working class has proceeded upon the lines of Trades’ Societies, forming in each city a powerful Central Labor Union. In New York the Central Labor Union, last November, chose for its standard bearer Henry George, and consequently its temporary electoral platform has been largely imbued with his principles. In the great cities of the North West the electoral battle was fought upon a rather indefinite labor platform, and the influence of Henry George’s theories was scarcely, if at all, visible. And while in these great centres of population and of industry the new class movement came to a political head, we find all over the country two wide spread labor organizations: the “Knights of Labor”\(^300\) and the “Socialist Labor Party,” of which only the latter has a platform in harmony with the modern European standpoint as summarized above.

Of the three more or less definite forms under which the American labor movement thus presents itself, the first, the Henry George movement in New York, is for the moment of a chiefly local significance. No doubt New York is by far the most important city of the States; but New York is not Paris and the United States are not France. And it seems to me that the Henry George platform, in its present shape, is too narrow to form the basis for anything but a local movement, or at best for a short-lived phase of the general movement. To Henry George, the expropriation of the mass of the people from the land is the great and universal cause of the splitting up of the people into Rich and Poor. Now this is not quite correct historically. In Asiatic and classical antiquity, the predominant form of class-oppression was slavery, that is to say, not so much the expropriation of the masses from the land as the appropriation of their persons. When, in the decline of the Roman Republic, the free Italian peasants were expropriated from their farms, they formed a class of “poor whites” similar to that of the Southern Slave States before 1861; and between slaves and poor whites,\(^b\) two classes equally unfit for self-emancipation, the old world went to pieces. In the middle

\(^a\) In the German edition the words “when once attained” are omitted.—Ed.

\(^b\) Instead of “poor whites”, the German edition has “free men gone to the dogs”.—Ed.
ages, it was not the expropriation of the people \textit{from}, but on the contrary, their appropriation \textit{to} the land which became the source of feudal oppression. The peasant retained his land, but was attached to it as a serf or villein, and made liable to tribute to the lord in labor and in produce. It was only at the dawn of modern times, towards the end of the fifteenth century, that the expropriation of the peasantry on a large scale laid the foundation for the modern class of wage-workers\(^a\) who possess nothing but their labor-power and can live only by the selling of that labour power to others. But if the expropriation from the land brought this class into existence, it was the development of capitalist production, of modern industry and agriculture on a large scale which perpetuated it, increased it, and shaped it into a distinct class with distinct interests and a distinct historical mission. All this has been fully expounded by Marx ("Capital," Part VIII: "The so-called primitive Accumulation.") According to Marx, the cause of the present antagonism of the classes and of the social degradation\(^b\) of the working class is their expropriation from \textit{all} means of production, in which the land is of course included.

If Henry George declares land-monopolization to be the sole cause of poverty and misery, he naturally finds the remedy in the resumption of the land by society at large. Now, the Socialists of the school of Marx, too, demand the resumption, by society, of the land, and not only of the land but of all other means of production likewise. But even if we leave these out of the question, there is another difference. What is to be done with the land? Modern Socialists, as represented by Marx, demand that it should be held and worked in common and for common account, and the same with all other means of social production, mines, railways, factories, etc.; Henry George would confine himself to letting it out to individuals as at present, merely regulating its distribution and applying the rents for public, instead of, as at present, for private purposes. What the Socialists demand, implies a total revolution of the whole system of social production; what Henry George demands, leaves the present mode of social production untouched, and has, in fact,\(^c\) been anticipated by the extreme

\(^a\) Instead of "the expropriation of the peasantry on a large scale laid the foundation for the modern class of wage-workers", the German edition has: "the expropriation of the peasants was carried out on a grand scale, and this time under historical conditions which gradually turned the peasants who had become propertyless into the modern class of wage-workers, into people...".—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) The German has "current humiliation" instead of "social degradation".—\textit{Ed.}

\(^c\) In the German edition, the words "in fact" are followed by "years ago".—\textit{Ed.}
section of Ricardian bourgeois economists who, too, demanded the confiscation of the rent of land by the State.

It would of course be unfair to suppose that Henry George has said his last word once for all. But I am bound to take his theory as I find it.

The second great section of the American movement is formed by the Knights of Labor. And that seems to be the section most typical of the present state of the movement, as it is undoubtedly by far the strongest. An immense association spread over an immense extent of country in innumerable "assemblies," representing all shades of individual and local opinion within the working class; the whole of them sheltered under a platform of corresponding indistinctness and held together much less by their impracticable constitution than by the instinctive feeling that the very fact of their clubbing together for their common aspiration makes them a great power in the country; a truly American paradox clothing the most modern tendencies in the most mediaeval mummeries, and hiding the most democratic and even rebellious spirit behind an apparent, but really powerless despotism—such is the picture the Knights of Labor offer to a European observer. But if we are not arrested by mere outside whimsicalities, we cannot help seeing in this vast agglomeration an immense amount of potential energy evolving slowly but surely into actual force. The Knights of Labor are the first national organization created by the American Working Class as a whole; whatever be their origin and history, whatever their shortcomings and little absurdities, whatever their platform and their constitution, here they are, the work of practically the whole class of American wage-workers, the only national bond that holds them together, that makes their strength felt to themselves not less than to their enemies, and that fills them with the proud hope of future victories. For it would not be exact to say that the Knights of Labor are liable to development. They are constantly in full process of development and revolution; a heaving, fermenting mass of plastic material seeking the shape and form appropriate to its inherent nature. That form will be attained as surely as historical evolution has, like natural evolution, its own immanent laws. Whether the Knights of Labor will then retain their present name or not, makes no difference, but to an outsider it appears evident that here is the raw material out of which the future of the American working class movement, and along with it, the future of American society at large, has to be shaped.

The third section consists of the Socialist Labor Party. This
section is a party but in name, for nowhere in America has it, up to now, been able actually to take its stand as a political party. It is, moreover, to a certain extent foreign to America, having until lately been made up almost exclusively by German immigrants, using their own language and for the most part little conversant with the common language of the country. But if it came from a foreign stock, it came, at the same time, armed with the experience earned during long years of class-struggle in Europe, and with an insight into the general conditions of working class emancipation, far superior to that hitherto gained by American workingmen. This is a fortunate circumstance for the American proletarians who thus are enabled to appropriate, and to take advantage of, the intellectual and moral fruits of the forty years' struggle of their European classmates, and thus to hasten on the time of their own victory. For, as I said before, there cannot be any doubt that the ultimate platform of the American working class must and will be essentially the same as that now adopted by the whole militant working class of Europe, the same as that of the German-American Socialist Labor Party. In so far this party is called upon to play a very important part in the movement. But in order to do so they will have to doff every remnant of their foreign garb. They will have to become out and out American. They cannot expect the Americans to come to them; they, the minority and the immigrants, must go to the Americans, who are the vast majority and the natives. And to do that, they must above all things learn English.

The process of fusing together these various elements of the vast moving mass—elements not really discordant, but indeed mutually isolated by their various starting-points—will take some time and will not come off without a deal of friction, such as is visible at different points even now. The Knights of Labor, for instance, are here and there, in the Eastern cities, locally at war with the organized Trades Unions. But then this same friction exists within the Knights of Labor themselves, where there is anything but peace and harmony. These are not symptoms of decay, for capitalists to crow over. They are merely signs that the innumerable hosts of workers, for the first time set in motion in a common direction, have as yet found out neither the adequate expression for their common interests, nor the form of organiza-

---

a In the German edition the end of the sentence reads: "as found only exceptionally hitherto in American workers".—Ed.

b Instead of "for the first time", the German edition has "now at last".—Ed.
tion best adapted to the struggle, nor the discipline required to insure victory. They are as yet the first levies *en masse* of the great revolutionary war, raised and equipped locally and independently, all converging to form one common army, but as yet without regular organization and common plan of campaign. The converging columns cross each other here and there; confusion, angry disputes, even threats of conflict arise. But the community of ultimate purpose in the end overcomes all minor troubles; ere long the straggling and squabbling battalions will be formed in a long line of battle array, presenting to the enemy a well-ordered front, ominously silent under their glittering arms, supported by bold skirmishers in front and by unshakable reserves in the rear.

To bring about this result, the unification of the various independent bodies into one national Labor Army, with no matter how inadequate a provisional platform, provided it be a truly working class platform—that is the next great step to be accomplished in America. To effect this, and to make that platform worthy of the cause, the Socialist Labor Party can contribute a great deal, if they will only act in the same way as the European Socialists have acted at the time when they were but a small minority of the working class. That line of action was first laid down in the "Communist Manifesto" of 1847 in the following words:

"The Communists"—that was the name we took at the time and which even now we are far from repudiating—"the Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties."

"They have no interests separate and apart from the interests of the whole working class."

"They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and model the proletarian movement."

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries they point out, and bring to the front, the common interests of the whole proletariat, interests independent of all nationality; 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the capitalist class has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

---

*a* In the German edition the end of the sentence from the words "nor the discipline..." is omitted.—*Ed.*

*b* The German has "general" instead of "provisional".—*Ed.*
"The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of all countries, that section which ever pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have, over the great mass of the proletarians, the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

"Thus they fight for the attainment of the immediate ends, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they represent and take care of the future of the movement." \(^a\)

That is the line of action which the great founder of Modern Socialism, Karl Marx, and with him, I and the Socialists of all nations who worked along with us, have followed for more than forty years, with the result that it has led to victory everywhere, and that at this moment the mass of European Socialists, in Germany and in France, in Belgium, Holland and Switzerland, in Denmark and Sweden as well as in Spain and Portugal, are fighting as one common \(^b\) army under one and the same flag.

London, January 26, 1887

Frederick Engels

---


Reproduced from the book collated with the German translation

---

\(^a\) Cf. present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 497, 518.— Ed.

\(^b\) The German edition follows "common" with "great".— Ed.
Citizens,

We find ourselves face to face with a terrible danger. We are threatened by a war in which those who loathe it and have only common interests—the French proletariat and the German proletariat—will be forced to butcher each other.

What is the real cause of this state of things?

It is militarism, it is the introduction of the Prussian military system in all the major countries of the Continent.

This system claims to arm the whole nation for the defence of its territory and its rights. That is a lie.

The Prussian system ousted the system of limited conscription and substitution bought by the wealthy, because it placed at the disposal of rulers all the resources of their countries, both manpower and materials. But it has not been able to create a popular army.

The Prussian system divides the citizens who are called up into two categories. The first are drafted into the army of the line, while the second are straightway assigned to the reserve or to the territorial army. The men in this second category receive no military instruction at all, or almost none; but the first serve with the colours for two or three years, sufficient time to turn them into an obedient army, accustomed to discipline, in other words an army ever ready to embark on foreign conquests and to suppress by violence any popular movements at home. For let us not forget that all the governments which have adopted this system are much more frightened of the working people within their frontiers than of rival governments beyond them.
Thanks to its flexibility this system is capable of enormous expansion. For as long as there remains a single young man who has not been drafted into the army, the available resources have not been exhausted. Hence the frantic competition between the states as to which of them possesses the largest and strongest army. Every addition to the military force of one state prompts the other states to do the same, if not more. And all this costs an enormous amount of money. The peoples are crushed by the burden of military expenditure. Peace becomes almost more expensive than war, so that eventually war no longer seems like a terrible scourge, but like a salutary crisis which will put an end to an impossible situation.

This is what has allowed intrigurers of all countries keen to fish in troubled waters to press for war.

And the remedy?

Abolish the Prussian system, replace it with a truly popular army, an ordinary school into which any citizen capable of bearing arms will be drafted for the time strictly necessary in order to learn the soldier's job; group the men graduating from this school into a reserve list, firmly organised by districts, so that every town, every canton has its own battalion, made up of men who know one another, united, armed, equipped, ready to march at twenty-four hours' notice if necessary. This means that every man will keep his rifle and equipment at home, as they do in Switzerland.

The first nation to adopt this system will double its real military strength while halving its war budget. It will prove its love of peace by the very fact of arming all its citizens. For this army, which is the nation itself, is as ill suited to conquest abroad as it is invincible in the defence of its own territory. And what government would dare lay a finger on civil liberties, if every citizen has at home his rifle and fifty rounds of ammunition?

London, February 13, 1887

Frederick Engels

First published in Le Socialiste, No. 79, February 26, 1887

Printed according to the newspaper collated with the manuscript

Translated from the French
To the Federation of the Centre of the French Workers' Party

In Paris

London, 18 March, 1887

Citizens,
I am with you in my heart to celebrate the 18 March.

F. Engels

First published in Le Socialiste, No. 83, March 26, 1887
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Sigismund Borkheim, the author of the following pamphlet, was born in Glogau on March 29, 1825. After completing his grammar-school education in Berlin in 1844, he studied in turn in Breslau, Greifswald and Berlin. Since he was too poor to bear the costs of the one-year military service, he satisfied his obligations to the army by joining in 1847 the artillery in Glogau as a three-year volunteer. After the 1848 revolution he took part in democratic meetings and this led to his being investigated by a court martial, from which he escaped by fleeing to Berlin. Here, safe from pursuit for the moment, he remained active in the movement and played an outstanding role in the storm on the Arsenal. A further flight to Switzerland became necessary to evade the new threat of arrest arising from this. In September 1848, when Struve organised the march of his volunteer corps to the Black Forest in Baden, Borkheim joined his force, was captured and remained in gaol until the Baden Revolution of May 1849 liberated the prisoners.

Borkheim went to Karlsruhe to offer his services as a soldier to the revolution. When Johann Philipp Becker was appointed colonel in command of the entire people's militia, he gave Borkheim the task of forming a battery for which the government initially supplied only the unharnessed guns. The horse teams had still not arrived when the movement of June 6 broke out. This was an attempt by the more resolute elements to induce the inert provisional government, which consisted in part of outright traitors, to bestir itself to greater efforts. Along with Becker, Borkheim had taken part in the demonstration whose only immediate effect, however, was that Becker, together with all his
volunteers and militiamen, was sent away from Karlsruhe to join the front on the Neckar. Borkheim could not follow him with his battery until he had been provided with horses for his cannons. By the time he was finally issued with these—Herr Brentano, the head of the government, found it was very much in his interest to get rid of the revolutionary battery—the Prussians had already conquered the Palatinate and the first act of Borkheim's battery was to take position on the Knieling Bridge and cover the withdrawal of the Palatinate army to Baden territory.

Together with the troops from the Palatinate and those from Baden still stationed around Karlsruhe, Borkheim's battery now advanced in a northerly direction. On June 21 it saw action at Blankenloch and played an honourable part in the encounter at Ubstadt (June 25). As part of the reorganisation of the army for its new positions on the River Murg, Borkheim and his artillery were assigned to the Oborski Division and distinguished himself in the fighting around Kuppenheim.

After the withdrawal of the revolutionary army to Swiss territory, Borkheim went to Geneva. Here he found his old commander and friend, J. Ph. Becker, and some younger comrades-in-arms, and they all banded together to form as cheerful a society as possible amidst the privations of refugee life. I myself spent several enjoyable days with them when I passed through there in autumn 1849. This was the same society that under the name of the "Brimstone Gang" acquired a highly undeserved posthumous notoriety thanks to the colossal lies of Herr Karl Vogt.308

However, the fun was not to last long. In the summer of 1850 the arm of the stern Federal Council reached also the harmless "Brimstone Gang", and the majority of its happy-go-lucky members were forced to leave Switzerland, since they were among the categories of refugees to be expelled. Borkheim went to Paris and subsequently to Strasbourg. But here too his stay was cut short. In February 1851 he was arrested and taken under police escort to Calais for deportation to England. For a whole three months he was dragged from place to place, for the most part in chains, through 25 different prisons. But wherever he came, the republicans had been notified in advance, and they went out to meet the prisoner, made sure he was well-provided for, did deals with and bribed the police and officials, and provided transport whenever possible. In this way he finally arrived in England.

Of course, he found the condition of the refugees in London far more wretched than in Geneva or even in France, but even
here his resilience did not desert him. He looked around for work and found it at first in a Liverpool emigration firm which needed German clerks to act as interpreters for the numerous German emigrants bidding farewell to their old fatherland in which peace and quiet had at last been restored. At the same time, he looked around for other business contacts and was so successful that after the outbreak of the Crimean War, he managed to despatch a steamship laden with all sorts of goods to Balaclava and, once there, to sell the cargo at fantastic prices, partly to the army authorities and partly to the English officers. On his return he had made a net profit of £15,000 (300,000 marks). But this success only spurred him on to further speculation. He made an agreement with the English Government to arrange for a further shipment. However, since by this time peace negotiations were already underway, the government stipulated in the contract that it could refuse to take delivery of the goods if the peace preliminaries had been settled by the time they arrived. Borkheim agreed to this. When he arrived in the Bosphorus with his steamship, peace was already a fact. Since the ship had only been hired for the outward voyage and since any amount of lucrative cargoes could be obtained for the return journey, the captain insisted on unloading without delay. The harbour was full to bursting point and as Borkheim was unable to find anywhere to store the cargo which was now left on his hands, the captain simply unloaded everything on the nearest beach. So Borkheim was stuck there in the middle of his useless crates and bales and barrels and had to helplessly watch his wares being plundered by the rabble that had come to the Bosphorus from all corners of Turkey and the whole of Europe. When he returned to England he found himself a pauper again—the £15,000 were all gone. His irrepressible resilience, however, was still there. He had lost all his money through speculation, but had gained a knowledge of business and made contacts in the world of commerce. He now discovered that he had an extremely fine palate for wine and became a successful representative for various Bordeaux exporters.

At the same time, however, he remained as active as he could in the political movement. He had known Liebknecht from Karlsruhe and Geneva. He came into contact with Marx through the Vogt scandal and in this way I renewed my acquaintance with him. Without committing himself to any specific programme, Borkheim always sided with the most extreme revolutionary party. His principal political activity was combating the great bulwark of
European reaction, Russian absolutism. So as to be better able to follow the Russian intrigues designed to subjugate the Balkans and indirectly increase its influence in Western Europe, he learnt Russian and spent many years studying the Russian daily press and émigré writings. Among other things, he translated Serno-Solovyevich’s pamphlet Our Russian Affairs which denounced the hypocrisies fabricated by Herzen (and continued subsequently by Bakunin) as a result of which the Russian refugees in Western Europe propagated not the truth they knew about Russia, but a conventional legend which fitted in with their nationalist and Pan-Slavist twaddle. He also wrote many essays on Russia for the Berlin Zukunft, the Volksstaat and so on.

In the summer of 1876, while on a visit to Germany, he suffered a stroke in Badenweiler which left him paralysed to his last day on the left side of his body. He was forced to give up his business. His wife died some years later. Since he had a weak chest, he had to move to Hastings so as to enjoy the mild sea air of the South English coast. Neither paralysis, nor illness, nor his straitened and far from assured means of subsistence were able to break his irrepressible mental powers. His letters were always cheerful to the point of exuberance, and when you visited him you had to help him laugh. His favourite reading matter was the Zurich Sozialdemokrat. He died after an attack of pneumonia on December 16, 1885.

The Blood-and-Thunder Patriots appeared straight after the war against France in the Volksstaat and soon after in an off-print. It proved to be a highly effective antidote to the mood of super-patriotic intoxication which overcame and which still affects both the German authorities and the German bourgeois. And, indeed, there could have been no better aid to sobering down than to recall the time when the same Prussia which was now praised to the skies had collapsed ignominiously before the onslaught of the same Frenchmen who were now being derided as the vanquished foe. And the medicine had to be all the more effective since the facts it recounted were drawn from a book in which a Prussian general, who was moreover the director of the general Academy of War, had used official Prussian documents to portray the moment of humiliation—and it should be admitted, in an impartial and dispassionate manner.¹ Like any other large social

¹ E. Höpfner, Der Krieg von 1806 und 1807.—Ed.
organisation, a great army is never better than when it turns in upon itself after a major defeat and does penance for its past sins. This was the fate of the Prussians after Jena, and again after 1850. In the latter case, even though they had not suffered a major defeat, their total military decline became palpably clear both to themselves and to the whole world in a series of minor campaigns—in Denmark and South Germany—and in the first large-scale mobilisation of 1850, when they only averted a real defeat by the political humiliations of Warsaw and Olmütz. They were forced to subject their own past to ruthless criticism in order to learn how to repair the damage. Their military literature, which in Clausewitz had brought forth a star of the first magnitude, but which had since sunk to unbelievable depths, arose once more under the necessity for this self-examination. And one of the fruits of this self-examination was Höpfner's book from which Borkheim culled the material for his pamphlet.

Even today it will be essential to recall again and again that age of arrogance and defeat, of the incapacity of the monarch, of the naive cunning of the Prussian diplomats ensnared in their own double-dealing, of the aristocratic officer-class whose loud-mouthed swaggering outlived their cowardly betrayals, and of the total collapse of a state-authority estranged from the people and based on lies and deception. The German philistine (and that includes the nobility and the princes) is, if possible, even more conceited and chauvinistic than he was then; diplomatic practice has become significantly more insolent, but it is as two-faced as ever; the aristocratic officer-class has grown sufficiently, both by natural and by artificial means, to enable it more or less to regain its old control over the army; the state is becoming more and more estranged from the masses of the people and is now well on the way to transforming itself into a consortium of landowners, stockbrokers and big industrialists for the exploitation of the people. True enough, if another war breaks out the Prussian-German army will have significant advantages over its opponents as well as its allies, if only because it was the model they all imitated. But these advantages will never again be as great as in the last two wars. The unity of the supreme command, for example, such as existed then, thanks to particularly fortunate circumstances, and the corresponding unconditional obedience of the lower echelons, is unlikely to recur in the same way. The business clique which now occupies a dominant position between the agrarian and military nobility—right up to the Emperor's entourage—and the stockjobbers, can easily prove fatal for the
provision of the army in the field. Germany will have allies, but it will leave them in the lurch, and they Germany, at the first opportunity. And, finally, the only war left for Prussia-Germany to wage will be a world war, a world war, moreover, of an extent and violence hitherto unimagined. Eight to ten million soldiers will be at each other’s throats and in the process they will strip Europe barer than a swarm of locusts. The depredations of the Thirty Years’ War compressed into three to four years and extended over the entire continent; famine, disease, the universal lapse into barbarism, both of the armies and the people, in the wake of acute misery; irretrievable dislocation of our artificial system of trade, industry and credit, ending in universal bankruptcy; collapse of the old states and their conventional political wisdom to the point where crowns will roll into the gutters by the dozen, and no one will be around to pick them up; the absolute impossibility of foreseeing how it will all end and who will emerge as victor from the battle. Only one consequence is absolutely certain: universal exhaustion and the creation of the conditions for the ultimate victory of the working class.

That is the prospect for the moment when the systematic development of mutual oneupmanship in armaments reaches its climax and finally brings forth its inevitable fruits. This is the pass, my worthy princes and statesmen, to which you in your wisdom have brought our ancient Europe. And when no alternative is left to you but to strike up the last dance of war—that will be no skin off our noses. The war may push us into the background for a while, it may wrest many a conquered base from our hands. But once you have unleashed the forces you will be unable to restrain, things can take their course: by the end of the tragedy you will be ruined and the victory of the proletariat will either have already been achieved or else inevitable.

London, December 15, 1887
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Let us now apply our theory to contemporary German history and its use of force, its policy of blood and iron. We shall clearly see from this why the policy of blood and iron was bound to be successful for a time and why it was bound to collapse in the end.

In 1815, the Vienna Congress had partitioned and sold off Europe in a manner which revealed to the whole world the complete ineptitude of the potentates and statesmen. The universal war of the peoples against Napoleon was the reaction of the national feeling of all the peoples which Napoleon had trampled on. In gratitude for this, the princes and diplomats at the Vienna Congress trampled still more contemptuously on that national feeling. The smallest dynasty was more esteemed than the largest nation. Germany and Italy were once again split up into small states, Poland partitioned for the fourth time and Hungary remained enslaved. It cannot even be said that an injustice was committed against the peoples; why did they tolerate it, and why did they greet the Russian Tsar\(^a\) as their liberator?

But this could not go on for long. Since the end of the Middle Ages, history has been working towards a Europe composed of large national states. Only such states are the normal political constitution of the ruling European bourgeoisie and, at the same time, an indispensable precondition for the establishment of harmonious international co-operation between peoples, without which the rule of the proletariat is impossible. To ensure international peace, all avoidable national friction must first be done away with, each people must be independent and master in their own house. With the

\(^a\) Alexander I.—Ed.
advance of commerce, agriculture, industry and thereby of the social position of power enjoyed by the bourgeoisie, national feeling rose everywhere and partitioned and oppressed nations demanded unity and independence.

Hence the 1848 revolution was aimed everywhere except in France at satisfying national demands just as much as the demand for freedom. But behind the bourgeoisie, which had been victorious at the first attempt, there already arose everywhere the menacing figure of the proletariat, which had actually won the victory, and which drove the bourgeoisie into the arms of the just defeated enemy—monarchistic, bureaucratic, semi-feudal and military reaction to which the revolution succumbed in 1849. In Hungary, where this was not the case, the Russians invaded and crushed the revolution. Not content with this, the Russian Tsar—a went to Warsaw, where he sat in judgment as the arbiter of Europe. He appointed his obedient creature Christian of Glücksburg heir to the Danish throne. He humiliated Prussia as it had never been humiliated before, prohibiting it even the slightest craving to exploit the German aspirations for unity and forcing it to re-establish the Federal Diet and submit to Austria. At first sight it seemed that the whole result of the revolution was the establishment in Austria and Prussia of a system of government, constitutional in form, but in the old spirit, and that the Russian Tsar was master of Europe more than ever before.

In reality, however, the revolution had vigorously jostled the bourgeoisie even in the dismembered countries, notably in Germany, out of its old traditional rut. The bourgeoisie had received a share, however modest, of political power, and every political success of the bourgeoisie is used for industrial advance. The “crazy year”, which had fortunately passed, tangibly demonstrated to the bourgeoisie that it now had to put an end to the old lethargy and doziness once and for all. As a result of the Californian and Australian gold rush and other circumstances, an expansion of world trade contacts and a business boom set in as never before—it was a matter of seizing the opportunity and making sure of one’s share. The large-scale industry which had appeared since 1830, and particularly since 1840, on the Rhine, in Saxony, in Silesia, in Berlin and some towns in the south, was now rapidly developed and expanded, cottage industry in rural districts became increasingly widespread, railway construction was accelerated, while the rapidly increasing flow of emigrants which
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accompanied all this gave rise to a German transatlantic steamship service which required no subsidies. German merchants settled in all overseas trade centres on a wider scale than ever before, handled an ever growing share of world trade and gradually began to offer their services for the sale not only of English, but also of German industrial products.

But the German system of small states with their numerous and varied trade and industrial laws inevitably soon became an unbearable fetter on vigorously growing industry and the trade associated with it. Every few miles a different law governed bills of exchange, there were different trade conditions; everywhere, literally everywhere, there were different sorts of chicanery, bureaucratic and fiscal traps, and often also guild barriers against which even licences were powerless. In addition there were many different local settlement laws and residence restrictions which made it impossible for the capitalists to move the labour force at their disposal in sufficient numbers to places where the availability of ore, coal, water power and other favourable natural conditions called for the siting of industrial enterprises. The ability to exploit the massive labour force of the Fatherland without hindrance was the first condition for industrial development, but wherever the patriotic manufacturer gathered workers from all parts, the police and the poor administration opposed the settlement of the new arrivals. All-German civic rights and full freedom of movement for all citizens of the Empire, a uniform body of commercial and industrial law were no longer patriotic fantasies of eccentric students, they had now become vital conditions for industry.

Besides, there were different currencies, different weights and measures in every state, no matter how small, and often there were two or three in a single state. And not a single one of these innumerable kinds of coins, weights and measures was recognised on the world market. [It is] hardly surprising, therefore, that merchants and manufacturers who traded on the world market or had to compete against imported articles, had, in addition to the many coins, weights and measures, to use also foreign ones: that cotton yarn was reeled in English pounds, silk cloth was produced in metres, foreign bills were issued in pounds sterling, dollars and francs. And how could large credit institutions be set up in these limited currency zones with banknotes here in guilder, there in Prussian talers, next to them in gold talers, "new two-third" talers, bank marks, current marks, the twenty-gulden system, the twenty-four-gulden system, with endless exchange computations and rate fluctuations?
And even if all this was finally overcome, how much effort had been spent on all this friction, how much money and time had been wasted! Finally, in Germany too, people became aware that nowadays time is money.

The fledgling German industry had to stand the test on the world market, it could grow only through export. For this it had to enjoy abroad the protection of international law. The English, French, American merchant could still take somewhat greater liberties abroad than at home. His legation intervened on his behalf, and, if need be, even a few men-of-war. But the German! In the Levant the Austrian at least could rely to some extent on his legation, elsewhere it did not help him much either. But whenever a Prussian merchant in a foreign land complained to his ambassador about an injustice he had suffered, he was almost always told: "Serves you right, what do you want here, why don't you stay well at home?" The subject of a small state was well and truly deprived of all rights everywhere. Wherever one went, German merchants were under foreign—French, English or American—protection, or else had quickly got themselves naturalised in their new country.\(^a\) Even if their ambassadors had wished to intervene on their behalf, what would have been the use? German ambassadors themselves were treated no better than boot-blacks overseas.

This shows that the call for a united "Fatherland" had a very material background. It was no longer the obscure urge of a member of a *Burschenschaft* at the Wartburg festival,\(^318\) "where courage and power burned bright in German souls", and where, as in the song set to a French tune, "the young man was carried away by a tempestuous striving to go and die fighting for the Fatherland"\(^b\) in order to restore the romantic imperial grandeur of the Middle Ages,—while in his older days the tempestuous youth became a common sanctimonious and absolutist vassal of his prince. Neither was it any longer the considerably more down-to-earth call for unity of the lawyers and other bourgeois ideologists of the Hambach festival,\(^319\) who thought they loved freedom and unity for their own sake and did not at all notice that the turning of Germany into a cantonal republic after the Swiss pattern, which the ideal of the least muddled among them amounted to, was just as impossible as the Hohenstaufen Empire\(^320\) of the students mentioned above. No, it was the desire of the practical merchant
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and industrialist arising out of immediate business needs to sweep away all the historically inherited small state junk which was obstructing the free development of commerce and industry, to abolish all the unnecessary friction the German businessman first had to overcome at home if he wished to enter the world market, and to which all his competitors were superior. German unity had become an economic necessity. And the people who now demanded it knew what they wanted. They had been educated in commerce and for commerce, knew how to drive a bargain and were willing to bargain. They knew that it was necessary to demand a high price but also that it was necessary to reduce it liberally. They sang of the "German Fatherland" including in it Styria, the Tyrol and "Austria rich in honours and victories", and

From the Maas to the Memel,
From the River Adige to the Belt
Deutschland, Deutschland über alles,
Over everything in the world—b

but for a payment in cash they were prepared to grant a considerable discount—from 25 to 30 per cent—on that Fatherland that was to become ever greater. Their plan for unification was ready and immediately practicable.

German unity, however, was not a purely German question. Since the Thirty Years' War, not a single all-German issue had been decided without very perceptible foreign interference. Frederick II had conquered Silesia in 1740 with the help of the French. The reorganisation of the Holy Roman Empire by decision of the Imperial Deputation in 1803 had literally been dictated by France and Russia. After that, Napoleon had organised Germany to suit his convenience. And finally, at the Vienna Congress, it was again mainly owing to Russia and in the second place to England and France that it was shattered into thirty-six states with over two hundred separate large and small patches of land, and, just as at the 1802-03 Imperial Diet in Regensburg, the German dynasties had veritably assisted in this and made the fragmentation still worse. In addition, some parts of Germany had been handed over to foreign sovereigns. Thus, Germany was not only powerless and helpless, torn by internal
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strife, condemned to political, military and even industrial insignificance. What was much worse, France and Russia had by repeated usage acquired a right to the fragmentation of Germany, just as France and Austria arrogated the right to see that Italy remained dismembered. This alleged right was invoked in 1850 by Tsar Nicholas when, refusing in the coarsest manner to allow any change in the constitution without authorisation, he endorsed the restoration of that expression of Germany's impotence, the Federal Diet.327

Germany's unity therefore had to be won in struggle not only against the princes and other internal enemies, but also against foreign countries. Or else—with help from abroad. What was the situation abroad at that time?

In France, Louis Bonaparte had utilised the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the working class to raise himself with the help of the peasants into the office of President and with the help of the army to the imperial throne. But a new Emperor Napoleon, one placed on the throne by the army within the borders of the France of 1815, was a still-born chimera. The resurrected Napoleonic empire meant the extension of France to the Rhine, the realisation of the hereditary dream of French chauvinism. At first, however, the Rhine was beyond Louis Bonaparte's reach; every attempt in that direction would have led to a European coalition against France. On the other hand, there was an opportunity to enhance France's position of power and to win fresh laurels for the army by waging in agreement with almost the whole of Europe a war against Russia, which had made use of the revolutionary period in Western Europe to occupy on the quiet the Danubian principalities and to prepare for a new war of conquest against Turkey. England entered into alliance with France, Austria showed good will towards both, only heroic Prussia kissed the Russian rod which had chastised it only but yesterday, and continued to maintain a pro-Russian neutrality. But neither England nor France wished a serious defeat of the enemy, and the war thus ended in very mild humiliation for Russia and a Russo-French alliance against Austria.*

* The Crimean War was an unparalleled, colossal comedy of errors, where one wondered at every new scene: who will be cheated this time? But that comedy took a toll of uncountable wealth and over a million human lives. No sooner had the war begun than Austria invaded the Danubian principalities; the Russians retreated before them. This made a war against Turkey on Russia's land frontier impossible so long as Austria remained neutral. However, Austria was willing to become an ally in a war on this frontier on condition that the war was waged in all seriousness
The Crimean War made France Europe's leading power and the adventurer Louis Napoleon the greatest man of the day, which, to be sure, does not mean much. However, the Crimean War had not brought France any territorial expansion and was therefore pregnant with a new war, in which Louis Napoleon was to fulfil his true mission, that of "aggrandiser of the empire". This new war had already been planned during the first one, since Sardinia was allowed to join the alliance of the Western powers as a satellite of imperial France and especially as its outpost against Austria; further preparations were made during the conclusion of peace by Louis Napoleon's agreement with Russia, who wanted nothing more than to chastise Austria.

Louis Napoleon was now the idol of the European bourgeoisie. Not only because he had "saved society" on December 2, 1851, when he destroyed the political rule of the bourgeoisie, it is true, but only to save its social rule. Not only because he showed that, under favourable circumstances, universal suffrage could be turned into an instrument for the oppression of the masses. Not only because, under his rule, industry and trade and notably speculation and stock exchange machinations advanced to a degree previously unknown. But, first and foremost, because the bourgeoisie saw in him the first "great statesman", who was flesh of their flesh, and bone of their bone. He was an upstart like every true bourgeois. "A dyed in the wool" Carbonari to restore Poland and permanently push back Russia's western border. This would also have brought in Prussia, through which Russia was still getting all imports; Russia would have been blockaded by land and by sea and would soon have been defeated. This, however, did not enter the plans of the allies. On the contrary, they were glad to have escaped the danger of a serious war. Palmerston proposed that the theatre of war be transferred to the Crimea—which was what Russia desired—and Louis Napoleon gladly agreed. Here the war could only be a sham one, and so all the protagonists were satisfied. However, Tsar Nicholas took it into his head to wage a serious war and forgot at the same time that this was most favourable country for a sham war but most unfavourable for a serious war. What is Russia's strength in defence—the immense extent of its territory, sparsely populated, roadless and poor in auxiliary resources—in the event of any Russian offensive war turns against Russia itself, and nowhere more than in the Crimean direction. The South Russian steppes, which were to become the graves of the invaders, became the graves of the Russian armies, whom Nicholas, with brutal and stupid ruthlessness, drove one after another—finally in mid-winter—into Sebastopol. When the last hurriedly recruited, haphazardly equipped and miserably provisioned army lost about two-thirds of its number (whole battalions perished in snowstorms) and the rest was unable to drive the enemy from Russian soil, arrogant, empty-headed Nicholas miserably broke down and poisoned himself. From then on, the war once again became a sham war and peace was soon concluded.
conspirator in Italy, an artillery officer in Switzerland, a
debt-burdened tramp of distinction and special constable in
England, yet constantly and everywhere a pretender to the
throne, he had prepared himself by his adventurous past and
moral failings in all countries for the role of Emperor of the
French and ruler of the destinies of Europe, as the exemplary
bourgeois, the American, prepares himself by a series of bankrupt-
cies, genuine and fraudulent, for the role of millionaire. As
Emperor he not only made politics serve the interests of capitalist
profits and stock exchange machinations, but also pursued politics
entirely according to the rules of the stock exchange and
speculated on the "nationalities principle". In France's previous
policy the fragmentation of Germany and Italy had been an
inalienable fundamental right of France; Louis Napoleon im-
mEDIATELY began to sell off that fundamental right bit by bit for
so-called compensations. He was ready to help Italy and Germany
do away with their fragmentation, provided Germany and Italy
paid him for every step towards national union by ceding
territory. This not only satisfied French chauvinism and gradually
expanded the empire to its 1801 borders but, in addition,
restored to France the exclusive role of enlightened power and the
liberator of the peoples, and depicted Louis Napoleon as the
protector of oppressed nationalities. And the whole enlightened
bourgeoisie, enthusiastic for national ideas—because it was deeply
interested in the removal of all obstacles to business on the world
market—unanimously exulted in this world-liberating enlighten-
ment.

The beginning was made in Italy. Austria had exercised
absolute rule there since 1849, and Austria was then the scapegoat
for the whole of Europe. The meagre results of the Crimean War
were not ascribed to the indecision of the Western powers, which
had only wanted a sham war, but to Austria's irresolute attitude,
for which no one had been more to blame than the Western
powers themselves. But the advance of the Austrians to the
Pruth—in gratitude for Russia's assistance in Hungary in
1849—agrieved Russia so much (although it was precisely that
advance which had saved Russia), that it looked with joy upon
every attack on Austria. Prussia no longer counted and had
already been treated en canaille at the Paris Peace Congress.
Thus, the war for the liberation of Italy "up to the Adriatic" was
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contrived with Russia's participation, launched in the spring of 1859 and completed in the summer on the Mincio. Austria was not driven out of Italy, Italy was not "free up to the Adriatic" and not united, Sardinia had extended its territory, but France had acquired Savoy and Nice and thus re-established its 1801 frontier with Italy.336

However, the Italians were not satisfied with this state of affairs. At that time, manufacture proper was still predominant in Italy, large-scale industry being as yet in its infancy. The working class was far from fully expropriated and proletarianised; in the towns, it still had its own means of production, in rural areas, industrial labour was a side-line occupation of small peasant owners or tenants. The energy of the bourgeoisie had therefore not yet been broken by opposition to a modern class-conscious proletariat. And since the fragmentation of Italy was preserved only as a result of foreign rule by the Austrians, under whose protection the princes carried their misgovernment to the extreme, the big landed nobility and the mass of the townspeople sided with the bourgeoisie as the champion of national independence. However, foreign rule was thrown off, except in Venetia, in 1859; Austria's further intervention in Italy was made impossible by France and Russia and nobody was afraid of it any longer. In Garibaldi, Italy had a hero of ancient dignity, who was able to work wonders and did work wonders. With a thousand volunteers, he overthrew the entire Kingdom of Naples, in fact united Italy, and tore to pieces the ingenious web of Bonapartist politics. Italy was free and essentially united—though not by Louis Napoleon's intrigues, but by the revolution.

Since the Italian war, the foreign policy of the Second French Empire was no longer a secret to anybody. The conquerors of the great Napoleon were to be punished—but l'un après l'autre, one after another. Russia and Austria had received their share, Prussia was next in turn. And Prussia was despised more than ever before; its policy during the Italian war had been cowardly and wretched, just as at the time of the Basle Peace in 1795.337 With its "free-hand policy"338 it had reached a point when it stood absolutely isolated in Europe, and its neighbours, big and small, anticipated with pleasure the spectacle of its being given a thrashing; its hands were free for one thing only—to cede the left bank of the Rhine to France.

Indeed, in the years immediately following 1859, the conviction grew everywhere, and nowhere more than on the Rhine, that the left bank would irrevocably be lost to France. Not that this was
particularly desired, but it was regarded as an inescapable fate, and, to tell the truth, it was not particularly feared. Old memories of French times, which had really brought liberty, were aroused in the peasant and petty bourgeois; among the bourgeoisie, the finance aristocracy, especially in Cologne, was already deeply involved in the machinations of the Parisian Crédit Mobilier and other fraudulent Bonapartist companies and loudly demanded annexation.*

However, the loss of the left bank of the Rhine would weaken not only Prussia, but Germany too. And Germany was more divided than ever before. There was greater estrangement than ever between Austria and Prussia owing to Prussia's neutrality in the Italian war; the brood of small princes cast half scared, half longing looks at Louis Napoleon as protector of a renewed Confederation of the Rhine—such was the position of official Germany. And that at a time when only the united forces of the entire nation were capable of averting the danger of dismemberment.

But how could the forces of the entire nation be united? After the attempts of 1848—almost all of them hazy—had failed and some of the haze was dispelled precisely because of this, three roads lay open.

The first road was that of genuine unification through the abolition of all individual states, that is, the openly revolutionary road. This road had just led Italy to its goal; the Savoy dynasty had joined the revolution and thereby walked off with the Italian crown. However, our German Savoyans, the Hohenzollerns, and even their most daring Cavour's à la Bismarck, were altogether unable to take such a courageous step. The people would have had to do everything themselves—and in a war over the left bank of the Rhine they would have probably been able to do the necessary. The inevitable retreat of the Prussians beyond the Rhine, a protracted war at the fortifications on the Rhine, and the betrayal by the South German princes that would undoubtedly ensue, would have been sufficient to fan up a national movement which would have swept away the entire dynastic system. In that case, Louis Napoleon would have been the first to sheath the sword. The Second Empire could afford to have opponents only among reactionary states against which it appeared as the

* Marx and I repeatedly saw on the spot that this was the general mood on the Rhine at that time. Industrialists on the left bank asked me, inter alia, how their industry would fare under the French customs tariff.
continuer of the French revolution, the liberator of the peoples. It was powerless against a people themselves embroiled in revolution, in fact, a victorious German revolution could have provided the impetus for the overthrow of the entire French Empire. That was at best; at worst, if the dynastic princes got the better of the movement, the left bank of the Rhine would be temporarily lost to France, the active and passive betrayal of the dynastic princes would be revealed to the whole world and would create a predicament in which there would be no way out for Germany but that of revolution, the eviction of all the princes, the establishment of a united German republic.

As things stood, this road to the union of Germany could be taken only if Louis Napoleon began a war over the border on the Rhine. But, for reasons we shall soon explain, this war did not take place. As a result, however, the issue of national union also ceased to be a vital question, one that had to be settled immediately under pain of destruction. For the time being, the nation could wait.

The second road was that of a union under Austrian supremacy. In 1815, Austria had willingly retained the position of a state with a compact, rounded-off territory, which had been imposed on it by the Napoleonic wars. It laid no claim to the former possessions in South Germany which it had ceded. It was content with annexing old and new territories which could be matched geographically and strategically with the remaining nucleus of the monarchy. The separation of German Austria from the rest of Germany, begun by the protective tariffs of Joseph II, aggravated by the police regime of Francis I in Italy, and carried to the extreme by the disintegration of the German Empire and by the Confederation of the Rhine, continued for all practical purposes ever after 1815. Metternich built a veritable Chinese Wall between his state and Germany. Tariffs kept out the material, censorship the intellectual products of Germany, the most incredible chicanery with regard to passports limited personal contacts to the barest minimum. The country was protected domestically against any, even the mildest, political stirring by an absolutist tyranny unique even in Germany. Thus, Austria had remained absolutely aloof from Germany's entire bourgeois-liberal movement. By 1848, at least the intellectual barrier was torn down to a large extent, but the events of that year and their consequences were hardly fitted to bring Austria closer to the rest of Germany. On the contrary, Austria more and more insisted on its independent position as a great power. And thus it happened
that, although the Austrian soldiers in the fortresses of the Confederation were liked, while the Prussians were hated and derided, and although Austria was still popular and respected throughout the predominantly Catholic South and West, no one thought seriously of German unification under Austrian supremacy, except perhaps a few princes from the small and medium German states.

Nor could it be otherwise. Austria itself had not wanted it any other way, even though it continued on the quiet to cherish romantic dreams of an empire. The Austrian customs barrier had in time become the only remaining material partition within Germany, and was therefore felt all the more acutely. There was no sense in the independent great power policy if it did not mean a sacrifice of German interests to specifically Austrian, that is, Italian, Hungarian, etc., interests. After, as before the revolution, Austria continued to be the most reactionary state in Germany, the most reluctant to follow modern trends, and, besides, the only remaining specifically Catholic great power. The more the post-March government strove to re-establish the old management of priests and Jesuits, the more impossible became its hegemony over a country which was one to two-thirds Protestant. And, finally, a unification of Germany under Austria was only possible through the breaking-up of Prussia. Although this in itself would have been no calamity for Germany, the breaking-up of Prussia by Austria would have been just as harmful as the breaking-up of Austria by Prussia before the imminent triumph of the revolution in Russia (after which it would become superfluous, because the now redundant Austria would disintegrate of itself).

In short, German unity under Austria's wing was a romantic dream and proved such when the German princes of the small and medium states assembled in Frankfurt in 1863 to proclaim Francis Joseph of Austria emperor of Germany. The King of Prussia simply did not show up and the emperor comedy was a flop.

There remained the third road: unification under Prussia's supremacy. And because this road was actually taken, it leads us from the field of speculation onto the more solid, even if rather filthy, ground of practical "Realpolitik".

Since Frederick II, Prussia had regarded Germany, as also Poland, merely as territory to be conquered, from which one took what one could get, on the understanding, however, that one had
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to share with others. The division of Germany with foreign countries, notably with France, had been Prussia's "German mission" since 1740. "Je vais, je crois, jouer votre jeu; si les as me viennent, nous partagerons" (I think I am going to play your game; if I am dealt the aces, we shall share them)—such were Frederick's parting words to the French ambassador, a when he went off to his first war.³⁴⁶ True to this "German mission", Prussia betrayed Germany in 1795 when the peace was signed in Basle, agreed in advance (in the Treaty of August 5, 1796) to cede the left bank of the Rhine to France in return for a promise of territorial expansion, and actually collected the reward for its treason against the Empire under a decision of the imperial deputation dictated by Russia and France.³⁴⁷ Again in 1805, it betrayed Russia and Austria, its allies, when Napoleon held up Hanover to it—a bait it was always willing to swallow, but became so entangled in its own stupid cunning that it was drawn into war with Napoleon after all and received a well-deserved thrashing at Jena.³⁴⁸ Still under the impression of these blows, Frederick William III was willing, even after the victories of 1813 and 1814, to forego all West German outposts, to confine himself to the possession of North-East Germany, to withdraw, like Austria, as much as possible from Germany—which would have transformed the whole of West Germany into a new Confederation of the Rhine under Russian or French protection. The plan failed: Westphalia and the Rhine Province were forced upon the King against his will, and with them a new "German mission".

For the time being, it was over with annexations—except for the purchase of some tiny patches of land. At home, the old bureaucratic Junker system gradually began to flourish again; the constitutional promises made to the people in times of great distress were persistently broken. Yet in spite of all that, the bourgeoisie was increasingly in the ascendant in Prussia too, because without industry and trade even the haughty Prussian state was now nothing. Slowly, unwillingly, in homeopathic doses, economic concessions had to be made to the bourgeoisie. In a way, these concessions offered a prospect of support for Prussia's "German mission": since Prussia, to remove the foreign customs barriers between its two parts, invited the neighbouring German states to form a customs union. Thus came into existence the Customs Union which, up to 1830, had been no more than a pious wish (only Hesse-Darmstadt had joined), but later, as a result of

³⁴⁶ Ed. L. Ch. Beauvau.
the somewhat quicker rate of political and economic development, joined the greater part of inner Germany economically to Prussia. The non-Prussian coastal regions remained outside the Union even after 1848.

The Customs Union was a major success for Prussia. The fact that it meant a victory over Austrian influence was hardly the crux of the matter. The main thing was that it won over the entire bourgeoisie of the medium and small states to Prussia's side. With the exception of Saxony, there was no German state whose industry had developed to a degree even approaching Prussia's, and this was due not only to natural and historical preconditions, but also to its bigger customs area and internal market. The more the Customs Union expanded, and the more it drew small states into this internal market, the more the rising bourgeoisie of these states became used to regarding Prussia as its economic and later also political leader, and the professors danced to the tune of the bourgeoisie. What the Hegelians construed philosophically in Berlin—namely that Prussia was called upon to assume leadership in Germany, Schlosser's pupils, notably Häusser and Gervinus, demonstrated historically in Heidelberg. This naturally presupposed that Prussia would change its entire political system, that it would fulfil the demands of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie.*

All this, however, happened not because there was any special bias in favour of the Prussian state, as was the case, for example, when the Italian bourgeoisie accepted Piedmont as the leading state after it had openly placed itself at the head of the national and constitutional movement. No, it was done reluctantly, the bourgeoisie chose Prussia as the lesser evil, because Austria barred them from its market and because, compared with Austria, Prussia still had a certain bourgeois nature, if only because of its meanness in financial matters. Prussia had two good institutions ahead of other large states: universal conscription and universal compulsory education. It had introduced them in times of desperate need, and in better days had been content with emptying them of their content—dangerous under certain circumstances—by negligently enforcing them and deliberately distorting them. But they continued to exist on paper, and this gave Prussia the possibility some day to unfold the latent potential energy of the masses to a

* The *Rheinische Zeitung* of 1842 discussed the question of Prussia's hegemony from this viewpoint. Gervinus told me as early as the summer of 1843 in Ostend: Prussia must assume leadership in Germany, but this presupposes three conditions: Prussia must provide a constitution, grant freedom of the press and pursue a more definite foreign policy.
degree unattainable in any other place with the same population. The bourgeoisie reconciled itself to these two institutions: around 1840 it was easy and comparatively cheap for the one-year conscripts, that is, for the sons of the bourgeois, to evade service by bribery, especially as the army itself attached little value to Landwehr officers recruited from merchant and industrial circles. The undoubtedly larger number of people with a certain amount of elementary knowledge still available in Prussia as a result of compulsory education was highly useful for the bourgeoisie; with the advance of large-scale industry it ultimately even became insufficient.* The complaints over the high cost of the two institutions, a expressed in heavy taxation, were made predominantly by the petty bourgeoisie; the ascendant bourgeoisie calculated that the annoying, to be sure, but unavoidable expenditure connected with the country’s future position as a great power would be amply compensated by higher profits.

In short, the German bourgeoisie had no illusions about Prussian kindness. If the idea of Prussian hegemony had become popular with them since 1840, it was only because and insofar as the Prussian bourgeoisie, owing to its quicker economic development, assumed the economic and political leadership of the German bourgeoisie, only because and insofar as the Rottecks and Welckers of the old constitutional South were eclipsed by the Camphausens, Hansemanns and Mildes of the Prussian North, and the lawyers and professors were eclipsed by the merchants and manufacturers. Indeed, in the years just preceding 1848, there had developed among Prussian liberals, especially on the Rhine, a quite different revolutionary atmosphere from that of the cantonalist liberals of the South. At that time there appeared the two best political folk songs since the 16th century, the song about Burgomaster Tschech and the one about the Baroness von Droste-Fischering, whose wantonness appals the now aged people who in 1846 gaily sang:

Has ever man had such hard luck
As our poor Burgomaster Tschech,
He shot at Fatty two paces away
And yet his bullet went astray!

* Even during the Kulturkampf days, Rhenish industrialists complained to me that they could not promote otherwise excellent workers to the job of supervisor because of the insufficiency of their knowledge acquired at school. This was particularly true in Catholic regions.

a Engels wrote in the margin: “Secondary schools for the bourgeoisie.” — Ed.
But all this was soon to change. The February revolution was followed by the March days in Vienna and the Berlin revolution of March 18. The bourgeoisie triumphed without having to put up a serious fight, it did not even want the serious fight when it came. The bourgeoisie, which shortly before had flirted with the socialism and communism of the time (notably on the Rhine), suddenly noticed that it had reared not only individual workers, but a working class, a still half-dreaming, it is true, but gradually awakening and, by its innate nature, revolutionary proletariat. This proletariat, which had everywhere won the victory for the bourgeoisie, was already advancing demands, particularly in France, which were incompatible with the entire bourgeois system; in Paris the first terrible struggle between the two classes took place on June 23, 1848, and after a four-day battle the proletariat was defeated. From then on, the mass of the bourgeoisie in the whole of Europe went over to the side of reaction and allied itself with the absolutist bureaucrats, feudals and priests, whom it had just overthrown with the help of the workers, against the enemies of society, those very same workers.

The form this took in Prussia was that the bourgeoisie left in the lurch the representatives it had itself elected and, with concealed or overt glee, sat by and watched them being dispersed by the government in November 1848. True, the Junker-bureaucratic ministry, which now asserted itself in Prussia for nigh on a decade, had to rule according to constitutional forms, but it avenged itself by resorting to a system of petty vexations and obstructions, unprecedented even in Prussia, under which no one suffered more than the bourgeoisie.\textsuperscript{354} But the latter had retired penitently into its shell and meekly submitted to the blows and kicks raining down on it as a punishment for its former revolutionary cravings, and gradually learned to think what it later was to express aloud: Yes, to be sure, we are dogs!

Then came the regency. To prove his loyalty to the throne Manteuffel surrounded the heir apparent,\textsuperscript{a} the present emperor, with spies, just at Puttkamer now does the editorial office of the \textit{Sozialdemokrat}. When the heir apparent became regent, Manteuffel, of course, was immediately kicked out and the New Era set in.\textsuperscript{355} It was only a change of scenery. The prince regent deigned to allow the bourgeoisie to be liberal again. The bourgeoisie gladly availed themselves of this permission, but they deluded themselves that they were now in full control of the situation and that the

\textsuperscript{a} Prince William, later Emperor William I.—\textit{Ed.}
Prussian state would have to dance to their tune. That was by no means what was intended by the “authoritative circles”, as they are servilely called. The reorganisation of the army was to be the price the liberal bourgeoisie had to pay for the New Era. The government demanded only the implementation of universal conscription to the extent to which it had been practised around 1816. From the viewpoint of the liberal opposition, absolutely nothing could be said against it that would not at the same time have flown in the face of its own talk about Prussia’s authority and its German mission. But the liberal opposition demanded as a condition for its consent that the term of service be limited by law to two years. In itself this was quite rational, the question was whether it could be enforced, whether the liberal bourgeoisie of the country were prepared to insist on this condition to the end, to risk their property and their lives. The government firmly insisted on a three years' term of service, the Chamber on two, and a conflict broke out. The government firmly insisted on a three years' term of service, the Chamber on two, and a conflict broke out. And with the conflict over the military question, foreign policy once again became decisive for domestic policy too.

We have seen how Prussia, by its stance in the Crimean and Italian wars, forfeited the last remnants of respect it had still enjoyed. That miserable policy could be partially justified by the poor state of its army. Since even before 1848, new taxes could not be imposed or new loans taken out without the consent of the estates, and since no one was willing to assemble the estates for this purpose, there never was enough money for the army, which went to ruin as a result of this boundless niggardliness. The spirit of parade and military drill that had prevailed under Frederick William III did the rest. How helpless this parade army showed itself in 1848 on the battlefields in Denmark can be read in the writings of Count Waldsee. The mobilisation of 1850 was a complete fiasco; there was a shortage of everything, and what was available was mostly useless. True, the voting of funds by the Chambers helped in this respect, the army was shaken out of the old rut, field service replaced parades, at least in most cases. But the numerical strength of the army was still the same as it had been around 1820, while all other great powers, notably France, which now presented the main danger, had substantially increased their armed forces. And yet there was universal conscription in Prussia, on paper every Prussian was a soldier, and while the
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See F. G. Waldsee, Die Methode zur kriegsgemäßen Ausbildung der Infanterie für das zerstreute Gefecht.—Ed.
population had grown from $10\frac{1}{2}$ million (1817) to $17\frac{3}{4}$ million (1858), the scale of the army was insufficient to accommodate and train more than a third of all the men fit for service. The government now demanded an increase in the army's strength corresponding almost exactly to the population growth since 1817. But the same liberal deputies who had been continually insisting on the government assuming the leadership of Germany, safeguarding its external power, and restoring its prestige among the nations—these same people higgled and haggled and refused to grant anything except on the basis of a two-year term of service. Did they possess the power to accomplish their will, on which they so stubbornly insisted? Did the people, or at least the bourgeoisie, back them, ready for action?

Quite the reverse. The bourgeoisie exulted in their verbal battles with Bismarck but actually organised a movement which, even if unconsciously, was in fact directed against the policy of the majority in the Prussian Chamber. Denmark's encroachments upon the Holstein constitution and the attempts at a forcible Danification of Schleswig made the German bourgeoisie indignant. He was used to being bullied by the great powers; but to be kicked by little Denmark, that roused his ire. The National Association was formed; it was precisely the bourgeoisie of the small states that constituted its strength. And the National Association, liberal to the bone as it was, demanded first and foremost national unification under Prussia's leadership, a liberal Prussia if possible, a Prussia the same as ever if it came to the worst. Getting a move on at long last, doing away with the wretched position of second-rank people the Germans held on the world market, chastising Denmark, showing their teeth to the great powers in Schleswig-Holstein, those were the main demands of the National Association. The demand for Prussian leadership was now free of the vagueness and haziness which had still characterised it up to 1850. It was now known for sure that it meant Austria's expulsion from Germany, the actual abolition of the sovereignty of small states, and that neither could be achieved without civil war and the division of Germany. But there was no longer any fear of civil war and the division was no more than the conclusion drawn from the Austrian customs restrictions. Germany's industry and trade had advanced to such a height, the network of German trading firms that spanned the world market had become so extensive and dense, that the proliferation of small states at home and the lack of rights and protection abroad had become intolerable. And while the strongest political organisation the
German bourgeoisie had ever had practically gave a vote of no confidence in the Berlin deputies, the latter continued to haggle over the term of service.

Such was the state of affairs when Bismarck decided to intervene actively in foreign politics.

Bismarck is Louis Napoleon translated from the adventurous French pretender to the throne into the Prussian backwoods Junker and member of the German students' association. Just like Louis Napoleon, Bismarck is a man of great practical judgment and great cunning, a born and sharp businessman, who in different circumstances would have competed on the New York stock exchange with the Vanderbilts and Jay Goulds; indeed, he has not badly succeeded in feathering his nest. But this advanced sense of the practical often goes hand in hand with a corresponding narrowness of outlook, and in this respect Bismarck excels his French predecessor. The latter had himself worked out his "Napoleonic ideas" during his vagabond years—of which they bore the stamp—while Bismarck, as we shall see, never managed to produce even a hint of any political ideas of his own but always combined the ready-made ideas of others to suit his own purposes. However, precisely this narrow-mindedness was his good fortune. Without it he would never have been able to regard the entire history of the world from a specific Prussian point of view; and if in this typically Prussian world outlook of his there had been a rent through which daylight could penetrate, he would have bungled his entire mission and it would have been the end of his glory. True, he was stumped when he had fulfilled, in his own way, his special mission dictated to him from outside, and we shall see what leaps he was forced to make because of his absolute lack of rational ideas and his inability to understand the historical situation he himself had created.

If Louis Napoleon's past had taught him to show little consideration in the choice of methods, Bismarck learned from the history of Prussian politics, notably from those of the so-called Great Elector and of Frederick II, to have even less regard for scruples, though here he could retain the exalting awareness of having remained true to the traditions of the Fatherland. His business sense taught him to repress his Junker appetites when this was necessary; when no longer necessary, they once again came sharply to the fore; this was, of course, a sign of his decline.
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a An allusion to N. L. Bonaparte's Des idées napoléoniennes.—Ed.
b Frederick William.—Ed.
His political method was that of the students' association, the comically literal interpretation of the students' beer drinking code designed to get them out of a scrape in their pub, and he used it unceremoniously in the Chamber in respect of the Prussian constitution; all innovations he introduced in diplomacy were borrowed from the students' association. But if Louis Napoleon often hesitated in decisive moments, as, for example, during the coup d'etat in 1851, when Morny positively had to force him to complete what he had begun, or on the eve of the 1870 war, when his uncertainty spoiled his whole position, it must be admitted that this never happened with Bismarck. His willpower never abandoned him, it was much more likely to turn into open brutality. And this, more than anything else, was the secret of his success. All the ruling classes in Germany, the Junkers and the bourgeoisie, had so much lost the last remnants of energy, it had become so much the custom in “educated” Germany to have no will, that the only man among them who really still possessed one became, precisely because of this, the greatest man among them and a tyrant over them all, at whose bidding they were ready to “jump over the stick”, as they themselves call it, against their better judgment and their conscience. True, in the “uneducated” Germany things have not yet reached such a pass; the working people have shown that they possess a will against which even Bismarck's strong will is unable to prevail.

A brilliant career lay before our Brandenburg Junker, if only he had the courage and sense to help himself to it. Had not Louis Napoleon become the idol of the bourgeoisie precisely because he dispersed their parliament while raising their profits? And did not Bismarck possess the same business talents which the bourgeois admired so much in the false Napoleon? Was he not attracted to his Bleichröder as much as Louis Napoleon to his Fould? Was there not in 1864 a contradiction in Germany between the bourgeois representatives in the Chamber, who, out of stinginess, wanted to reduce the service term, and the bourgeois outside, in the National Association, who demanded national action at any cost, action for which an army was essential? Was it not a contradiction quite similar to the one that existed in France in 1851 between the bourgeois in the Chamber who wanted to keep the power of the President in check and the bourgeois outside who wanted peace and quiet and a strong government, peace and quiet at any cost—a contradiction which Louis Napoleon solved by dispersing the brawlers in parliament and giving peace and quiet to the mass of the bourgeois? Were not things in Germany much
more assuredly in favour of a bold move? Had not the plan for the reorganisation been supplied ready-made by the bourgeoisie, and were not the latter themselves calling loudly for an energetic Prussian statesman who would carry out their plan, expel Austria from Germany and unite the small states under Prussia's supremacy? And if this demanded that the Prussian constitution be treated a bit roughly, that the ideologists in and outside the Chamber be pushed aside according to their deserts, was it not possible to rely on universal suffrage, just as Louis Bonaparte had done? What could be more democratic than to introduce universal suffrage? Had not Louis Napoleon proved that it was absolutely safe—if properly handled? And did not precisely this universal suffrage offer the means to appeal to the broad mass of the people, to flirt a bit with the emerging social movement, should the bourgeoisie prove refractory?

Bismarck took action. What had to be done was to repeat Louis Napoleon's coup d'état, to make the real balance of power tangibly clear to the German bourgeoisie, forcibly to dispel their liberal self-delusion, but to carry out their national demands which coincided with Prussia's aspirations. It was Schleswig-Holstein that first provided a lever for action. As regards foreign policy, the field had been prepared. The Russian Tsar had been won over to Bismarck's side by the latter's dirty work against the Polish insurgents in 1863; Louis Napoleon had also been worked on and could justify his indifference, if not his silent abetment, of Bismarck's plans, with his favourite "nationalities principle"; Palmerston was Prime Minister in England, but he had placed the little Lord John Russell in the Foreign Office only for the purpose of having him make a laughing-stock of himself. But Austria was Prussia's rival for supremacy in Germany and precisely in this matter it could not afford to let Prussia outdo it, especially since it had in 1850 and 1851 acted in Schleswig-Holstein as Emperor Nicholas' henchman more vilely even than Prussia. The situation was therefore extremely favourable. No matter how much Bismarck hated Austria, and how gladly Austria would once again have taken it out of Prussia, there was nothing they could do after the death of Frederick VII of Denmark but take joint action against Denmark—with the tacit consent of Russia and France. Success was assured in advance, so long as Europe remained neutral; it did, the duchies were conquered and ceded under the peace treaty.
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a Alexander II.—Ed.
In this war, Prussia had pursued an additional purpose—that of testing before the enemy the army it had been training according to new principles since 1850 and had reorganised and strengthened in 1860. It had stood the test beyond all expectations and that in all manner of military situations. The battle at Lyngby in Jutland proved that the needle-gun was far superior to the muzzle-loader and that the Prussians knew how to use it properly, since the rapid firing of 80 Prussians from behind hedgerows turned three times as many Danes to flight. At the same time it had been noticed that the only lesson the Austrians had drawn from the Italian war\(^a\) and French fighting tactics was that shooting was no good, that a true soldier had to repulse the enemy immediately with his bayonet, and this was borne in mind, for no more welcome enemy tactics could even be desired against the muzzles of the breech-loaders. To give the Austrians the chance of convincing themselves of this in practice at the earliest possible moment, the peace treaty gave over the duchies to the joint sovereignty of Austria and Prussia, thereby creating a purely temporary situation, which was bound to breed conflict after conflict, and which thus left it entirely to Bismarck to decide when he should choose to use such a conflict for his big blow at Austria. Since it was a Prussian political tradition to exploit a favourable situation “ruthlessly to extreme”, in Herr von Sybel’s words, it was self-evident that under the pretext of freeing the Germans from Danish oppression about 200,000 Danes of North Schleswig were annexed to Germany. The one who got nothing was the Duke of Augustenburg, the candidate of the small states and of the German bourgeoisie for the Schleswig-Holstein throne.

Thus Bismarck had carried out the will of the German bourgeoisie in the duchies against their will. He had expelled the Danes and defied the foreign countries, and the latter had not made a move. But no sooner were they liberated than the duchies were treated as conquered territory, not consulted about their wishes and simply temporarily shared out between Austria and Prussia. Prussia had once again become a great power, was no longer the fifth wheel on the European coach, there was good progress in the fulfilment of the bourgeoisie’s national aspirations, but the way chosen was not the liberal way of the bourgeoisie. Thus the Prussian military conflict continued; it even became ever

\(^a\) Austro-Italo-French war of 1859.— Ed.
more insoluble. The second scene of Bismarck’s principal state action had to be ushered in.

* * *

The Danish war had fulfilled part of the national aspirations. Schleswig-Holstein was “liberated”, the Warsaw and London Protocols, in which the great powers had put their seal to Germany’s humiliation by Denmark, had been torn to pieces and thrown at their feet, and they had not uttered a sound. Austria and Prussia were together again, their armies had been victorious shoulder to shoulder, and no potentate any longer thought of encroaching upon German territory. Louis Napoleon’s cravings for the Rhine, which hitherto had been pushed into the background by other business—the Italian revolution, the Polish insurrection, the Danish complications, and finally the Mexican campaign, had no longer any chance of being satisfied. For a conservative Prussian statesman, the world situation left nothing to be desired from the foreign policy point of view. But up to 1871 Bismarck had never been conservative, and was less so now than ever, and the German bourgeoisie was not at all satisfied.

The German bourgeoisie continued to labour under the familiar contradiction. On the one hand, it demanded exclusive political power for itself, i.e., for a ministry elected from among the liberal majority in the Chamber; and such a ministry would have had to wage a ten-year struggle against the old system represented by the crown before its new position of power was finally recognised; hence ten years of internal weakness. On the other hand, it demanded a revolutionary transformation of Germany, which could be effected only by force, that is, only by an actual dictatorship. At the same time, however, the bourgeoisie since 1848 had demonstrated again and again, at every decisive moment, that it did not possess even a trace of the energy needed to accomplish either of these demands, let alone both. In politics there are only two decisive powers: organised state power, the army, and the unorganised, elemental power of the popular masses. Since 1848, the bourgeoisie had forgotten how to appeal to the masses; it feared them even more than it did absolutism. The bourgeoisie by no means had the army at its disposal. But Bismarck had.

In the continuing conflict over the constitution, Bismarck fought the parliamentary demands of the bourgeoisie to the uttermost.
But he burned with the desire to carry out its national demands, since they coincided with the innermost strivings of Prussian policy. If he now once more carried out the will of the bourgeoisie against its will, if he made the unification of Germany, in the way it had been formulated by the bourgeoisie, a reality, the conflict would be resolved of itself, and Bismarck would inevitably become the idol of the bourgeoisie as Louis Napoleon, his model, before him.

The bourgeoisie supplied him with the aim, Louis Napoleon with the method of achieving the aim; only the implementation was left to Bismarck.

To place Prussia at the head of Germany, it was necessary not only to expel Austria forcibly from the German Confederation but also to subjugate the small states. In Prussian politics, such a refreshing jolly war of Germans against Germans had been the principal means of territorial expansion since the year dot, no worthy Prussian feared such a thing. Just as little misgiving could be caused by the other principal means: alliance with foreign countries against Germans. The out-and-out support of sentimental Alexander of Russia was certain. Louis Napoleon had never denied Prussia’s Piedmont mission in Germany and was quite willing to make a deal with Bismarck. If he could get what he wanted peacefully, in the form of compensation, so much the better. Besides, he did not need to get the entire left bank of the Rhine at one go, if he received it piecemeal, a strip for every new advance by Prussia, it would be less conspicuous, and yet lead to his goal. In the eyes of the French chauvinists, a square mile on the Rhine was worth the whole of Savoy and Nice. Negotiations were therefore held with Louis Napoleon, and his permission was obtained for Prussia’s expansion and the establishment of a North German Confederation. That he was offered in return a strip of German territory on the Rhine is beyond doubt; in the negotiations with Govone, Bismarck mentioned Rhenish Bavaria and Rhenish Hesse. This he subsequently denied, to be sure. But a diplomat, particularly a Prussian diplomat, has his own views of the limits within which one is justified, and even obliged, to do a little violence to the truth. After all, truth is a woman and therefore, according to Junker ideas, actually likes it. Louis Napoleon was not so stupid as to allow Prussian expansion without a Prussian promise of compensation; Bleichröder would sooner
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have lent money without interest. But he did not know his Prussians well enough and was anyway cheated in the end. In short, after he had been assured, an alliance was formed with Italy for the “stab in the heart”.

The philistines in various countries were highly indignant over this expression. But quite wrongly. À la guerre comme à la guerre. The expression only proves that Bismarck recognised the German civil war of 1866 for what it was, namely, a revolution, and that he was willing to carry out that revolution with revolutionary methods. And he did. His treatment of the Federal Diet was revolutionary. Instead of submitting to the constitutional decision of the federal authorities, he accused them of violating the federal treaty—a pure pretext—broke up the Confederation, proclaimed a new constitution with a Reichstag elected by revolutionary universal suffrage and finally expelled the Federal Diet from Frankfurt. In Upper Silesia he formed a Hungarian legion under revolutionary General Klapka and other revolutionary officers whose soldiers, Hungarian deserters and prisoners of war, were to fight against their own legitimate commander-in-chief. After the conquest of Bohemia, Bismarck issued a proclamation “To the Population of the Glorious Kingdom of Bohemia”, whose content was likewise a hard slap in the face for legitimist traditions. After peace had already been established, he seized for Prussia all the possessions of three legitimate German federal monarchs and a free city without the slightest qualms of his Christian and legitimist conscience over the fact that these princes who had been expelled were no less rulers “by the grace of God” than the King of Prussia. In short, it was a complete revolution, carried out with revolutionary means. We are naturally the last to reproach him for this. On the contrary, what we reproach him with is that he was not revolutionary enough, that he was no more than a Prussian revolutionary from above, that he began a whole revolution in a position where he was able to carry through only half a revolution, that, once having set out on the course of annexations, he was content with four miserable small states.

And then Napoleon the Little came limping up behind and demanded his reward. During the war he could have taken whatever he wanted on the Rhine, for not only the land, but also
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the fortresses, were exposed. He hesitated; he expected a protracted war that would wear out both sides; instead, there was a series of quick blows, and Austria was crushed in eight days. At first he demanded what Bismarck had named to General Govone as a possible compensation—Rhenish Bavaria and Rhenish Hesse, including Mainz. But Bismarck could not give that up now, even if he had wanted to. The enormous successes of the war had imposed new obligations on him. At a time when Prussia set itself up as the protector of Germany, it could not sell off Mainz, the key to the Middle Rhine, to a foreign country. Bismarck refused. Louis Napoleon was willing to bargain; he now demanded only Luxemburg, Landau, Saarlouis and the Saarbrücken coal basin. But this too Bismarck no longer could relinquish, the more so as Prussian territory too was claimed. Why had Louis Napoleon not seized it himself at the right moment, when the Prussians were stuck in Bohemia? In short, nothing came of the compensation to France. Bismarck knew this meant a future war with France, but that was exactly what he wanted.

In the peace treaties, Prussia did not exploit the favourable situation as ruthlessly this time as it had usually done in moments of success. There were sound reasons for it. Saxony and Hesse-Darmstadt were included in the new North German Confederation and, if only for this reason, were spared. Bavaria, Württemberg and Baden had to be treated with indulgence, because Bismarck had to sign secret offensive and defensive agreements with them. And Austria—had not Bismarck rendered it a service by smashing the traditional entanglement that tied it to Germany and Italy? Had he not just now secured for it the long-sought position of an independent great power? Had he not actually known better than Austria itself what was good for it when he had defeated it in Bohemia? Did not Austria, if properly handled, have to realise that the geographical position, the mutual entanglement of the two countries made the Germany united by Prussia its essential and natural ally?

Thus it came about that, for the first time in its existence, Prussia was able to surround itself with a halo of generosity, and this because it threw a sprat to catch a salmon.

Not only Austria had been beaten on the Bohemian battlefields—the German bourgeoisie had been beaten as well. Bismarck had shown it that he knew better what was good for it than it knew itself. A continuation of the conflict by the Chamber was out of the question. The liberal pretensions of the bourgeoisie had been buried for a long time to come, but its national demands
were receiving fuller satisfaction with every passing day. Bismarck fulfilled its national programme with a speed and accuracy that surprised the bourgeoisie itself, and having proved to it palpably, in corpore vili—on its own vile body—its limping and listlessness, and thus its complete inability to implement its own programme, he also played the magnanimous towards it and applied to the now actually disarmed Chamber to exempt the government from indemnity for its anti-constitutional rule during the conflict. Touched to tears, it agreed to this now harmless step forward.374

Nevertheless, the bourgeoisie was reminded that it too had been defeated at Königgrätz.375 The constitution of the North German Confederation was modelled on the pattern of the Prussian constitution as authentically interpreted during the conflict. Refusal of taxes was prohibited. The federal Chancellor and his ministers were appointed by the King of Prussia, independently of any parliamentary majority. The army's independence of parliament, secured by the conflict, was stressed also in respect of the Reichstag. But the members of this Reichstag had the exalting awareness that they had been elected by universal suffrage. They were also reminded of this, and most unpleasantly, by the sight of the two socialists a sitting among them. For the first time socialist deputies, representatives of the proletariat, appeared in a parliamentary body. This was an ominous sign.

At first all this was unimportant. The thing now was to advance and exploit the new unity of the Empire, at least that of the North, in the interests of the bourgeoisie and thereby to lure the South German bourgeois too into the new Confederation. The constitution of the Confederation took the economically most important legislative relations away from the competency of the individual states and transferred them to the Confederation: common civil law and freedom of movement within the entire Confederation, right of residence, legislation on the crafts, trade, customs tariffs, navigation, coins, weights and measures, railways, waterways, post and telegraphs, patents, banks, all foreign policy, consulates, commercial protection abroad, sanitary police, the penal code, judicial proceedings, etc. Most of these questions were now regulated quickly, and in general liberally, by law. And then,—at long last!—the ugliest abuses of the small state system were abolished, those that, on the one hand, most obstructed capitalist development, and, on the other, the Prussian craving for power. But that was no world-historic achievement, as the
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bourgeoisie, now turning chauvinistic, trumpeted forth, but a very, very long overdue and imperfect imitation of what the French Revolution had already done seventy years before, and what all other civilised states had introduced long ago. Instead of boasting, it would have been more appropriate to feel ashamed that "highly educated" Germany was the last to do it.

Throughout all this period of the North German Confederation, Bismarck willingly obliged the German bourgeoisie in the economic field and, even in questions affecting the competency of parliament, showed the iron fist only in a velvet glove. This was his best period; at times one could entertain doubts about his peculiarly Prussian narrow-mindedness, his inability to realise that there are in world history other and more powerful forces than armies and diplomatic intrigues relying on them.

Bismarck not only knew that the peace with Austria was pregnant with war with France, he also desired it. This war was to provide the means of perfecting the Prusso-German Empire demanded of him by the German bourgeoisie.* The attempts gradually to transform the Customs Parliament into a Reichstag and thus to draw the southern states little by little into the North German Confederation were wrecked by the loud call of the South German deputies: No extension of competence! The mood of the governments, which had only recently been defeated on the field of battle, was no more favourable. Only fresh, palpable proof that the Prussians were not only much more powerful than these governments, but also powerful enough to protect them, that is, a new all-German war, could rapidly bring the moment of surrender. Besides, after the victories, it seemed as though the dividing line on the Main, upon which Bismarck and Louis Napoleon had secretly agreed beforehand, had after all been imposed on the Prussians by the latter; in that case, a union with South Germany was a violation of the formally recognised right of the French this time to the fragmentation of Germany, was a casus belli.

In the meantime, Louis Napoleon had to search for a patch of

* Even before the Austrian war, when Bismarck was interpellated by a minister from a central German state on his demagogic German policy, he replied that, despite all the rhetoric, he would expel Austria from Germany and break up the Confederation.—"And the central states, do you think they will quietly look on?"—"You, the central states, you will do nothing."—"And what is to become of the Germans then?"—"I shall then lead them to Paris and unite them there." (Told in Paris before the Austrian war by the said minister from the central state and published during that war in the Manchester Guardian by Mrs. Crawford, its Paris correspondent.)
land somewhere near the German border which he could pocket as compensation for Sadowa. When the new North German Confederation was formed, it did not include Luxemburg, now a state in personal union with Holland, but otherwise completely independent. Besides, it was approximately as much Frenchified as Alsace and was far more attracted to France than to Prussia, which it positively hated.

Luxemburg is a striking example of what Germany's political wretchedness since the Middle Ages had made of the German-French borderlands, the more striking because Luxemburg had until 1866 nominally belonged to Germany. Up to 1830, it had been composed of a French and a German part, but the German part had already at this early stage submitted to superior French culture. The German Emperors of Luxemburg were French in both language and education. Since its incorporation in the Burgundy lands (1440), Luxemburg, like all the other Low Countries, had remained in a purely nominal union with Germany; even admission to the German Confederation in 1815 changed nothing. After 1830, the French part and a substantial portion of the German part were annexed to Belgium. However, in what remained of German Luxemburg, everything continued on a French footing: the courts, the authorities, the Chamber, everything was conducted in French, all public and private documents, all business accounts were kept in French, in secondary schools the teaching was in French, French was and remained the language of the educated—naturally a French that groaned and panted with the High German sound shift. In short, two languages were spoken in Luxemburg: a Rhenish Franconian popular dialect, and French, while High German remained a foreign tongue. The Prussian garrison in the capital made things worse rather than better. This may be shameful for Germany but it is true. And this voluntary Frenchification of Luxemburg showed the similar processes in Alsace and German Lorraine in their true light.

The King of Holland, a the sovereign Duke of Luxemburg, who could well use hard cash, was willing to sell the duchy to Louis Napoleon. The people of Luxemburg would have undoubtedly approved their incorporation into France—the proof was their attitude in the war of 1870. From the standpoint of international law, Prussia could not object, since it had itself brought about
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Luxemburg's exclusion from Germany. Its troops were stationed in the capital as the federal garrison of a federal German fortress; as soon as Luxemburg ceased to be a federal fortress, they no longer had any right to be there. Why did they not go home, why could Bismarck not agree to Luxemburg's annexation?

Simply, because the contradictions in which he had become entangled were now becoming evident. As far as Prussia was concerned, before 1866 Germany was simply territory for annexation, which had to be shared with foreign countries. After 1866, Germany became a Prussian protectorate, which had to be defended against foreign claws. True, in the interests of Prussia, whole parts of Germany had been excluded from the newly founded so-called Germany. But the right of the German nation to its own territory now imposed on the Prussian Crown the duty of preventing the incorporation of these parts of the former federal territory into foreign states, of leaving the door open for their future union with the new Prussian-German state. It was for this reason that Italy had stopped at the Tyrolean border, and that Luxemburg could not be allowed to go over to Louis Napoleon. A truly revolutionary government could declare this openly. Not so the royal Prussian revolutionary, who had finally succeeded in transforming Germany into a "geographic concept" in Metternich's sense. From the point of view of international law, he had placed himself in the wrong, and the only way he could get out of the difficulty was to use his favourite students' beerhouse interpretation of international law.

If in so doing he was not simply laughed to scorn, it was only because, in the spring of 1867, Louis Napoleon was not at all ready for a big war. Agreement was reached at the London Conference. The Prussians evacuated Luxemburg, the fortress was demolished, the duchy was declared neutral. The war was again postponed.

Louis Napoleon could not rest content with this. He was willing to tolerate the aggrandisement of Prussia only if he received corresponding compensation on the Rhine. He was willing to content himself with little, he had even reduced that, but he had received nothing, had been cheated of everything. However, a Bonapartist Empire in France could exist only if it shifted the border gradually towards the Rhine and if France—in fact or at least in imagination—remained the arbiter of Europe. The border shift had failed, France's position as arbiter was already threatened, the Bonapartist press loudly called for revenge for Sadowa—if Louis Napoleon wanted to keep his throne, he had to
remain true to his role and to obtain by force what he had not obtained amicably, in spite of services rendered.

So eager war preparations, both diplomatic and military, were begun by both sides. And then the following diplomatic event occurred:

Spain was looking for a candidate for the throne. In March, Benedetti, the French ambassador in Berlin, picked up rumours about claims for the throne advanced by Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern; he was charged by Paris to investigate the matter. Under-Secretary of State von Thile gave him his word of honour that the Prussian Government knew nothing about it. During a visit to Paris, Benedetti learned the Emperor’s opinion: “This candidature is essentially anti-national, the country will not tolerate it, it must be prevented.”

Incidentally, Louis Napoleon showed thereby that he was already down at heel. Indeed, what could have been a better “revenge for Sadowa” than a Prussian Prince on the Spanish throne, the unavoidable annoyances resulting therefrom, Prussian involvement in the internal relations between the Spanish parties, perhaps even a war, a defeat of the dwarfish Prussian navy, in any case a Prussia looking quite grotesque in the eyes of Europe? But Louis Bonaparte could no longer afford this spectacle. His credit was already so much shaken that he was committed to the traditional point of view according to which a German sovereign on the Spanish throne would place France between two fires and was therefore intolerable—a childish point of view after 1830.

So Benedetti visited Bismarck to receive further information and to make France’s point of view clear to him (May 11, 1869). He did not learn anything particularly conclusive from Bismarck. Bismarck, however, did learn from Benedetti what he wanted to find out: that Leopold’s nomination as candidate would mean an immediate war with France. This gave Bismarck the opportunity to have the war break out when it suited him.

In actual fact, Leopold’s candidature emerged once again in July 1870 and immediately led to war, no matter how much Louis Napoleon resisted it. He not only saw that he had walked into a trap, he also knew that his emperorship was at stake, and he had little confidence in the faithfulness of his Bonapartist Brimstone gang, who assured him that everything was ready, up to the last button on the men’s spats, and even less confidence in their military and administrative skill. But the logical consequences of
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his own past drove him towards destruction; his hesitation itself hastened his doom.

Bismarck, on the other hand, was not only quite ready for action militarily, but this time he actually had the people behind him, who saw only one fact behind the diplomatic lies spread by both sides: namely, that this was a war not only for the Rhine, but for national existence. For the first time since 1813, reserves and the Landwehr\textsuperscript{382} once again flocked to the colours, eager and keen to fight. It did not matter how all this had come about, did not matter what piece of the two-thousand-year-old national heritage Bismarck had, off his own back, promised or not promised to Louis Napoleon: the thing was to teach foreign countries once and for all that they were not to interfere in German internal affairs and that it was not Germany's mission to support Louis Napoleon's shaky throne by ceding German territory. All class differences vanished in the face of this national upsurge, all cravings of the South German courts for a Confederation of the Rhine, all attempts at a restoration of the expelled monarchs melted away.

Both sides had sought allies. Louis Napoleon had Austria and Denmark for sure, and was pretty certain of Italy. Bismarck had Russia. But Austria, as always, was not ready and could not participate effectively before September 2—and on September 2 Louis Napoleon was a prisoner of war of the Germans, and Russia had informed Austria that it would attack Austria the moment Austria attacked Prussia. In Italy, however, Louis Napoleon's double-dealing policy wrought vengeance upon him: he had sought to set national unity in motion, but at the same time to protect the Pope from that same national unity; he had kept Rome occupied with troops he now needed at home but which he could not withdraw without obliging Italy to respect the sovereignty of Rome and the Pope; this in turn prevented Italy from supporting him. Denmark finally got the order from Russia to behave itself.

The rapid blows of the German armies from Spicheren and Wörth to Sedan\textsuperscript{383} were more decisive in localising the war than all diplomatic negotiations. Louis Napoleon's army was defeated in every battle and finally three-quarters of it went to Germany as prisoners of war. This was not the fault of the soldiers, who had fought bravely enough, but of the leaders and the administration. But if, like Louis Napoleon, one had created an empire with the help of a gang of rascals, if this empire had been maintained for eighteen years merely by abandoning France to the exploitation of that gang, if all decisive posts in the state had been filled with people belonging to that very gang and all subordinate posts with
their accomplices, then one should not engage in a life-and-death battle if one does not wish to be left in the lurch. The entire edifice of the empire that had been the admiration of European philistines for years crashed in less than five weeks; the revolution of September 4 simply cleared away the rubble, and Bismarck, who had gone to war to found a small German empire, turned out one fine morning to be the founder of a French republic.

According to Bismarck's own proclamation, the war was waged not against the French people, but against Louis Napoleon. With his fall, all the reasons to wage war thus disappeared. The government of September 4, which was not so naïve in other matters, also deluded itself to this effect, and was greatly surprised when Bismarck suddenly showed himself a Prussian Junker.

No one in the world hates the French as much as the Prussian Junkers do. For not only had the hitherto tax-exempled Junker suffered heavily during the chastisement by the French (from 1806 to 1813), which he had brought about by his own arrogance; but, what was much worse, the godless French had so confused the people by their outrageous revolution that the old grandeur of the Junkers had for the most part been laid to rest even in old Prussia, so that year in and year out the poor Junkers had to struggle hard to keep what was left of it, and many of them were already debased to a shabby sponging nobility. For this, revenge had to be taken on France, and the Junker officers in the army under Bismarck's leadership took care of that. Lists of war contributions exacted by France from Prussia were drawn up and the size of the war contributions imposed on the various towns and departments was calculated accordingly, but naturally taking into account France's much greater wealth. Foodstuffs, forage, clothes, footwear, etc., were requisitioned with demonstrative ruthlessness. A mayor in the Ardennes who said that he would be unable to make the deliveries was given twenty-five strokes of the cane without further ado, as the Paris government officially proved. The francs-tireurs, who acted in such strict accordance with the Prussian Landsturm Statute of 1813 as if they had made a special study of it, were shot without mercy on the spot. The stories about clocks being sent home are also true, even the Kölnische Zeitung reported it. Only, according to Prussian views, those clocks were not stolen but were ownerless, having been found in abandoned villas near Paris and confiscated for the dear ones at home. Thus, the Junkers under Bismarck's leadership saw to it that, despite the irreproachable behaviour of the men and many of the officers, the specifically Prussian character of the war
was preserved, and that this was driven home to the French, who held the entire army responsible for the mean spitefulness of the Junkers.

And yet it fell to the lot of these same Junkers to render to the French people an honour unequalled in history. When all attempts to make the enemy relieve the siege of Paris had failed, all the French armies had been beaten back. Bourbaki's last great counter-attack on the German lines of communication had proved abortive, when all Europe's diplomats had abandoned France to its fate without stirring a finger, emaciated Paris finally had to surrender. The hearts of the Junkers beat faster when they were finally able to enter the godless nest in triumph and take complete vengeance upon the Paris arch-rebels—the complete vengeance which had been denied to them by Alexander of Russia in 1814 and Wellington in 1815; now they could chastise the seat and homeland of the revolution to their hearts' content.

Paris surrendered, it paid a contribution of 200 millions; the forts were handed over to the Prussians; the garrison laid down its arms before the victors and delivered up its field guns; the cannons on the wall around Paris were taken off their gun-carriages; all means of resistance belonging to the state were handed over piece by piece. But the actual defenders of Paris, the National Guard, the armed Parisians, remained untouched, for nobody expected them to give up their arms, either their rifles or their cannons*; and so that it would be known to the whole world that the victorious German army had respectfully stopped before the armed people of Paris, the victors did not enter Paris, but were content to be allowed to occupy for three days the Champs Élysées, a public park, protected, guarded and enclosed on all sides by the sentries of the Parisians! No German soldier set foot in Paris City Hall or stepped on the boulevards, and the few that were admitted to the Louvre to admire the art treasures there had to ask for permission, otherwise it would have been a violation of the surrender. France was defeated, Paris starved, but the Parisian people had by their glorious past ensured respect for themselves, so that no victor dared to demand their disarmament, no one had the courage to enter their homes or to desecrate by a triumphal march those streets which had been the battle-ground of so many

* It was these cannons, which belonged to the National Guard and not to the state, and had therefore not been handed over to the Prussians, that Thiers ordered on March 18, 1871, to be stolen from the Parisians, thereby bringing about the rebellion that gave rise to the Commune.
revolutions. It was as if the upstart German Emperor\(^a\) was taking off his hat before the living revolutionaries of Paris, as once his brother\(^b\) had before the dead March fighters of Berlin,\(^388\) and as if the entire German army stood behind him presenting arms.

But that was the only sacrifice Bismarck had to make. Under the pretext that there was no government in France which could sign a peace treaty with him—which was just as true as it was false both on September 4 and on January 28—he had exploited his successes in the truly Prussian manner, to the very last drop, and declared himself ready for peace only after France had been completely crushed. In the peace treaty itself, once again according to the good old Prussian custom, he “ruthlessly exploited the favourable situation”. Not only was the unheard-of sum of 5,000 millions in war reparations extorted, but also two provinces, Alsace and German Lorraine, with Metz and Strasbourg were torn away from France and incorporated into Germany.\(^389\)

With this annexation, Bismarck appeared for the first time as an independent politician, who was no longer implementing in his own way a programme dictated from outside, but translating into action the products of his own brain, thereby committing his first enormous blunder.\(^c\)

Alsace had been conquered in the main by France during the Thirty Years' War.\(^390\) Richelieu had thereby abandoned Henry IV's sound principle:

“Let the Spanish language belong to the Spaniard, the German to the German, but where French is spoken, that belongs to me.”

In so doing, Richelieu relied on the principle of the natural border on the Rhine, the historical border of old Gaul. This was folly; but the German Empire, which incorporated the French-speaking parts of Lorraine and Belgium and even of the Franche-Comté, had no right to reproach France with annexing German-speaking lands. And even if, in 1681, in peacetime, Louis XIV had seized Strassburg with the help of a pro-French party in the city,\(^391\) it is not for Prussia to be indignant over it, having raped the Free Imperial town of Nuremberg in exactly the
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\(^a\) William I.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) Frederick William IV.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^c\) The text below, up to the words “Bismarck had reached his objective” (see this volume, p. 497), is printed according to the \textit{Neue Zeit}, Vol. I, No. 25, 1895-96, pp. 772-76, because the relative manuscript pages are missing.—\textit{Ed.}
same way in 1796, although, to be sure, without having been called by a Prussian party, and without success.*

Lorraine was sold off to France in 1735 by Austria under the Peace of Vienna, and in 1766 it definitively became a French possession. For centuries it had belonged to the German Empire only nominally, its dukes were French in every respect and had almost always been allied with France.

Before the French Revolution, there were a great many small domains in the Vosges which behaved in respect to Germany like estates of the empire subject immediately to the emperor, but recognised the sovereignty of France. They derived benefits from this hermaphroditic position, and if the German Empire tolerated it instead of calling these sovereigns to account, it could not complain when France, by virtue of its sovereignty, extended protection to the people of these territories against the expelled princes.

On the whole, before the Revolution, this German territory was practically not Frenchified at all. German remained the school and official language internally, at least in Alsace. The French Government patronised the German provinces, which now, after many years of war devastation, had seen no more enemies on their lands since the early 18th century. The German Empire, perpetually torn by internal wars, was really not in a state to attract the Alsatians back to the maternal bosom; at least they now

* Louis XIV is reproached with having set loose his "reunion chambers" in times of peace on German areas which did not belong to him. This is something that could not be said of the Prussians even by those who had the most malicious envy of them. On the contrary. After they had signed a separate peace with France in 1795 in direct violation of the imperial constitution and had rallied their equally renegade small neighbours behind the demarcation line around themselves in the first North German Confederation, they utilised, for attempts to annex territory in Franconia, the tight spot the South German estates of the empire found themselves in as a result of continuing the war alone in alliance with Austria. They set up reunion chambers according to Louis' pattern in Ansbach and Bayreuth (which were then Prussian), raised claims to a series of neighbouring areas, in comparison with which Louis' legal pretexts were absolutely convincing; and when the Germans then retreated after a beating and the French moved into Franconia, the Prussian saviours occupied the Nuremberg area, including the suburbs up to the city wall, and tricked the Nuremberg philistines, who were trembling with fear, into signing a treaty (September 2, 1796) which subjected the city to Prussian rule on the condition that Jews would never be allowed within the city walls. Immediately after that, Archduke Charles took the offensive again, beat the French at Würzburg on September 3 and 4, 1796, and the attempt to knock the idea of Prussia's German mission into the heads of the Nurembergers thus went up in smoke.
had peace and quiet, knew how things stood, and the philistines
who set the tone accepted the inscrutable ways of the Lord; after
all, their fate was not unprecedented: the people of Holstein were
also under foreign, Danish, rule.

Then came the French Revolution. What Alsace and Lorraine
never dared hope to receive from Germany was given to them by
France as a gift. The feudal fetters were smashed. The serf, the
peasant liable to statute labour, became a free man, in many cases
the free owner of his farmstead and field. In the towns, patrician
rule and guild privileges disappeared. The nobility was driven out.
In the lands of the small princes and lords, the peasants followed
the example of their neighbours and expelled the sovereigns,
government chambers and nobility, and declared themselves free
French citizens. In no other part of France did the people join the
revolution with greater enthusiasm than in the German-speaking
part. And when the German Empire now declared war on the
revolution, when the Germans, who not only continued to carry
their own chains submissively, but also allowed themselves to be
used once again to force the old servitude upon the French and to
re-impose on the Alsatian peasants the feudal lords they had only
just expelled, now it was all over with the Germanism of the
people of Alsace and Lorraine, it was then that they learned to
hate and despise the Germans; it was then that the Marseillaise
was written in Strasbourg, set to music and first sung by the Alsatians,
and that the German French, despite their language and their
past, fused on hundreds of battlefields in the struggle for the
revolution into a single nation with the native French.

Did not the great revolution work the same miracle with the
Flemings of Dunkirk, the Celts of Brittany, the Italians of Corsica?
And if we complain that this happened also with Germans, does it
not show that we have forgotten our entire history, which made
this possible? Have we forgotten that the whole left bank of the
Rhine, which took only a passive part in the revolution, was
pro-French when the Germans again moved in in 1814, and
continued to be pro-French up to 1848, when the revolution
rehabilitated the Germans in the eyes of the people on the Rhine?
Have we forgotten that Heine's enthusiasm for the French and
even his Bonapartism were but the echo of general public feeling
on the left bank of the Rhine?

When the allies invaded in 1814 it was precisely in Alsace and
German Lorraine that they encountered the most resolute
hostility, the most vehement resistance on the part of the people
themselves; because here the danger was felt of having to become
German again. And yet, at that time, practically only German was spoken there. But when the danger of being torn from France had passed, when an end had been put to the annexationist appetites of the romantic Germanophile chauvinists, the awareness appeared that a closer fusion with France was needed also in respect of the language, and then the Frenchification of schools was introduced, similar to that voluntarily established by the Luxemburgers in their land. Yet the transformation proceeded very slowly; only the present generation of the bourgeoisie is really Frenchified, while the peasants and workers speak German. The position is approximately the same as in Luxemburg: literary German has been ousted by French (except partially in the pulpit), but the German folk dialect has lost ground only at the language border and is used as the popular language to a much greater extent than in most parts of Germany.

Such was the land that Bismarck and the Prussian Junkers, backed by the revival of chauvinistic romanticism which seems inseparable from all German problems, undertook to make German again. The wish to make Strasbourg, the homeland of the \textit{Marseillaise}, German, was just as absurd as to make Nice, the homeland of Garibaldi, French. But in Nice, Louis Napoleon at least observed decency and put the question of annexation to the vote—and the manoeuvre succeeded. Quite apart from the fact that for very good reasons the Prussians detest such revolutionary measures—never and nowhere has there been an instance when the mass of the people wanted to be annexed to Prussia—it was known only too well that precisely here the entire population was more closely attached to France than were the native French themselves. And thus this arbitrary act was performed by brute force. It was an act of revenge against the French Revolution; one of the parts which had been fused with France precisely as a result of the revolution was torn away.

It is true that militarily there was a purpose behind this annexation. Metz and Strasbourg gave Germany an enormously strong line of defence. So long as Belgium and Switzerland remain neutral a massive French offensive can be begun only on the narrow strip of land between Metz and the Vosges; and besides, Koblenz, Metz, Strasbourg and Mainz form the strongest and biggest quadrangle of fortresses in the world. However, half of this quadrangle of fortresses, as is the case also with the Austrian fortresses in Lombardy,\textsuperscript{395} lies in enemy territory and forms citadels there to keep the population down. Moreover, to complete the quadrangle, it was necessary to seize areas beyond the
German-language border and to annex a quarter of a million of native Frenchmen as well.

The great strategic advantage is thus the only reason that can justify the annexation. However, can this gain in any way be compared with the harm it wrought?

The Prussian Junker refused to reckon with the great moral disadvantage at which the young German Empire had placed itself by openly and frankly declaring brutal force its guiding principle. Quite the reverse, refractory subjects forcibly kept in check are a necessity for him; they are proof of increased Prussian might; and essentially he has never any others. But he was obliged to reckon with the political consequences of the annexation. And these were clearly apparent. Even before the annexation came into force, Marx loudly drew the world's attention to it in a circular of the International: *The annexation of Alsace and Lorraine makes Russia the arbiter of Europe.* And this has been repeated often enough by the Social-Democrats from the rostrum of the Reichstag until the truth of this statement was finally acknowledged by Bismarck himself in his Reichstag speech of February 6, 1888, by his whimpering before the almighty Tsar, b the lord of war and peace. 396

Actually, the situation was clear as daylight. To tear from France two of its fanatically patriotic provinces, meant to push it into the arms of anybody who held out hope for their return and to make it an eternal enemy. However, Bismarck, in this respect a worthy and conscientious representative of the German philistines, demanded that the French renounce Alsace and Lorraine not only constitutionally but also morally, and in addition wanted them to be downright glad that these two parts of revolutionary France "had been returned to the old Fatherland", of which they simply would not hear. Unfortunately, however, the French did not do so, any more than the Germans morally renounced the left bank of the Rhine during the Napoleonic wars, even though this area had not the slightest longing to return to them at that time. As long as the people of Alsace and Lorraine wish to return to France, it must and will strive to regain them and look for means and, hence, also for allies, to achieve this. And the natural ally against Germany is Russia.

If the two biggest and strongest nations of the Western
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continent neutralise each other by their hostility, if there is just one bone of contention between them which incites them to fight each other, the advantage lies only with Russia, whose hands are so much the freer; Russia who is all the less hampered by Germany in its cravings for conquest, the more it can count on unconditional support from France. And was it not Bismarck who placed France in a position where it has to beg for Russia's alliance, where it must willingly abandon Constantinople to Russia, if only the latter promises the return of France's lost provinces? And if in spite of all that the peace has been kept for seventeen years, is there any other reason than that the Landwehr system introduced in France and Russia requires at least sixteen, and after the most recent German improvements even twenty-five years, to provide the full number of trained age groups? And now that the annexation has for seventeen years been the dominant factor in all European politics, is it not at this moment the main cause of the crisis threatening the continent with war? Remove this single fact and peace is assured!

The Alsatian bourgeois who speaks French with an Upper German accent, that hybrid fop who puts on greater French airs than a Frenchman through and through, who looks down on Goethe and goes into raptures over Racine, who still cannot rid himself of his bad conscience over his secret Germanness and exactly for that reason has to run down everything German, so that he does not even suit the role of a mediator between Germany and France, this Alsatian bourgeois is indeed a despicable fellow, be he a Mulhouse industrialist or a Paris journalist. But what has made him what he is if not the history of Germany over the past three hundred years? And were not until quite recently almost all Germans abroad, especially the merchants, genuine Alsatians, who denied their German origin, who masochistically imposed on themselves the alien nationality of their new homeland and thus voluntarily made themselves certainly no less ridiculous than the Alsatians, who at least are more or less compelled by circumstances to do so? In England, for example, the German merchants who immigrated between 1815 and 1840 had almost without exception become Anglicised, spoke almost exclusively English among themselves, and even today, for example, at the Manchester Stock Exchange, there are old German philistines running around who would give half their wealth if they could pass for true Englishmen. Only in 1848 did a change set in, and since 1870, when even lieutenants of the reserve have been coming to England and Berlin has been sending
its contingents here, the former servility is being ousted by a
Prussian arrogance which makes us no less ridiculous abroad.

Perhaps the union with Germany has been made more palatable
to the Alsatians since 1871? On the contrary. They have been
placed under a dictatorship, whereas next door, in France, there
was a republic. A pedantical and obtrusive Prussian Landrat
system has been introduced, in comparison with which the
interference of the notorious French system of prefects, regulated
by strict laws, is solid gold. An end has been rapidly put to the
last remnants of freedom of the press, right of assembly and
association, refractory town councils have been dissolved and
German bureaucrats appointed mayors. On the other hand,
however, there has been flattery of the "notables", that is, the
thoroughly Frenchified nobles and bourgeois, and their exploiter
interests have been protected against the peasants and workers,
who, although not well disposed towards Germany, at least spoke
German, and formed the only element with which an attempt at
reconciliation was possible. And what has been the result? That in
February 1887, when the whole of Germany allowed itself to be
intimidated and put a majority of the Bismarck cartel in the
Reichstag, Alsace and Lorraine elected nothing but staunch
Frenchmen and rejected everyone who was suspected of even the
mildest pro-German sympathies.

Now, if the Alsatians are as they are, have we the right to be
angry over that? Not at all. Their opposition to the annexation is
an historical fact, which should not be deleted but explained. And
this is the time for us to ask ourselves: how numerous and how
colossal were the historical sins Germany committed before such a
feeling could assert itself in Alsace? And how must our new
German Empire look from the outside if, after seventeen years of
re-Germanisation attempts, the Alsatians unanimously tell us:
Spare us that? Have we the right to imagine that two successful
campaigns and seventeen years of Bismarckian dictatorship suffice
to do away with all the effects of three hundred years of
ignominious history?

Bismarck had reached his objective. His new Prussian-German
Empire had been publicly proclaimed at Versailles, in Louis XIV's
splendid state hall. France lay defenceless at his feet; defiant
Paris, which he himself had not dared touch, had been incited to
the Commune uprising by Thiers and then crushed by the soldiers
of the former imperial army returning from captivity. All
European philistines admired Bismarck as they had admired Louis
Napoleon, Bismarck's model, in the fifties. With Russian help
Germany had become the first power in Europe, and all power in Germany was concentrated in the hands of dictator Bismarck. Everything depended now on what he could do with that power. If he had so far carried out the unification plans of the bourgeoisie, even if not by bourgeois, but by Bonapartist methods, this matter was pretty well settled, and he now had to make his own plans, to show what ideas his own head could produce, and these had to find expression in the internal consolidation of the new empire.

German society is composed of big landowners, peasants, bourgeois, petty bourgeois and workers; these can in turn be grouped into three major classes.

*Big landed property* is in the hands of a few magnates (notably in Silesia) and a large number of middle landowners, most highly concentrated in the old Prussian provinces east of the Elbe. It is these Prussian Junkers who more or less dominate the entire class. They are farmers themselves, inasmuch as they entrust the cultivation of their estates for the most part to managers, and in addition they often own distilleries and beet-sugar refineries. Wherever possible, their landed property is entailed upon the family by right of primogeniture. The younger sons join the army or the civil service, so that an even less wealthy petty nobility made up of officers and civil servants clings to this petty landowning gentry and is supplemented over and above this through the intensive promotion of nobles from among the higher officers and civil servants of bourgeois origin. On the lower fringes of all this bunch of nobles, there naturally emerges a numerically parasitic nobility, a noble Lumpenproletariat, which lives on debts, dubious gambling, pushiness, begging and political espionage. This society in its totality forms the Prussian Junkers and is one of the main pillars of the old Prussian state. However, the landowning core of the Junkers themselves has feet of clay. The duty to live up to its status becomes more and more expensive every day; the support for the younger sons through the lieutenant and assessor stage, the marrying off of daughters, all costs money; and since all these are duties which push all other considerations into the background, it is no wonder that incomes are insufficient, that IOU's have to be signed or even mortgages have to be taken out. In short, Junkers stand always on the brink of the abyss; every misfortune, be it a war, a bad harvest or a commercial crisis, threatens to push them over the brink; and it is therefore no wonder that for well over a hundred years now they have been saved from ruin only by all sorts of state assistance and, in fact,
continue to exist only thanks to state assistance. This artificially preserved class is doomed to extinction and no state assistance can keep it alive in the long run. But with it disappears also the old Prussian state.

The peasant is an element that is little active politically. In so far as he himself is a proprietor, he is going ever more to ruin because of the unfavourable production conditions of the allotment peasants, who cannot engage in stock-breeding, having been deprived of the old common Mark or community pasture. As a tenant, his position is even worse. Petty peasant production presupposes a predominantly subsistence economy, the money economy seals its doom. Hence the growing indebtedness, the massive expropriation by mortgage creditors, the recourse to domestic industry, so as just not to be evicted from his native soil. Politically, the peasantry is mainly indifferent or reactionary: on the Rhine it is ultramontane because of its old hatred for the Prussians, in other areas it is particularist or protestant-conservative. Religious feeling still serves this class as an expression of social or political interests.

We have already spoken about the bourgeoisie. From 1848 it experienced an unprecedented economic advance. Germany had increasingly participated in the vast expansion of industry following the 1847 commercial crisis, an expansion brought about by the establishment during that period of ocean steam navigation, the enormous extension of the railways and the discovery of gold in California and Australia.\(^{399}\) It was precisely the bourgeoisie's striving for the abolition of the obstructions to trade caused by the system of small states and for a position on the world market equal to that of its foreign competitors that gave the impetus to Bismarck's revolution. Now that French milliards were flooding Germany, a new period of feverish enterprise opened up before the bourgeoisie, during which it—by a crash on a national German scale\(^{400}\)—proved for the first time that it had become a big industrial nation. The bourgeoisie was even then the economically most powerful class among the population; the state had to obey its economic interests; the revolution of 1848 had given the state an external constitutional form within which the bourgeoisie could rule also politically and develop its domination. Yet it was still far from actual political domination. In the conflict it had not triumphed over Bismarck; the resolution of the conflict through the revolutionising of Germany from above had also taught it that, for the time being, the executive power was dependent on it, at best, in a very indirect form, that it could neither appoint nor
dismiss ministers, nor dispose of the army. Besides, it was cowardly and limp in the face of an energetic executive power, but so were the Junkers, though this was more excusable in the case of the bourgeoisie because of the direct economic antagonism between it and the revolutionary industrial working class. There was no doubt, however, that it gradually had to destroy the Junkers economically, that it was the only propertied class which retained any prospect of a future.

The petty bourgeoisie consisted first of all of remnants of the medieval craftsmen, who had been represented on a larger scale in backward Germany than in the rest of Western Europe; secondly, of the down-and-out bourgeois; and thirdly, of elements of the propertyless population who had risen to be small merchants. With the expansion of large-scale industry, the existence of the entire petty bourgeoisie lost the last remnants of stability; changes of occupation and periodic bankruptcies became the rule. This once so stable class which had been the nucleus of the German philistines fell from its previous contentment, docility, servility, piety and respectability into wild decadence and dissatisfaction with the fate allotted to it by God. The remnants of the craftsmen loudly demanded the restoration of guild privileges, some of the others became mildly democratic men of Progress,401 some even grew closer to the Social-Democrats and in some instances directly joined the working-class movement.

Finally the workers. The agricultural workers, at least those in the east, still lived in semi-serfdom and could not be taken into account. On the other hand, Social-Democracy had made enormous progress among the urban workers and grew to the extent that large-scale industry proletarianised the mass of the people and thereby exacerbated the class antagonism between the capitalists and the workers. Even if the Social-Democratic workers were for the time being still divided into two parties fighting each other,402 since the publication of Marx’s Capital, the fundamental differences between them had nevertheless as good as disappeared. Orthodox Lassalleanism, with its exclusive demand for “producer associations assisted by the state”, was gradually dying away and proved less and less capable of forming the nucleus of a Bonapartist state socialist workers’ party. The harm wrought in this respect by individual leaders was rectified by the common sense of the masses. The union of the two Social-Democratic tendencies, which was delayed almost exclusively because of questions of personalities, was certain to take place in the near future. But even during the split and despite it, the movement was
strong enough to strike fear into the industrial bourgeoisie and to paralyse it in its struggle against the government, which was still independent of it; and after 1848 the German bourgeoisie never rid itself of the Red spectre again.

The class structure underlay the party structure in parliament and in the provincial diets. The large landed estate owners and part of the peasantry formed the mass of the conservatives; the industrial bourgeoisie provided the Right wing of the bourgeois liberals—the National Liberals, while the Left wing comprised the weakened democratic party or so-called Party of Progress, which consisted of petty bourgeois supported by a section of the bourgeoisie and the workers. Finally, the workers had their independent party, the Social-Democrats, which included also some petty bourgeois.

A person in Bismarck’s position and with Bismarck’s past, having a certain understanding of the state of affairs, could not but realise that the Junkers, such as they were, were not a viable class, and that of all the propertied classes only the bourgeoisie could lay claim to a future, and that therefore (disregarding the working class, an understanding of whose historical mission we cannot expect of him) his new empire promised to be all the stabler, the more he succeeded in laying the groundwork for its gradual transition to a modern bourgeois state. Let us not expect of him what was impossible under the circumstances. An immediate transition to a parliamentary government with the decisive power vested in the Reichstag (as in the British House of Commons) was neither possible nor even advisable at that moment; Bismarck’s dictatorship in parliamentary forms must have seemed to him still necessary for the time being; and we do not in the least blame him for allowing it to survive for the moment, we only ask what good it was. And there can be hardly any doubt that paving the way for a system corresponding to the British constitution was the only way which offered the prospect of ensuring a sound basis and quiet internal development for the new empire. By leaving the larger part of the Junkers, who were beyond salvation anyway, to their inevitable doom, it still seemed possible to forge what remained of them with new elements into a class of independent big landowners, which would become only the ornamental élite of the bourgeoisie; a class to which the bourgeoisie, even at the height of its power, would have to grant state representation and with it the most lucrative positions and enormous influence. By granting the bourgeoisie political concessions, which anyway could not be withheld for any length of time
(such at least should have been the argument from the standpoint of the propertied classes), by granting it these concessions gradually, and even in small and rare doses, the new empire would at least be steered onto a course which would enable it to catch up with the other, politically far more advanced West-European states, to shake off the last remnants of feudalism and philistine traditions which still held a firm grip on the bureaucracy, and, above all, to stand on its own feet by the time its by no means youthful founders departed this life.

This was not even difficult. Neither the Junkers nor the bourgeoisie possessed even average energy. The Junkers had proved this in the past sixty years, during which the state had constantly done what was best for them despite the opposition of these Don Quixotes. The bourgeoisie, also made malleable by its long prehistory, was still licking the wounds left by the conflict; Bismarck's successes since then had further broken its power of resistance, and fear of the dangerously growing working-class movement did the rest. Under these circumstances, it would not have been difficult for the man who had put the national aspirations of the bourgeoisie into practice to keep any pace he desired in implementing its political demands, which were in any case very modest on the whole. It was only necessary for him to be clear about the objective.

From the point of view of the propertied classes, this was the only rational way. From the standpoint of the working class, it was obvious that it was already too late to set up bourgeois rule on a lasting basis. Large-scale industry, and with it the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, took shape in Germany at a time when the proletariat could enter the political scene as an independent force almost simultaneously with the bourgeoisie, that is, at a time when the struggle of the two classes has already begun, before the bourgeoisie has conquered exclusive or predominant political power. But even if the time for quiet and firmly founded rule by the bourgeoisie had already passed in Germany, it was still the best policy in 1870, in the interests of the propertied classes in general, to steer towards this bourgeois rule. For only in this way was it possible to abolish the abundant remnants of the times of decaying feudalism which continued to flourish in legislation and administration; only thus was it possible gradually to transplant all the achievements of the Great French Revolution to Germany, in short, to cut off Germany's overlong old pigtail, and to place it deliberately and irrevocably on the road of modern development, to adapt its political system to its industrial development. When
ultimately the unavoidable struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat set in, it would at least proceed under normal circumstances, in which everyone would realise what was at stake, and not in the state of disorder, obscurity, conflicting interests and perplexity we saw in Germany in 1848. The only difference being that this time the perplexity would be exclusively on the side of the propertied classes; the working class knows what it wants.

As things stood in Germany in 1871, a man like Bismarck was indeed compelled to pursue a policy of manoeuvring between the various classes. And to that extent he is not open to reproach. It is only a question of what aim that policy pursued. If, irrespective of the pace, it was aimed consciously and resolutely at the ultimate rule of the bourgeoisie, it was in harmony with historical development as far as this could be possible at all from the standpoint of the propertied classes. If it aimed at preserving the old Prussian state, at gradually Prussianising Germany, it was reactionary and doomed to ultimate failure. But if it only pursued the aim of preserving Bismarck's rule, it was Bonapartist and bound to meet the same end as all Bonapartism.

* * *

The immediate task was the imperial constitution. The material available was the constitution of the North German Confederation, on the one hand, and the treaties with the South German states, on the other. The factors which were to help Bismarck draw up the imperial constitution were, on the one hand, the dynasties represented in the Federal Council and, on the other, the people represented in the Reichstag. The North German constitution and treaties limited the claims of the dynasties. The people, on the other hand, were entitled to a considerable increase in their share of political power. They had won independence from foreign interference and unification—as far as there could be any talk of unification—on the battlefield; they were also above all called upon to decide what use this independence was to be put to, how this unification would be implemented in detail and how it would be used. And even if the people recognised the legal grounds underlying the North German constitution and treaties, that in no way prevented them from being granted a greater share of power in the new constitution than they had in the old one. The Reichstag was the only body which in reality represented the
new "unity". The greater the voice of the Reichstag and the freer the imperial constitution as compared with the constitutions of the individual provinces, the more the new Empire would have to fuse into one, the more the Bavarian, Saxon and Prussian would have to dissolve into the German.

To anyone who could see further than his nose this should have been obvious. But Bismarck held quite a different opinion. On the contrary, he used the patriotic frenzy unleashed after the war precisely to persuade the majority in the Reichstag to renounce not only an extension but even a clear definition of the rights of the people and to confine itself to a simple reproduction in the imperial constitution of the legal basis underlying the North German constitution and the treaties. All attempts of the small parties to give expression in it to the freedoms of the people were dismissed, including even the proposal of the Catholic Centre to incorporate in it the articles of the Prussian constitution guaranteeing the freedom of the press, of assembly and association and the independence of the Church. The Prussian constitution, twice and thrice pruned as it was, was still more liberal than the imperial constitution. Taxes were voted not yearly, but once and for all, "by law", so that any refusal of taxes by the Reichstag was out of the question. Thus there was applied to Germany the Prussian doctrine, inconceivable to the non-German constitutional world, according to which the elected assembly had only the right on paper to refuse expenditure, while the government pocketed the revenue in hard cash. While the Reichstag was thus robbed of the most effective means of power and reduced to the humble position of the Prussian chamber smashed up by the revisions of 1849 and 1850, by Manteuffelism, by conflict and by Sadowa, the Federal Council, in effect, enjoyed full power, which the old Federal Diet possessed nominally, and enjoyed it in reality, for it had been freed of the fetters that paralysed the Federal Diet. The Federal Council had a decisive voice not only in legislation, alongside the Reichstag; it was also the supreme administrative body, inasmuch as it issued instructions on the implementation of imperial laws, and in addition decides "on shortcomings, which emerge during the implementation of imperial laws...", i.e., on shortcomings, which in other civilised countries can be remedied only by a new law (Article 7, Para. 3, which greatly resembles a legal trap).a

Thus, Bismarck sought his main support not in the Reichstag,

\begin{footnote}
Verfassung des Deutschen Reichs in Reichs-Gesetzblatt, 1871, p. 68.— Ed.
\end{footnote}
which represented national union, but in the Federal Council, which represented particularistic disunion. He lacked the courage—he, who set himself up as champion of the national idea—to place himself genuinely at the head of the nation or of its representatives; democracy was to serve him and not he democracy; rather than rely on the people, he relied on underhand dealings behind the scenes, on his ability to scrape together a majority, even if a refractory one, in the Federal Council by means of diplomacy, the stick and the carrot. The pettiness of his conception, the baseness of his viewpoint that is revealed to us here is quite in keeping with the man's character as we have got to know him so far. Yet, it is surprising that his great successes were unable to make him rise above himself even for a moment.

However, in the prevailing situation, the point was to provide a single firm pivot for the entire imperial constitution, namely, the imperial chancellor. The Federal Council had to be put in a position in which there could be no other responsible executive authority than that of the imperial chancellor and which would exclude the admissibility of responsible imperial ministers. Indeed, every attempt to normalise the imperial administration by setting up a responsible ministry was regarded as an encroachment upon the rights of the Federal Council and encountered insurmountable resistance. As was soon discovered, the constitution was "made to measure" for Bismarck. It was a further step on the road to his absolute personal dictatorship by balancing the parties in the Reichstag and the particularist states in the Federal Council—a further step on the road to Bonapartism.

By the way, it cannot be said that the new imperial constitution—except for certain concessions to Bavaria and Württemberg—was a direct step back. But that is the best that can be said of it. The economic requirements of the bourgeoisie were in the main satisfied, its political claims—inasmuch as it still made any—encountered the same obstructions as during the conflict.

Inasmuch as it still made political claims! For it cannot be denied that with the National Liberals these claims had shrunk to a very modest size and continued to shrink with every passing day. These gentlemen, far from demanding that Bismarck should facilitate their collaboration with himself, were much more concerned with doing his will wherever possible, and quite often also where it was impossible, or should have been impossible. Bismarck despised them and no one can blame him for that—but were his Junkers one iota better or braver?
The next field in which unity of the Empire had to be introduced, the monetary system, was normalised by the currency and banking laws passed between 1873 and 1875. The introduction of gold currency was a considerable step forward; but it was introduced only hesitantly and waveringly and is not firmly established even today. The monetary system adopted—the third of a taler under the name of "mark", a unit with a decimal division—had been suggested by von Soetbeer at the close of the thirties; the actual unit was the gold twenty-mark piece. By a barely noticeable change in value it could have been made absolutely equivalent either to the British sovereign, or the gold twenty-five franc coin, or the gold U.S. five-dollar piece, and linked to one of the three great currency systems on the world market. Preference was given to a separate currency system, thereby needlessly complicating trade and exchange calculations. The laws on imperial treasury notes and banks limited the fraudulent transactions in securities of small states and their banks and, taking into consideration the crash which had in the meantime occurred, they were marked by a definite timidity, which well became Germany, still inexperienced in this field. But here, too, the economic interests of the bourgeoisie were on the whole adequately looked after.

Finally there came an agreement on uniform laws. The resistance of the central German states to the extension of imperial competency to the material civil law was overcome, but the civil code is still in the making, while the penal code, criminal and civil procedural law, trade laws, the regulations concerning insolvency and the judicial system have been unified everywhere. The abolition of the motley formal and material legal standards in force in the small states was in itself an urgent requirement for ongoing bourgeois development, and this abolition is the chief merit of the new laws—a far greater one than their content.

The English jurist relies on a legal heritage that has preserved a good part of the old German freedoms through the Middle Ages, that does not know the police state, which was nipped in the bud by the two revolutions of the 17th century and has attained its apex in two centuries of uninterrupted development of civic freedom. The French jurist relies on the Great Revolution, which, after the total destruction of feudalism and absolutist police tyranny, translated the economic conditions of life in the newly created modern society into the language of legal standards in the classical code of law proclaimed by Napoleon. But on what legal basis do our German jurists rely? Nothing but the several-century-
long process of disintegration of medieval survivals, a passive process mostly spurred on by blows from the outside, and not complete to this day; an economically backward society, which the feudal Junker and the guild master haunt as ghosts looking for a new body; a legal order in which police tyranny—even though the arbitrary justice of the princes disappeared in 1848—is daily tearing new holes. The fathers of the new imperial legal codes have come from this worst of all bad schools, and their work is quite in keeping with it. Apart from the purely legal aspect, political freedom has fared pretty badly in these codes of law. If the Schöffen courts provide the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie with a means of collaborating in repressing the working class, the state insures itself as much as possible against the danger of renewed bourgeois opposition by curtailing the rights of the jury. The political paragraphs of the penal code are frequently enough as vague and elastic as if they were made to measure for the present imperial court, and the latter for them. That the new legal codes are a step forward in comparison with Prussian common law—today even Stoecker would be unable to concoct something as horrible as that code, even if he were to allow himself to be cut back. But the provinces which had until now lived under French law feel very acutely the difference between the blurred copy and the classic original. It was the defection of the National Liberals from their programme that made possible this strengthening of state power at the expense of civic freedoms, this first actual retrogression.

Mention should also be made of the imperial press law. The penal code had essentially already regulated the material law pertaining to it; the elaboration of identical formal stipulations for the whole Empire and the abolition of the security and stamp duties existing here and there were therefore the main content of the law and at the same time the only progress it achieved.

To enable Prussia once again to prove itself a model state, so-called self-government was introduced there. The aim was to abolish the most objectionable survivals of feudalism and yet, actually, to leave, as far as possible, everything as before. The District Ordinance served this purpose. The manorial police power of the Junkers had become an anachronism. In name—as a feudal privilege—it was abolished, but actually it was re instituted by the establishment of independent rural districts [Gutsbezirke], within which the landowner either himself acts as rural superintendent [Gutsvorsteher] with the powers of the head of the rural community [Gemeindevorsteher] or appoints this rural superinten-
dent, and was also reinstated by transferring the entire police power and police jurisdiction of the administrative district [Amtsbezirk] to a district head [Amtsvorsteher], a position held in rural areas almost exclusively by big landowners, of course, who in this way got the rural community under their thumb. The feudal privileges of individuals were abolished, but the absolute power connected with these privileges was handed over to the entire class. By similar conjuring the English big landowners turned into justices of the peace and the masters of the rural administration, the police and the lower courts of justice and thereby secured for themselves under a new, modernised title further enjoyment of all essential positions of authority, which they could not continue to hold under the old feudal form. That, however, is the only similarity between the English and the German “self-government”. I should like to see the British Minister who would dare to propose in Parliament that elected local officials should be approved and that in case an undesired person is elected he be forcibly replaced by an appointee of the state, to propose that there be civil servants vested with the authority of the Prussian Landrats, heads of administrative districts and Oberpräsidents, to propose that the administrative bodies of the state be given the right provided for in the District Ordinance to intervene in the internal affairs of communities, small administrative units and districts and to exclude recourse to law, a thing unheard of in English-speaking countries and in English law, but which we see on almost every page of the District Ordinance. And while the district diets [Kreistag] as well as the provincial diets are still composed in the old feudal manner of representatives of the three estates: the big landowners, towns and rural communities, in England even a highly conservative ministry moves a bill transferring the whole county administration to authorities elected by almost universal suffrage.413

The draft of the District Ordinance for the six Eastern provinces (1871) was the first indication that Bismarck did not even think of allowing Prussia to dissolve into Germany, but that, on the contrary, he sought to further strengthen these six provinces—the stronghold of the old Prussianism. Under changed names, the Junkers retained all essential positions of power, while the helots of Germany, the rural workers of these areas—such as farmhands and day labourers—remained in their former de facto serfdom and were admitted to only two public functions: to become soldiers and to serve the Junkers as voting stock during the elections to the Reichstag. The service Bismarck rendered
thereby to the revolutionary socialist party is indescribable and deserves the warmest gratitude.

What can be said about the mindlessness of the Junker gentlemen, who, like spoiled children, kicked against the District Ordinance which had been drawn up exclusively in their interest, in the interest of perpetuating their feudal privileges, under a somewhat modernised name? The Prussian House of Lords, or, to be more exact, of Junkers, at first rejected the draft, which had already been delayed for a whole year; and adopted it only after 24 new “Lords” had been nominated peers. Once again the Prussian Junkers proved that they were petty, obdurate, incorrigible reactionaries, unable to form the nucleus of a large independent party which could play an historical role in the life of the nation, as the English big landowners actually do. Thereby they proved their complete lack of sense; Bismarck had only to reveal to the world their equally complete lack of character, and a little pressure, pertinently applied, would transform them into a Bismarck Party sans phrase.

The Kulturkampf was to serve this purpose.

The implementation of the Prussian-German imperial plan should have evoked a counterblow—the amalgamation into a single party of all anti-Prussian elements, which had previously relied on separate development. These motley elements found a common banner in Ultramontanism. The rebellion of sound common sense even among the numerous orthodox Catholics against the new dogma of Papal infallibility, on the one hand, the destruction of the Papal States, and the so-called imprisonment of the Pope in Rome, on the other, forced all the pugnacious forces of Catholicism to rally closer together. Thus even during the war, in the autumn of 1870, the specifically Catholic Party of the Centre was formed in the Prussian Provincial Diet; in the first German Reichstag of 1871 it had only 57 seats, but it grew stronger with every new election until it had over 100 representatives. It was composed of very heterogeneous elements. In Prussia its main strength consisted of the Rhenish small peasants, who still regarded themselves as “Prussians under duress”, then of the Catholic big landowners and peasants of the Westphalian bishoprics of Münster and Paderborn, and of the Catholic Silesians. The second great contingent was provided by the South German Catholics, notably the Bavarians. It was not so much the Catholic religion that formed the Centre Party's strength, but the fact that it represented the antipathies of the popular masses against everything specifically Prussian, now laying claim to domination.
over Germany. These antipathies were particularly strong in the Catholic areas; and then there were sympathies with Austria, now expelled from Germany. In harmony with these two popular trends, the Centre was decidedly particularist and federalist.

This essentially anti-Prussian character of the Centre was immediately recognised by the other small Reichstag factions, which were anti-Prussian for local reasons, not, as the Social-Democrats, for national and general reasons. Not only the Catholic Poles and Alsatians, but even the Protestant Guelphs\textsuperscript{417} allied themselves closely with the Centre. And even though the bourgeois liberal factions could never fully understand the actual character of the so-called Ultramontanes, they did have an inkling of the true state of affairs when they styled the Centre “unpatriotic” and “hostile to the Empire”\textsuperscript{a}.

\textsuperscript{a} The manuscript breaks off here.—\textit{Ed.}
The following piece of writing is an off-print of part of my work *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*, and contains three chapters that bear the title “The Force Theory”. They have already appeared separately in Russian translation, namely as the appendix to the Russian edition of my *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*. Only the most necessary changes and addenda have been made in the present edition. But an off-print requires a special addendum.

If I publish in German a pamphlet on “the role of force in history”, the German reader has every right to expect me not to conceal my views on the very important part played by force precisely in his own history over the past thirty years. For this reason I have added a fourth section, which naturally covers only the main points. Perhaps I shall be granted the opportunity one day to deal with the subject in more detail.

Written between the end of December 1887 and March 1888
First published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 1, No. 22, 1895

Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time

---

а Ф. Энгельс, *Развитие научного социализма*, Женева, 1884.—*Ed.*
PREFACE TO THE 1888 ENGLISH EDITION
OF THE MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The “Manifesto” was published as the platform of the “Communist League”, a working-men’s association, first exclusively German, later on international, and, under the political conditions of the Continent before 1848, unavoidably a secret society. At a Congress of the League, held in London in November, 1847, Marx and Engels were commissioned to prepare for publication a complete theoretical and practical party programme. Drawn up in German, in January, 1848, the manuscript was sent to the printer in London a few weeks before the French revolution of February 24th. A French translation was brought out in Paris, shortly before the insurrection of June, 1848. The first English translation, by Miss Helen Macfarlane, appeared in George Julian Harney’s “Red Republican,” London, 1850. A Danish and a Polish edition had also been published.

The defeat of the Parisian insurrection of June, 1848,—the first great battle between Proletariat and Bourgeoisie—drove again into the background, for a time, the social and political aspirations of the European working-class. Thenceforth, the struggle for supremacy was again, as it had been before the revolution of February, solely between different sections of the propertied class; the working class was reduced to a fight for political elbow-room, and to the position of extreme wing of the Middle-class Radicals. Wherever independent proletarian movements continued to show signs of life, they were ruthlessly hunted down. Thus the Prussian police hunted out the Central Board of the Communist League, then located in Cologne. The members were arrested, and, after eighteen months’ imprisonment, they were tried in October, 1852. This celebrated “Cologne Communist trial” lasted from October 4th till November 12th; seven of the prisoners were sentenced to terms of imprisonment in a fortress, varying from three to six
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years. Immediately after the sentence, the League was formally dissolved by the remaining members. As to the "Manifesto," it seemed thenceforth to be doomed to oblivion.

When the European working-class had recovered sufficient strength for another attack on the ruling classes, the International Working Men's Association sprang up. But this association, formed with the express aim of welding into one body the whole militant proletariat of Europe and America, could not at once proclaim the principles laid down in the "Manifesto." The International was bound to have a programme broad enough to be acceptable to the English Trades' Unions, to the followers of Proudhon in France, Belgium, Italy, and Spain, and to the Lassalleans* in Germany. Marx, who drew up this programme to the satisfaction of all parties, entirely trusted to the intellectual development of the working-class, which was sure to result from combined action and mutual discussion. The very events and vicissitudes of the struggle against Capital, the defeats even more than the victories, could not help bringing home to men's minds the insufficiency of their various favourite nostrums, and preparing the way for a more complete insight into the true conditions of working-class emancipation. And Marx was right. The International, on its breaking up in 1874, left the workers quite different men from what it had found them in 1864. Proudhonism in France, Lassalleanism in Germany were dying out, and even the Conservative English Trades' Unions, though most of them had long since severed their connexion with the International, were gradually advancing towards that point at which, last year at Swansea, their President could say in their name "Continental Socialism has lost its terrors for us." In fact: the principles of the "Manifesto" had made considerable headway among the working men of all countries.

The Manifesto itself thus came to the front again. The German text had been, since 1850, reprinted several times in Switzerland,

* Lassalle personally, to us, always acknowledged himself to be a disciple of Marx, and, as such, stood on the ground of the "Manifesto". But in his public agitation, 1862-64, he did not go beyond demanding co-operative workshops supported by State credit.

---

a See this volume, p. 329.—Ed.
b W. Bevan.—Ed.
c [W. Bevan's speech at the Twentieth Annual Trades' Union Congress at Swansea on September 6, 1887.] In: W. Binning, "The Trades' Union Congress", The Commonweal, No. 88, September 17, 1887.—Ed.
England and America. In 1872, it was translated into English in New York, where the translation was published in *Woodhull and Claflin’s Weekly*. From this English version, a French one was made in “Le Socialiste” of New York. Since then at least two more English translations, more or less mutilated, have been brought out in America, and one of them has been reprinted in England. The first Russian translation, made by Bakounine, was published at Herzen’s “Kolokol” office in Geneva, about 1863; a second one, by the heroic Vera Zasulitch, also in Geneva, 1882. A new Danish edition is to be found in “Socialdemokratisk Bibliothek,” Copenhagen, 1885; a fresh French translation in “Le Socialiste,” Paris, 1886. From this latter a Spanish version was prepared and published in Madrid, 1886. The German reprints are not to be counted, there have been twelve altogether at the least. An Armenian translation, which was to be published in Constantinople some months ago, did not see the light, I am told, because the publisher was afraid of bringing out a book with the name of Marx on it, while the translator declined to call it his own production. Of further translations into other languages I have heard, but have not seen them. Thus the history of the Manifesto reflects, to a great extent, the history of the modern working-class movement; at present it is undoubtedly the most wide-spread, the most international production of all Socialist Literature, the common platform acknowledged by millions of working men from Siberia to California.

Yet, when it was written, we could not have called it a Socialist Manifesto. By Socialists, in 1847, were understood, on the one hand, the adherents of the various Utopian systems: Owenites in England, Fourierists in France, both of them already reduced to the position of mere sects, and gradually dying out; on the other hand, the most multifarious social quacks, who, by all manners of tinkering, professed to redress, without any danger to capital and profit, all sorts of social grievances in both cases men outside the working class movement, and looking rather to the “educated” classes for support. Whatever portion of the working class had become convinced of the insufficiency of mere political revolutions, and had proclaimed the necessity of a total social change, that portion, then, called itself Communist. It was a crude, rough-hewn, purely instinctive sort of Communism; still, it touched the cardinal point and was powerful enough amongst the working class to produce the Utopian Communism, in France, of Cabet, and in Germany, of Weitling. Thus, Socialism was, in 1847, a middle-class movement, Communism a working class movement.
Socialism was, on the Continent at least, "respectable"; Communism was the very opposite. And as our notion, from the very beginning, was that "the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself," there could be no doubt as to which of the two names we must take. Moreover, we have, ever since, been far from repudiating it.

The "Manifesto" being our joint production, I consider myself bound to state that the fundamental proposition which forms its nucleus, belongs to Marx. That proposition is: that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles form a series of evolution in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinctions and class-struggles.

This proposition which, in my opinion, is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology, we, both of us, had been gradually approaching for some years before 1845. How far I had independently progressed towards it, is best shown by my "Condition of the Working Class in England." But when I again met Marx at Brussels, in spring, 1845, he had it ready worked out, and put it before me, in terms almost as clear as those in which I have stated it here.

From our joint preface to the German edition of 1872, I quote the following:—

"However much the state of things may have altered during the last 25 years, the general principles laid down in this Manifesto are, on the whole, as correct to-day as ever. Here and there some


a K. Marx, "Provisional Rules of the Association" (present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14; see also Vol. 23, p. 3.).—Ed.
detail might be improved. The practical application of the principles will depend, as the manifesto itself states, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing, and, for that reason, no special stress is laid on the revolutionary measures proposed at the end of Section II. That passage would, in many respects, be very differently worded to-day. In view of the gigantic strides of Modern Industry since 1848, and of the accompanying improved and extended organisation of the working-class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details become antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that 'the working-class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.' (See "The Civil War in France; Address of the General Council of the International Working-men's Association," London, Truelove, 1871, p. 15, where this point is further developed.) Further, it is self-evident, that the criticism of socialist literature is deficient in relation to the present time, because it comes down only to 1847; also, that the remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition-parties (Section IV.), although in principle still correct, yet in practice are antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed, and the progress of history has swept from off the earth the greater portion of the political parties there enumerated.

"But then, the Manifesto has become a historical document which we have no longer any right to alter." The present translation is by Mr. Samuel Moore, the translator of the greater portion of Marx's Capital. We have revised it in common, and I have added a few notes explanatory of historical allusions.

London, 30th January, 1888

Frederick Engels


Reproduced from the book


—Ed. Instead of “since 1848”, the 1872 edition has “in the past twenty-five years”. —Ed.

—Ed. Instead of “of the accompanying improved and extended”, the 1872 edition has “with its advancing party”. —Ed.


In the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Berlin, 1859, Karl Marx relates how the two of us in Brussels in the year 1845 decided "to set forth together our conception"—the materialist conception of history which was elaborated mainly by Marx—"as opposed to the ideological one of German philosophy, in fact to settle accounts with our former philosophical conscience. The intention was carried out in the form of a critique of post-Hegelian philosophy. The manuscript, two large octavo volumes, had long ago reached the publishers in Westphalia when we were informed that owing to changed circumstances it could not be printed. We abandoned the manuscript to the gnawing criticism of the mice all the more willingly since we had achieved our main purpose—self-clarification."c

Since then more than forty years have elapsed and Marx died without either of us having had an opportunity of returning to the subject. We have expressed ourselves in various places regarding our relation to Hegel, but nowhere in a comprehensive, coherent account. To Feuerbach, who after all in some respects forms an intermediate link between Hegelian philosophy and our conception, we never returned.

In the meantime the Marxian world outlook has found adherents far beyond the boundaries of Germany and Europe and

---

a See this volume, pp. 353-98.—Ed.
b K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology.*—Ed.
in all the literary languages of the world. On the other hand, classical German philosophy is experiencing a kind of rebirth abroad, especially in England and Scandinavia, and even in Germany itself people appear to be getting tired of the pauper's broth of eclecticism which is ladled out in the universities there under the name of philosophy.

In these circumstances a short, coherent account of our relation to Hegelian philosophy, of how we proceeded, as well as of how we departed, from it, appeared to me to be increasingly necessary. Equally, a full acknowledgement of the influence which Feuerbach, more than any other post-Hegelian philosopher, had upon us during our Sturm und Drang period, appeared to me to be an undischarged debt of honour. I therefore willingly seized the opportunity when the editors of the Neue Zeit asked me for a critical review of Starcke's book on Feuerbach. My contribution was published in that journal in the fourth and fifth numbers of 1886 and appears here in revised form as a separate publication.

Before sending these lines to press I have once again ferreted out and looked over the old manuscript of 1845-46. The section dealing with Feuerbach is not completed. The finished portion consists of an exposition of the materialist conception of history which proves only how incomplete our knowledge of economic history still was at that time. It contains no criticism of Feuerbach's doctrine itself; for the present purpose, therefore, it was useless. On the other hand, in an old notebook of Marx's I have found the eleven theses on Feuerbach printed here as an appendix. These are notes hurriedly scribbled down for later elaboration, absolutely not intended for publication, but invaluable as the first document in which is deposited the brilliant germ of the new world outlook.

London, February 21, 1888

Frederick Engels

First published in F. Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang der klassischen deutschen Philosophie, Stuttgart, 1888

Printed according to the book

---

a K. Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach".—Ed.
Towards the end of 1847, a Free Trade Congress was held at Brussels. It was a strategic move in the Free Trade campaign then carried on by the English manufacturers. Victorious at home, by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, they now invaded the continent in order to demand, in return for the free admission of continental corn into England, the free admission of English manufactured goods to the continental markets. At this Congress, Marx inscribed himself on the list of speakers; but, as might have been expected, things were so managed that before his turn came on, the Congress was closed. Thus, what Marx had to say on the Free Trade question, he was compelled to say before the Democratic Association of Brussels, an international body of which he was one of the vice-presidents.

The question of Free Trade or Protection being at present on the order of the day in America, it has been thought useful to publish an English translation of Marx' speech, to which I have been asked to write an introductory preface.

"The system of protection," says Marx, "was an artificial means of manufacturing manufacturers, of expropriating independent laborers, of capitalizing the national means of production and subsistence, and of forcibly abbreviating the transition from the

* Preface (translated by the author) to the English edition of Marx's speech on the question of free trade, being published in New York (German by E. Bernstein and K. Kautsky, Appendix II to Marx's Poverty of Philosophy, Stuttgart, Dietz, p. 188 ff.). Since this preface is intended primarily for an American audience, the German policy on protective tariffs could be mentioned only in passing. However, the author will doubtless soon find an occasion to deal with the question specifically with respect to Germany. [Engels' note to the German translation.]
medieval to the modern mode of production.” * Such was protection at its origin in the seventeenth century, such it remained well into the nineteenth century. It was then held to be the normal policy of every civilized state in Western Europe. The only exceptions were the smaller states of Germany and Switzerland—not from dislike of the system, but from the impossibility of applying it to such small territories.

It was under the fostering wing of protection that the system of modern industry—production by steam-moving machinery—was hatched and developed in England during the last third of the eighteenth century. And, as if tariff-protection was not sufficient, the wars against the French Revolution helped to secure to England the monopoly of the new industrial methods. For more than twenty years English men-of-war cut off the industrial rivals of England from their respective colonial markets, while they forcibly opened these markets to English commerce. The secession of the South American colonies from the rule of their European mother-countries, the conquest by England of all French and Dutch colonies worth having, the progressive subjugation of India, turned the people of all these immense territories into customers for English goods. England thus supplemented the protection she practised at home, by the Free Trade she forced upon her possible customers abroad; and, thanks to this happy mixture of both systems, at the end of the wars, in 1815, she found herself, with regard to all important branches of industry, in possession of the virtual monopoly of the trade of the world.

This monopoly was further extended and strengthened during the ensuing years of peace. The start which England had obtained during the war, was increased from year to year; she seemed to distance more and more all her possible rivals. The exports of manufactured goods in ever growing quantities became indeed a question of life and death to that country. And there seemed but two obstacles in the way: the prohibitive or protective legislation of other countries, and the taxes upon the import of raw materials and articles of food in England.

Then the Free Trade doctrines of classical political economy—of the French physiocrats ⁴⁵⁰ and their English successors, Adam Smith and Ricardo—became popular in the land of John Bull.


---

a In the German translation: “turned all these countries”.—Ed.
b The reference is to the Napoleonic Wars of 1796-1814.—Ed.
Protection at home was needless to manufacturers who beat all their foreign rivals, and whose very existence was staked on the expansion of their exports. Protection at home was of advantage to none but the producers of articles of food and other raw materials, to the agricultural interest, which, under then existing circumstances in England, meant the receivers of rent, the landed aristocracy. And this kind of protection was hurtful to the manufacturers. By taxing raw materials it raised the price of the articles manufactured from them; by taxing food, it raised the price of labor; in both ways, it placed the British manufacturer at a disadvantage as compared with his foreign competitor. And, as all other countries sent to England chiefly agricultural products, and drew from England chiefly manufactured goods, repeal of the English protective duties on corn and raw materials generally, was at the same time an appeal to foreign countries, to do away with, or at least, to reduce, in return, the import duties levied by them on English manufactures.

After a long and violent struggle, the English industrial capitalists, already in reality the leading class of the nation, that class whose interests were then the chief national interests, were victorious. The landed aristocracy had to give in. The duties on corn and other raw materials were repealed. Free Trade became the watchword of the day. To convert all other countries to the gospel of Free Trade, and thus to create a world in which England was the great manufacturing centre, with all other countries for its dependent agricultural districts, that was the next task before the English manufacturers and their mouthpieces, the political economists.

That was the time of the Brussels Congress, the time when Marx prepared the speech in question. While recognizing that protection may still, under certain circumstances, for instance in the Germany of 1847, be of advantage to the manufacturing capitalists; while proving that Free Trade was not the panacea for all the evils under which the working class suffered, and might even aggravate them; he pronounces, ultimately and on principle, in favor of Free Trade. To him, Free Trade is the normal condition of modern capitalistic production. Only under Free Trade can the immense productive powers of steam, of electricity, of machinery, be fully developed; and the quicker the pace of this development, the sooner and the more fully will be realized its inevitable results: society splits up into two classes, capitalists here, wage-laborers there; hereditary wealth on one side, hereditary poverty on the other; supply outstripping demand, the markets
being unable to absorb the ever growing mass of the productions of industry; an ever recurring cycle of prosperity, glut, crisis, panic, chronic depression and gradual revival of trade, the harbinger not of permanent improvement but of renewed overproduction and crisis; in short, productive forces expanding to such a degree that they rebel, as against unbearable fetters, against the social institutions under which they are put in motion; the only possible solution: a social revolution,\(^a\) freeing the social productive forces from the fetters of an antiquated social order, and the actual producers, the great mass of the people, from wage-slavery. And because Free Trade is the natural, the normal atmosphere for this historical evolution, the economic medium in which the conditions for the inevitable social revolution\(^b\) will be the soonest created,—for this reason, and for this alone, did Marx declare in favor of Free Trade.

Anyhow, the years immediately following the victory of Free Trade in England seemed to verify the most extravagant expectations of prosperity founded upon that event. British commerce rose to a fabulous amount; the industrial monopoly of England on the market of the world seemed more firmly established than ever; new iron works, new textile factories arose by wholesale; new branches of industry grew up on every side. There was, indeed, a severe crisis in 1857, but that was overcome, and the onward movement in trade and manufactures soon was in full swing again, until in 1866 a fresh panic occurred, a panic, this time, which seems to mark a new departure in the economic history of the world.

The unparalleled expansion of British manufactures and commerce between 1848 and 1866 was no doubt due, to a great extent, to the removal of the protective duties on food and raw materials. But not entirely. Other important changes took place simultaneously and helped it on. The above years comprise the discovery and working of the Californian and Australian gold fields\(^431\) which increased so immensely the circulating medium of the world; they mark the final victory of steam over all other means of transport\(^c\); on the ocean, steamers now superseded sailing vessels; on land, in all civilized countries, the railroad took

\(^a\) The German translation has “social transformation” instead of “social revolution”.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) The German translation has here “this inevitable solution”.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^c\) Instead of the last phrase the German translation has: “they represent a general transformation of the means of transport”.—\textit{Ed.}
the first place, the macadamized road the second; transport now became four times quicker and four times cheaper. No wonder that under such favorable circumstances British manufactures worked by steam should extend their sway at the expense of foreign domestic industries based upon manual labor. But were the other countries to sit still and to submit in humility to this change, which degraded them to be mere agricultural appendages of England, the "workshop of the world"?

The foreign countries did nothing of the kind. France, for nearly two hundred years, had screened her manufactures behind a perfect Chinese wall of protection and prohibition, and had attained in all articles of luxury and of taste a supremacy which England did not even pretend to dispute. Switzerland, under perfect Free Trade, possessed relatively important manufactures which English competition could not touch. Germany, with a tariff far more liberal than that of any other large continental country, was developing its manufactures at a rate relatively more rapid than even England. And America was, by the civil war of 1861, all at once thrown upon her own resources, had to find means how to meet a sudden demand for manufactured goods of all sorts, and could only do so by creating manufactures of her own at home. The war demand ceased with the war; but the new manufactures were there, and had to meet British competition. And the war had ripened, in America, the insight that a nation of thirty-five millions, doubling its numbers in forty years at most, with such immense resources, and surrounded by neighbors that must be for years to come chiefly agriculturalists, that such a nation had the "manifest destiny" to be independent of foreign manufactures for its chief articles of consumption, and to be so in time of peace as well as in time of war. And then America turned protectionist.

It may now be fifteen years ago, I travelled in a railway carriage with an intelligent Glasgow merchant, interested, probably, in the iron trade. Talking about America, he treated me to the old Free Trade lucubrations: "Was it not inconceivable that a nation of sharp business men like the Americans should pay tribute to indigenous iron masters and manufacturers, when they could buy the same, if not a better article, ever so much cheaper in this country?" And then he gave me examples as to how much the Americans taxed themselves in order to enrich a few greedy iron masters. "Well," I replied, "I think there is another side to the question. You know that in coal, water-power, iron and other ores, cheap food, home-grown cotton and other raw materials, America
has resources and advantages unequalled by any European country; and that these resources cannot be fully developed except by America becoming a manufacturing country. You will admit, too, that nowadays a great nation like the Americans cannot exist on agriculture alone; that that would be tantamount to a condemnation to permanent barbarism and inferiority; no great nation can live, in our age, without manufactures of her own. Well, then, if America must become a manufacturing country, and if she has every chance of not only succeeding, but even outstripping her rivals, there are two ways open to her: either to carry on, for let us say fifty years, under Free Trade an extremely expensive competitive war against English manufactures that have got nearly a hundred years' start; or else to shut out, by protective duties, English manufactures, for say twenty-five years, with the almost absolute certainty that at the end of the twenty-five years she will be able to hold her own in the open market of the world. Which of the two will be the cheapest and the shortest? That is the question. If you want to go from Glasgow to London, you can take the parliamentary train at a penny a mile and travel at the rate of twelve miles an hour. But you do not; your time is too valuable, you take the express, pay twopence a mile and do forty miles an hour. Very well, the Americans prefer to pay express fare and to go express speed.” My Scotch Free Trader had not a word in reply.

Protection, being a means of artificially manufacturing manufacturers, may, therefore, appear useful not only to an incompletely developed capitalist class still struggling with feudalism; it may also give a lift to the rising capitalist class of a country which, like America, has never known feudalism, but which has arrived at that stage of development where the passage from agriculture to manufactures becomes a necessity. America, placed in that situation, decided in favor of protection. Since that decision was carried out, the five and twenty years of which I spoke to my fellow-traveller have about passed, and, if I was not wrong, protection ought to have done its task for America, and ought to be now becoming a nuisance.

That has been my opinion for some time. Nearly two years ago, I said to a protectionist American: “I am convinced that if America goes in for Free Trade she will in ten years have beaten England in the market of the world.”

Protection is at best an endless screw, and you never know when you have done with it. By protecting one industry, you directly or indirectly hurt all others, and have therefore to protect them too.
By so doing you again damage the industry that you first protected, and have to compensate it; but this compensation reacts, as before, on all other trades, and entitles them to redress, and so on in infinitum. America, in this respect, offers us a striking example of the best way to kill an important industry by protection. In 1856, the total imports and exports by sea of the United States amounted to $641,604,850, of this amount, 75.2 per cent. were carried in American, and only 24.8 per cent. in foreign vessels. British ocean-steamers were already then encroaching upon American sailing vessels; yet, in 1860, of a total sea-going trade of $762,288,550, American vessels still carried 66.5 per cent. The civil war came on, and protection to American ship-building; and the latter plan was so successful that it has nearly completely driven the American flag from the high seas. In 1887 the total sea-going trade of the United States amounted to $1,408,502,979, but of this total only 13.8 per cent. were carried in American, and 86.2 per cent. in foreign bottoms. The goods carried by American ships amounted, in 1856, to $482,268,274; in 1860 to $507,247,757. In 1887 they had sunk to $194,356,746.* Forty years ago, the American flag was the most dangerous rival of the British flag, and bade fair to outstrip it on the ocean; now it is nowhere. Protection to ship-building has killed both shipping and ship-building.

Another point. Improvements in the methods of production nowadays follow each other so rapidly, and change the character of entire branches of industry so suddenly and so completely, that what may have been yesterday a fairly balanced protective tariff is no longer so to-day. Let us take another example from the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1887:

"Improvement in recent years in the machinery employed in combing wool has so changed the character of what are commercially known as worsted cloths that the latter have largely superseded woollen cloths for use as men's wearing apparel. This change ... has operated to the serious injury of our domestic manufacturers of these (worsted) goods, because the duty on the wool which they must use is the same as that upon wool used in making woollen cloths, while the rates of duty imposed upon the latter when valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound are 35 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem, a whereas the duty on worsted cloths valued at not exceeding 80 cents ranges from 10 to 24 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. In some cases the duty on the wool used in making worsted cloths exceeds the duty imposed on the finished article."

* Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury etc., for the Year 1887, Washington, 1887, pp. XXVIII, XXIX.

a In proportion to estimated value of goods.—Ed.
Thus what was protection to home industry yesterday, turns out to-day to be a premium to the foreign importer; and well may the Secretary of the Treasury\(^a\) say:

"There is much reason to believe that the manufacture of worsted cloths must soon cease in this country unless the tariff law in this regard is amended" (p. XIX).

But to amend it, you will have to fight the manufacturers of woollen cloths who profit by this state of things; you will have to open a regular campaign to bring the majority of both Houses of Congress, and eventually the public opinion of the country, round to your views, and the question is, Will that pay?

But the worst of protection is, that when you once have got it you cannot easily get rid of it. Difficult as is the process of adjustment of an equitable tariff, the return to Free Trade is immensely more difficult. The circumstances which permitted England to accomplish the change in a few years, will not occur again. And even there the struggle dated from 1823 (Huskisson), commenced to be successful in 1842 (Peel's tariff),\(^435\) and was continued for several years after the repeal of the Corn Laws. Thus protection to the silk manufacture (the only one which had still to fear foreign competition) was prolonged for a series of years and then granted in another, positively infamous form; while the other textile industries were subjected to the Factory Act, which limited the hours of labor of women, young persons and children,\(^436\) the silk trade was favored with considerable exceptions to the general rule, enabling them to work younger children, and to work the children and young persons longer hours, than the other textile trades. The monopoly that the hypocritical Free Traders repealed with regard to the foreign competitors, that monopoly they created anew at the expense of the health and lives of English children.

But no country will again be able to pass from Protection to Free Trade at a time when all, or nearly all branches of its manufactures can defy foreign competition in the open market. The necessity of the change will come long before such a happy state may be even hoped for. That necessity will make itself evident in different trades at different times; and from the conflicting interests of these trades, the most edifying squabbles, lobby intrigues, and parliamentary conspiracies will arise. The machinist, engineer, and ship-builder may find that the protection granted to the iron master raises the price of his goods so much that his export trade is thereby, and thereby alone, prevented; the

\(^a\) Charles Fairchild.—Ed.
cotton-cloth manufacturer might see his way to driving English cloth out of the Chinese and Indian markets, but for the high price he has to pay for the yarn, on account of protection to spinners; and so forth. The moment a branch of national industry has completely conquered the home market, that moment exportation becomes a necessity to it. Under capitalistic conditions, an industry either expands or wanes. A trade cannot remain stationary; stoppage of expansion is incipient ruin; the progress of mechanical and chemical invention, by constantly superseding human labor, and ever more rapidly increasing and concentrating capital, creates in every stagnant industry a glut both of workers and of capital, a glut which finds no vent everywhere, because the same process is taking place in all other industries. Thus the passage from a home to an export trade becomes a question of life and death for the industries concerned; but they are met by the established rights, the vested interests of others who as yet find protection either safer or more profitable than Free Trade. Then ensues a long and obstinate fight between Free Traders and Protectionists; a fight where, on both sides, the leadership soon passes out of the hands of the people directly interested into those of professional politicians, the wire-pullers of the traditional political parties, whose interest is, not a settlement of the question, but its being kept open forever; and the result of an immense loss of time, energy, and money is a series of compromises, favoring now one, now the other side, and drifting slowly though not majestically in the direction of Free Trade—unless Protection manages, in the meantime, to make itself utterly insupportable to the nation, which is just now likely to be the case in America.

There is, however, another kind of protection, the worst of all, and that is exhibited in Germany. Germany, too, began to feel, soon after 1815, the necessity of a quicker development of her manufactures. But the first condition of that was the creation of a home market by the removal of the innumerable customs lines and varieties of fiscal legislation formed by the small German states, in other words, the formation of a German Customs Union or Zollverein.437 That could only be done on the basis of a liberal tariff, calculated rather to raise a common revenue than to protect home production. On no other condition could the small states have been induced to join. Thus the new German tariff, though slightly protective to some trades, was, at the time of its introduction, a model of Free Trade legislation; and it remained so, although, ever since 1830, the majority of German manufacturers kept clamoring for protection. Yet, under this extremely
liberal tariff, and in spite of German domestic industries based on hand-labor being mercilessly crushed out by the competition of English factories worked by steam, the transition from manual labor to machinery was gradually accomplished in Germany too, and is now nearly complete; the transformation of Germany from an agricultural to a manufacturing country went on at the same pace, and was, since 1866, assisted by favorable political events: the establishment of a strong central government, and federal legislature, ensuring uniformity in the laws regulating trade, as well as in currency, weights and measures, and, finally, the flood of the French milliards. Thus, about 1874, German trade on the market of the world ranked next to that of Great Britain,* and Germany employed more steam power in manufactures and locomotion than any European Continental country. The proof has thus been furnished that even nowadays, in spite of the enormous start that English industry has got, a large country can work its way up to successful competition, in the open market, with England.

Then, all at once, a change of front was made: Germany turned protectionist, at a moment when more than ever Free Trade seemed a necessity for her. The change was no doubt absurd; but it may be explained. While Germany had been a corn-exporting country, the whole agricultural interest, not less than the whole shipping trade, had been ardent Free Traders. But in 1874, instead of exporting, Germany required large supplies of corn from abroad. About that time, America began to flood Europe with enormous supplies of cheap corn; wherever they went, they brought down the money revenue yielded by the land, and consequently its rent; and from that moment, the agricultural interest, all over Europe, began to clamor for protection. At the same time, manufacturers in Germany were suffering from the effect of the reckless overtrading\(^b\) brought on by the influx of the French milliards, while England, whose trade, ever since the crisis of 1866, had been in a state of chronic depression, inundated all accessible markets with goods unsalable at home and offered abroad at ruinously low prices. Thus it happened that German

\* General Trade of Exports and Imports added in 1874, in millions of dollars: Great Britain—3300; Germany—2325; France—1665; United States—1245 millions of dollars. (Kolb, Statistik, 7th edit., Leipsic, 1875, p. 790.)\(^a\)

\(a\) In the pamphlet the figures are given in millions of thaler, and in the German translation, in millions of marks.—\textit{Ed.}

\(b\) The German translation adds here “and excessive speculation”.—\textit{Ed.}
manufacturers, though depending, above all, upon export, began to see in protection a means of securing to themselves the exclusive supply of the home market. And the government, entirely in the hands of the landed aristocracy and squirearchy, was only too glad to profit by this circumstance, in order to benefit the receivers of the rent of land, by offering protective duties to both landlords and manufacturers. In 1878, a highly protective tariff was enacted both for agricultural products and for manufactured goods. 498

The consequence was that henceforth the exportation of German manufactures was carried on at the direct cost of the home consumers. Wherever possible, “rings” or “trusts” a were formed to regulate the export trade and even production itself. The German iron trade is in the hands of a few large firms, mostly joint stock companies, who, betwixt them, can produce about four times as much iron as the average consumption of the country can absorb. To avoid unnecessary competition with one another, these firms have formed a trust which divides amongst them all foreign contracts, and determines in each case the firm that is to make the real tender. This “trust,” some years ago, had even come to an agreement with the English iron masters, but this no longer subsists. Similarly, the Westphalian coal mines (producing about thirty million tons annually) had formed a trust to regulate production, tenders for contracts, and prices. And, altogether, any German manufacturer will tell you that the only thing the protective duties do for him is to enable him to recoup himself in the home market for the ruinous prices he has to take abroad. And this is not all. This absurd system of protection to manufacturers is nothing but the sop thrown to industrial capitalists to induce them to support a still more outrageous monopoly given to the landed interest. Not only is all agricultural produce subjected to heavy import duties which are increased from year to year, but certain rural industries, carried on on large estates for account of the proprietor, are positively endowed out of the public purse. The beet-root sugar manufacture is not only protected, but receives enormous sums in the shape of export premiums. One who ought to know is of opinion that if the exported sugar was all thrown into the sea, the manufacturer would still clear a profit out of the government premium. Similarly, the potato-spirit distilleries receive, in consequence of

---

a Here and below the German translation has “cartels” instead of “rings” and “trusts”.—Ed.
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recent legislation, a present, out of the pockets of the public, of about nine million dollars\(^a\) a year. And as almost every large land-owner in Northeastern Germany is either a beet-root sugar manufacturer or a potato-spirit distiller, or both, no wonder the world is literally deluged with their productions.

This policy, ruinous under any circumstances, is doubly so in a country whose manufactures keep up their standing in neutral markets chiefly through the cheapness of labor. Wages in Germany, kept near starvation point at the best of times, through redundancy of population (which increases rapidly, in spite of emigration), must rise in consequence of the rise in all necessaries caused by protection; the German manufacturer will, then, no longer be able, as he too often is now, to make up for a ruinous price of his articles by a deduction from the normal wages of his hands, and will be driven out of the market.\(^b\) Protection, in Germany, is killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

France, too, suffers from the consequences of protection. The system, in that country, has become, by its two centuries of undisputed sway, almost part and parcel of the life of the nation. Nevertheless, it is more and more becoming an obstacle. Constant changes in the methods of manufacture are the order of the day\(^c\); but protection bars the road. Silk velvets have their backs nowadays made of fine cotton thread; the French manufacturer has either to pay protection price for that, or to submit to such interminable official chicanery as fully makes up for the difference between that price and the government drawback on exportation; and so the velvet trade goes from Lyons to Crefeld, where the protection price for fine cotton thread is considerably lower.

French exports, as said before, consist chiefly of articles of luxury, where French taste cannot, as yet, be beaten; but the chief consumers, all over the world, of such articles are our modern upstart capitalists who have no education and no taste, and who are suited quite as well by cheap and clumsy German or English imitations, and often have these foisted upon them for the real French article at more than fancy prices. The market for those specialties which cannot be made out of France is constantly getting narrower, French exports of manufactures are barely kept up, and must soon decline; by what new articles can France

---

\(^a\) The German translation has "thirty-six million marks".—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The German translation has "will lose its competitiveness" instead of "will be driven out of the market".—*Ed.*

\(^c\) In the German translation the sentence begins as follows: "Large-scale industry calls for constant changes in the methods of production".—*Ed.*
replace those whose export is dying out? If anything can help here, it is a bold measure of Free Trade, taking the French manufacturer out of his accustomed hothouse atmosphere and placing him once more in the open air of competition with foreign rivals. Indeed, French general trade would have long since begun shrinking, were it not for the slight and vacillating step in the direction of Free Trade made by the Cobden treaty of 1860, but that has well-nigh exhausted itself and a stronger dose of the same tonic is wanted.

It is hardly worth while to speak of Russia. There, the protective tariff—the duties having to be paid in gold, instead of in the depreciated paper currency of the country—serves above all things to supply the pauper government with the hard cash indispensable for transactions with foreign creditors; on the very day on which that tariff fulfils its protective mission by totally excluding foreign goods, on that day the Russian government is bankrupt. And yet that same government amuses its subjects by dangling before their eyes the prospect of making Russia, by means of this tariff, an entirely self-supplying country, requiring from the foreigner neither food, nor raw material, nor manufactured articles, nor works of art. The people who believe in this vision of a Russian Empire, secluded and isolated from the rest of the world, are on a level with the patriotic Prussian lieutenant who went into a shop and asked for a globe, not a terrestrial or a celestial one, but a globe of Prussia.

To return to America. There are plenty of symptoms that Protection has done all it could for the United States, and that the sooner it receives notice to quit, the better for all parties. One of these symptoms is the formation of "rings" and "trusts" within the protected industries for the more thorough exploitation of the monopoly granted to them. Now, "rings" and "trusts" are truly American institutions, and, where they exploit natural advantages, they are generally, though grumblingly, submitted to. The transformation of the Pennsylvanian oil supply into a monopoly by the Standard Oil Company is a proceeding entirely in keeping with the rules of capitalist production. But if the sugar-refiners attempt to transform the protection granted them, by the nation, against foreign competition, into a monopoly against the home consumer, that is to say against the same nation that granted the

---

a The last three words are omitted in the German translation.—Ed.
b The German translation has "faithful subjects".—Ed.
c In the German translation the end of the sentence reads: "it is time to finish with it".—Ed.
protection, that is quite a different thing. Yet the large sugar-refiners have formed a "trust" which aims at nothing else. And the sugar trust is not the only one of its kind. Now, the formation of such trusts in protected industries is the surest sign that protection has done its work, and is changing its character; that it protects the manufacturer no longer against the foreign importer, but against the home consumer; that it has manufactured, at least in the special branch concerned, quite enough, if not too many manufacturers; that the money it puts into the purse of these manufacturers is money thrown away, exactly as in Germany.

In America, as elsewhere, Protection is bolstered up by the argument that Free Trade will only benefit England. The best proof to the contrary is that in England not only the agriculturists and landlords but even the manufacturers are turning protectionists. In the home of the "Manchester school" of Free Traders, on Nov. 1, 1886, the Manchester chamber of commerce discussed a resolution

"that, having waited in vain forty years for other nations to follow the Free Trade example of England, the chamber thinks the time has arrived to reconsider that position."

The resolution was indeed rejected, but by 22 votes against 21! And that happened in the centre of the cotton manufacture, i.e., the only branch of English manufacture whose superiority in the open market seems still undisputed! But, then, even in that special branch inventive genius has passed from England to America. The latest improvements in machinery for spinning and weaving cotton have come, almost all, from America, and Manchester has to adopt them. In industrial inventions of all kinds, America has distinctly taken the lead, while Germany runs England very close for second place. The consciousness is gaining ground in England that that country's industrial monopoly is irretrievably lost, that she is still relatively losing ground, while her rivals are making progress, and that she is drifting into a position where she will have to be content with being one manufacturing nation among many, instead of, as she once dreamt, "the workshop of the world." It is to stave off this impending fate that Protection, scarcely disguised under the veil of "fair trade" and retaliatory tariffs, is now invoked with such fervor by the sons of the very men who, forty years ago, knew no salvation but in Free Trade. And when English manufacturers begin to find that Free Trade is ruining them, and ask the government to protect them against their foreign

---

a The German translation has here "through the protective tariffs".—Ed.
competitors, then, surely, the moment has come for these competitors to retaliate by throwing overboard a protective system henceforth useless, to fight the fading industrial monopoly of England with its own weapon, Free Trade.

But, as I said before, you may easily introduce Protection, but you cannot get rid of it again so easily. The legislature, by adopting the protective plan, has created vast interests, for which it is responsible. And not every one of these interests—the various branches of industry—is equally ready, at a given moment, to face open competition. Some will be lagging behind, while others have no longer need of protective nursing. This difference of position will give rise to the usual lobby-plotting, and is in itself a sure guarantee that the protected industries, if Free Trade is resolved upon, will be let down very easy indeed, as was the silk manufacture in England after 1846. That is unavoidable under present circumstances, and will have to be submitted to by the Free Trade party so long as the change is resolved upon in principle.

The question of Free Trade or Protection moves entirely within the bounds of the present system of capitalist production, and has, therefore, no direct interest for us Socialists who want to do away with that system. Indirectly, however, it interests us, inasmuch as we must desire the present system of production to develop and expand as freely and as quickly as possible; because along with it will develop also those economic phenomena which are its necessary consequences, and which must destroy the whole system*: misery of the great mass of the people, in consequence of overproduction; this overproduction engendering either periodical gluts and revulsions, accompanied by panic, or else a chronic stagnation of trade; division of society into a small class of large capitalists, and a large one of practically hereditary wage-slaves, proletarians, who, while their numbers increase constantly, are at the same time constantly being superseded by new labor-saving machinery; in short, society brought to a deadlock, out of which there is no escaping but by a complete remodelling of the economic structure which forms its basis. From this point of view, forty years ago, Marx pronounced, in principle, in favor of Free Trade as the more progressive plan, and, therefore, the plan which would soonest bring capitalist society to that deadlock. But if Marx declared in favor of Free Trade on that ground, is that

---

a In the German translation the words "and which must destroy the whole system" are absent.—Ed.
not a reason for every supporter of the present order of society to declare against Free Trade? If Free Trade is stated to be revolutionary, must not all good citizens vote for Protection as a conservative plan?

If a country nowadays accept Free Trade, it will certainly not do so to please the Socialists. It will do so because Free Trade has become a necessity for the industrial capitalists. But if it should reject Free Trade, and stick to Protection, in order to cheat the Socialists out of the expected social catastrophe, that will not hurt the prospects of Socialism in the least. Protection is a plan for artificially manufacturing manufacturers, and therefore also a plan for artificially manufacturing wage-laborers. You cannot breed the one without breeding the other. The wage-laborer everywhere follows in the footsteps of the manufacturer; he is like the "gloomy care" of Horace, that sits behind the rider, and that he cannot shake off wherever he go. You cannot escape fate; in other words you cannot escape the necessary consequences of your own actions. A system of production based upon the exploitation of wage-labor, in which wealth increases in proportion to the number of laborers employed and exploited, such a system is bound to increase the class of wage-laborers, that is to say, the class which is fated one day to destroy the system itself. In the meantime, there is no help for it: you must go on developing the capitalist system, you must accelerate the production, accumulation, and centralization of capitalist wealth, and, along with it, the production of a revolutionary class of laborers. Whether you try the Protectionist or the Free Trade plan will make no difference in the end, and hardly any in the length of the respite left to you until the day when that end will come. For long before that day will protection have become an unbearable shackle to any country aspiring, with a chance of success, to hold its own in the world market.

Written in April and early May 1888

First published in Die Neue Zeit, No. 7, July 1888 and also in the pamphlet K. Marx, Free Trade, Boston, 1888
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a The German translation has "then nobody will be cheated more than itself" instead of "that will not hurt the prospects of Socialism in the least".—Ed.
b Horace, Carminum. III. 1.—Ed.
c In the German translation the end of the sentence reads: "and thus to exacerbate a class antagonism which will one day destroy the entire system".—Ed.
d In the German translation the word "revolutionary" is absent, and the sentence ends as follows: "located outside official society".—Ed.
Seeing the constant interest you take in the questions raised with regard to the coming International Working Men’s Congress, I hope you will allow a Frenchman and a Member of the so-called Marxist Organisation of France (Agglomération Parisienne), to say a few words in reply to a circular published in the Bulletin of the Paris Labour Exchange and reproduced in English, in Justice of April 27th.

Now the Paris Labour Exchange is an out and out Possibilist institution. They have got hold of it with the help of the Opportunist and Radical Members of the Paris Town Council, and every trades union which dares openly oppose Possibilist principles and tactics, is at once excluded. This above mentioned circular, though issued in the name of 78 Paris Trades Unions, is therefore quite as much a Possibilist production as if issued by the Possibilist Committee themselves.

This circular calls upon “all the working class organisations of France, without distinction of the shades of Republican or Socialist opinion,” to join in the Possibilist Congress. Now this seems fair enough. And as our section of the French Socialists has driven the Possibilists entirely out of the provinces, so much so that they dared not attend their own Congress at Troyes, as soon they heard that we were to be admitted, and as our organisations in the provinces are by far more numerous than all the Possibilist organisations in France put together, no doubt we should have the majority of French delegates even in this Possibilist Congress, if a fair basis of representation was secured. But there’s the rub. The Possibilist Committee have made heaps of regulations for their Congress, but this most important point is never mentioned.
Nobody knows whether each group is to send one, two, or more delegates, or whether the number of delegates is to be regulated by the number of members in each group. Now, as the Possibilists are acknowledged to be strongest in Paris, they might send two or three delegates for each group, where we, in our simplicity, send only one. They may manufacture as many delegates as they like. They have them ready at hand in Paris, and need merely nominate them. And thus, with all this apparent fairness, the French section of the Congress may be turned into a packed set of Possibilists, who might treat us as they liked, unless we had an appeal to the Congress.

For this reason alone we could not give up the sovereignty of the Congress with regard to all its internal concerns, if, indeed, that first and fundamental principle could be given up. It is not quite forgotten in London yet, I believe, that the Parliamentary Committee, last November, made it pretty clearly understood that they had hired the room, and that the Congress was there at their sufferance—and we do not want to have that repeated in Paris.

Written in late April 1889

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Labour Elector*, vol. I, No. 18, May 4, 1889
The German miners' strike is an immense event for us. Like the miners in England in the Chartist times, the colliers of Germany are the last to join the movement, and this is their first start. The movement began in the Westfalian coalfield in the North—a district producing 45 million tons annually, and not yet half-developed, coal having been bored at a depth of 500 yards. These miners—hitherto good subjects, patriotic, obedient, and religious, and furnishing some of the finest infantry for the VII. army corps (I know them well, my native place is only 6 or 7 miles south of the coalfields), have now been thoroughly aroused by the oppression of their capitalists. While the mines—almost all joint stock concerns—paid enormous dividends, the real wages of the men were constantly being reduced, the nominal weekly wages were kept up, in some cases even raised in appearance, by forcing the men to work enormous overtime—in place of single shifts of 8 hours they worked from 12 to 16 hours, thus making from 9 to 12 shifts weekly. Truck shops, disguised under the name of "Co-operative" shops, prevailed. Cheating, on the quantity of coal got by rejecting whole truckfuls of coal as being bad or not properly filled, was the rule. Well, since last winter, the men have given notice several times that they would strike unless this was remedied, but to no purpose, and at last they did strike, after having given due notice of their intention, and the owners lie when they maintain the contrary. In a week 70,000 men were out, and the masters had to feed the strike, for they paid wages once a month only, and always kept one month's wages in hand which they now had to fork out to the strikers. The masters were thus caught in their own net. Well, the men sent that celebrated deputation to the
Emperor—a snobby, conceited coxcomb of a boy—who received them with a threatening speech; if they turned towards the social democrat and reviled the authorities, he would have them shot down without mercy.\footnote{That had in fact been tried already at Bochum, where a sublieutenant, a \textit{lad of 19}, ordered his men to fire on the strikers, most of them fired in the air.} But all the same, the whole empire trembled before these men on strike. The military commander of the district\footnote{went to the spot, so did the Home Secretary, and everything was tried to bring the masters round to make concession. The Emperor even told them to open their pockets, and said in a council of ministers “My soldiers are there to keep order, but not to provide big profits to the mine-owners.”} went to the spot, so did the Home Secretary,\footnote{Well, by the intervention of the Liberal Opposition (who have lost one seat in Parliament after another by the workmen passing over to us) a compromise was effected, and the men returned to work. But no sooner were they in than the masters broke their word, discharged some of the ringleaders (though they had agreed not to do so), refused arranging for overtime by agreement with the men, as agreed upon, etc. The strike threatened to break out again, but the matter is still in suspense, and, I am sure, the Government, who are in a devil of a funk, will make them give in at least for a time. Then the strike spread to Coalfield No. II. and III. This district has been kept, so far, free from Socialist contagion, as every man who went there to agitate, when caught in the meshes of the law, got as many years’ imprisonment as he would have got months’ anywhere else in Germany. The Government alone made concessions to the men, but whether these will suffice remains to be seen. Then the men in the Saxon Coalfield, and in the two Siberian\footnote{Coalfields, still further east, took up the tune, so that in the last three weeks there have been at least 120,000 colliers on strike in Germany, and from them the Belgian and Bohemian miners caught the infection, while in Germany a number of other trades who had prepared strikes for this spring season, have also left work.} Coalfields, still further east, took up the tune, so that in the last three weeks there have been at least 120,000 colliers on strike in Germany, and from them the Belgian and Bohemian miners caught the infection, while in Germany a number of other trades who had prepared strikes for this spring season, have also left work. Thus there is no doubt the German colliers have joined their brethren in the struggle against capital, and as they are a splendid body of men, and almost all have passed through the army, they form an important addition to our ranks. Their belief in emperor and priest has been}
shattered, and whatever the Government may do, no Government can give satisfaction to the men without upsetting the capitalist system—and that the German Government neither can nor will attempt. It is the first time that the Government had to pretend to observe an impartial position in a strike in Germany: so its virginity in that respect has gone for ever, and both William and Bismarck had to bow before the array of 100,000 working men on strike. That alone is a glorious result.

Written in late May 1889

Reproduced from the magazine

First published in *The Labour Leader*,
vol. 1, No. 5, June 1889
The partisans of the Possibilist Paris Congress—the unmistakeable Mr. Smith Hedingley in the Star, Mr. H. Burrows and Mrs. Besant in the weekly Press—are repeating over and over again that their Congress was a really representative one, while the Marxist Congress contained people who represented only themselves, and for that reason dared not accept the challenge of the Possibilists to show them their credentials. The English delegates to the Marxist Congress will no doubt seek, and find, an opportunity to prove the untruth of the charges brought against them; so we may for the present dismiss that part of the subject, and merely observe that the Possibilists could hardly offer a greater insult to the Marxist Congress than to ask it to ignore the process of the verification of its own credentials, completed as far back as the second (or third?) day, and to submit their credentials to a fresh examination; while the Possibilists, in their resolution on the subject, carefully avoided engaging themselves to an examination of their credentials by the Marxists.

That the above is the correct view of the matter, and that the Possibilists, much more than the Marxists, had reason to show their credentials to none but friends, was proved by the observations of Dr. Adler, in the Marxist Congress, of what he had learnt about the “Austrian” Possibilist delegates. As the thing is characteristic of the way in which the Possibilists manufactured truly representative delegates, it deserves reproduction.

In the Possibilist list of delegates we find under “Austria” the following bodies represented:—“Bakers Union of Vienna,” “Federation of Upper Austria and Salzburg,” “Federation of Working-men of Bohemia-Moravia, and Silesia.” Now Dr. Adler, who has
during the last three years, with wonderful energy, tact, and perseverance, reorganised the Socialist movement in Austria, and who knows every workmen's society in every town in Austria, told the Congress that these various societies, whatever may be their other merits, have one fatal defect: they do not exist.

When it became known in Paris that the Marxist Congress had met on the Sunday, and that there were delegates from Austria, there came to it on the Monday two Austrians and saw Dr. Adler. They told him they were bakers, for some time past working in Paris; that a Hungarian baker, of the name of Dobosy, had engaged them as "delegates" for a workingmen's congress; was this the same congress? Adler questioned them and found out that they were engaged for the Possibilist Congress, for which they had cards of membership; that they had told the people who had engaged them that they represented absolutely nobody but themselves, that they were told that did not matter, Austria being a despotic country, regular credentials were not required; that they now found the true Austrian delegates were at the other Congress; what were they to do? The Austrian delegates told them they had no business to play at delegates at any Congress. Well, they arranged for another interview. They came again a day or two after, assisted at the meeting of the Marxist Congress, and then declared they saw themselves they must get out of this false position, but how? They were told to return their credentials. They had none. Then return your cards of membership. This they promised to do, and returned to say they had done so.

This is a sample of what the Possibilists and their English partisans call "strictly representative." And the imposing list of Hungarian societies with names so well hidden under misprints that only with a few of them is the pretended locality recognizable, are, according to the true Hungarian delegates at the Marxist Congress, equally non-existent outside the wonderland of Possibilist fancy. Indeed, the concoction here is too flagrant. "Circles of Social Study and Federation of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Trieste, and Fiume"—this pompous title bears the stamp of its Parisian origin too conspicuously. And to think that behind all this there are not even the—three tailors of Tooley Street! 452

We are further told that it is absolutely false that the Possibilist Congress was a mere Trades Unions Congress. Mr. Herbert Burrows is quite indignant at such a calumny; with the exception of a few English Trades Unionists "the whole of the delegates" were revolutionary Socialists, and as such represented their respective societies. Well, to give but one example, what does El
Socialista, of Madrid (26th July) say of the Spanish Possibilist delegates? That "they say they represent 20,000 Socialists, when they are but delegates of societies in which there is room for the Carlist\textsuperscript{453} as well as for the revolutionary Socialist"—entirely non-political clubs, in fact, what is called, in England, Trades Unions.

Written in early August 1889

First published in *The Labour Elector*, vol. II, No. 32, August 10, 1889

Reproduced from the newspaper
I envy you your work in the Dock Strike. It is the movement of the greatest promise we have had for years, and I am proud and glad to have lived to see it. If Marx had lived to witness this! If these poor down-trodden men, the dregs of the proletariat, these odds and ends of all trades, fighting every morning at the dock gates for an engagement, if they can combine, and terrify by their resolution the mighty Dock Companies, truly then we need not despair of any section of the working class. This is the beginning of real life in the East End, and if successful will transform the whole character of the East End. There—for want of self-confidence, and of organisation among the poor devils grovelling in stagnant misery—lasciate ogni speranza. ... If the dockers get organised, all other sections will follow... It is a glorious movement and again I envy those that can share in the work.

Written between August 20 and 26, 1889 Reproduced from the newspaper
First published in The Labour Elector, vol. II, No. 35, August 31, 1889

a "All hope abandon..." (Dante, Divine Comedy, Inferno, c. III, v. 5).— Ed.
The Abdication of the Bourgeoisie

Of all the national bourgeoisies, it is undoubtedly the English one that has up to now preserved the keenest sense of class, i.e., sense of politics. Our German bourgeoisie is stupid and cowardly; it has not even been able to seize and hold onto the political power the working class won for it in 1848; in Germany the working class must first sweep away the remnants of feudalism and of patriarchal absolutism, which our bourgeoisie was duty-bound to eradicate long ago. The French bourgeoisie, the most mercenary and pleasure-seeking of all, is blinded to its future interests by its own greed for money; it lives only by the day; in its frenzied thirst for profit it plunges itself into the most ignominious corruption, declares that income tax is socialist high treason, can find no way of countering any strike other than with infantry salvoes, and thus manages to bring about a situation where in a republic with universal suffrage the workers are left with hardly any other means of victory than violent revolution. The English bourgeoisie is neither as greedily stupid as the French, nor as pusillanimously stupid as the German. During the period of its greatest triumphs it has constantly made concessions to the workers; even its most dyed-in-the-wool contingent, the conservative landowning and finance aristocracy, was not afraid to give the urban workers suffrage on such a scale that it is purely the fault of the workers themselves that they have not had 40 to 50 representatives of their own in Parliament since 1868. And since then the entire bourgeoisie—the Conservatives and the Liberals combined—has extended this wider suffrage to the rural areas as well, has roughly equalled out the size of the constituencies and thereby placed at least another thirty constituencies at the disposal of the working
class. Whereas the German bourgeoisie has never had the ability to lead and represent the nation as its ruling class, whereas the French proves daily—and just again at the elections—that it has completely lost this ability—and yet there was a time when it possessed that ability to a higher degree than any other middle class—the English bourgeoisie (into which the so-called aristocracy has been absorbed and assimilated) exhibited until recently a certain talent for doing justice to its position as leading class at least to some degree.

This now seems to be changing more and more.

Everything connected with the old government of the City of London—the constitution and the administration of the City proper—is still downright medieval. And this includes also the Port of London, the leading port in the world. The wharfingers, the lightermen and the watermen form regular guilds with exclusive privileges and in part still don medieval costumes. These antiquated guild privileges have in the past seventy years been crowned with the monopoly of the dock companies, and thereby the whole huge Port of London has been handed over for ruthless exploitation to a small number of privileged corporations. And this whole privileged monstrosity is being perpetuated and, as it were, made inviolable through an endless series of intricate and contradictory Acts of Parliament through which it was born and raised, and in such a manner that this legal labyrinth has become its best rampart. But while these corporations presume on their medieval privileges in dealing with ordinary traders and make London the most expensive port in the world, their members have become regular bourgeois, who besides fleecing their customers, exploit their workers in the most despicable manner and thus profit simultaneously from the advantages of medieval guild and modern capitalist society.

Since, however, this exploitation took place within the framework of modern capitalist society, it was, despite its medieval cloak, subject to the laws of that society. The big swallowed the small or at least chained them to their triumphal chariot. The big dock companies became the masters of the guilds of the wharfingers, the lightermen and the watermen, and thereby of the whole Port of London, thus opening up the prospect of unlimited profits for themselves. This prospect blinded them. They squandered millions on stupid installations; and since there were several
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a In the original these English words are given in parentheses after their German equivalents.—Ed.
such companies, they engaged in a competitive war, which cost further millions, produced more senseless structures and pushed the companies to the brink of bankruptcy, until finally they came to terms two years ago.

In the meantime the London trade had passed its peak. Le Havre, Antwerp, Hamburg and, since the new sea canal had been built, also Amsterdam, drew a growing share of the traffic that had formerly centred on London. Liverpool, Hull and Glasgow also took their share. The newly built docks remained empty, dividends dwindled and partly disappeared altogether, shares dropped, and the dock managers, arrogant, purse-proud snobs, stubborn and spoilt by the good old times, were at their wits' end. They did not want to admit the true reasons for the relative and absolute decline in the traffic of the Port of London. And these reasons, insofar as they are of a local character, are purely and simply their own arrogant perversity and its cause, the privileged position, the medieval, long outdated constitution of the City and Port of London, which by right should be in the British Museum, next to the Egyptian mummies and the Assyrian stone monsters.

Nowhere else in the world would such folly be tolerated. In Liverpool, where similar conditions were taking shape, they were nipped in the bud and the entire port constitution was modernised. But in London traders suffer because of it, grumble and—submit to it. The bourgeoisie, the bulk of whom have to pay the costs of these fatuities, yield to this monopoly, even if unwillingly, but yield just the same. They no longer have the energy to shake off this demon that in time threatens to stifle the living conditions of all of London.

Then the dock workers' strike breaks out.457 It is not the bourgeoisie robbed by the dock companies that rebel, it is the workers exploited by them, the poorest of the poor, the lowest layer of the East End proletarians, who fling down the gauntlet to the dock magnates. And then, at last, the bourgeoisie realise that they too have an enemy in the dock magnates, that the striking workers have taken up the struggle not only in their own interests, but indirectly also in the interests of the bourgeois class. That is the secret of the public sympathy for the strike and of the unprecedentedly generous money contributions from bourgeois circles. But thus far and no further. The workers went into action to the accompaniment of acclamation and applause from the bourgeoisie; the workers fought the battle to the end and proved not only that the proud dock magnates could be defeated but by their struggle and victory also stirred up public opinion to such an
extent that the dock monopoly and the feudal port constitution are no longer tenable and will soon really have to move to the British Museum.

The job should have been done by the bourgeoisie long ago. They were unable or unwilling to do it. Now the workers have taken it in hand and now it will be done. In other words, in this case the bourgeoisie have renounced their own part in favour of the workers.

Now a different picture. From the medieval Port of London we move on to the modern cotton spinners of Lancashire. We presently find ourselves at a juncture where the cotton harvest of 1888 is exhausted and that of 1889 has not yet come onto the market, that is, speculation in raw materials has the best prospects at present. A rich Dutchman called Steenstrand has, with other cronies, formed a "ring" to buy up all the available cotton and to boost prices accordingly. The cotton spinners can retaliate only by cutting consumption, that is, by shutting down their mills for several days a week or altogether, until the new cotton is in sight. They have been trying to do this for six weeks. But now as on previous occasions it refuses to work. This is because many of the spinners are so heavily indebted that a partial or complete standstill would push them to the brink of ruin. Others even want the majority to stop and thereby to boost the price of cotton yarn; while they themselves intend to continue operating and to profit from the higher yarn prices. A good ten years' experience has shown that there is only one way to enforce a shut-down of all cotton mills—no matter for what ultimate purpose—namely, by introducing a wage cut of, say, 5 per cent. Then there is a strike, or a lockout by the mill-owners themselves, and then, in the struggle against the workers, absolute unity prevails among the mill-owners, and the machines are brought to a standstill even by those who do not know whether they will ever be able to set them going again.

As things stand, a wage cut is not advisable today. But how otherwise can a general closure of the mills be brought about, without which the spinners will for about six weeks be delivered, bound hand and foot, to the speculators? By a step which is unique in the history of modern industry.

The mill-owners, through their central committee, "semi-officially" approach the Central Committee of the Workers' Trade Unions with a request that the organised workers in the common interest, force the obstinate mill-owners to shut down by organising strikes. Messrs mill-owners, admitting their own inability to take
concerted action, ask the once so hated workers' trade unions kindly to use coercion against them, the mill-owners, so that the mill-owners, induced by bitter necessity, should finally act in concert, as a class, in the interests of their own class. They have to be forced to do so by the workers, for they themselves are unable to bring this about!

The workers consented. And the workers' threat alone sufficed. In 24 hours the "ring" of cotton speculators was smashed. This shows what can be done by the mill-owners, and what by the workers.

Thus, here, in the most modern of all modern large-scale industries, the bourgeoisie proves to be just as incapable of asserting its own class interests as in medieval London. And what is more, it openly admits it, and by turning to the organised workers with the request that they force through a major class interest of the mill-owners against the will of mill-owners themselves, it not only abdicates, but recognises in the organised working class its successor, which is called upon to rule and is capable of doing so. It proclaims itself that even if every single mill-owner is able to manage his own mill, it is the organised workers alone who are now able to take the management of the entire cotton industry into their own hands. And this means, in plain language, that the only occupation left to the mill-owners is to become paid business managers in the service of the organised workers.

F. Engels

Written between late September and early October 1889

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 40, October 5, 1889
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
In essence, associations—whether naturally evolved or created—have hitherto existed for economic ends, but these ends have been concealed and buried beneath ideological matters of secondary importance. The ancient polis, the medieval town or guild, the feudal confederacy of landowning nobility—all had secondary ideological aims which they hallowed and which in the case of the patrician body of consanguinity and the guild arose from the memories, traditions and models of gentile society no less than in that of the ancient polis. The capitalist commercial companies are the first to be wholly rational and objective—but vulgar. The association of the future will combine the rationality of the latter with the old ones' concern for the social welfare of all, and thus fulfil its purpose.

Written in 1884

Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
Reformation—Lutheran and Calvinist—bourgeoisie's revolution No. 1, in which Peasant War is the critical episode. Dissolution of feudalism, along with the development of towns, both decentralising, absolute monarchy therefore a virtual necessity for holding together the nationalities. Had to be absolute, precisely because of the centrifugal nature of all the elements. Absolute not to be understood in the vulgar sense, however; constantly at odds partly with the Estates, partly with rebellious feudal lords and towns; the Estates nowhere abolished; thus better described as an *Estate* monarchy (still feudal, decaying feudal and embryonic bourgeois).

Victory of revolution No. 1, which was much more European than the English one, and became European much more quickly than the French one, in Switzerland, Holland, Scotland, England—to a certain extent in Sweden, too, already [under] G[ustavus] Vasa, and Denmark, here not until 1660 in orthodox, absolutist form.

I.\(^a\) Causes in Germany. History from beginning. Germany broken after the heroic age of the migration of peoples. Only restored from France, by Charlemagne. Hence Roman empire

\(^a\) In the manuscript the text marked "I" by Engels is placed after that marked "II".—*Ed.*
idea. Renewed by Otto. More non-Germans than Germans. Ruin of Germany by this policy—of pillaging the Italian cities—under the Hohenstaufens. Thus fragmentation confirmed—excepto casu revolutionis. Development from interregnum to 15th century. Ruin of Germany by this policy—of pillaging the Italian cities—under the Hohenstaufens. Thus fragmentation confirmed—excepto casu revolutionis. Development from interregnum to 15th century. Rise of the towns. Decay of feudalism never perfected in Germany under pressure from the princes (the emperor as sovereign against, as emperor for the imperial knights). Gradual emancipation of the peasants, until setback in 15th century. Germany materially on a par with the other countries of the day.—Crucial that in Germany because of provincial fragmentation and long-term freedom from invasion the need for national unity not so strong as in France (the Hundred Years’ War), Spain, which had just been reconquered from the Moors, Russia, which had just driven out the Tatars, England (Wars of the Roses), and that even the emperors of the day so shabby.

II. With the Renaissance in its European guise based on general decay of feudalism and rise of the towns. Then absolutist national monarchies—everywhere except in Germany and Italy.

III. Character of the Reformation as sole possible, popular expression of universal aspirations, etc.

Written at the end of 1884

First published, in Russian, in Marx-Engels Archives, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

---

a Save in the case of revolution.—Ed.
While the wild battles of the ruling feudal nobility filled the Middle Ages with their clamour, the quiet work of the oppressed classes had undermined the feudal system throughout Western Europe, had created conditions in which less and less room remained for the feudal lord. To be sure, the noble lords still carried on their mischievous ways in the country, tormenting the serfs, living high on their sweat, demolishing their crops under horses' hooves, raping their wives and daughters. But towns had sprung up all around; in Italy, Southern France, on the Rhine, old Roman municipalia had risen from their ashes; elsewhere, particularly in the heart of Germany, new creations; always ringed by protective walls and ditches, fortresses far stronger than the nobility's castles, because pregnable only by a large army. Behind these walls and ditches evolved the medieval handicrafts (burgher guild and pretty small), the first capitals accumulated, the need arose for traffic between the towns themselves and with the rest of the world, and, with this need, gradually the means to protect this traffic.

In the fifteenth century the burghers of the towns had already become more indispensable to society than the feudal nobility. True, agriculture was still the occupation of the vast majority of the population, and thus the main branch of production. But the few isolated free peasants who here and there withstood the arrogant behaviour of the nobility were sufficient proof that the main ingredient in farming was not the nobles' indolence and extortion, but the peasant's labour. And then the needs of the nobles, too, had increased and changed to such an extent that the towns had become indispensable even to them; after all, they
procured their only instrument of production, their armour and weapons, from the towns! Native cloth, furniture and jewellery, Italian silks, Brabant lace, Nordic furs, Arabian perfumes, fruit from the Levant, Indian spices—everything apart from soap—they bought from the town dwellers. International trade of a kind had developed; the Italians travelled the Mediterranean and, beyond that, the Atlantic coasts as far as Flanders; the Hanseatic merchants still controlled the North Sea and the Baltic in the face of mounting competition from the Dutch and the English. Communication was maintained by land between the northern and southern centres of the maritime traffic; the routes along which this communication took place passed through Germany. While the nobility became increasingly superfluous and an ever greater obstacle to development, the burghers of the towns became the class that embodied the further development of production and trade, of culture and of the social and political institutions.

All these advances in production and exchange were, in point of fact, by today's standards, of a very limited nature. Production remained enthralled in the form of pure guild crafts, thus itself still retaining a feudal character; trade remained within the limits of European waters, and did not extend any further than the coastal towns of the Levant, where the products of the Far East were acquired by exchange. But small-scale and limited though the trades—and hence the trading burghers—remained, they were sufficient to overthrow feudal society, and at least they continued to move forward, whereas the nobility stagnated.

But then the burghers of the towns had a mighty weapon with which to oppose feudalism: money. Money had scarcely found any place in the archetype feudal economy of the early Middle Ages. The feudal lord obtained from his serfs everything that he needed; either in the form of labour or in finished products; the women spun and wove the flax and wool and made the clothes; the men sowed the fields; the children minded the lord's livestock, collected for him wild fruits, birds' nests and straw; besides that, the whole family had to supply corn, fruit, eggs, butter, cheese, poultry, young livestock and much else. Every feudal form was self-sufficient; even military services were exacted in products; trade and exchange did not exist, money was superfluous. Europe had been reduced to such a low level, had begun all over again to such an extent that at that time money had much less of a social function than a purely political one: it was a means of paying taxes, and was chiefly acquired through robbery.

All this had now changed. Money had again become a universal
means of exchange, and consequently its volume had increased considerably; the noble could no longer do without it either, and having little or nothing to sell, since robbery was also not quite so easy now, he eventually had to make up his mind to borrow from the usurer among the burghers. Long before the castles of the knights were breached by the new artillery they had been undermined by money; in fact, gunpowder was merely a bailiff, as it were, in the service of money. Money was the burghers' greatest political leveller. Wherever a personal relationship was superseded by a money relationship, a payment in kind by payment in money, a bourgeois relationship took the place of a feudal one. Admittedly, in the countryside the old brutal natural economy continued to exist in the great majority of cases; but there were already whole districts where, as in Holland, in Belgium, on the Lower Rhine, the peasants paid the lord money instead of labour service and tributes in kind, where lords and bondsmen had already taken the first decisive step towards becoming landowners and tenants, where even in the countryside the political institutions of feudalism were thus losing their social basis.

The extent to which the feudal system had, by the end of the fifteenth century, already been undermined and eaten away on the inside by money is strikingly illustrated by the thirst for gold that seized Western Europe at this time. It was gold the Portuguese sought on the African coast, in India, throughout the Far East; gold was the magic word which drove the Spaniards across the Atlantic Ocean to America; gold was the first thing the white man enquired about the moment he set foot on a newly discovered shore. But this urge to set off on adventures to far-off places in search of gold, no matter how much it manifested itself in feudal and semi-feudal forms at the beginning, was nevertheless in its very roots incompatible with feudalism, whose foundation was agriculture and whose campaigns of conquest were essentially aimed at the acquisition of land. Moreover, shipping was a decidedly bourgeois trade which has stamped its anti-feudal character on all modern navies too.

In the fifteenth century the feudal system was thus in utter decline throughout Western Europe; everywhere towns with anti-feudal interests, with their own laws and with an armed citizenry had wedged their way into feudal areas, bringing the feudal lords under their sway, in part already socially, through money, and here and there also politically; even in country areas where agriculture had flourished because of particularly favoura-
ble conditions the old feudal ties began to dissolve under the influence of money; only in newly conquered lands such as Germany east of the Elbe, or in otherwise backward tracts far from the trade routes, did the old rule of the nobility continue to prosper. But everywhere—in the towns and in the country alike—there had been an increase in the elements among the population whose chief demand was to put an end to the constant, senseless warring, to the feuds between the feudal lords which made internal war permanent even when there was a foreign enemy on their native soil, to that state of incessant, utterly pointless devastation that had persisted throughout the Middle Ages. Still too weak themselves to impose their will, these elements found strong support at the apex of the whole feudal system—in the monarchy. And this is the point where the consideration of social relations leads us to those of the state, where we make the transition from economics to politics.

Out of the confusion of peoples that characterised the earliest Middle Ages, there gradually developed the new nationalities, a process whereby, it will be recalled, in most of the former Roman provinces the vanquished assimilated the victor, the peasant and townsman assimilated the Germanic lord. Modern nationalities are thus also the product of the oppressed classes. Menke’s district map of central Lorraine* gives a clear picture of the ways in which fusion took place here, boundary demarcation there. One need only follow the boundary line between Romance and German placenames on this map to be convinced that this linguistic boundary between Belgium and Lower Lorraine coincides in the main with that which existed between French and German as recently as a hundred years ago. Here and there one finds a narrow, disputed area where the two languages are struggling for predominance; but on the whole it is clear what is to remain German and what is to remain Romance. The Old Low Franconian and Old High German form of most placenames on the map shows, however, that they belong to the ninth century, to the tenth at the latest, and hence that the boundary had already been essentially drawn towards the end of the Carolingian age. On the Romance side, particularly close to the linguistic boundary, there are now mixed names, made up of a German personal name and a Romance placename, e.g. west of the Maas near Verdun:

Eppone curtis, Rotfridi curtis, Ingolini curtis, Teudegisilo-villa, today Ippécourt, Récourt la Creux, Amblaincourt-sur-Aire, Thierville. These were Franconian manor houses, small German colonies on Romance soil, which sooner or later succumbed to Romanisation. In the towns and in scattered rural areas there were stronger German colonies that retained their language for some time to come; it was from one of these, for example, that The Lay of Ludwig\textsuperscript{465} originated at the end of the ninth century; but the fact that prior to this a large proportion of the Franconian lords had been Romanised is proved by the oath formulas of the kings and magnates of 842, in which Romance already appears as the official language of France.\textsuperscript{466}

Once their boundaries had been fixed (disregarding subsequent wars of conquest and annihilation, such as those against the Slavs of the Elbe\textsuperscript{467}) it was natural for the linguistic groups to serve as the existent basis for the formation of states; for the nationalities to start developing into nations. The rapid collapse of the mixed state of Lotharingia\textsuperscript{468} shows how powerful this element was as early as the ninth century. True, linguistic boundaries and national frontiers were far from coincident throughout the Middle Ages; but every nationality except perhaps Italy was represented by a separate big state in Europe, and the tendency to form national states, which becomes increasingly clear and deliberate, constitutes one of the Middle Ages’ most considerable levers of progress.

In each of these medieval states the king now constituted the head of the entire feudal hierarchy, a head with whom the vassals were unable to dispense and against whom they were at the same time in a state of permanent rebellion. The basic relation of the whole feudal system—the granting of land in return for the delivery of certain personal services and dues—provided, even in its original and simplest form, plenty of material for strife, especially when so many people had an interest in picking quarrels. So what was to be expected in the later Middle Ages, when the conditions of vassalage in every country formed an inextricable tangle of rights and duties that had been granted, withdrawn, renewed once more, forfeited, amended or subjected to new conditions? For part of his lands, Charles the Bold, for instance, was the Emperor’s vassal, for others the King of France’s vassal; on the other hand, the King of France, his liege lord, was simultaneously in certain areas the vassal of Charles the Bold, his own vassal; how were conflicts to be avoided? Hence these centuries of alternation between the vassals’ attraction towards the
royal centre, which alone could protect them from outsiders and from one another, and the repulsion away from the centre into which that attraction was continually and inevitably transformed; hence the incessant struggle between kings and vassals, whose desolate din drowned out all else during this long period when robbery was held to be the only source of income worthy of a free man; hence that endless, constantly regenerated cycle of betrayal, assassination, poisoning, treachery and every conceivable vileness that, concealed behind the poetical name of chivalry, never ceased to speak of honour and loyalty.

That in this general turmoil the monarchy was the progressive element is perfectly obvious. It stood for order amid disorder, the nation in the process of formation as opposed to disintegration into rebellious vassal states. Any revolutionary elements that formed beneath the surface of feudalism were as dependent on the monarchy as the monarchy on them. The alliance between the monarchy and the burghers dates from the tenth century; often interrupted by conflicts, just as nothing else followed a steady course during the Middle Ages, it was renewed, becoming firmer and more powerful each time, until it helped the monarchy to ultimate victory, and to show its gratitude the monarchy subjugated and plundered its ally.

Kings and burghers alike found a powerful support in the rising estate of lawyers. With the rediscovery of Roman law came the division of labour between the priests, the legal advisers of the feudal age, and the non-clerical law scholars. These new lawyers were from the very outset essentially a bourgeois estate; but the law they studied, surveyed and practised was by its nature essentially anti-feudal and in certain respects bourgeois. Roman law is the classic legal expression of the day-to-day relations and conflicts of a society in which pure private property dominates, so much so that no subsequent legislation has ever been able to improve on it in any major respect. But the bourgeois property of the Middle Ages still had a heavy admixture of feudal restrictions, and consisted, for example, very largely of privileges; to that extent, then, Roman law was a long way ahead of the bourgeois conditions of the time. Subsequent historical development of bourgeois property could proceed, however, only in one way: it was bound to turn into pure private property, and this is what happened. But this development was bound to find a powerful lever in Roman law, which already contained in a finished form all that the bourgeoisie of the later Middle Ages aspired to, albeit unconsciously as yet.
Though Roman law in many individual cases provided a pretext for even greater oppression of the peasants by the nobility, for instance when the peasants were unable to adduce any written proof of their exemption from otherwise customary burdens, it does not alter the matter. Even without Roman law, the nobility would have found such pretexts, and indeed found them daily. At any rate, it was a tremendous advance when a legal system came into force that knew absolutely nothing of feudal relations and fully anticipated modern private property.

We have seen how the feudal nobility started to become superfluous in economic terms, indeed a hindrance, in the society of the later Middle Ages—how it already stood in the way, politically, of the development of the towns and the national state which was then only possible in a monarchist form. In spite of all this, it had been sustained by the fact that it had hitherto possessed a monopoly over the bearing of arms: without it no wars could be waged, no battles fought. This, too, was to change; the last step would be taken to make it clear to the feudal nobles that the period in which they had ruled society and the state was now over, that they were no longer of any use in their capacity as knights—not even on the battlefield.

Opposing the feudal economy with an army that was itself feudal, in which the soldiers were bound by closer ties to their immediate liege lord than to the command of the royal army—this obviously meant going round in a vicious circle, without achieving any advance. From the beginning of the fourteenth century the kings strove to free themselves of this feudal army and create an army of their own. From this time on we find in the armies of the kings a constantly growing proportion of recruited or hired troops. At first they were chiefly infantry, comprising the scum of the towns and runaway serfs, Lombards, Genoese, Germans, Belgians, etc., who were employed for occupying towns and for siege duties, but in the beginning could scarcely be used on the battlefield. But towards the end of the Middle Ages we also find knights entering the service of foreign princes as mercenaries with their retinues gathered together the devil knows how, thus demonstrating the irrevocable collapse of feudal warfare.

The fundamental condition for an efficient infantry arose simultaneously in the towns and in the free peasants, wherever the latter were still to be found or had re-formed. Until then the knights with their retinue, likewise mounted, had been not so much the core of the army as the army itself; the baggage-train of
attendant, serf infantrymen did not count, appearing in the open field merely in order to run away or to loot. As long as the golden age of feudalism lasted, until the end of the thirteenth century, the cavalry fought and decided every battle. From that time on, things changed, and moreover in various points simultaneously. The gradual disappearance of serfdom in England created a sizeable class of free farmers, either landowners (yeomen) or tenants, and thus the raw material for a new type of infantry, skilled in the use of the bow, the English national weapon at the time. The introduction of these archers, who always fought on foot whether they travelled on horseback or not, gave rise to a major change in the tactics of English armies. From the fourteenth century onwards the English knights preferred to fight on foot where the terrain or other circumstances rendered this appropriate. Behind the archers, who started the battle and softened up the enemy, the massed array of dismounted knights awaited the enemy attack or the right moment to advance, while only part of them remained on horseback in order to facilitate the decisive encounter by attacks on the flanks. The then unbroken series of English victories in France were largely due to the restoration of a defensive element in the army, and were for the most part just as much defensive battles with offensive retaliation as Wellington’s in Spain and Belgium. With the adoption of new tactics by the French—possible since Italian mercenary crossbowmen had assumed the functions of the English archers in their case—the triumphant progress of the English was at an end. Also at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the infantrymen of the Flemish towns had dared—often successfully—to confront the French knights in open battle, and Emperor Albrecht, by his attempt to betray the autonomous Swiss peasants to the Archduke of Austria, who was he himself, had provided the impetus for the formation of the first modern infantry with a European reputation. In the victories of the Swiss over the Austrians, and particularly over the Burgundians, heavily armed cavalry—mounted and dismounted—succumbed once and for all to the infantry, the feudal army to the beginnings of the modern army, the knight to the burgher and free peasant. And the Swiss, to establish from the outset the bourgeois character of their republic, the first independent republic in Europe, immediately turned their fame as warriors to cash. All political considerations faded away: the cantons turned into recruiting offices to drum up mercenaries for the highest bidder. The recruitment drive also made its way around other places, in Germany in particular; but the cynicism of
a government which only seemed to exist in order to sell off its native people remained unequalled until surpassed by German princes in the years of greatest national humiliation.

Then, also in the fourteenth century, gunpowder and artillery were brought over to Europe via Spain by the Arabs. Until the end of the Middle Ages hand guns remained unimportant, which is understandable, since the bows of the English archers at Crécy had as great a range as the smoothbore rifles of the infantry at Waterloo and were perhaps more accurate—though lacking the same effect. Field guns were also still in their infancy; on the other hand, heavy guns had already breached the free-standing walls of the knights' castles on many occasions, demonstrating to the feudal nobility that gunpowder marked the end of their rule.

The spread of book printing, the revival of the study of classical literature, the entire cultural movement which had been gathering strength and becoming more widespread ever since 1450—all these factors aided the bourgeoisie and the monarchy in their fight against feudalism.

The combined action of all these causes, strengthened year after year by their increasing interaction on one another, which tended more and more in the same direction, was crucial to the victory over feudalism in the second half of the fifteenth century, not yet for the bourgeoisie, but certainly for the monarchy. All at once the monarchy gained the upper hand throughout Europe, as far as the distant lands adjoining it that had not passed through the feudal state. On the Iberian peninsula two of the Romance language peoples there united to form the Kingdom of Spain, and the Provençal-speaking Aragonese empire submitted to standard Castilian; the third people joined its linguistic area (with the exception of Galicia) with the Kingdom of Portugal, the Iberian Holland, turning their back on the interior and demonstrating their right to a separate existence through its activity at sea.

In France Louis XI finally managed, after the demise of the Burgundian middle kingdom, to establish national unity represented by the monarchy on the then much curtailed French territory to such an extent that his successor was already able to interfere in Italian quarrels and this unity was only once called into question for a short time, by the Reformation.

England had at last given up its quixotic wars of conquest in France, which in the long run would have bled it dry; the feudal

---

\[a\] Aragon and Castile united in 1479.—Ed.

\[b\] Charles VIII.—Ed.
nobility sought recompense in the Wars of the Roses, and got more than they had bargained for: they wiped each other out, and brought the House of Tudor to the throne, whose royal power exceeded that of all its predecessors and successors. The Scandinavian countries had long since achieved unity; after its unification with Lithuania, Poland was approaching its heyday, with the power of its monarchy as yet undiminished; even in Russia the subjugation of the princelings and the shedding of the Tatar yoke, had gone hand in hand and were finally sealed by Ivan III. In the whole of Europe there were only two countries in which the monarchy, and the national unity that was then impossible without it, either did not exist at all or existed only on paper: Italy and Germany.

Written at the end of 1884
First published, in Russian, in the journal Proletarskaya Revolutsia, No. 6, 1935

Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time

---

\(^{a}\) In 1480.—Ed.
Melbourne—September '41, Whig


December 13. Royal proclamation that torchlight meetings and armed assemblies illegal.

" 20. Meeting of the Anti-Corn Law League in Manchester.


February 5. In the Queen's Speech Chartists threatened with the law.


April 1. Meeting in Edinburgh to support ministers. The Chartists won and threw the

---

a The date when the Melbourne Whig Cabinet fell.—Ed.

b In the manuscript this sentence is crossed out by a vertical line.—Ed.

c In the next three dates in the manuscript some of the words are crossed out.—Ed.
Chartist Agitation

LORD PROVOST out of the CHAIR AND CARRIED THEIR RESOLUTION.

April 29. Chartist RIOTS in Llanidloes.—The Chartists in control of the town for a while. (In Newport shortly before, John Frost removed from the MAGISTRACY.)

May 8. H. Vincent arrested FOR INCITING TO RIOT at Newport. (Ministerial crisis—replâtrage.)

" 13. The rest of the Chartist CONVENTION (thus the petty bourgeois out) removed to Birmingham. 50,000 men received and led through the city. Manifesto passed immediately at the first session: TO WITHDRAW ALL THEIR MONEY FROM BANKS, TO DEAL EXCLUSIVELY WITH CHARTISTS AND TO HAVE A SACRED MONTH AND TO ARM.—F. O'Connor demands that the petition to the Queen to appoint a Chartist ministry should be presented peacefully by 500,000 men armed with rifles.

May 25. Meeting in Kersal Moor. F. O'Connor says he came because the meeting had been declared illegal by the magistracy.

June 14. Attwood presents the Chartist Petition, 1,280,000 signatures. URGENCY REFUSED BY 235:46.

" 18. Grote's MOTION ON BALLOT rejected 333:216.

July 4. Chartist RIOTS in Birmingham, Bull Ring meeting broken up by police and army. Secretary of the CONVENTION arrested. The CONVENTION protests.

" 15. Bull Ring riots again, procession through the town, looting, several shops burnt down. Army called out, NO LOSS OF LIFE.

" 18. Llanidloes RIOTERS SENTENCED TO IMPRISONMENT.


August 2. Vincent & Co. sentenced to imprisonment AT Monmouth.

" 3. Birmingham RIOTERS TRIED, 3 sentenced to death, but REPRIEVED.

---

a Here: patching up.—Ed.
b Victoria.—Ed.
c William Lovett.—Ed.
August 6. Chartist Convention, now in Arundel Coffee House, London, decides to postpone the Sacred Month set for August 12 owing to lack of preparation, but on the 12th the Trades which can are to take 2-3 days off and to hold processions and meetings on the present awful state of the country.

" 11. St. Paul’s Church [in London] and the Manchester Old Church occupied by Chartists during the sermon, which did not lead to anything.

" 12. Manchester, Macclesfield, Bolton, etc. Attempt to go through with the three-day Sacred Month. Feeble and unsuccessful.

" 15. Chester Assizes. J. R. Stephens’ trial for unlawful meeting and exciting to riot at Cotton Tree, Hyde. That was the meeting where the volleys were fired.—18 months Knutsford.

" 27. Parliament prorogued.

" 30. Nouveau replâtrage ministeriel. a


" 20. F. O’Connor arrested, Manchester, sedition.

" 23. Ebenezer Elliott accuses the Chartists of being Tory agents (Sheffield).

November 4. Newport Riots. The Hill Men under Frost and Williams march on the town, meet up at Tredegar Park with Jones’ column (from Pontypool) and attack the soldiers, who had already been summoned (to protect the assembled magistrates). Skirmish. 9 dead are left lying there, others... and the wounded carried off. Frost arrested the next morning. The soldiers commanded by a lieutenant! Williams apprehended soon after.—Trial December 31-January 8. According to one witness the Welsh Mail to Birmingham was to be stopped, and its non-arrival was to be the signal to strike in the Midlands

a New ministerial patch-up.—Ed.
and the North. Frost, Williams and Jones sentenced to death, TRANSPORTED FOR LIFE.


March  . The ministry twice defeated in the HOUSE OF COMMONS. Start of the BLASPHEMY PROSECUTIONS by HOME SECRETARY'S COMMITTEE.

" 17. F. O'Connor TRIED at York ASSIZE. Now DEFERRED.

" 25. Meeting of the ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE. Palace Yard. Resolution PASSED.

" 31. To date total of ANTI-CORN LAW petition signatures only 980,352.

April 8. Bronterre O'Brien, Liverpool ASSIZES, 18 MONTHS IMPRISONMENT FOR SEDITION.


August 4. Lord Ashley CARRIES ADDRESS TO CROWN on child labour (thus only because of LIBERALS' weakness!)


November 6. Hetherington condemned for BLASPHEMY, SENTENCE DEFERRED.

1841. January 21. RADICAL MEETING AT Leeds for unity with the Chartists. But only agreed on UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, not on the other points of the Charter.


February 16. MINISTRY DEFEATED BY 31 OUT OF 223.

April 29. ANTI-CORN LAW MEETINGS in Deptford, in vain, in Leeds actually broken up by Chartists. Russell wishes to tinker with CORN LAWS.

May 7. MINISTRY DEFEATED 36 OUT OF 598.

" 25. Duncombe presents Chartists' petition (amnesty), 1,300,000 signatures, the ANTI-CORN LAW only 474,448.

---
a Queen Victoria.— Ed.

" 4. Peel's **no confidence in Ministry**: 312 for, 311 against dissolution.

" 23. Hetherington versus Moxon. **Blasphemy** against Shelley. GUILTY.


" 28. Melbourne ministry brought down, **majority**—91 out of 629. *Peel*.  
*Peel Ministry*—until July 1846.

**Great distress** in manufacturing districts: Leeds, Paisley, Glasgow, Bradford, Nottingham, etc.

November 10. Trade Convention in Derby, for **free trade**.

December 29. Bankruptcies in Glasgow.


February 1. **Anti-Corn Law** Meeting broken up by Chartists in Southampton with Tory help.

" 2. **Anti-Corn Law** Bazar in Manchester.


" 9. Peel proposes the **sliding scale** 20/- at 51/- corn price, 1/- at 73/- corn price.\(^a\)

March 11. Peel's budget—tariffs of £1,200,000 abolished, particularly on raw materials and semi-manufactures. **Income tax**. The **sliding scale** becomes law (Royal Ascent) April 29.

May 2. Chartist Petition with 3,317,702 signatures carried to Parliament in procession from Lincoln's Inn Fields. Had to be taken to pieces because the door too small. Duncombs demands that the Petition should be heard by Council at the Bar. 49:287.

\(^a\) From the maximum duty of 20s. at the price of 51s. and lower per quarter to the minimum duty of 1s. at the price of 73s. and higher per quarter.—*Ed.*
May 25. Meeting in Stockport on distress. Poor rates risen from £2,628 in 1836/37 to £7,120; over 1/2 the spinners ruined; over 3,000 houses empty (Stockport to let); in Heaton Norris 1/4 of the houses empty and 1,000 occupants relieved by parish.

June 1. Strike of colliers in Dudley district.

3. Large meeting of unemployed in Glasgow, ending in a begging procession through the town.

In Ireland provision riots, in Ennis a ship carrying flour looted, in Cork futile assault on the potato market.

7. Ashley introduces a factory bill, restricting women's and children's labour in mines and factories.

June 25. Leeds Mercury says 4,025 families, =1/3 of the town's population receiving poor relief. Great "distress" everywhere.

28. Peel's tariff through the Commons. July 4 through the Lords 2nd reading.

July 1. Debate on distress. No result, as usual. In Ireland agrarian outrages all the time.

2. Food riots [in] Dumfries, several mealmongers' shops looted.

5. Anti-Corn Law Conference in London. Bright's threatening speech. Reports that in Sheffield 10,000 people in extreme distress, in Wolverhampton 62 blast furnaces idle, in Stockport the poor rate of 2/- in the £ produces only £3,600, whereas in 1839 1/8d. had produced £5,000. More poor rate 3/4d. in the £ and almost daily meetings of workers and shopkeepers to see what to do. Burslem great agitation, military called out.

5. Free Trade Conference [in] Sheffield. Reverend W. Bailey: it was not words which would move Parliament, but force, a gentleman is reported to have spoken of Peel's assassination, etc.

11. Villiers' motion for Committee of whole House to consider Corn Laws rejected, 117:231.
At the same time several attempts on the Queen's life and Peel's protective law against causing a nuisance to the Queen: transportation and the [colonies].

July 18. Meetings in Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds ON DISTRESS, deputation to Peel to do something before the closing of Parliament.

August 1. STRIKE of the COAL and IRON MINERS, Airdrie and Coatbridge, immediately followed by the Glaswegians, FOR ADVANCING WAGES.

" 4. Ashton AND Oldham STRIKE—Manchester RIOTS.


" 17. Proclamation by the Chartist NATIONAL EXECUTIVE (in contrast)—warlike.

" 18. "THE PACIFICATION OF THE NORTH IS COMPLETED."

" 24. White (George) in Birmingham despite the police, despite warrant goes with guard to meetings and speaks.

September 5. York AND Lancaster SPECIAL ASSIZES, some 156 RIOTERS TRIED.

" 30. Stafford SPECIAL ASSIZES FOR RIOTERS. F. O'Connell arrested FOR EXCITING TO SEDITION in Manchester, etc., at meetings in August.

October 6. Cobden announces at Manchester meeting that the League intends to raise £50,000.

December 9. The quaint city COMMON COUNCIL votes for FREE TRADE IN CORN.

" 31. REVENUE FOR QUARTER SHOWS DECREASE £940,062.


" 26. ANTI-CORN LAW WEEKLY MEETING, Wilson announces renewed agitation, 400,000 TRACTS SENT OUT LAST WEEK, 3 TONS MORE TOMORROW.


" 23. Walter's motion for easing the Poor Law, during which it emerged that the Government has been implementing the new Poor Law with increasing severity.

March 1. Trial of F. O'Connor and Co. in Lancaster. O'Connor guilty and many others, now reserved on point of law.

" 15. From today weekly meetings of the Anti-Corn Law League in Drury Lane Theatre resumed.

March 24. Factory Bill read 2nd time. Revenue a/c rising, but still below last year (except new Income Tax).

April 27. Irish Arms Bill as many arms bought up there.

May 9. Villiers' Corn Law Motion, after 5 evening debates, defeated 381:125. Peel declares that he intends to oppose repeal absolutely.

" 24. Richard Arkwright's will proved—£8,000,000.


" 10. Rebecca riots in Wales began: Abolition of turnpikes, of tithes and commuted rent charges, church rate and new poor law.

" 15. Repeal meeting [in] Ennis—500,000 men. Educational clauses—In fact bill abandoned on account of opposition of the Dissenters (petition over 2,000,000 signatures).

(All repeal magistrates in Ireland dismissed up to now.)


August 15. Monster repeal meeting [at] Tara Hill.

Rebecca in Wales continuing.—OUTRAGES in Ireland.—Threat to withhold rent payment, CUTTING CROPS, etc.

September 28. ANTI-CORN-LAW agitation in London resumed with meeting in Covent Garden Theatre. 9,000,000 TRACTS distributed in previous year.

October 1. REPEAL MONSTER MEETING in Mullaghmust.


" 10. ROYAL COMMISSION to inquire into Rebecca CAUSES.

" 14. O'Connell accused—still no point formulated, but QUIT UNDER BAIL to appear next term to answer any charge by ATTORNEY GENERAL.

" 21. ANTI-CORN-LAW VICTORY at CITY LONDON ELECTION: Pattison over Baring.

" 23. COUNCIL AT HALL in Dublin opened.—O'Connell now "PEACEFUL"!

" 26. TRIALS of Rebecca—heavy sentences (Cardiff).


January 15. O'Connell's TRIAL. Sentenced, confirmed on May 24 by QUEEN'S BENCH. 12 MONTHS.

February 1. Parliament opened.

" 6. New FACTORY BILL (not passed previous year).

" 12. REVEREND Oastler freed after 3 years in debtors gaol.


July '46-February '62. Russell

December 7. F. O'Connor's motion to investigate how the Union with Ireland had been made and what it had achieved, 23:255.


April 1. Rifle Clubs formed in Ireland.


7. A Gagging Act against inflammatory speeches introduced by Grey.

10. Kennington Common. The Chartists in processions to Kennington Common to assemble there and thence on to the House of Commons with the monster petition. 250,000 Special Constables.—4,300 soldiers to Kennington.—On Saturday evening split over arming: B. O'Brien for, F. O'Connor against. B. O'Brien withdraws with his lot. The demonstration fell flat, the march to Westminster abandoned, and F. O'Connor handed over the petition that evening in the usual way.

13. Debate on the petition, instead of 5,706,000 signatures, said to be only 1,975,496, including much nonsense.


27. John Mitchel 14 years transportation.—Riots in Clarkenwell Green and Bethnal
Green, nothing significant, because of this conviction of Chartists and Repealers.\textsuperscript{490}

June

\textbf{GOLD EXCITEMENT IN CALIFORNIA.}

" 6. Jones and 3 others committed for sedition.

" 7. O'Connell's Repeal Association broken up.


" 12. Chartist demonstration a failure it seems, very pitiful.

\textit{June. Insurrection}\textsuperscript{a}

July 7. Jones and 5 others 2 years and bound over afterwards.

" 22. Russell demands suspension of habeas corpus\textsuperscript{491} in Ireland, Bill introduced.


August 8. Berkeley's Ballot Motion carried against government 86:81.


" 15. 14 Chartist leaders arrested in Manchester for inciting to rise in arms.

" 16. 18 Chartist leaders arrested in London, Orange Street, armed; others in Moor Street. Allegedly they were due to strike during the night. Lot of ammunition seized.

" 25. Trial of the London Chartists, 26th, trial of Manchester Chartists. Condemned to 2 years hard labour.

" 26. Trial of those arrested on August 16 in London—transportation for life.

\textsuperscript{a} Of the Paris workers on June 22-25, 1848.—\textit{Ed.}
1852. June 8. F. O'Connor gets up to silly tricks in House of Commons, arrested by Sergeant at Arms, taken to madhouse.

1855. August 30. †F. O'Connor in Notting Hill.

1856. May 3. Amnesty for Frost, Williams and Jones and the other transported Irish prisoners.


Written in August 1886
First published, in Russian, in Marx-Engels Archives, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
[PLAN OF CHAPTER FOUR OF THE PAMPHLET
THE ROLE OF FORCE IN HISTORY]

1. 1848. Postulate of national states. Italy, Germany, Poland, Hungary.
2. Bonaparte's enlightened policy of conquest: nationhood in exchange for compensation. Italy.
4. Position in Germany. Unity: 1. through revolution, 2. through Austria, 3. through Prussia (Customs' Union).

Written between the end of 1887 and March 1888

First published, in Russian, in Marx-Engels Archives, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

a This point also includes the notes written on the same sheet and crossed out by Engels presumably after he had used them in his work, "1. Methods of warfare. Contribution, franc-tireurs, [Thefts of] clock, thrashing. Severity of Junkers' revenge from above. 2. Overthrow of the Empire. 3. Hats off to Paris! 4. Milliards and Alsace-Lorraine." — Ed.
I. 3 classes: two lousy, one of them decaying, the other on the ascent, and workers who only want bourgeois fair play. Manoeuvring between the latter two therefore the only proper way—perish the thought! Policy: To strengthen state power in general and to make it financially independent in particular (nationalisation of the railways, monopolies), police state and regional principles of justice.

"Liberal" and "National", the dual nature of 1848, still in evidence in Germany of 1870-88.

Bismarck had to rely on the Reichstag and the people, and this called for complete freedom of the press, speech, association and assembly, just for orientation.

II. 1. Structure [of the Empire]

a) Economic—ill-conceived currency law main achievement already.

b) Political—restoration of the police state, and anti-bourgeois judicial laws (1876), poor copy of the French version.—Legal uncertainty.—Culminated in the Imperial Court. 1879.

2. Lack of ideas proved by playing around and slandering Bismarck. Bismarck's party sans phrase.

Kulturkampf. The Catholic priest is no gendarme or policeman. Jubilation by the bourgeoisie—hopelessness—going to Canossa. Only rational result—civil marriage!
3. Swindles and crash. His involvement. Wretchedness of conservative Junkers, who are just as dishonourable as the bourgeoisie.

4. [Bismarck's] complete transformation into a Junker.
   a) Protective tariffs, etc., coalition of bourgeois and Junkers, with the latter taking the lion's share.
   b) Attempts at a tobacco monopoly defeated in 1882.
   c) Colonial swindles.

5. Social policy à la Bonaparte.
   a) Anti-Socialist Law and crushing of workers' associations and funds.
   b) Social reform crap.

III. 6. Foreign policy. Threat of war, effect of annexation. Increase in strength of army. Septennate. In due course, a return to the pre-1870 year group to maintain superiority for a few more years.

IV. Result: a) A domestic situation which collapses with the death of those two: no empire without emperor! Proletariat driven to revolution; an unprecedented growth in social-democracy on the repeal of the Anti-Socialist Law—chaos.
   b) Overall outcome—a peace worse than war at best; or else a world war.

Written between late December 1887 and March 1888
First published in Die Neue Zeit, Vol. 1, No. 26, 1895-96

Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time

---

a Bismarck and William I.—Ed.
Primitiveness. "Civilised Country."\(^a\)


Country of unexpected contrasts: more railways than roads and the latter appalling—Good plank road—elevated railways above and dreadful pavement below—log cabins but carpets and pianos inside—indeed, even the bourgeois Yankees and the feudal Canadians alongside them—the idyllic Hoboken and insects close to New York.

Publicness of life, in contrast to England. Only bedrooms private, and even these scarcely so (fanlights, ventilation).—Hall, office, writing room, ladies' parlors; heaters make it unnecessary to keep rooms closed even in winter, and so it does not exist. Loafing about in the hotels.

Greeks in Rome in the last days of the republic.

Religion—their theory, to be grasped historically. Go-ahead nation—pushing past, not being able to see anyone walking or standing in front of them. Even in Boston, and worst there on account of the narrow streets—women too.

Spitting—privies—hypocrisy about drink not only in prohibition states—nobody drinks in public—prudery—rooster and roaches.

Opposite to Canada.—French Canadians really detached from France by the Revolution and have preserved the feudalism guaranteed by the conquest—they are going to ruin—Falls opposite Niagara\(^497\)—empty houses, bridges, etc.—Emigration to

\(^a\) The words in English are written in the margin.—\(Ed.\)
New England, where they replace the Chinese.—English Canadians also slow, even in Toronto much dilapidation.

The Americans unable to enjoy.

The Americans unable to walk—either rush or loaf. 

_Provincials._

Foundation the old solid petty bourgeois, small townsman and small peasant of the 17th-18th centuries. He is everywhere unmistakable with his wooden fashion, but also forms the solid foundation amidst wild speculation, just like the Swiss, to whom a certain resemblance.

Obtrusiveness of American manners: Doctor, _City of Berlin._

Get up early.

New York—harbour—beauty.—Natural setting for the centre of capitalist production—and how this destiny is fulfilled. First evening impression, dazzling, pavements, dirt, noise, horrible. By day even more ugliness—telegraph poles, overhead railways, signs crossways, company signs, architecture hidden, throngs of people, carriages, trams and _elevated_ far above London, ugly, disfigured, everywhere advertisements, obtrusiveness. Croupier type. Haggard appearance of the people, even the women. Shops dazzling compared with London, and in greater numbers. This the gateway to the promised land. Ghastly noises at sea and on land. Noise from the carts, one makes more than ten in Europe. All aesthetics trampled underfoot as soon as momentary profit comes in view.

Horses like the people: elements of a good stock, not yet ready. Mostly lighter than in England—in Canada, on the other hand, thoroughly English type.

Résumé: capitalist production is overexploitation. Adirondacks forest devastation—nowhere else timber forest either (Isle of Gnants perhaps excepted).

Railways poor, slow, stopping train, delay and wait in Buffalo, incomprehensibly long halt at the stations; few trains per day; long bends, hence the long carriages (cf. street corner tracks in New York—_elevated_), rolling, due to elasticity of the beams and the trembling, sea-sickness.

---

_a_ This word is written in the margin.—*Ed.*

_b_ The name of the steamer in which Engels travelled to America.—*Ed.*
Americans no nation. 5-6 different types, held together by the need for cohesion forged in the Civil War,\textsuperscript{498} and the feeling that they have in them the making of the greatest nation of the 20th century.

Genuinely capitalist\textsuperscript{a}:

Business is concluded in a strictly businesslike manner. No tips. Anyone who gives them in situations where we would consider them unavoidable is then thoroughly exploited as a greenhorn.

The parvenu—national character.

Educated persons commonly display great self-possession, others at least show confidence and assurance to the point of importunity.

Written in the latter half of September 1888
Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

\textsuperscript{a} These words are written in the margin.—\textit{Ed.}
We generally imagine America to be a new world—new not merely with regard to the time of its discovery, but also in all its institutions, far ahead of us olde-worlde sleepy Europeans in its scorn for everything hereditary and traditional, a world, newly built from scratch on virgin soil, by modern men on purely modern, practical, rational principles. And the Americans do their part in strengthening this view of ours. They look down with contempt on us as dubious, impractical people, enmeshed in all sorts of received prejudices, who go in fear of everything new, whereas they, the Most Go-Ahead Nation, examine every new proposal for improvement simply for its practical utility and, having once recognised it as possible, introduce it immediately, indeed almost overnight. But in America everything ought to be new, rational, practical—that is, everything ought to be different from what it is with us.

I first met a large number of Americans on the steamer City of Berlin. They were mostly very nice people, ladies and gentlemen, more accessible than the English, at times somewhat blunt in their speech, but otherwise rather like the better dressed people anywhere else. What, however, set them apart was a strangely petty-bourgeois bearing—not that of the timid, uncertain German petty bourgeois, nor that of the English; a bearing which, by virtue of the great assurance with which it presented itself as if it were quite natural, showed itself to be an inherited quality. The younger ladies, in particular, left the impression of a certain

---

a In the manuscript this English phrase is given in parentheses after its German equivalent.—Ed.
naivety such as is found in Europe only in smaller towns; when striding resolutely, almost fiercely across the deck, arm in arm, or on the arm of a man, they had the very same springy gait and held down their skirts when threatened by the wind with the same demure grip as innocent young things from the country back home. They reminded me mostly of Swedish girls—they were big and robust like them, too—and I expected them to curtsy at any moment, as Swedish women do. My American fellow travellers had also received their share of the physical and intellectual clumsiness which is the universal hereditary trait of the Germanic race and had not shaken it off at all. In short, my initial impression of the Americans was by no means one of national superiority over the Europeans, by no means that of a totally new, modern national type, but on the contrary that they were people who still clung on to inherited petty-bourgeois habits which are considered outdated in Europe, that we Europeans contrast with them in this connection as the Parisians with the provincials.

When I entered my first bedroom in New York, what did I find? Furniture of the quaintest old style imaginable, chests of drawers with brass rings or hoops as handles on the drawers, such as was the fashion in the early years of the century, and in Europe are still found only in the country; alongside them, more recent styles after the English or French pattern, but even these were also dated enough and mostly in the wrong place; nothing new since the huge rocking chair, which described an arc of 240 degrees, went out of fashion again. And thus everywhere, the chairs, tables and cupboards mostly look like the heirlooms of past generations. The carriages on the New York streets have such an outdated appearance that at first glance one believes no European farm would still have in its possession a hand-cart of such a model. True, on closer observation one finds that these carriages are much improved and most expeditiously equipped, furnished with excellent suspension and extremely lightly built out of very strong wood; but for all these improvements the old-fashioned model remained intact. In London, right up to the early 40s, there were cabs which people boarded from the rear and where they sat on the right and the left opposite one another, as in an omnibus; since 1850 they have disappeared; yet in Boston, as far as I know the only American city where cabs are in common use, these boneshakers still flourish to this day. The American inns of today, with their luxurious furnishings and their hundreds of rooms, show in their entire American plan that they have grown out of the remote farmhouses in sparsely populated areas, which even today
occasionally offer travellers board and lodging for payment—I shall return to this point—and hence display peculiarities which appear to us to be not simply strange, but downright quaint. And so on.

But anyone who wishes to savour the pleasure of a journey such as one had to endure in Europe at the time of the Thirty Years' War\textsuperscript{500} should head for an American mountain district and travel to the end of the last railway line and take the stagecoach further out into the wilderness. The four of us made such a trip to the Adirondacks and have seldom laughed as much as we did on the roof of that coach. An old boneshaker of an indescribable model, compared with which the famous Prussian carriages from the year dot seem the height of splendour, with seats—quite in keeping—for six to nine people up on the roof and the box, that was the conveyance. As for the road, I beg your pardon, it wasn't a road, one could hardly even call it a path; two deeply rutted tracks in the sandy soil, uphill, downhill.\textsuperscript{a}

Written in late September 1888


Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

\textsuperscript{a} The manuscript breaks off here.—\textit{Ed.}
APPENDICES
[TO THE EDITORS OF TO-DAY] 501

[Draft]a

To the British Publishing Co.

Sir (or Gentn)

In reply to your letter of the — I beg to say that since my last I have compared your article with the original Le Capital.

I find that it is a very imperfect translation of Ch. XXIII (23) Réproduction simple, and that the translator has made very important mistakes in consequence of want of sufficient acquaintance, partly with the leading ideas of Le Capital, partly with French grammar.

It must appear to me very unfair that a single chapter should be taken out of the middle of a closely-reasoned scientific work and without a word of introduction be presented to the public.

When it comes to the publishing of translations of entire chapters of my father’s works, the question of copyright crops up. Please do not forget that I am responsible for their share of that copyright to other people and to my father’s memory for the way his works are done into English. Upon this point I reserve all my rights.

However I will permit you to publish another chapter in your next issue, on condition that you head it with a few lines stating

1) That the last was Ch. 23 and the present is Ch. so and so, out of Le Capital, published in Paris 1872.502

2) That the translation is yours; and

3) That you inform me which further chapters you intend to translate after which I shall consider whether I can give you my

---

a The draft was written in Engels’ hand on behalf of Eleanor Marx-Aveling.— Ed.
permission to do so, which will very materially depend upon the character of the translation itself.

Your allusion to a poem of V. Hugo is entirely irrelevant, considering that it is well known that V. Hugo could not write a line of English and that my father has been an English author for more than thirty years.

Written in the latter half of April 1883


Reproduced from the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
...I must let you know the result of my first meeting with Engels, because I think some of his opinions will be pleasing for you.

We talked a great deal about Russian matters, about how the cause of our political and social revival is likely to proceed. As was to be expected, our views were in total agreement; each of us kept finishing off the ideas and phrases of the other. He too believes (like both Marx and myself) that the task of a revolutionary party or a party of action in Russia at the present time lies not in propagating the new socialist ideal and not even in striving to realise this by no means fully elaborated ideal with the help of a provisional government composed of our comrades, but in directing all forces towards 1) either forcing the Tsar to convene a Zemsky Sobor, 2) or by means of intimidating the Tsar, etc., causing profound disorder that would result in the convening of the Sobor or something similar. He believes, as I do, that such a Sobor would inevitably lead to a radical, not only political but also social reorganisation. He believes in the tremendous significance of the electoral period, in the sense of incomparably more successful propaganda than all books and whispered communications. He regards a purely liberal constitution without profound economic restructuring as impossible, and therefore does not fear this danger. He believes that enough material for the restructuring of society on new principles has accumulated in the real conditions of the people’s life. Of course, he does not believe in the instantaneous realisation of communism or anything like that, but only of that which has already matured in the life and heart of the people. He believes that the people will find themselves eloquent spokesmen to express their needs and aspirations, etc. He believes
that no forces will be capable of halting this reorganisation, or revolution, once it has begun. Thus one thing only is important: to smash the fatal force of stagnation, to knock the people and society for a moment out of the state of inertness and immobility, to cause disorder which will force the government and the people to set about internal restructuring, which will stir up the calm popular sea and arouse the attention and enthusiasm of the whole people for the cause of a full social reorganisation. And the results will show themselves, precisely those results which are possible, desirable and practicable for the time in question.

All this is devilishly brief, but I cannot write in any more detail at the moment. Moreover all this may not be entirely to your liking, so I will hasten to convey to you with literal accuracy other opinions of his which are most flattering to the Russian revolutionary party. They are as follows:

"Everything now depends on what is done in the immediate future in St. Petersburg, to which the eyes of all thinking, far-seeing and perspicacious people in the whole of Europe are now turned."

"Russia is the France of the present century. The revolutionary initiative of a new social reorganisation legally and rightly belongs to it."

"...The collapse of Tsarism, which will destroy the last bastion of monarchism in Europe and put an end to Russia’s ‘aggressiveness’, Poland’s hatred of it and a great deal more, will lead to a completely different combination of powers, smash Austria to smithereens and arouse in all countries a powerful impetus for internal reorganisation."

"...It is unlikely that Germany will decide to take advantage of the Russian disorders and move its forces into Russia to support the Tsar. But if it did do so, all the better. It would mean the end of its present government and the beginning of a new era. Annexation by it of the Baltic provinces is pointless and impracticable. Such seizures of opposite (?) or adjoining narrow littorals and bits of land, and the resultant ludicrous configurations of states, were possible only in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but not now. Moreover it is no secret to anyone that the Germans constitute an insignificant reactionary minority there.” (I am adding this point for Y.P. in view of her ultra-patriotic opinions on this point.)

---

*Yulia Petrovna—the pseudonym of Galina Chernyavskaya-Bokhanovskaya.—* *Ed.*
“Both Marx and I find that the Committee's letter to Alexander III is positively excellent in its political essence and calm tone. It shows that there are people with a statesmanlike cast of mind in the ranks of the revolutionaries.”

May I hope that all this is sufficiently flattering and pleasing for you and that you will thank me for these lines? Do you remember that I said Marx himself had never been a Marxist? Engels told me that during the struggle of Brousse, Malon and Co. with the others, Marx used to joke: “All I know is that I am not a Marxist!”...

First published in Osnovy teoreticheskogo sotsializma i ikh prilozhenie k Rossi, Geneva, March 1893

Printed according to the book
Translated from the Russian
Published in English for the first time
The insurrection of May 1849, which roused the Rhenish provinces and South Germany to revolt, was provoked by the refusal of most of the governments of the small states to accept the constitution approved by the National Assembly at Frankfurt. This Assembly never had any real power and, to make matters worse, had neglected to take the necessary steps to acquire some; once it had finished its constitution on paper it lost the last remains of its moral power. Although rather romantic, the constitution was the sole banner to rally around to try to launch a new movement, even if it meant not implementing it after the victory.

The rising started in Dresden on 3 May; a few days later it spread to the Bavarian Palatinate and the Grand Duchy of Baden. The Grand Duke\(^a\) hastened to flee as soon as he had seen the troops fraternising with the people.

The Prussian Government, which had crushed the revolutionary movement in November 1848, disarmed Berlin and placed Prussia under a state of siege, became the protector of all the governments of the other states. It immediately sent troops to Dresden who, after four days of fighting and heroic resistance, defeated the insurgents.

But to subdue the Palatinate and the Duchy of Baden an army was needed: in order to form it, Prussia had to call the \textit{Landwehr}\textsuperscript{508} to arms. At Iserlohn (Westphalia) and Elberfeld (Rhenish Prussia) men refused to march. Troops were sent. The towns

\(^{a}\) Leopold.—\textit{Ed.}\textsuperscript{510}
barricaded themselves and repulsed them. Iserlohn was taken after two days of fighting. Elberfeld offering no opportunities for resistance, the insurgents, about a thousand in number, resolved to force a way through the troops surrounding them and to reach the south in full revolt. They were cut to pieces, and their commander, Mirbach, was taken prisoner; nevertheless, a large number of insurgents, aided by the populace of the countryside, did manage to get through to the south. Engels was Mirbach's aide-de-camp; but the latter, before putting his plan into action, sent him on a mission to Cologne, which was in the hands of the Prussian army. The truth is that Mirbach did not want to have this known communist in his corps, lest he should scare the bourgeois of the country which he intended to pass through.

In the meantime the rising spread throughout the south of Germany; but as in Paris in 1871 the revolutionaries committed the fatal blunder of not attacking. The troops of the surrounding small states were demoralised and looking for an excuse to join the insurrection: at that time they were determined not to fight against the people. The insurgents could have got the population to rise up and join them by announcing that they were going to the rescue of the Frankfurt Assembly, surrounded by Prussian and Austrian troops. Engels and Marx, after the suppression of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, went to Mannheim to propose to the leaders of the movement that they should march on Frankfurt. They refused to listen to them. They pleaded as an excuse that the troops were disorganised by the flight of their former officers, that they were short of ammunition, etc.

Whereas the insurgents remained with shouldered arms, the Prussians, united with the Bavarians and reinforced by the troops of the small states, which the insurgents could have won over with greater daring, advanced in forced marches on the rebellious areas. The reactionary army, 36,000 men strong, cleared the Palatinate in a week of the 8-9,000 insurgents who were occupying it; it must be said that the two fortresses of the country had remained in the hands of reaction. The revolutionary army fell back on the Baden troops comprising roughly 10,000 men of the line and 12,000 irregulars. There were four general engagements: the reactionary forces were only victorious thanks to their numerical superiority and to the violation of Württemberg territory, which allowed them to turn the revolutionary army's flank at the decisive moment. After six weeks of fighting in the open country the remains of the rebel army had to take refuge in Switzerland.
During this last campaign Engels was aide-de-camp to Colonel Willich, commander of a corps of communist irregulars. He took part in three engagements and in the final decisive battle of the Murg. Colonel Willich, having fled to the United States, died with the rank of general, which he won during the war of secession.\textsuperscript{509}

This stubborn resistance in open country, mounted by a few thousand insurgents with no organisation and almost without artillery against a skilfully disciplined Prussian army, shows what our friends, the socialists beyond the Rhine, will be able to achieve the day the revolutionary clarion call rings out in Europe.

Written in mid-November 1885
First published in \textit{Le Socialiste}, November 21, 1885
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English in full for the first time
The medieval world view was essentially theological. The unity of the European world, though actually non-existent on the inside, was established against outside forces, the common Saracen enemy, by Christianity. The unity of the West European world, which comprised a group of nations developing in constant interaction, was epitomised by Catholicism. This theological epitome was not merely an idea. It really existed, not only in the Pope, its monarchical focus, but above all in the Church. The Church was organised on feudal and hierarchical lines and, owning about a third of the land in each country, occupied a position of tremendous power within the feudal system. With its feudal landholdings, the Church was the actual link between the different countries, and the Church's feudal organisation gave a religious blessing to the secular feudal system of government. Besides, the clergy was the only educated class. It was therefore natural that Church dogma formed the starting-point and basis of all thought. Everything—jurisprudence, science, philosophy—was pursued in accordance with it, from the angle of whether or not the contents were in keeping with Church doctrine.

But in the bosom of the feudal system there developed the power of the bourgeoisie. A new class emerged to oppose the big landowners. Above all, the burghers were exclusively producers of, and traders in, commodities, while the feudal mode of production essentially rested on the direct consumption of products produced within a limited circle—consumption partly by the producers themselves, partly by the recipients of feudal tributes. The Catholic world view, tailored as it was to feudalism, was no longer adequate for this new class and its conditions of production and
exchange. Nevertheless, it, too, continued for some time to be ensnared in the toils of the prevailing omnipotent theology. From the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, all the reformations and the ensuing struggles waged in the name of religion were, theoretically speaking, no more than repeated attempts by the bourgeoisie, the urban plebeians and the peasantry that rose in rebellion together with them, to adapt the old, theological world view to the changed economic conditions and position of the new class. But this did not work. The religious banner was raised for the last time in England in the seventeenth century, and scarcely fifty years later the new world view that was to become the classical one of the bourgeoisie emerged undisguised in France: the legal world view.

It was a secularisation of the theological world view. Dogma, divine law, was supplanted by human law, the Church by the State. The economic and social relations, which people previously believed to have been created by the Church and its dogma—because sanctioned by the Church—were now seen as being founded on the law and created by the State. Because the exchange of commodities on the level of society and in its fully developed form, i.e. based on the granting of advances and credit, results in complex contractual relations and thus requires universally valid regulations, which can only be provided by the community—legal norms laid down by the State—people imagined that these legal norms did not arise from the economic facts of life but from their formal stipulation by the State. And because competition, the basic form of intercourse between free commodity producers, is the greatest equaliser, equality before the law became the bourgeoisie’s main battlecry. The fact that the struggle of this new rising class against the feudal lords and the absolute monarchy, which then protected them, had to be, like any class struggle, a political struggle, a struggle for control over the State, and had to be waged for the sake of legal demands, helped to consolidate the legal world view.

But the bourgeoisie produced its negative complement, the proletariat, and with it a new class struggle, which broke out even before the bourgeoisie had completely won political power. Just as the bourgeoisie, in its day, in the struggle against the nobility, continued for a time to labour under the burden of the theological world view, which had been handed down to it, so the proletariat initially adopted the legal outlook from its adversary and sought weapons therein to use against the bourgeoisie. Like their theoretical champions, the first proletarian parties remained firmly
on the juridical "legal foundation"—only they constructed a legal foundation different from that of the bourgeoisie. On the one hand, the demand for equality was extended to include social as well as legal equality; on the other hand, from Adam Smith's propositions that labour is the source of all wealth, but that the product of labour must be shared by the worker with the landowner and the capitalist, the conclusion was drawn that this division was unjust and should either be abolished altogether or at least modified in favour of the workers. But the feeling that leaving the matter on the purely juridical "legal foundation" would not at all make it possible to eliminate the evils created by the bourgeois capitalist mode of production, notably that based on modern, large-scale industry, led the greatest thinkers among even the early socialists—Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen—to abandon the juridical and political domain altogether and declare all political struggle fruitless.

The two views were equally incapable of precisely and fully expressing the striving of the working class for emancipation, a striving stemming from the obtaining economic situation. The demand for equality, just like that for the full fruits of one's labour, became entangled in insoluble contradictions as soon as they were to be legally formulated in detail, leaving the heart of the matter, the transformation of the mode of production, more or less untouched. The rejection of political struggle by the great utopians was simultaneously a rejection of class struggle, i.e. of the only course of action open to the class whose interests they championed. Both views overlooked the historical background to which they owed their existence; both appealed to the emotions—one to the sense of justice, and the other to the sense of humanity. Both clothed their demands in pious wishes that left unanswered the question as to why they had to be implemented at this precise moment, and not a thousand years earlier or later.

Stripped of all property in the means of production as a result of the transformation of the feudal into the capitalist mode of production and constantly reproduced by the mechanism of the capitalist mode of production in this hereditary state of propertylessness, the working class cannot adequately express its condition in terms of the legal illusion of the bourgeoisie. It can only fully perceive this condition itself if it views things as they really are, without legally tinted spectacles. And it was enabled to do this by Marx with his materialist conception of history, with the proof that all of people's legal, political, philosophical, religious, etc., ideas ultimately derive from their economic conditions, from the way in
which they produce and exchange products. This set out the world view corresponding to the conditions of proletarian life and struggle; the workers' lack of property could only be matched by a corresponding lack of illusions. And this proletarian world view is now spreading throughout the world.

Understandably, the struggle between the two world views continues; not only between proletariat and bourgeoisie, but also between free-thinking workers and those still dominated by the old tradition. On the whole, ordinary politicians here use the customary arguments to defend the old view. But there are also so-called scholarly lawyers, who have made legal sophistry a profession of their own.*

Until now these gentlemen have considered themselves too refined to deal with the theoretical aspect of the labour movement. We should therefore be extremely grateful that a real professor of law, Dr. Anton Menger, at last designs to give a "closer dogmatic elucidation" of the history of socialism from the viewpoint of the "philosophy of law".**

In fact the socialists have hitherto been barking up the wrong tree. They have neglected the very thing that mattered most.

"Not until socialist ideas are detached from the interminable economic and philanthropic discussions ... and transformed into down-to-earth legal terms" (p. III), not until all the "politico-economic frippery" (p. 37) is done away with, can the "legal treatment of socialism ... the most important task of the contemporary philosophy of law" [p. III] be taken in hand.

Now, "socialist ideas" are concerned precisely with economic relations, above all the relation between wage labour and capital, and, this being so, these economic discussions would appear, after all, to amount to more than mere detachable "frippery". Moreover, political economy is a science, so called, and a somewhat more scientific one than the philosophy of law at that,

* See the article by Fr. Engels on "Ludwig Feuerbach" in the Neue Zeit IV, p. 206 [see this volume, p. 393]: "It is among professional politicians, theorists of public law and jurists of private law that the connection with economic facts gets well and truly lost. Since in each particular case the economic facts must assume the form of juristic motives in order to receive legal sanction; and since, in so doing, consideration has, of course, to be given to the whole legal system already in operation, the juristic form is, in consequence, made everything and the economic content nothing. Public law and private law are treated as separate spheres, each having its own independent historical development, each being capable of, and needing, a systematic presentation by the consistent elimination of all innate contradictions."

** Dr. Anton Menger, Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag in geschichtlicher Darstellung, Stuttgart, Cotta, 1886, X, p. 171.
being concerned with facts and not with mere ideas, like the latter. But this is a matter of total indifference to the professional lawyer. For him, economic research stands on a par with philanthropic rhetoric. *Fiat justitia, pereat mundus*.

Furthermore, the "politico-economic frippery" in Marx—and this is what our lawyer finds hardest to swallow—is not simply economic research. It is essentially historical. It demonstrates the course of social development, from the feudal mode of production of the Middle Ages to the advanced capitalism of today, the demise of earlier classes and class antagonisms and the formation of new classes with new conflicts of interest manifesting themselves, inter alia, in new legal demands. Even our lawyer seems to have a faint glimmering of this, discovering on p. 37 that today's

"philosophy of law ... is essentially nothing more than a replica of the state of the law as handed down by history", which could be "termed the *bourgeois philosophy of law*" and "alongside which a *philosophy of law of unpropertied classes of the people* has emerged in the shape of socialism".

But if this is so, what is the cause? Where do the "bourgeois" and the "unpropertied classes of the people" come from, each possessing a specific philosophy of law corresponding to its class position? From the law, or from economic development? What else does Marx tell us but that the views of law held by each of the large social classes conform with their respective class positions? How did Menger get in among the Marxists?

Yet this is but an oversight, an inadvertent acknowledgement of the strength of the new theory which the stern lawyer let slip, and which we shall therefore simply record. On the contrary, when our man of law is on his home, legal ground, he scorns economic history. The declining Roman Empire is his favourite example.

"The means of production were never so centralised," he tells us, "as when half the African province was in the possession of six people ... never were the sufferings of the working classes greater than when almost every productive worker was a slave. Neither was there at that time any lack of fierce criticism of the existing social order—particularly from the Church Fathers—which could rival the best socialist writings of the present; nevertheless, the fall of the Western Roman Empire was not followed by socialism, for instance, but—by the medieval legal system" (p. 108).

And why did this happen? Because

"the nation did not have a clear picture of the future order, one free of all effusiveness".

---

a Let justice be done, though the world perish (a dictum attributed to Emperor Ferdinand I of Austria (1556-64). See J. Manlius, *Loci Communes*, II, p. 290).—Ed.
Mr. Menger is of the opinion that during the decline of the Roman Empire the economic preconditions for modern socialism were in existence; it was simply its legal formulation that was lacking. Because of this, it was feudalism, and not socialism, that took over, making a nonsense of the materialist conception of history!

What the lawyers of the declining Roman Empire had formed so neatly into a system was not feudal law but Roman law, the law of a society of commodity producers. Since Mr. Menger operates on the assumption that the legal idea is the driving force of history, he now makes the quite preposterous demand on the Roman lawyers that, instead of the legal system of existing Roman society, they should have delivered the very opposite—"a clear picture, free of all effusiveness", of an imaginary social system. So that is Menger's philosophy of law, applied to Roman law! But Menger's claim that the economic conditions had never been so favourable to socialism as under the Roman Emperors is downright horrendous. The socialists that Menger seeks to disprove see the guarantee of socialism's success in the development of production itself. On the one hand, the development of large-scale machine-based enterprises in industry and agriculture makes production increasingly social, and the productivity of labour enormous; this necessitates the abolition of class distinctions and the transfer of commodity production in private enterprises into direct production for and by society. On the other hand, the modern mode of production gives rise to the class which increasingly gains the power for, and interest in, actually carrying through this development: a free, working proletariat.

Now compare the conditions in imperial Rome, where there was no question of large-scale machine-based production, either in industry or in agriculture. True, we find a concentration of landownership, but one would have to be a lawyer to equate this with the development of labour performed socially in large enterprises. For the sake of argument, let us present Mr. Menger with three examples of landownership. Firstly, an Irish landlord who owns 50,000 acres tilled by 5,000 tenants in smallholdings averaging 10 acres; secondly, a Scottish landlord who has turned 50,000 acres into hunting grounds; and thirdly, an immense American farm of 10,000 acres, growing wheat on a large industrial scale. No doubt he will declare that in the first two cases the concentration of the means of production has advanced five times as far as in the last.

The development of Roman agriculture during the imperial age
led, on the one hand, to the extension of pastoral farming over vast areas and the depopulation of the land; on the other, to the fragmentation of the estates into smallholdings which were handed over to *colons* and became miniature enterprises run by dependent small farmers, the forerunners of the serfs, thus establishing a mode of production that already contained the germ of the medieval one. And it was for this reason among others, esteemed Mr. Menger, that the Roman world was superseded by the "medieval legal system". No doubt there were, at various times, large-scale agricultural enterprises in individual provinces, but there was no machine production with free workers—it was a *plantation* economy that used *slaves*, barbarians of widely differing nationalities, who often could not understand one another. Then there were the free proletarians: not *working* proletarians but the *Lumpen* proletarians. Nowadays society increasingly depends on the labour of the proletarians and they are becoming increasingly essential to its continued survival; the Roman Lumpenproletarians were parasites who were not merely useless but even harmful to society, and hence lacked any effective power.

But to Mr. Menger's way of thinking, the mode of production and the people were apparently never so ripe for socialism as they were in the imperial age! The advantage of steering well clear of economic "friperies" is obvious.

We shall allow him the Church Fathers, since he says nothing as to wherein their "criticism of the existing social order ... could rival the best socialist writings of the present". We are indebted to the Church Fathers for not a little interesting information about Roman society in decline, but as a rule they never engaged in *criticism*, being content simply to *condemn* it, and they often did it in such strong terms that the fiercest language of the modern socialists, and even the clamour of the anarchists, seem tame in comparison. Is this the "superiority" to which Mr. Menger refers?

With the same contempt for historical fact that we have just observed, Menger states on p. 2 that the privileged classes receive their income *without personal services to society* in return. So the fact that ruling classes in the ascendant phase of their development have very definite social functions to perform, and for this very reason become ruling classes, is quite unknown to him. While socialists recognise the temporary historical justification for these classes, Menger here declares their appropriation of surplus product to be theft. Therefore, it must come as a surprise to him to find on pp. 122 and 123 that these classes are daily losing more and more of the *power* to protect their right to this income. That
this power consists in the performance of social functions and vanishes at a later stage of development with the demise of these functions is a complete enigma to this great thinker.

Enough. The worthy professor then proceeds to deal with socialism from the point of view of the philosophy of law, in other words, to reduce it to a few brief legal formulas, to socialist "basic rights", a new edition of human rights for the nineteenth century. Such basic rights have, of course,

"little practical effect", but they are "not without their uses in the scientific sphere" as "slogans" (pp. 5, 6).

So we have already sunk to the point where we are only dealing with slogans. First the historical context and content of this mighty movement are eliminated to make way for mere "philosophy of law", and then this philosophy of law is reduced to slogans which, it is admitted, are not worth a rap in practice! It was certainly worth the trouble.

The worthy professor now discovers that the whole of socialism can be reduced, legally speaking, to three such slogans, three basic rights. These are:

1. the right to the full proceeds of one's labour,
2. the right to a livelihood,
3. the right to work.

The right to work is only a provisional demand, "the first clumsy formula wherein the revolutionary demands of the proletariat are summarised" (Marx), and thus does not belong here. Yet he overlooks the demand for equality, which dominated all of French revolutionary socialism, from Babeuf to Cabet and Proudhon, but which Mr. Menger will hardly be able to formulate legally, although (or perhaps because) it is the most legalistic of all the demands mentioned. We are thus left with a quintessence consisting of the meagre propositions 1 and 2, which, to cap it all, are mutually contradictory. Menger finally realises this on p. 27, but it in no way prevents every socialist system from having to live with them (p. 6). But it is quite evident that cramming widely differing socialist doctrines from widely differing countries and stages of development into these two "slogans" is bound to adulterate the entire exposé. The peculiarity of each individual doctrine—what actually constitutes its historical importance—is not merely cast aside as a matter of secondary importance; it is

---

actually rejected as quite wrong because it diverges from the slogan and contradicts it.

The work we discuss deals only with No. 1, the right to the full proceeds of one's labour.

The worker's right to the full proceeds of his labour, that is, each individual worker's right to his specific proceeds, is only found in this strict sense in the doctrine of Proudhon. To demand that the means of production and the products should belong to the workers as a whole is quite a different matter. This demand is communist and, as Menger discovers on p. 48, goes beyond demand No. 1, which causes him a good deal of embarrassment. Consequently, one moment he has to place the communists under No. 2, and the next he has to twist and turn basic right No. 1 until he can fit them in there. This occurs on p. 7. Here it is assumed that even after commodity production has been abolished it nevertheless continues to exist. It seems quite natural to Mr. Menger that even in a socialist society exchange values, i.e. commodities for sale, are produced and the prices of labour continue to exist—in other words, that labour power continues to be sold as a commodity. The only point which concerns him is whether the historically inherited prices of labour will be maintained in a socialist society with a surcharge, or whether there ought to be

"a completely new method of determining the prices of labour".

The latter would, in his opinion, shake society even more severely than the introduction of the socialist social system itself. This confusion of concepts is understandable as on p. 94 our scholar talks about a socialist theory of value, imagining, as others have done before him, that Marx's theory of value is supposed to provide a yardstick for distribution in the society of the future. Indeed, on p. 56 it is stated that the full proceeds of labour are nothing definite, as they can be calculated according to at least three different standards, and eventually, on pp. 161, 162, we are told that the full proceeds of labour constitute the "natural principle of distribution" and are only possible in a society with common property but individual use—that is, a society not today proposed as an ultimate goal by a single socialist anywhere! What an excellent basic right! And what an excellent philosopher of the law for the working class!

In this way Menger has made it easy for himself to give a "critical" presentation of the history of socialism. Three words I'll tell you of import great, and even though they are not on
everyone's lips, they are quite sufficient for the matriculation examination that is being carried out with the socialists here. So step this way, Saint-Simon, over here, Proudhon, come on, Marx and whatever you are called: Do you swear by No. 1, or No. 2, or No. 3? Now quick into my Procrustean bed, and if anything overhangs, I'll chop it off, as economic and philanthropic fripperies!

The point at issue is simply in whom the three basic rights foisted onto socialism by Menger are first to be found: whoever is the first to come up with one of these formulas is the great man. Understandably enough, it is impossible to do such a thing without dropping a few ridiculous clangers, the would-be learned apparatus notwithstanding. He believes, for example, that to the Saint-Simonists the oisifs denote the owning classes and the travailleurs, the working classes (p. 67), in the title of Saint-Simon's work Les oisifs et les travailleurs.—Fermages, loyers, intérêts, salaires (The Idle and the Workers.—Farm Rents, Rents, Interest, Wages), where the absence of profit alone should have taught him better. On the same page Menger himself quotes a key passage from the Globe, the organ of Saint-Simonism, which, alongside the scholars and the artists, lavishes praise on the industriels, i.e. the manufacturers, (as opposed to the oisifs) as mankind's benefactors and which simply demands the abolition of the tribute to the oisifs, that is, the rentiers, those who are in receipt of farm rent, rent and interest. In this list, profit is again excluded. In the Saint-Simonist system the manufacturer occupies a prominent position as a powerful and well-paid agent of society, and Mr. Menger would do well to study this position more closely before continuing his treatment of it from the point of view of the philosophy of law.

On page 73 we are told that in the Contradictions économiques Proudhon had, "albeit rather obscurely", promised "a new solution of the social problem", while retaining commodity production and competition. What the worthy professor still finds rather obscure in 1886, Marx saw through as early as in 1847, demonstrating that it was actually an old idea, and predicting the bankruptcy that Proudhon in fact suffered in 1849.511

But enough of this. Everything we have discussed up to now is only of secondary concern to Mr. Menger, and also to his audience. If he had only written a history of right No. 1, his book

---

a Paraphrase of two lines from Schiller's poem "Die Worte des Glaubens".—Ed.
b Headline of an article by B. P. Enfantin published in Le Globe, No. 66, March 7, 1831.—Ed.
would have disappeared without a trace. The history is only a pretext for writing the book; the purpose of that book is to drag Marx down. And it is only read because it deals with Marx. For a long time now it has not been so easy to criticise him—ever since an understanding of his system has gained wider currency and the critic has no longer been able to count on the ignorance of his audience. There is only one option: in order to drag Marx down, his achievements are attributed to other socialists in whom no one is interested, who have vanished from the scene and who have no political or scientific importance any longer. In this way they hope to dispose of the founder of the proletarian world view, and indeed the world view itself. Mr. Menger undertook the task. People are not professors for nothing. They want to make their mark, too.

The matter becomes quite simple.

The present social order gives landowners and capitalists a "right" to part—the bulk—of the product produced by the worker. Basic right No. 1 says that this right is a wrong and the worker should have the whole proceeds of his labour. This takes care of the entire content of socialism, unless basic right No. 2 comes into the picture. So whoever first said that the present right of those who own the soil and the other means of production to part of the proceeds of labour is a wrong is the great man, the founder of "scientific" socialism! And these men were Godwin, Hall and Thompson. Leaving out all the interminable economic fripperies and getting to the legal residue, Menger finds nothing but the same assertion in Marx. Consequently Marx simply copied these old Englishmen, particularly Thompson, and took care to keep quiet about his source. The proof has been adduced.

We give up any attempt to make this hidebound lawyer understand that nowhere does Marx demand the "right to the full proceeds of labour", that he makes no legal demands of any kind at all in his theoretical works. Even our lawyer seems to have a faint inkling of this when he reproaches Marx for nowhere giving

"a thorough presentation of the right to the full proceeds of labour" (p. 98).

In Marx's theoretical studies legal right, which always merely reflects the economic conditions prevalent in a specific society, is only considered as a matter of purely secondary importance; his main concern is the historical justification for certain conditions, modes of appropriation and social classes in specific ages, the investigation of which is of prime importance to anyone who sees in history a coherent, though often disrupted, course of develop-
ment rather than, as the eighteenth century did, a mere muddle of folly and brutality. Marx views the historical inevitability of, and hence the justification for, the slave-owners of classical times, the feudal lords of the Middle Ages, etc., as the lever of human development for a limited historical period. He thereby also recognises the temporary historical justification for exploitation, for the appropriation of the product of labour by others. Yet at the same time he demonstrates that not only has this historical justification disappeared, but that the continued existence of exploitation in any form, far from furthering social development, is daily impeding it more and more and involving it in increasingly violent collisions. Menger's attempt to force these epoch-making historical investigations into his narrow, legalistic Procrustean bed only goes to show his total inability to understand things that go beyond the narrowest legal horizon. Basic right No. 1, as formulated by him, does not exist for Marx at all.

But here it comes!

Mr. Menger has discovered the term "surplus value" in Thompson. No doubt about it—Thompson is the discoverer of surplus value, and Marx a wretched plagiarist:

"In Thompson's views one immediately recognises the mode of thinking, indeed even the forms of expression, that are later found in so many socialists, particularly Marx and Rodbertus" (p. 53).

Thompson is therefore undeniably the "foremost founder of scientific socialism" (p. 49). And what does this scientific socialism consist in?

The view "that rent and profits on capital are deductions which the owners of land and capital make from the full proceeds of labour, is by no means peculiar to socialism, as many representatives of bourgeois political economy, e.g. Adam Smith, proceed from the same opinion. Thompson and his followers are original only in so far as they regard rent and profit on capital as wrongful deductions that conflict with the worker's right to the full proceeds of his labour" (pp. 53-54).

Thus scientific socialism does not consist in discovering an economic fact—according to Menger, this had already been done by earlier economists—but simply in declaring this fact wrongful. That is Mr. Menger's view of the matter. If the socialists had really made it so easy for themselves, they could have packed up long ago, and Mr. Menger would have been spared his legal-philosophical clanger. But that's what happens when you reduce a movement in world history to legal slogans that fit in your waistcoat pocket.

But what about the surplus value stolen from Thompson? The facts of the matter are as follows:
In his *Inquiry into the Principles of Distribution of Wealth etc.* (Chapter 1, section 15), Thompson considers

"what proportion of the products of their labour ought the labourers to pay" ("*ought"*, literally "are obliged", hence "ought to pay under the law") "for the use of the articles, called capital, to the possessors of them, called capitalists". The capitalists say that "without this capital, in the shape of machinery, materials, etc., mere labour would be unproductive; and therefore it is but just that the labourer should pay for the use of that". And Thompson continues: "Doubtless, the labourer must pay for the use of these, when so unfortunate as not himself to possess them; the question is, how much of the products of his labour *ought* to be subtracted for their use" (p. 128 of the Pare edition of 1850).

This certainly does not sound at all like the "right to the full proceeds of labour". On the contrary, Thompson finds it quite acceptable that the worker should forfeit part of the proceeds of his labour for the use of the borrowed capital. The question for him is simply how much. Here there are "two measures, the worker’s and the capitalist’s". And what is the worker’s measure? It is

"the contribution of such sums as would replace the waste and value of the capital, by the time it would be consumed, with such added compensation to the owner and superintendent of it, as would support him in equal comfort with the more actively employed* productive labourers*."

Thus, then, is the worker’s demand, according to Thompson, and anyone who does not "immediately recognise the mode of thinking, indeed even the forms of expression" from "Marx" would be mercilessly failed in Mr. Menger’s philosophy-of-law examination.

But surplus value—what about surplus value? Patience, dear reader, we are almost there.

"The measure of the capitalist would be the additional value produced by the same quantity of labour, in consequence of the use of the machinery or other capital; the whole of such surplus value to be enjoyed by the capitalist for his superior intelligence and skill in accumulating and advancing to the labourers his capital, or the use of it" (Thompson, p. 128).

This passage, taken literally, is utterly incomprehensible. No production is possible without the means of production. But the means of production are here assumed to be in the form of capital, i.e. in the possession of capitalists. So if the worker

---

*a* The English word “ought” is given after the quotation, which is in German.—*Ed.*

*b* The English words “superintendent” and “more actively employed” are given after their German equivalents in the text.—*Ed.*
produces without the "use of machinery or other capital", he is attempting the impossible; he does not in fact produce anything at all. But if he does produce with the use of capital, then his entire product would be what is called surplus value here. So let's read on. On p. 130 Thompson has the same capitalist say:

"Before the invention of machinery, before the accommodation of workshops, or factories, what was the amount of produce which the unaided powers of the labourer produced? Whatever that was, let him still enjoy... To the maker of the buildings or the machinery, or to him who by voluntary exchange acquired them, let all the surplus value of the manufactured article go, as a reward", etc.

Here Thompson's capitalist is simply expressing the manufacturers' everyday illusion that the working hour of the worker producing with the aid of machinery, etc., produces a greater value than the working hour of the simple artisan before the invention of machinery. This notion is fostered by the extraordinary "surplus value" pocketed by the capitalist who breaks into a field hitherto held by manual labour, with a newly invented machine on which he and perhaps a few other capitalists have a monopoly. In this case, the price of the hand-made product determines the market price of the entire output of this sector of industry; the machine-made product might cost a mere quarter of the labour, thus leaving the manufacturer with a "surplus value" of 300 per cent of his cost price.

Naturally, the general spread of the new machine soon puts paid to this sort of "surplus value"; but then the capitalist notices that as the machine-made product comes to determine the market price and this price progressively falls to the real value of the machine-made product, the price of the hand-made product also falls and is thus forced down below its previous value, so that machine labour still produces a certain "surplus value" compared with manual labour. Thompson places this fairly common self-deception in the mouth of his manufacturer. How little he shares it himself, however, he expressly states immediately before this, on p. 127:

"The materials, the buildings, the wages, can add nothing to their own value. The additional value proceeds from labour alone."

We must beg our reader's indulgence when we point out especially for Mr. Menger's edification that this "additional value" of Thompson's is by no means the same as Marx's surplus value but the entire value added to the raw material by labour, that is, the sum total of the value of the labour power and surplus value in the Marxian sense.
Only now, after this indispensable "economic frippery", can we fully appreciate the audacity with which Mr. Menger says on p. 53:

"In Thompson's view ... the capitalists consider ... the difference between the worker's necessities of life and the real proceeds of their labour, rendered more productive by machinery and other capital expenditure, to be surplus (or additional) value, a which must fall to the owners of land and capital."

This purports to be the "free" German rendering of the passage that we quoted above from Thompson, p. 128. But all that Thompson's capitalist is referring to is the difference between the product of the same quantity of labour, 2 according to whether the work is performed with or without the use of capital: the difference between the product of the same quantity of labour performed manually or with the help of machines. Mr. Menger can only smuggle in "the worker's necessities of life" by totally falsifying Thompson.

To sum up: The "surplus value" of Thompson's capitalist is not Thompson's "surplus" or "additional value"; much less is either of them Mr. Menger's "surplus value"; and least of all is any of the three Marx's "surplus value".

But that does not bother Mr. Menger in the slightest. On p. 53 he continues:

"Rent and profit on capital are therefore nothing but deductions which the owners of land and capital are able to make from the full proceeds of labour, to the detriment of the worker, by virtue of their legal position of power" — the whole substance of this sentence is already found in Adam Smith — and then he triumphantly exclaims: "In Thompson's views one immediately recognises the mode of thinking, indeed even the forms of expression, that are later found in so many socialists, particularly Marx and Rodbertus."

In other words, Mr. Menger came across the term surplus (or additional) value in Thompson, only managing to conceal by means of an outright misrepresentation that in Thompson the term is used in two totally different senses, which again are both totally different from the sense in which Marx uses the term surplus value [Mehrwert].

This is the entire substance of his momentous discovery! What a pitiful result when set against the grandiose proclamation in the preface:

"In this work I shall present proof that Marx and Rodbertus borrowed their principal socialist theories from older English and French theorists, without giving the sources of their views."

---

a The English words are given after their German equivalents in the text.— Ed.
How miserable the comparison that precedes this sentence now seems:

“If anyone had ‘discovered’ the theory of the division of labour thirty years after the publication of Adam Smith’s work on the wealth of nations, or if a writer today sought to present Darwin’s theory of evolution as his own intellectual property, he would be considered either an ignoramus or a charlatan. Only in the social sciences, which almost entirely lack an historical tradition, are successful attempts of this kind conceivable.”

We shall disregard the fact that Menger still believes Adam Smith “discovered” the division of labour, while Petty had fully developed this point as long as eighty years before Adam Smith. What Menger says about Darwin, however, now rather rebounds on him. Back in the sixth century B.C., the Ionian philosopher Anaximander put forward the view that man had evolved out of a fish, and this, it will be recalled, is also the view of modern evolutionary science. Now if someone were to stand up and maintain that the mode of thinking and indeed the forms of expression of Darwin could be recognised in Anaximander and that Darwin had done nothing more than plagiarise Anaximander carefully concealing his source, he would be adopting exactly the same approach to Darwin and Anaximander as Mr. Menger adopts to Marx and Thompson. The worthy professor is right: “only in the social sciences” can one count on the ignorance that makes “successful attempts of this kind conceivable”.

But as he places so much emphasis on the term “surplus value”, regardless of the concept associated with it, let us divulge a secret to this great expert on the literature of socialism and political economy: not only does the term “SURPLUS PRODUCE” occur in Ricardo (in the chapter on wages), but the expression “plus-value”, alongside the “mieux-value” employed by Sismondi, is commonly used in business circles in France, and has been used as far back as anyone can remember, to designate any increase in value that does not cost the owner of the commodities anything. This would seem to make it doubtful whether Menger’s discovery of Thompson’s discovery (or rather Thompson’s capitalist’s discovery) of surplus value will be recognised even by the philosophy of law.

However, Mr. Menger is not finished with Marx yet, by any means. Just listen:

“It is characteristic that Marx and Engels have been misquoting this fundamental work of English socialism” (viz. Thompson) “for forty years” (p. 50).

---

a D. Ricardo, On the Principles of Political Economy, and Taxation, pp. 90-115.— Ed.
So Marx—not content with hushing up his secret Egeria for forty years—also has to go and misquote her! And not just once, but for forty years. And not only Marx, but Engels too! What an accumulation of premeditated villainy! Poor Lujo Brentano, who has been hunting in vain for twenty years for just one single misquotation by Marx, and during this witch-hunt has not only burnt his own fingers but has brought ruin upon his gullible friend Sedley-Taylor of Cambridge—kick yourself, Lujo, for not finding it! And in what does it consist, this horrendous falsification that has been stubbornly pursued for forty years, is “characteristic” into the bargain, and, to cap it all, is given the character of a treacherous plot by Engels’ malicious forty-year-long complicity?

“...misquoting for forty years by giving its year of publication as 1827!”

When the book had appeared as early as 1824!

“Characteristic”, indeed—of Mr. Menger. But that is far from being the only—listen here, Lujo!—the only misquotation by Marx and Engels, who seem to practise misquotation professionally—perhaps even on the move? In the Misère de la philosophie (1847) Marx got Hodgskin mixed up with Hopkins, and forty years later (nothing less than forty years will satisfy these wicked men) Engels commits the same offence in his preface to the German translation of the Misère. With his eagle eye for printer’s errors and slips of the pen it really is a loss to mankind that the good professor did not become a printer’s proofreader. But no—we must take back this compliment. Mr. Menger is no good at reading proofs, either; for he, too, commits slips of the pen, that is to say, he misquotes. This happens not only with English titles but also with German ones. He refers, for instance, to “Engels’ translation of this work”, i.e. the Misère. According to the title page of the work the translation was not by Engels. In the preface in question Engels quotes the passage from Marx mentioning Hopkins verbatim: he was thus obliged to reproduce the error in his quotation in order not to misquote Marx. But these people simply cannot do anything right for Mr. Menger.

But enough of these trivia in which our philosopher of law takes such delight. It is “characteristic” of the man and the likes of him that he feels obliged to show he has read two or three more books than Marx had “forty years ago”, in 1847, even though he became familiar with the entire literature on the subject through Marx in the first place—nowhere does he quote a single English author not already quoted by Marx, apart from perhaps Hall and
world-famous people like Godwin, Shelley's father-in-law. A man who has the titles of all the books quoted by Marx in his pocket and all the present facilities and amenities of the British Museum at his disposal and is unable to make any discovery in this field apart from the fact that Thompson's *Distribution* appeared in 1824, and not 1827, really should not brag about his bibliographical erudition.

The same applies to Mr. Menger as to many other social reformers of our day: grand words and negligible deeds, if any. He promises to demonstrate that Marx is a plagiarist—and shows that one word, "Mehrwert" [surplus value], had been used before Marx, though in a different sense!

The same holds for Mr. Menger’s legal socialism. In his preface, Mr. Menger declares that in the

"legal treatment of socialism" he sees the "most important task of the philosophy of law of our time... Its correct handling will substantially contribute to ensuring that the indispensable amendments of our legal system are effected by way of a peaceful reform. Only when the ideas of socialism are transformed into sober legal concepts will the practical politicians be able to acknowledge how far the existing legal system needs reforming in the interests of the suffering masses."a

He intends to set about this transformation by presenting socialism as a legal system.

And what does this legal treatment of socialism amount to? In the "Concluding Remarks" he says:

"There can surely be no doubt that the formation of a legal system that is fully dominated by these fundamental legal concepts" (basic rights 1 and 2) "can only be a matter of the distant future" (p. 163).

What appears to be the most important task of "our time" in the preface is assigned to the "distant future" at the end.

"The necessary changes" (in the existing legal system) "will take place by way of prolonged historical development, just as our present social system eroded and destroyed the feudal system over the centuries, until all that was needed was one blow to completely eliminate it" (p. 164).

Fine words, but what place is there for the philosophy of law if society’s "historical development" brings about the necessary changes? In the preface it is the lawyers who determine the course taken by social development; now that the lawyer is about to be taken at his word, his pluck deserts him and he mutters something about historical development, which does everything on its own.

"But does our social development advance towards realising the right to the full proceeds of one’s labour or the right to work?"

---
a A. Menger, *Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag...*, p. III.—Ed.
Mr. Menger declares that he does not know. How ignominiously he now abandons his socialist “basic rights”. But if these basic rights cannot coax a dog away from the hearth, if they do not determine and realise social development but are determined and realised by it, why go to all the trouble of reducing socialism to the basic rights? Why all the bother of stripping socialism of its economic and historical “fripperies”, if we are to find out in hindsight that these “fripperies” are its real substance? Why only tell us at the end that the whole study is utterly pointless, since the objective of the socialist movement cannot be perceived by turning the ideas of socialism into sober legal concepts but only by studying social development and its motive forces?

Mr. Menger’s wisdom ultimately amounts to declaring that he cannot say which direction social development will take, but he is sure of one thing: “the weaknesses of our present social system should not be artificially exacerbated” (p. 166) and, to make it possible to preserve these “weaknesses”, he recommends—free trade and the avoidance of further indebtedness on the part of the State and the local communities!

This advice is the sole tangible result of Mr. Menger’s philosophy of law, which presents itself with such fuss and self-praise. What a pity that the worthy professor does not let us into the secret of how modern states and local communities are supposed to manage without “contracting national and local debts”. If he should happen to know the secret, let him not keep it to himself forever. It would certainly pave his way “to the top” and a ministerial portfolio a good deal faster than his achievements in the “philosophy of law” ever will.

Whatever reception these achievements may find in “high places”, we believe we can safely say that the socialists of the present and the future will make Mr. Menger a gift of all his basic rights, or at any rate will refrain from disputing his right to the “full proceeds of his labour”.

This does not mean to say, of course, that the socialists will refrain from making specific legal demands. An active socialist party is impossible without such demands, like any political party. The demands that derive from the common interests of a class can only be put into effect by this class taking over political power and securing universal validity for its demands by making them law. Every class in struggle must therefore set forth its demands in the form of legal demands in a programme. But the demands of every class change in the course of social and political transformations, they differ from country to country according to the country's
distinctive features and level of social development. For this reason, too, the legal demands of the individual parties, for all their agreement on ultimate goals, are not entirely the same at all times and for every nation. They are an element subject to change and are revised from time to time, as may be observed among the socialist parties of different countries. When such revisions are made, it is the actual conditions that have to be taken into account, it has not, however, occurred to any of the existing socialist parties to construct a new philosophy of law out of its programme, nor is this likely ever to happen in the future. At any rate, Mr. Menger's achievements in this field can only have a deterrent effect.

That is the only useful thing about his little book.

Written November-beginning of December 1886
First published in Die Neue Zeit, No. 2, 1887

Printed according to the journal
Published in English in full for the first time
In your article concerning me\(^a\) in the *Volkszeitung* of March 2\(^b\) you maintain

"that Aveling is said to have submitted a bill which contained items that a labour agitator, who must know that the donations\(^c\) raised to finance agitation come almost entirely out of the pockets of hard-working labourers, really should not present".

Passing over all the minor points and restricting my reply to the one main point, I wish to state:

The weekly bills submitted by me to the Executive contained all my expenses, that is to say both those chargeable to the Party and others to be met by me personally. I had made it clear to the Executive in advance and in the most unambiguous way—first in a verbal agreement with the treasurer, R. Meyer, and then in several letters—that all the purely personal expenses were to be defrayed by me in return for the $366.00 ($3 per day) guaranteed to me by the Executive, and that I left it entirely up to the Executive to decide which items of expenditure should be passed on to the party, and which items should be charged to me personally.

I never expected—even less demanded—that any of these personal items of expenditure should be paid for "out of the pockets of hard-working labourers", and indeed none of them have been. For further information about this I refer you to my

---

\(^a\) Edward Aveling, on behalf of whom this letter was written.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) "Affaire Aveling noch einmal", *New Yorker Volkszeitung*, No. 52, March 2, 1887.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) The *New Yorker Volkszeitung* has "money".—*Ed.*
enclosed circular of February 26 to the sections,\textsuperscript{515} to the publication of which I can no longer object after what has occurred.

In addition I would point out that a printing error has crept into your article. My reply to your article of January 12\textsuperscript{a} was dated not “Feb. 1887” but January 26, 1887, and was sent off to you on the same day that article came to my notice.

With social-democratic greetings.\textsuperscript{b}

Edward Aveling

London, March 16, 1887

First published in the \textit{New Yorker Volkszeitung}, No. 76, March 30, 1887

Printed according to the manuscript collated with the newspaper text

Published in English for the first time

\textsuperscript{a} “Aveling und die Sozialisten”, \textit{New Yorker Volkszeitung}, No. 10, January 12, 1887.— \textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} This phrase is omitted in the text published in the newspaper.— \textit{Ed.}
ENGELS' AMENDMENTS
TO THE PROGRAMME OF THE NORTH OF ENGLAND
SOCIALIST FEDERATION\textsuperscript{516}

\textit{Wage-workers of all Countries—Unite!}

THE NORTH OF ENGLAND SOCIALIST FEDERATION
(FOUNDED IN NORTHUMBERLAND, MAY, 1887)

PRINCIPLES\textsuperscript{a}

The North of England Socialist Federation has been formed to educate and organize the people to achieve the economic emancipation of labour.

While fully sympathising with and helping every effort of the wage-earners to win better conditions of life under the present system, the Socialist Federation aims at abolishing the Capitalist and Landlord class, \textit{as well as the wage-working class}, and forming //the workers of society// all members of society into a Co-operative Commonwealth.

An employing class monopolising all the means of getting and making wealth, and a wage-earning class compelled to work //primarily// for the profit of these employers, is a system of tyranny and slavery.

The antagonism of these two classes //brings about// \textit{manifests itself in} fierce competition—for employment amongst the workers and for markets amongst the capitalists. This //gives rise to class hatred and class strife// \textit{divides the nation against itself, forms it into two hostile camps}, and destroys real independence, liberty, and happiness.

The present system gives ease and luxury to the idlers, toil and poverty to the workers, and degradation to all; it is essentially unjust and should be abolished. \textit{And it can be abolished, now that the productiveness of labour has become so vast that no extension of markets can absorb its overflowing produce, the very superabundance of the means}

\textsuperscript{a} The words crossed out by Engels are given in double oblique lines, and the text added by him is printed in italics.—\textit{Ed.}
of life and of enjoyment thus becoming the cause of stagnation of trade, want of employment and consequent misery of the toiling millions.

Our aim is to bring about a Socialist System which will give healthy and useful labour to all, ample wealth and leisure to all, and the truest and fullest freedom to all.

All are invited to help the Socialist Federation in this great cause. Adherents shall acknowledge truth, justice, and morality as the basis of their conduct towards each other and towards all men. They shall acknowledge no rights without duties: no duties without rights.

Written between June 14 and 23, 1887

Reproduced from the Principles with amendments in Engels' hand
Published in English for the first time
Wage-workers of all Countries—Unite!

THE NORTH OF ENGLAND
SOCIALIST FEDERATION.
(FOUNDED IN NORTHUMBERLAND, MAY, 1887.)

PRINCIPLES.
The North of England Socialist Federation has been formed to educate and organize the people to achieve the economic emancipation of labour.

While fully sympathising with and helping every effort of the wage-earners to win better conditions of life under the present system, the Socialist Federation aims at abolishing the Capitalist and landlord classes and forming the worker into a Co-operative Commonwealth.

An employing class monopolising all the means of getting and making wealth, and a wage-earning class compelled to work primarily for the profit of these employers, is a system of tyranny and slavery.

The antagonism of these two classes brings about fierce competition—for employment amongst the workers and for markets amongst the capitalists. This gives rise to class hatred and class strife and destroys real independence, liberty, and happiness.

The present system gives ease and luxury to the idlers, toil and poverty to the workers, and degradation to all; it is essentially unjust and should be abolished.

Our aim is to bring about a Socialist System which will give healthy and useful labour to all, ample wealth and leisure to all, and the truest and fullest freedom to all.

All are invited to help the Socialist Federation in this great cause. Adherents shall acknowledge truth, justice, and morality as the basis of their conduct towards each other and towards all men. They shall acknowledge no rights without duties; no duties without rights.

PROGRAMME.
The Socialist Federation seeks to gain its ends by working on the following lines:

(1) Forming and helping other Socialist bodies to form a National and International Socialist Labour Party.
(2) Striving to secure political power by promoting the election of Socialists to Parliament, Local governments, School Boards, and other administrative bodies.
(3) Helping Trade Unionism, Co-operation, and every genuine movement for the good of the workers.
(4) Promoting a scheme for the National and International Federation of Labour.

All who agree with these objects are invited to become members.

For Rules see other side.

Programme of the North of England Socialist Federation with Engels' amendments
TO THE EDITOR OF JUSTICE

Dear Comrade.—The Press has already announced that four German Socialists—Bernstein, Motteler, Schlueter and Tauscher, editors and publishers of the Zurich Sozial Demokrat,—have been expelled from Switzerland by the Federal Council of that country for “having abused the hospitality extended to them.” This severe measure must appear all the more surprising, as the paper in question, during the eight years of its existence, has always carefully refrained from attacks upon Switzerland and Swiss institutions, and as its language generally has never been more moderate than during the last few months.

The official text of the order of expulsion giving the reasons upon which the Federal Council bases it, is now before us, and these reasons are surprising indeed. The Federal Council would make us believe that its attention was first called to the Sozial Demokrat, not by anything published by that paper itself, but by a comic paper, printed in the same office in January, 1887, of which only one number was bought! And yet the Sozial Demokrat from the first day of its publication had been watched with the greatest and most constant attention by the German authorities, and, at their request by the Swiss authorities.

The Federal Council having thus become aware of the necessity of watching the Sozial Demokrat, now found out, as it tells us, that this paper “was written in a generally violent language offensive to the authorities of the German Empire.” That is to say, the paper did not proclaim actual and forcible resistance against the State power in Germany, much less in Switzerland. It merely stigmatised as such and called by their proper names, the infamies committed in Germany by the authors of the Anti-Socialist Law and their
executive tools. That, however, is "abuse of hospitality" in a republic, which itself celebrates year by year in hundreds of commemorative festivals the homicidal act of William Tell, and brags of the asylum it offers to refugees of all nations.

In consequence of this violent language, we are further informed, an official warning was administered to the Sozial Demokrat, which, however, had not the desired effect. "Certainly the editors henceforth took care to avoid coarsely offensive expressions." But they declined "to change anything in the fundamental programme of the paper," and moreover they "reproduced articles which appeal to force, though accompanied by commentaries intended to make people believe in the moderation of the paper itself." To prove this latter grave offence, the Federal Council states that on April 7th, 1888, the Sozial Demokrat reprinted certain resolutions passed in 1866—twenty-two years ago!—by 500 Germans in Zurich, resolutions calling upon the German people of that day to rise in arms against their government. In 1866 not one of the 500 Germans present at that meeting in Zurich was molested by the Federal Council on account of these resolutions. But if in 1888 the Sozial Demokrat merely states these facts, that is sufficient to expel from Switzerland four men connected with that paper.

Altogether the reasons given are ridiculous. But the fact is the Federal Council dared not state the real reasons for its actions: that Bismarck and Puttkamer, his home secretary, are furious at the German Social-Democrats in Switzerland having succeeded in unmasking a set of spies and agents provocateurs sent out by the German police in order to manufacture evidence to enable the government to demand the prolongation, and with increased stringency, of this Socialist Coercion Bill. The expulsion is Puttkamer's revenge for the defeat inflicted upon him by the Socialist members in the Reichstag and by the Sozial Demokrat, and the Federal Council acts as Puttkamer's humble servant. The expulsion of our comrades means the extension of the German Socialist Coercion Act to Switzerland; it means that the dynamitards of the Russian police will henceforth enjoy in Zurich the same official protection that is extended to them in Berlin.

The only country in Europe where a right of asylum may still be said to exist is England. No doubt Bismarck will try, as he has done before now, to draw England within the nets of his international political police and to place German Socialists, in England too, under his "petty state of siege." Will there be English statesmen prepared to meet him half way? If so, let us
hope that English working men will know how to stop their
government from playing the same abject and cowardly part now
played by the Swiss Federal Council.

I am, dear comrade, yours fraternally,

Karl Kautsky

Written on April 25 or 26, 1888
Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the newspaper *Justice,*
No. 224, April 28, 1888
Question: Is socialism in England moving forward—that is, do the English working men's organisations accept the socialist critique of economic development more readily than they used to, and do they aspire—to any extent worth mentioning—to the "ultimate aims" of socialism?

Engels: I am quite satisfied with the progress of socialism and the workers' movement in England; but this progress mainly consists in the development of the proletariat consciousness of the masses. The official workers' organisations, the trade unions, which were threatening in places to become reactionary, are obliged to limp along behind, like the Austrian Landsturm.519

Question: What is the position in this respect in Ireland? Is there anything there—apart from the national question—that could arouse hope among socialists?

Engels: A pure socialist movement cannot be expected from Ireland for quite a long time yet. First people want to become small landowning farmers, and when they are, along comes the mortgage and ruins them all over again. Meanwhile that is no reason why we shouldn't help them to free themselves from their landlords—that is, to make the transition from a semi-feudal to a capitalist condition.

Question: What is the attitude of the English workers to the Irish movement?

Engels: The masses are for the Irish. The organisations, like the workers' aristocracy in general, follow Gladstone and the liberal bourgeois, and go no further than they.

Question: What do you think about Russia? That is, how far have you modified your view—which you and Marx expressed some six years ago when I was in

---

a Theodor Cuno, the representative of the New Yorker Volkszeitung.—Ed.
London—that because of the nihilist, terrorist successes of the day the impulse for a European revolutionary movement would probably come from Russia?\textsuperscript{a}

Engels: On the whole I am still of the opinion that a revolution or even just the convocation of some kind of national assembly in Russia would revolutionise the whole European political situation. But today this is no longer the most obvious possibility. To make up for it, we have a new William.\textsuperscript{b}

To the question of how he would characterise the present European situation, Engels answered: "I have not seen a European paper for seven weeks now, so I am in no position to characterise anything that is going on over there."

This concluded the discussion.

First published in the New Yorker Volkszeitung, No. 226, September 20, 1888

Printed according to the newspaper

\textsuperscript{a} Marx and Engels expressed this idea in the "Preface to the Second Russian Edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party" (see present edition, Vol. 24).— Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} William II.— Ed.
NOTES
AND
INDEXES
Engels' works on the early history of the Germans relate to his study of the early stages in the development of society. They laid the basis for the historical materialist explanation of the origin of classes and the state and made a major contribution to the research into the history of the formation of European peoples.

These manuscripts were not published during the author's lifetime. Engels used part of the material he had collected in the essay "The Mark" (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 499-56).

During his work on the manuscript Engels may have changed his initial plan. The material relating to point 2 ("The District and Army Structure") of the draft plan, published here, is missing in the manuscript On the Early History of the Germans and is evidently used in the second chapter of The Frankish Period directly linked with the first manuscript. That Engels departed from his initial plan is also proved by the fact that The Franconian Dialect (see this volume, pp. 81-107), originally planned as a note, was transferred to The Frankish Period and elaborated as its component part.

The headings of the first three chapters of Engels' manuscript On the Early History of the Germans ("Caesar and Tacitus", "The First Battles Against Rome" and "Progress Until the Migration Period") were supplied by the editors according to Engels' draft plan; the heading of the fourth chapter ("Note: The German Peoples") is given in the manuscript by Engels himself.


Passages from this work were published in English for the first time in: Marx, Engels, On Literature and Art, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, pp. 187-88 and 212-14 and in full in Marx, Engels, Pre-Capitalist Socio-Economic Formations. A Collection, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, pp. 298-360.

The dating of the draft plan, as of the works themselves, is given according to MEGA2, Abt. I, Bd. 25, S. 988-89.

In this volume, these works have been arranged according to the dates on which Engels completed them.
In the nineteenth century the term *Aryans* referred to the peoples using Indo-European languages. Nowadays the term is applied to the tribes and peoples speaking Indo-Iranian languages.


4 *Periodos oder Über den Ozean*, a work by Pytheas of Massilia, has not been preserved and is only known from references by other ancient authors.

5 The *great migration of peoples* (Völkerwanderung)—a conventional name for mass intrusions of the Germanic, Slavic, Sarmatian and other peoples into the territory of the Roman Empire in the 4th-7th centuries, which led to the collapse of the Western Roman Empire and the transition from slavery to feudalism throughout the Roman Empire.

6 See Note 1.

7 *Proconsul*—an office introduced in Ancient Rome in 327 B.C. Originally the proconsul discharged military duties outside Rome, but after the provinces were formed he acted as governor and military commander there (propraetor in minor provinces).

8 Germany received Roman law in the 15th and 16th centuries. Here, as in the rest of Europe, Roman law originated from Digests (or Pandects), the main part of the Byzantine codification of Roman law promulgated under Emperor Justinian in 533 (*Corpus iuris civilis*). Digests mainly cover private law regulating property, family, hereditary and liability relations, as well as criminal and procedural law.

9 *Lictor*—a minor official in Ancient Rome.

10 General Yorck, who in 1812 commanded a Prussian auxiliary corps of the Napoleonic army in Russia, concluded the Tauroggen Convention with the Russian Command on December 30, 1812, pledging to take no part in the fighting against the Russian army for two months.

   In the Battle of Leipzig between the allied Russian, Austrian, Prussian and Swedish forces and the army of Napoleon I (October 16-19, 1813), the Saxon Corps, which fought in the ranks of Napoleon's army, at a crucial moment suddenly went over to the other side and turned its guns against the French.

11 This refers to the mutiny in the mercenary army of the Spanish King Philip II, which occupied the Netherlands, in the summer and autumn of 1576. The soldiers revolted because they had not been paid for a number of years.

12 The reference is to the insurrection of the Illyrian tribes (A.D. 6-9) sparked off by oppression on the part of the Roman administration, and unbearable taxes. It swept over Dalmatia and Pannonia, that is the whole of Illyricum. The insurgents killed Roman soldiers and merchants, attacked Macedonia and threatened Italy. Fifteen Roman legions were brought together to suppress the insurrection which was not quelled until the August of A.D. 9, following three military expeditions under the command of Tiberius and Germanicus.
The reference is to the Roman fortification which owes its name to the Germanic tribe of Angrivarians who lived on both banks of the Weser, north of the Cheruscus and south of the Saxons. p. 31

This refers to the ancient burial place which was discovered near the town of Hallstatt in Southwest Austria in 1846 and gave the name to the archaeological culture of the tribes inhabiting the southern part of Central Europe in the period of the early Iron Age (c. 900-400 B.C.). p. 33

The reference is to the *Agri Decumates* (tithe lands). These lands, lying between the right bank of the Upper Rhine and the Danube, were annexed to the Roman Empire in A.D. 83 under Domitian and distributed among the Roman veterans and Gauls. p. 34

The events described by Engels are mentioned in: Carl Fredrik Wiberg, *Der Einfluß der klassischen Völker auf den Norden durch den Handelsverkehr*, Hamburg, 1867, p. 115 and Hans Hildebrand, *Das heidnische Zeitalter in Schweden*, Hamburg, 1873, p. 182. p. 38

This refers to *Leges barbarorum* (laws of the barbarians)—codes of law which originated between the 5th and 9th centuries and were, in the main, a written record of the customary or prescriptive law of the various Germanic tribes. p. 42

Alamannic law (*Lex Alamannorum*)—a code of common law of the Alamanni, one of the ancient Germanic tribes. It dates back to the period between the end of the 6th and 8th centuries and reflects the transition from the gentile and tribal system to early feudalism. Smiths are mentioned in Chapter LXXIV, 5. p. 42

Bavarian law (*Lex Baiuvariorum*)—a code of common law of the Bavarians, a Germanic tribe. It dates back to the mid-8th century and, distinct from Alamannic law, reflects a later stage in the development of the Germanic tribes, when the Mark community was disintegrating and feudalism just emerging. Punishment for theft is mentioned in Chapter IX, 2. p. 42

Frisian law (*Lex Frisionum*)—a code of common law of the ancient Germanic tribe of Frisians (8th cent.). It contains passages borrowed from Alamannic law and certain revised enactments of the Frankish kings. p. 42

Salic law (*Lex Salica*)—a code of common law of the Salian Franks, used by the greater part of the population of the Frankish state. Compiled in the early 6th century on the orders of King Clovis (481-511), it was supplemented and revised under his successors. Salic law reproduces various stages of ancient judicial procedure and is an important historical document showing the evolution of Frankish society from the primitive communal system to the emergence of feudal relations. p. 42

The *grand army* (*grande armée*)—the name given in 1805 to the group of the armed forces of the French Empire operating in the main theatres of the Napoleonic wars. Besides French troops, it included contingents from various countries conquered by Napoleon (Italy, Holland, the German states and Poland). p. 46

Pliny's work *Bellorum Germaniae libri* is not extant. p. 46

The *Carolingians*—the dynasty of kings and emperors (from 800) in the Frankish state (751-10th cent.), which got its name from Charlemagne. The
policy pursued by the Carolingians was conducive to the growth of feudalism in
Western Europe, accelerated the enserfment of the peasantry, strengthened the
economic and political position of big landowners and led to the consolidation
of central authority.

In the first book of his *Natural History* Pliny lists the works by Roman and
Greek authors whom he quotes, Strabo and Plutarch among them.

Engels' manuscript *The Frankish Period* was not published during his lifetime.
The manuscript has two parts; the first part includes two chapters: "The
Radical Transformation of the Relations of Landownership under the
Merovingians and Carolingians" and "The District and Army Structure". The
second part of the manuscript bears the title "Note: The Franconian Dialect".
Each part is a complete whole. All headings are given in conformity with Engels'
manuscript.

*The Frankish Period* was first published in full ("The Franconian Dialect"
was published earlier, see Note 47) in: Marx and Engels, *Works*, First Russian
Edition, Vol. XVI, Part I, Moscow, 1937, and in the language of the original
in: Friedrich Engels, *Zur Geschichte und Sprache der deutschen Frühzeit*. Ein

*The Frankish Period* (without "Note: The Franconian Dialect") was
published in English for the first time in: Marx, Engels, *Pre-Capitalist

The *Merovingians*—the first royal dynasty in the Frankish state (457-751),
which got its name from its legendary founder Merovaeus. The policy pursued
by the Merovingians promoted the rise of feudal relations among the Franks.
For the *Carolingians*, see Note 24.

The terms the "Mark system" and "Mark" are explained in G. L. von Maurer,
*Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark-, Hof-, Dorf- und Stadt-Verfassung der öffentlichen
Gewalt*, Munich, 1854, pp. 5 and 40.


*Antrustions*—warriors under the early Merovingians (see Note 27); evidently
descendants of the gentile nobility.

*Majo-r domo* (Lat. *major domus*)—the highest official in the Frankish state under
the Merovingians (see Note 27). Originally the major-domo was appointed by
the king and was in charge of the palace. As feudalism advanced and royal
power was weakened the functions of major-domos were extended; they
became the biggest landowners and concentrated state power in their hands.
Most powerful of all were the major-domos from the Pepinide clan—Pepin of
Heristal (687-712), Charles Martel (715-741) and Pepin the Short (741-751)
who became the first king (751-768) of the Carolingian dynasty (see Note 24).

The Saxons defeated the Frankish army at Mount Süntel on the right bank of
the Weser (782).

For more than two centuries, from around 560, the Avars made
innumerable raids on the territory of the Frankish state. In 796 the joint forces
of the Franks and the southern Slavs destroyed the Avars' central fortification
in Pusta-Ebene.
The Arabs, who conquered Spain at the beginning of the 8th century, invaded Southern Gaul in 720. In the Battle of Poitiers (732) Charles Martel defeated the Arabs and put an end to their incursions into Europe.  

33 See Note 24.

34 The Franks were converted to Christianity in 496 during the reign of Clovis I (481-511). The adoption of Christianity and alliance with the Catholic episcopate secured Clovis the support of the clergy and goodwill towards the Franks on the part of the Catholic Gals and Romans.

35 \textit{Capitularies}—royal legislative acts and ordinances of the early Middle Ages (the Carolingian dynasty—8th-10th cent.). The Aachen Capitulary (\textit{Capitulare duplex Aquisgranense a. 811}), which noted the wholesale seizure of peasant lands by ecclesiastical and secular feudal lords, is a major source on the history of the Frankish state. The full Latin text of the Aachen Capitulary is quoted by Paul Roth in \textit{Geschichte des Beneficialwesens von den ältesten Zeiten bis ins zehnte Jahrhundert}, Erlangen, 1850, p. 253, Note 31.

36 The information quoted by Engels is taken from the 9th-century polyptych (record of landed property, population and incomes) of Saint-Germain-des-Prés Monastery. For the first time this record was published with commentaries by the French historian Guérard, under the title \textit{Polyptique de l'abbé Irminon}, vols I-II, Paris, 1844. Engels is quoting from Paul Roth's book \textit{Geschichte des Beneficialwesens...}, Erlangen, 1850, p. 251. Details on the landed property of the monasteries of St. Denis, Luxeuil and St. Martin de Tours are also taken from Roth's book.

37 \textit{Colons} were bondsmen of the Carolingian feudal lord on whose land they lived; colons had no right to abandon their plots which were in their hereditary use.

\textit{Lites}—a semi-free stratum among the Franks and Saxons. They occupied an intermediate position between free-holders and slaves.

38 In response to an appeal by Pope Stephen II, Pepin the Short undertook two campaigns to Italy (in 754 and 756) against the Langobardian King Aistulf. Part of the lands he conquered Pepin ceded to the Pope and this laid the foundation of the Papal States (756).

39 This refers to the second synod in Lestines (743) which endorsed the secularisation of Church lands in favour of the state as effected under Charles Martel.

40 The risings of the Alamanni were suppressed by Pepin the Short (in 744) and Carloman (in 746), and after this their duchy was destroyed. The Thuringians won independence in 640.

Charlemagne's wars against Saxony, which was conquered and annexed to the Frankish state, lasted for more than 30 years (from 772 to 804). During this period the Saxons twice (in 782 and 792) rose in revolt against their conquerors.

41 The growing discord in the family forced Louis the Pious, Charlemagne's son and successor, to divide the empire among his heirs on three occasions (in 817, 829 and 837); this led to the internal wars that continued till his death and ended in the political disintegration of the empire. In 843, following Louis' death, his sons concluded in Werden a treaty on a new division of the empire. The Werden treaty virtually laid the foundation of France, Germany and Italy—three modern states of Western and Central Europe.
Formulas were models for drawing up legal deeds and transactions relating to property and other matters in the Frankish state between the end of the 6th and the end of the 9th centuries. Several collections of such formulas have survived to this day. That quoted by Engels is included in the collection Formulae Turonenses vulgo Sirmondicae dictae. Engels may have taken it from Roth's book Geschichte des Beneficialwesens..., p. 379, Note 51.

In his description of Charlemagne's Capitularies (Capitulare a. 847, Capitulare a. 813, Capitulare a. 816) Engels makes use of the material in Paul Roth's Geschichte des Beneficialwesens..., pp. 380-81, notes 58 and 61.

The reference is to the Annales Bertiniani, an important source on the history of the Carolingian empire. The Annales, which owe their name to St. Bertin Monastery in France, are a chronicle covering the period from 741 to 882 and consisting of three parts written by different authors. The Annales advocate the interests of the French Carolingians and support their claim to the territory of the East Frankish kingdom. The Annales Bertiniani were published in the well-known series Monumenta Germaniae historica.

Engels' description of the Annales Bertiniani is based on Roth's Geschichte des Beneficialwesens..., p. 385, Note 81.

This refers to the rising of free and semi-free Saxon peasants-freelings and lites or the Stellinga (from Stellinger—Sons of the Old Law), which took place in 841-843 and was directed against the feudal order in Saxony.

Charlemagne was crowned Roman Emperor in 800.

Engels' manuscript The Franconian Dialect remained unfinished and was not printed during the author's lifetime. It was first published by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Friedrich Engels, Der fränkische Dialekt, Moskau, 1935 (Фридрих Энгельс, Франкский диалект, Москва, 1935), the German and Russian given parallel.

Here it is published in English for the first time.

Hêliand, a literary monument of the ancient Saxon language dating back to the 9th century, is an abridged version of the Gospel. Its author was presumably a monk from the Werden Monastery on the Ruhr.

Two manuscripts of the Hêliand are extant: one originating in Munich (dating back to the 9th century); the other named after Cotton, an English collector of antiquities, dates back to the 10th and 11th centuries. The title of the manuscript, which literally means Saviour, was provided by the German linguist Johann Schmeller in 1830. The Hêliand was first published by Moritz Heyne in 1866 in Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Litteratur-Denkmäler. Vol. II. Altniederdeutsche Denkmäler, Part I.

The Werden tax registers (Die Freckenhorster Heberolle) got their name from the monastery in Freckenhorst, a town to the southeast of Münster. They were published by Moritz Heyne in Kleinere altniederdeutsche Denkmäler, Paderborn, 1867, pp. 65-82.

The reference is to the glosses, i.e. explanation of obscure and unusual words, which the Dutch philologist Justus Lipsius copied in 1599 from the 9th-century manuscript of the psalms. The Lipsius Glosses (Glossae Lipsianae) were published by Moritz Heyne in Kleinere altniederdeutsche Denkmäler, Paderborn, 1867, pp. 41-58.
The Paderborn records, relics of local law relating to the 10th and 11th centuries, were published in 1831-32 by the German historian Paul Wigand in Archiv für Geschichte und Alterthumskunde Westphalens, Vol. 5, Lemgo, 1831, and in Die Provinzialrechte der Fürstenthümer Paderborn und Corvey in Westphalen, vols 2 and 3, Leipzig, 1832.

This refers to the rendering of the Gospel made by Otfrid, a monk from Weissenburg, between 863 and 871. Otfrid's Gospel (Liber Evangeliorum domini gratia theotisce conscriptus) is one of the first relics of ancient German literature. Its language is regarded as a southern variety of the Rhenish Franconian dialect.


The reference is to the manuscript dating back to the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th century and expressing a formula of the baptismal vow (Taufgelöbnis). Engels quotes this manuscript according to Kleinere altniederdeutsche Denkmäler, published by Moritz Heyne. Paderborn, 1867, p. 85.

In 1234, in the battle of Altenesch, the combined forces of the Count of Oldenburg, other princes and of Archbishop of Bremen defeated the Eastern Frisians, who lived between the Weser and the Jade, and annexed their lands to Oldenburg.

The reference is to the bourgeois revolution of 1566-1609 in the Netherlands. It combined the national liberation war against absolutist Spain with the anti-feudal struggle and ended in victory in the north of the country (now the territory of the Netherlands) where the first bourgeois republic in Europe was formed.

Manneken-Pis—a statue of the boy crowning the ancient fountain in Brussels, the work of Jérôme Duquesnoy, a Flemish sculptor of the 17th century.

A reference to the Topographische Special-Karte von Deutschland, published by Gottlob Daniel Reymann, continued by C. W. von Oesfeld and F. Handtke, Glogau, n.d. Engels made use of separate sheets designated by the name of the principal town and the number of the corresponding square or section of the map.


The geographical data which Engels refers to at various points in his work are taken mainly from Map 32 (Deutschland's Gaue. II. Mittleres Lothringen).

On September 27, 1856, soon after Georg Weerth's death, Engels wrote to Marx about his firm intention to write an obituary and have it published in one of the Berlin newspapers (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 72). However, this proved impossible in the reactionary situation of the 1850s.

Engels fulfilled his intention 27 years later. The essay about the revolutionary poet that appeared in the newspaper Sozialdemokrat on June 7, 1883 was entitled "Song of the Apprentices" by Georg Weerth (1846). In the Second Russian Edition of the Works and in the editions in other languages that followed the title of the article was changed in conformity with its subject-matter.

Between December 1843 and April 1846 Weerth was a clerk at the Bradford branch of the textile firm Passavant and Co.

From April 1846 Weerth was employed by the Hamburg trade firm Emanuel und Sohn with offices in England (Bradford), France, the Netherlands and Belgium.

In this article devoted to an historical and linguistic analysis of the last book of the New Testament, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* or *The Apocalypse*, Engels examines questions relating to the history of early Christianity. He had dealt with some of the same problems previously in the article "Bruno Bauer and Early Christianity" (see present edition, Vol. 24); later, in 1894, Engels analysed them more thoroughly in the article "On the History of Early Christianity" (present edition, Vol. 27).

The Tübingen school, comprising a group of liberal German Protestant theologians, was founded in 1830 by Ferdinand Christian Baur, a professor at Tübingen University. (As distinct from the group of Tübingen theologians that existed in the last quarter of the 18th century, it is sometimes called the neo-Tübingen school.) Its adherents engaged in a critical study of ancient Christian literature, notably the New Testament. Without essentially abandoning the confines of Christian theology, they were the first to inquire into the sources of the New Testament. At the beginning of his philosophical career David Strauss also belonged to the Tübingen school, but subsequently his criticism became much more radical. The school disintegrated by the 1860s.

Engels gave a detailed description of this school in his article "On the History of Early Christianity" (present edition, Vol. 27).

The Stoics—disciples of philosopher Zeno of Citium, who taught at the Stoa (Painted Porch) in Athens. Hence the name of this one of the principal schools of Hellenistic and Roman philosophy founded in the late 4th and early 3rd centuries B.C. Among its followers were such ancient philosophers as Seneca (1st cent. A.D.), Philo of Alexandria (1st cent. A.D.) and Marcus Aurelius (2nd cent. A.D.).

The Stoics sought to corroborate the inner independence of human personality, yet at the same time they displayed an extreme sense of resignation towards the surrounding world and made no attempts to change it. Stoicism introduced a strict division of philosophy into logic, physics and ethics. It exerted a considerable influence on the formation of the Christian religion.

Ferdinand Benary gave a course of lectures in Berlin University and simultaneously published them in the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* that appeared in Berlin (Nos. 17-20 and 30-32 for 1841).

This Preface to the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 477-519) was written for the third German authorised edition, the first to appear after Marx's death.


Engels wrote this article for the newspaper *Der Sozialdemokrat* on the first anniversary of Marx's death.

This article was published in English for the first time in Marx K. and

68 Referring here and below to the *Code Napoléon*, Engels meant the entire system of bourgeois law as represented by five codes (civil, civil procedure, commercial, criminal and criminal procedure) promulgated in 1804-10 during Napoleon's reign. These codes were introduced into the regions of Western and South-Western Germany conquered by France and remained in force in the Rhine Province even after its incorporation into Prussia in 1815.

69 The *Prussian Law* (*Das Allgemeine Landrecht für die Preussischen Staaten*) was promulgated in 1794. It included civil, commercial, credit, maritime and insurance law as well as criminal, ecclesiastical, state and administrative law, and endorsed the obsolete legal standards of semi-feudal Prussia. To a large extent the Prussian Law remained in force until the introduction of the civil code in 1900.

70 After the March 1848 Revolution Gustav Adolph Schlöffel, a German democratic student, began to publish the *Volksfreund* newspaper in Berlin. On April 19, in its issue No. 5, the newspaper carried two of his articles in which he attacked private property and defended the rights of the working people. For this Schlöffel was brought before a court of law and sentenced to six months' imprisonment in a fortress on a charge of incitement to revolt.

71 The reference is to the Camphausen-Hansemann liberal ministry formed in Prussia on March 29, 1848.

72 Engels is referring to the articles in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* devoted to a critique of the French and Berlin National Assemblies. Some of these articles were written by Marx (see present edition, vols 7, 8); Engels summarised this critique in his work *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany* (see present edition, Vol. 11, p. 79).

73 On February 24, 1848 Louis Philippe was overthrown in France.

On February 24 (March 7), 1848, having received news of the victory of the February Revolution in France, Nicholas I ordered a partial mobilisation in Russia in preparation for the struggle against the revolution in Europe.

74 A series of articles "Die schlesische Milliarde" written by Wilhelm Wolff, a friend and associate of Marx and Engels, appeared in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Nos. 252, 255, 256, 258, 264, 270-72 and 281 between March 22 and April 25, 1849. In 1886 these articles with some changes were published as a separate pamphlet with Engels' Introduction (see this volume, pp. 341-51). A detailed analysis of these articles is given by Engels in his work "Wilhelm Wolff" (see present edition, Vol. 24).

75 On June 13, 1849, the Party of the Mountain organised in Paris a peaceful protest demonstration against the despatch of French troops to Italy to restore the power of the Pope in Rome and consolidate French influence in that country. The proposed troop despatch was a violation of the French constitution which prohibited the use of the army against the freedom and independence of other nations.

The vacillations and indecision of its leaders led to the demonstration's failure, and it was dispersed by government troops. Many leaders of the Mountain were arrested and deported or were forced to emigrate from France.
The Legislative Assembly adopted a number of laws suppressing democratic rights.

Concerning Engels’ part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849, see *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 147-239).

*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* is one of Engels’ most important works. It is based on a detailed synopsis made by Marx in 1880-81 of Lewis H. Morgan’s book, *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery, Through Barbarism to Civilization*, London, 1877. Marx’s synopsis contained his critical notes, his own propositions and also some factual material taken from other sources. Engels assumed that Marx had planned to write a special work on the history of mankind in the early period of its development using Morgan’s book as a basis. Having acquainted himself with Marx’s synopsis and Morgan’s book, Engels deemed it necessary to write such a work, regarding it as the fulfilment of Marx’s behest. On March 24, 1884 Engels wrote to Karl Kautsky: “Actually I am indebted to Marx for it and can incorporate his notes” (see present edition, Vol. 47). In his work on the book, Engels made use of almost all Marx’s notes, pointing this out in every case, and also of the structure of Marx’s synopsis, which differed from that of Morgan’s book. Engels relied, particularly in the first three chapters, on the factual material from Morgan’s observations of the life of the North American Indians and in several cases on his arguments and conclusions; he also employed information provided by other scholars about peoples at the same stage of development. In chapters IV-VI, in addition to the information from Morgan’s book, Engels used a number of specialised works on ancient history. Chapters VII and VIII are based exclusively on Engels’ own studies of the early history of the Germans (see this volume, pp. 6-107). Chapter IX, the last one, contains conclusions drawn by Engels himself.

The first edition of *The Origin of the Family* appeared early in October 1884 in Zurich, since it was impossible to publish the book in Germany given the Anti-Socialist Law. The two editions that followed (in 1886 and 1889) were published in Stuttgart without any changes. Polish, Romanian, Italian, Danish and Serbian translations were issued in the latter half of the 1880s.

The fourth edition of the book, with considerable addenda and certain changes made by Engels on the basis of the latest findings in the field of archaeology, ethnography and anthropology, appeared in 1891. In this volume all the essential differences in reading occurring in the 1884 and 1891 editions are given in footnotes.


All references in the text of the present volume are given according to this edition.

*Pueblo* (Sp.—people, population) is the name of the four linguistic groups of Indian tribes who lived on the territory of New Mexico (now the South-Western part of the USA). Originally the Spanish conquerors applied this name to five-
or six-storey fortress-like houses inhabited by Indian communities; later this name was also applied to the inhabitants of these unusual villages. The Pueblo culture had its heyday in the 12th and 13th centuries. p. 137

80 This letter of Marx's is not extant. Engels mentions it in his letter to Karl Kautsky of April 11, 1884 (see present edition, Vol. 47). p. 147

81 The reference is to the libretto of the operatic tetralogy *Ring of the Nibelungs* (*Der Ring des Nibelungen*) composed by Richard Wagner, the subject of which was taken from the Scandinavian epic *Edda* and the German epic *Nibelungenlied*.

The *Nibelungenlied* is the ancient German heroic epic based on myths and lays. Written versions of the song appeared only in the 13th-16th centuries. The *Nibelungenlied* penetrated into Scandinavia (6th-8th cent.) where it found reflection in the songs of *Edda*.

The events that accompanied the great migration of peoples (see Note 5), notably the invasion of Europe by the Huns (5th cent.), served as the historical basis of the *Nibelungenlied*, though its final character owed more to the conditions of life in Germany in the 12th century. p. 147

82 The *Ögisdrekkja* (Lokasenna) is a song from the first part of *The Elder Edda*, known as *Songs about Gods*. The *Ögisdrekkja* describes the quarrel between Loki, the god of fire, and other gods at a feast given by the sea giant Ogir.

*The Elder Edda* is a collection of epic poems and songs about the lives and deeds of the Scandinavian gods and heroes. It has come down to us in a manuscript dating back to the 13th century, discovered in 1643 by the Icelandic Bishop B. Sveinsson. p. 147

83 *Asa* and *Vana*—gods in Scandinavian mythology.

The *Ynglinga Saga* is the first of the 16 sagas in the book about Norwegian kings (from ancient times to the 12th century) entitled *Heimskringla*. It was written by Snorri Sturluson, an Icelandic poet and chronicler, in the first half of the 13th century.

p. 148

84 According to this system each tribe was divided into two or four marriage classes (sections). Marriage was allowed only between certain specified pairs of these classes. Children born of this marriage belonged to the third marriage class which was part of the tribe including either a maternal or a paternal marriage class. Such a division restricted marriages between close relatives.

p. 151

85 Wright's letters found in Morgan's archives were published in the magazine *American Anthropologist*. New Series, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1933. p. 158

86 *Saturnalian feasts* were held annually in Ancient Rome in honour of Saturn, the god of agriculture. They began on December 17, after the harvest, and were accompanied by carnivals and festivals, with the entire population taking part, including slaves who were allowed to sit at the table alongside free citizens. The cult of fertility presupposed the freedom of sexual intercourse during Saturnalian feasts.

p. 159

87 This refers to the decision which King Ferdinand V of Spain, acting as mediator between peasants and seigniors, took under the pressure of the insurgent peasants of Northern Catalonia in 1484.

The decision is known as the Guadalupe decree after the name of the monastery in Estremadura, where, on April 21, 1486, the King met authorised representatives of the peasants and the landlords. The decree granted the
peasants personal freedom, but for the right to keep land holdings they had to pay their landlords high redemption fees. The decree abolished the jurisdiction of the landlords and several humiliating feudal practices. A number of burdensome duties had to be redeemed.  

p. 161

88 The Pravda of Yaroslav, or the Ancient Pravda, is the first part of the Russian Pravda, the code of laws of ancient Rus. It appeared in the first half of the 11th century and is associated with the name of Prince Yaroslav the Wise of Kiev. The Pravda is based on the common law of the Eastern Slavs in the period of early feudalism and reflects the social and economic relations of the 11th and 12th centuries.

p. 167

89 The Dalmatian Laws, or the Poljica Statute, were in force in Poljica, a historical part of Dalmatia, up to the beginning of the 19th century. The first articles of the Statute were drawn up in the first half of the 15th century. The document reflects the norms of the criminal, civil and procedural law as well as the social and economic relations existing in the communities of Poljica in the 15th-18th centuries.

p. 167

90 Engels may have taken the information on family communities in France from M. M. Kovalevsky's book Tableau des origines et de l'évolution de la famille et de la propriété, Stockholm, 1890.

p. 168

91 Calpullis—a territorial community of the Aztecs (ancient Mexico) based on the common ownership of land. Part of the land was assigned to individual families each of which embraced several generations inhabiting a common dwelling and constituted a household community.

p. 168

92 The Helots, part of the agricultural population of Ancient Sparta subjugated by the Dorians, belonged to the state and were attached to the land owned by the Spartiates—a class of citizens of Ancient Sparta enjoying full civil rights. Helots could be neither sold nor killed; they owned the means of production and worked on their plots of land.

p. 172

93 The hierodules—temple slaves and attendants in Ancient Greece and the Greek colonies. In many places, including Asia Minor and Corinth, the female temple slaves were engaged in prostitution.

p. 174

94 This refers to the troubadour poetry of Provence (Southern France) between the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 13th centuries.

p. 177

95 Engels is referring to the nine poems that have survived from the lyrical cycle attributed to Wolfram von Eschenbach and written in the Tagelieder genre, as well as his epic poem Parzival and two unfinished poems Titurel and Willehalm.

p. 178

96 Daphnis and Chloe—heroes of the ancient Greek novel (2nd-3rd century); no information concerning its author, Longus, is extant.

p. 184

97 Gutrun (Kudrun)—a German epic poem of the 13th century. It has survived in a manuscript dating back to the 16th century and was not discovered until the beginning of the 19th century.

p. 185

98 The reference is to the conquest of Mexico by Spanish conquistadors in 1519-21.

p. 196

99 New Mexicans—see Note 79.

p. 200

100 The main works written by Georg Ludwig Maurer are: Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark-, Hof-, Dorf- und Stadt-Verfassung und der öffentlichen Gewalt, Munich,
1854; Geschichteder Markenverfassung in Deutschland, Erlangen, 1856; Geschichteder Fronhöfe, der Bauernhöfe und der Hofverfassung in Deutschland, vols I-IV, Erlangen, 1862-63; Geschichteder Dorfverfassung in Deutschland, vols I-II, Erlangen, 1865-66; Geschichteder Städteverfassung in Deutschland, vols I-IV, Erlangen, 1869-71.

101 The "Neutral Nations" was the name of a 17th-century tribe related to the Iroquois which lived on the northern shore of Lake Erie. It was given this name by the French colonists because it remained neutral in the war between the Iroquois proper and the Hurons. The war ended in victory for the Iroquois in 1651.

102 In January 1879, the British troops invaded Zululand (South Africa) with the aim of conquering this country. On January 22, the Zulu army under Cetschwayo (Cetywayo) defeated the colonialist troops near Isandhlwana, inflicting heavy losses. It was only after the arrival of fresh reinforcements that the British troops succeeded in finally defeating the Zulus in the summer of 1879.

In 1881, the Nubians, Arabs and other nationalities of the Sudan rose up against the British colonialists, Turkish and Egyptian authorities and native feudal lords. The uprising was led by Mohammed Ahmed, who proclaimed himself "Mahdi" (saviour). On November 5, 1883, the ten-thousand-strong expeditionary corps under General Hicks was defeated and routed by the insurgents near the town of El Obeid. The uprising lasted till 1898-99.

103 The reference is to Demosthenes' speech in court, Against Eubulides (LVII), in which he mentions the ancient custom of laying to rest only persons of the given gens in gentle burial places.

104 This passage written in Marx's synopsis in German is a concise summary of Morgan's following argument:

"Although these [Grote's] observations seem to imply that they [the Grecian gentes] are no older than the then existing mythology ... in the light of the facts presented, the gentes are seen to have existed long before this mythology was developed—before Jupiter or Neptune, Mars or Venus were conceived in the human mind" (Lewis H. Morgan, Ancient Society, London, 1877, p. 228).

105 In the passage which Engels quotes from Marx's synopsis, part of the quotation (from the words "The system of consanguinity" to "the relationships of all the members of a gens to each other" and from the words "This fell into desuetude" to "a purely fictitious, fanciful creation of the brain") is a slightly abridged version of Morgan's text (Lewis H. Morgan, Ancient Society, pp. 233-34).

106 See Note 79.

107 Thetes, the fourth, and lowest, class of Athenian citizens, were admitted to civil offices by the law on lower electoral qualifications adopted in 477 B.C.

108 The reference is to the metoikos, or aliens who settled in a Greek city state (polis). Being personally free, they were denied political rights, could not marry Athenian citizens and, as a rule, could not own real estate and land on the territory of the city state where they settled. The metoikos were obliged to have "patrons" from among the Athenian citizens, to pay a special tax to the state and serve in the army.
In the 5th-4th centuries B.C. the *metoikos* formed a considerable part of the urban population in Attica and played an important role in its economic life, particularly in trade.  

109 The reference is to the reforms carried out by Cleisthenes in 510-509 B.C. They deprived the gentile nobility of its supremacy in governing Athens and abolished the last remnants of the gentile constitution, since the population was now divided according to the territorial principle, and not according to the gentile principle as before. The reforms increased the importance of the urban population; many *metoikos* (see Note 108) and freedmen who engaged in trade and handicrafts received civic rights.  

110 Pisistratus, who belonged to an impoverished aristocratic family, usurped power in Athens in 560 B.C. and established a dictatorial regime, becoming a tyrant. This regime existed with intervals (Pisistratus was twice driven out of Athens and returned again) until his death in 527 B.C., and then up to 510 B.C. when his son Hippius was banished and the slave-owning democracy headed by Cleisthenes won the day in Athens. Pisistratus' efforts to defend the interests of small and medium landowners and penalise the gentile aristocracy did not give rise to any serious changes in the political structure of the Athenian state.  

111 The *Laws of the Twelve Tables* (*Leges duodecim tabularum*) were enacted in 451-450 B.C. by the Committee of Decemvirs. Originally the laws were carved on ten tables, later two more tables were added. The laws preserved remnants of the gentile system and reflected the social relations of Ancient Rome, referring mainly to civil and criminal law and legal procedure. They were used as the basis for the further development of Roman civil law.  

112 The reference is to the battle in Teutoburg Forest (A.D. 9) fought between the Germanic tribes led by the Cherusci chief Arminius in revolt against Rome and the Roman legions commanded by Quintilius Varus. The Roman troops were routed and their general killed.  

113 This refers to the end of the rule of Appius Claudius, head of the Committee of Decemvirs which enacted the Laws of the Twelve Tables in 451-450 B.C. (see Note 111). However, abuses of power on the part of Appius Claudius led to an insurrection by the plebeians; he was arrested and died in prison. The *Second Punic War* (218-201 B.C.) was one of the three wars between Rome and Carthage, the two largest slave-owning states of antiquity. Rome sought to abolish Carthage's domination of trade in the Western Mediterranean and indeed defeated it.  

114 The reference is to the comparative tables of ancient and modern measures and also of monetary units, given at the end of A. Durcau de la Malle's *Économie politique des Romains*, Vol. I.  

115 At several points in this and the next chapters Engels makes use of his unfinished works "On the Early History of the Germans" and "The Frankish Period" (see this volume, pp. 6-107) and the article "The Mark" (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 439-56).  

116 The conquest of Wales by the English was completed in 1283. However, Wales retained its autonomy and was united with England in the mid-16th century.  

117 In 1869-70 Engels devoted himself to a major work on the history of Ireland,

118 In September 1891 Engels toured Scotland and Ireland.

119 A reference to the rebellion of the Scottish highlanders in 1745 caused by oppression and eviction from the land carried out in the interests of the Anglo-Scottish landed aristocracy and bourgeoisie. Part of the nobility in the Scottish Highlands, who supported the claims of the overthrown House of Stuart to the English Crown (the official aim of the insurgents was to enthrone Charles Edward, the grandson of James II), took advantage of the discontent among the highlanders. The suppression of the rebellion put an end to the clan system in the Scottish Highlands and resulted in further evictions.

120 See Note 5.

121 See Note 18.

122 *Burgundian law* (*Lex Burgundionum*)—a code of legislative acts promulgated by the Burgundian kings in the second half of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th century. It regulated the major aspects of the life of Burgundian society and its relations with the Gallic and Roman population.

123 *The Hildebrand Song* (*Hildebrandslied*)—an 8th-century German epic poem, of which only a few passages have survived.

124 *The Völuspá* (*Vision of the Seeress*)—the best-known song from *The Elder Edda* (see Note 82), depicting the history of the world from its creation to the final destruction—the “Twilight of the Gods”—and its second birth—the triumph of peace and justice.

125 In 69-70, Claudius Julius Civilis, chief of the Batavians, who lived at the Rhine estuary and were allied with the Romans, led an insurrection against Rome. It was joined by other Germanic peoples and some of the Gauls. The insurrection was sparked off by the growing taxes, increased levies to the army and the abuse of power by Roman officials. Initially the insurgents achieved considerable success. The Gaulish aristocracy, however, continued to support Rome, and this spelled defeat for the insurgents. The insurrection was quelled, but the Batavians were freed from taxes.

126 *Codex Laureshamensis* (*Lorch Capitulary*)—a collection of the copies of letters patent and privileges belonging to the Lorch Monastery which was founded in the latter half of the 8th century in the Frankish state. A large feudal estate in South-Western Germany, it was located close to the town of Worms. The collection was compiled in the 12th century and is an important historical document on the system of peasant and feudal landownership in the 8th-9th centuries.

127 See Note 5.

128 The reference may have been to the defeats which the retinues of Odoacer, the founder of the first barbarian kingdom on the territory of Italy, suffered from the Ostgoth leader Theodoric in the battles of Aquileja and Verona in 489. As a result of these defeats Odoacer lost power in Italy and was killed.
129 The reference is to the provinces which were part of the Roman state. p. 247

130 Benefices—plots of land bestowed as rewards—were a transitional form of holding, on the road to feudal ownership. This form of remuneration became common practice in the Frankish state following Charles Martel's reform on benefices in the 730s. Gradually the beneficiaries succeeded in turning these life-long grants into fiefs, or hereditary feudal estates. A detailed description of the role which the system of benefices played in the development of feudalism is given by Engels in his unfinished work The Frankish Period (see this volume, pp. 58-81). p. 252

131 Gau counts (Gaugrafen)—royal officers appointed to administer districts or counties in the Frankish state. They were invested with judicial power, collected taxes and led the troops during military campaigns. For their service they received one-third of the royal income collected in the given county and were rewarded with landed estates. Gradually the counts became feudal seigneurs endowed with sovereign powers, particularly after 877, when the office was formally proclaimed hereditary. p. 252

132 See Note 37. p. 252

133 See Note 37. p. 253

134 Angariae—compulsory services performed by residents of the Roman Empire, who were obliged to supply carriers and horses for state transports. p. 253

135 The reference is to the economic organisation of vast estates owned by Charlemagne. It was established by the so-called Capitulary on Royal Estates (capitulare de villis) promulgated in about 800. Special attention was given to more effective control over the fulfilment of numerous obligations imposed on the peasants working on such estates, as well as to the preservation of the estates themselves and of profits received from them. All this testified to the growth of feudalism in Frankish society. p. 254

136 Commendation—an act by which a peasant commended himself to the "patronage" of a small landowner or a small landowner to the "patronage" of a powerful feudal lord in accordance with the established practice (military and other services for the benefit of the "patron", the transfer to him of a plot of land in return for a conventional holding). This meant the loss of personal freedom for the peasants and made small landowners vassals of the powerful feudal lords. This practice, widespread in Europe from the 8th and 9th centuries onwards, led, on the one hand, to the transformation of the peasants into serfs and, on the other, to the consolidation of the feudal hierarchy. p. 254

137 The Hildebrand Song—see Note 123.

The Battle of Hastings took place on October 14, 1066 between the troops of William, Duke of Normandy, which invaded England, and the Anglo-Saxon army of King Harold. The poorly armed Anglo-Saxons were defeated and King Harold killed. In December 1066 William took London, was crowned King of England and came to be known as William the Conqueror. p. 262

138 Dithmarschen—a district in the south-west of present-day Schleswig-Holstein. It was remarkable for its peculiar historical development; in particular, up to the second half of the 19th century there were still survivals of patriarchal customs
and the communal system was preserved among the peasants even after the conquest by Danish and Holstein feudal lords in the 16th century. p. 269

139 Engels wrote this introductory note for the 1884 edition of Marx's *Wage Labour and Capital* (see present edition, Vol. 9, pp. 197-228); in 1891 Engels incorporated it into his Introduction to the new edition of this work by Marx (see present edition, Vol. 27).

This note was published in English for the first time in K. Marx, *Wage Labour and Capital*, Modern Press, London, 1885. p. 277

140 The German Workers' Society was founded by Marx and Engels in Brussels at the end of August 1847, its aim being the political education of the German workers who lived in Belgium and dissemination of the ideas of scientific communism among them. With Marx, Engels and their followers at its head, the Society became the legal centre of the revolutionary proletarian forces in Belgium. Its most active members belonged to the Communist League. The Society played an important part in founding the Brussels Democratic Association (see Note 193). After the February 1848 revolution in France, the Belgian authorities arrested and banished many of its members. p. 277

141 Engels' letters written between August and October 1884 show that he did a great deal of work in preparing Marx's *Poverty of Philosophy* for publication in German. (The book was written and published in French in 1847 and was not republished in full during Marx's lifetime.) Engels edited the translation made by Eduard Bernstein and Karl Kautsky and supplied a number of notes to it.

The first German edition of Marx's book appeared in the second half of January 1885 and, a little earlier, at the beginning of January, Engels published his Preface in the magazine *Die Neue Zeit* under the title "Marx und Rodbertus". It was also included in the second German edition of the book which appeared in 1892 with a special preface written by Engels (see present edition, Vol. 27). p. 278

142 Marx wrote the statement about the break with *Der Social-Demokrat* on February 18, 1865 and sent it to Engels, who fully endorsed it and returned it to Marx with his signature; on February 23, 1865 Marx sent the statement to the editors of the newspaper. This was occasioned by Schweitzer's series of articles *Das Ministerium Bismarck* in which he expressed overt support for Bismarck's policy of unifying Germany under Prussian supremacy. Marx took measures to make Schweitzer publish the statement. It was published in many papers, among them the *Barmer Zeitung* and *Elberfelder Zeitung* on February 26. Schweitzer was forced to publish this statement in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 29, March 3, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 80). p. 278

143 The reference is to Engels' Preface to the first German edition of Vol. II of Marx's *Capital*, which Engels completed on May 5, 1885 (see present edition, Vol. 36). p. 279

144 See the anonymous pamphlet: *The Source and Remedy of the National Difficulties, deduced from principles of political economy, in a letter to Lord John Russell*, London, 1821.

For more details about the pamphlet see Engels' Preface to Vol. II of Marx's *Capital* (present edition, Vol. 36). p. 279

The reference is to the people who took part in publishing the literary legacy of Rodbertus-Jagetzow, in particular his work *Das Kapital. Vierter socialer Brief an von Kirchmann*, Berlin, 1884; the publisher of this work and the author of the introduction to it was Theophil Kozak; the preface was written by the German vulgar economist Adolf Wagner.

Engels is referring to the preface to K. Rodbertus-Jagetzow's work, *Das Kapital. Vierter socialer Brief an von Kirchmann*, Berlin, 1884, pp. VII-VIII, in which Adolf Wagner wrote: "Rodbertus evinces here such a power of abstract thinking as is possessed only by the greatest masters."

§ 110 of the German Imperial Criminal Code promulgated in 1871 stipulated a fine of up to 600 marks or imprisonment for a term of up to 2 years for a public appeal in writing to disobey the laws and decrees operating in the German Empire.

The second French edition of *The Poverty of Philosophy*, which was being prepared by Marx's daughter Laura Lafargue, appeared in Paris only after Engels' death, in 1896.

Engels wrote this article on January 25, 1885 for *Der Sozialdemokrat*. About the same time he sent a letter to Paul Lafargue describing the same facts and expressing the same ideas more concisely and in somewhat different terms (see present edition, Vol. 47). Lafargue passed this letter on to Jules Guesde who drew on it in writing his article published as a leader in *Cri du Peuple*, No. 461 on January 31, 1885. Guesde quoted a long passage from Engels' letter without naming him, just saying that he had received this letter from London from "one of the veterans of our great social battles". The article was reprinted in the Polish socialist press and in the USA.

On January 13 (1), 1885, Russia and Prussia exchanged notes on extradition of persons accused of criminal offences against the monarchs of the contracting parties or members of their families, as well as of persons found guilty of manufacturing or storing explosives.

Olga Novikova, a Russian journalist who lived in London in 1876 and 1877, took an active part in the campaign against the attempts by Disraeli's Conservative government to involve Britain in the war against Russia on the side of Turkey. She had contacts with the ruling circles of Russia and support among the members of the British Liberal Party, Gladstone in particular. The campaign, which swept both Britain and Russia, helped to prevent Britain entering the war. Engels is referring to Olga Novikova's article "The Russianization of England".

Engels wrote this article for the magazine *The Commonweal*; later he translated it into German and had it published in *Die Neue Zeit* (June 1885). Subsequently he incorporated it into the Appendix to the 1887 American edition of *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* (see this volume, pp. 399-405) and in 1892 into the prefaces to the English and the second German editions of this work (see present edition, Vol. 27).

The reference is to the movement for the repeal of the Corn Laws introduced in the interests of the English landed aristocracy as far back as the 15th century. The maintenance of high import tariffs on corn in order to maintain high prices on the home market prevented the growth of capitalist profit. In 1838 the Manchester factory owners Cobden and Bright founded the Anti-Corn Law League, which demanded lower corn tariffs and unlimited
freedom of trade for the purpose of weakening the economic and political power of the landed aristocracy and reducing agricultural workers' wages. The battle over the Corn Laws ended with their repeal in 1846.  


The People's Charter containing the demands of the Chartists was published on May 8, 1838 in the form of a Bill to be submitted to Parliament. It consisted of six points: universal suffrage (for men of 21 years of age and over), annual elections to Parliament, secret ballots, equal constituencies, abolition of property qualifications for parliamentary candidates, and salaries for M.P.s. In 1839 and 1842, petitions for the Charter were rejected by Parliament.

The reference is to the Chartists' peaceful march to Parliament planned for April 10, 1848, in order to hand in the third petition concerning the People's Charter. The government, however, prohibited the demonstration and took steps to prevent it by concentrating military units in the capital and mobilising a whole army of “special constables” from among the bourgeoisie. Many of the Chartist leaders wavered, abandoned their intention of staging the march and persuaded those who had assembled to disperse.

The reference is to the Reform Bill which was finally passed by the British Parliament in June 1832. The Reform Act of 1832 consisted of three acts adopted for England and Wales on June 7, for Scotland on July 17, and for Ireland on August 17, 1832. It was directed against the political monopoly of the landed and finance aristocracy and enabled the industrial bourgeoisie to be duly represented in Parliament. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, the main forces in the struggle for the reform, remained disfranchised.

See Note 154.

The expression the “workshop of the world”, first used with regard to England by Benjamin Disraeli in his speech to the House of Commons on March 15, 1838, was current in the 19th century.

The reference is to the factory legislation that appeared in England in the first third of the 19th century in connection with the factory system of the capitalist mode of production and the struggle of the proletariat for legislative regulation of working conditions. The first Factory Acts (1802, 1819, 1833, 1844) limited the employment of child labour in the textile industry. The Act of 1833 introduced a special office of factory inspectors who had the right to supervise the operation of factory legislation and the right to penalise manufacturers violating the Factory Acts. Of great importance was the Act of 1847 which limited the working day of women and children employed in the textile industry to ten hours.

The Reform of 1867 granted the franchise in towns to all house-owners, lease-holders and tenants residing in the same place not less than a year and paying a rent of not less than £10. The property qualification for voters in the counties was lowered to £12 rent per year. Voting rights were also granted to a section of the industrial workers.

The Reform of 1884 extended the provisions of the 1867 Reform to rural areas, and voting rights were granted to a section of rural population. As a
result of the two reforms, the number of electors, however, comprised just 13 per cent of the country's total population. The rural and urban poor and women were still deprived of voting rights. p. 297

163 The *British Association for the Advancement of Science* was founded in 1831 and continues to exist to this day. It publishes accounts of its annual meetings in the quarterly magazine *The Advancement of Science.* p. 300

164 On December 2, 1851 Louis Bonaparte carried out a coup d'état by dissolving the Legislative Assembly.

On January 14, 1852 a new constitution was introduced which conferred all state power upon the President, elected for ten years; the composition and legislative functions of the Council of State, the Legislative Corps and the Senate were placed under his direct control. This constitution in fact restored the regime of the empire in France. On December 2, 1852 the Second Republic was abolished and the Prince-President was formally proclaimed Emperor of the French under the name of Napoleon III. Thus the coup d'état of December 2, 1851 had led to the establishment of the Bonapartist Second Empire. p. 302

165 The pamphlet, *Karl Marx vor den Kölner Geschwornen. Prozeß gegen den Ausschuß der rheinischen Demokraten wegen Aufrufs zum bewaffneten Widerstand*, appeared early in October 1885 as the second instalment of the “Social-Democratic Library” published in German, first in Zurich, and later in London (1885-90). The pamphlet reprinted the newspaper reports on the trial from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Nos. 226 and 231-33 of February 19, 25, 27 and 28, 1849. p. 304

166 This expression was used in the royal proclamation of March 21, 1848, in which Frederick William IV declared his readiness to stand “at the head [an die Spitze] of the whole fatherland in order to save Germany”. During the campaign for the unification of Germany this expression was used to describe Prussia’s intention to unite the country under its supremacy. p. 305

167 The trial of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* began on February 7, 1849. Karl Marx, editor-in-chief, Frederick Engels, co-editor, and Hermann Korf, responsible publisher, were tried by a Cologne jury court. They were accused of slandering Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel and calumniating the police officers who had arrested Gottschalk and Anneke, in the article “Arrests” published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 35, July 5, 1848 (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 177-79). Marx’s and Engels' defence counsel at the trial of February 7 was Karl Schneider II. The jury acquitted the defendants. For Marx’s and Engels’ speeches at this trial see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 304-22. p. 306

168 The Kreuz-Zeitung’s party—a name given from 1851 to the end of the 19th century to the extreme Right wing of the Prussian Conservative Party grouped round the *Neue Preussische (Kreuz-) Zeitung.* p. 307

169 The reference is to the formation of the North German Confederation under Prussian supremacy. As a result of the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, Austria and the South-German states remained outside the Confederation (see Note 171). The victory of Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War led to the national unification of Germany and the foundation of a German Empire in which the Prussian monarchy played the leading role. p. 307

170 The *National Liberal Party*, formed in the autumn of 1866 after a split in the
Party of Progress (see Note 401), was the mainstay of an alliance between the
Junkers and the bourgeoisie and advocated struggle for civil equality and
bourgeois-democratic freedoms.

The policy of the National Liberals showed that the German liberal
bourgeoisie had capitulated to Bismarck's government. Following the introduction
of Bismarck's half-hearted reforms, the National Liberal Party actively
supported the policy of colonial expansion, the military build-up and
suppression of the working-class movement. It continued its existence until the
November 1918 Revolution in Germany.

Engels is referring to the steps taken by Prussia on the eve of the
Austro-Prussian War of 1866: on June 8, Prussian troops invaded the Duchy of
Holstein which, according to the treaty between Prussia and Austria, was under
Austrian jurisdiction and belonged to the German Confederation. Following a
decision by the member-states of the German Confederation, initiated by
Austria, to mobilise the federal army, Prussia declared its withdrawal from the
Confederation and on June 16 began hostilities against Saxony, Hanover, the
Electorate of Hesse, and Nassau, all members of the Confederation. On
June 17, Austria declared war on Prussia.

The **German Confederation** (Deutscher Bund) was an ephemeral union of
German states formed by decision of the Congress of Vienna in June 1815 and
originally comprised 35 absolutist feudal states and 4 free cities. The central
body of the German Confederation was the Federal Diet which consisted of
representatives of the German states. Though it had no real power, it was
nevertheless a vehicle of feudal and monarchical reaction. For all practical
purposes the Confederation sealed Germany's political and economic fragment-
tion and retarded its development.

The German Confederation ceased to exist during the Austro-Prussian War
of 1866.

The reference is to the military and diplomatic steps which Bismarck's
government took in connection with the Austro-Prussian War of 1866.

In October 1865, Bismarck conducted unofficial negotiations with
Napoleon III in Biarritz, seeking to secure France's neutrality in the war he
was planning. Questions under discussion concerned a possible return to Italy
of Venetia, then belonging to Austria, as well as territorial concessions to
France at the expense of the Rhine provinces and other territories. These talks
resulted in the conclusion on April 8, 1866 of a treaty on an offensive and
defensive alliance between Prussia and Italy. The treaty provided for Italy to
attack Austria only after Prussia had started the war. If Prussia's attack did not
follow within three months, the treaty was to be invalid.

In July 1866, on Bismarck's initiative, a Hungarian legion was formed in
Silesia under the command of General Klapka. The aim of the legion, which
consisted of Hungarian émigrés and prisoners-of-war, was to invade Hungary
during the war. However, Klapka's legion, soon after crossing the frontier early
in August 1866, was recalled and disbanded in connection with the end of the
war.

After the conclusion of the Prague Peace Treaty on August 23, 1866,
Prussia annexed (on September 20) the Kingdom of Hanover, the Electorate of
Hesse-Kassel, the Duchy of Nassau and the city of Frankfurt am Main, which
had fought on Austria's side.

The Constitution of the North German Confederation (the Confederation
included 19 states and 3 free cities) was approved on April 17, 1867 by the
Constituent Reichstag of the Confederation (it held sessions between February 24 and April 17, 1867) and reaffirmed Prussia's de facto domination. The Prussian King was proclaimed President of the Confederation and Commander-in-Chief of the federal armed forces; he was also put in charge of foreign policy. The legislative powers of the Confederation's Reichstag, which was elected by universal suffrage, were extremely limited: the laws it adopted became valid only after approval by the Federal Council and endorsement by the President. This constitution later became the basis for the Constitution of the German Empire. Saxony, which fought on Austria's side in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, was forced after the war to become a member of the North German Confederation and then submit to this constitution.

The treaties of Tilsit were signed on July 7 and 9, 1807 by Napoleonic France and Russia and Prussia, members of the fourth anti-French coalition. The treaty imposed harsh terms on Prussia, which lost nearly half its territory to the German states dependent on France, was made to pay indemnities, and had its army reduced.

A reference to the Anti-Socialist Law, or Exceptional Law against the Socialists (Gesetz gegen die gemeingefährlichen Bestrebungen der Sozialdemokrate), introduced by Bismarck's government with the support of a majority in the Reichstag on October 21, 1878 for the purpose of combatting the socialist and working-class movement. The law deprived the Social-Democratic Party of Germany of its legal status; it prohibited all its organisations, workers' mass organisations and the socialist and workers' press, decreed confiscation of socialist literature, and subjected Social-Democrats to repression. The Social-Democratic Party, however, with the active assistance of Marx and Engels, managed to gain the upper hand over both the opportunist and "ultra-left" elements within its ranks. By correctly combining illegal work with utilising all legal possibilities the Party considerably increased and extended its influence among the masses while the Anti-Socialist Law was in force. The law was abrogated on October 1, 1890. For Engels' appraisal of it see his article "Bismarck and the German Working Men's Party" (present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 407-09).

The reference is to the American War of Independence (1775-83). On July 4, 1776 the Declaration of Independence was passed by the delegates of 13 North American colonies at a Congress in Philadelphia. The Declaration proclaimed secession from England and the formation of an independent republic—the United States of America. It formulated such bourgeois-democratic principles as freedom of the individual, equality before the law, sovereignty of the people, and exerted a major influence on the European revolutionary movement and the French Revolution in particular. However, the democratic rights proclaimed were from the very start violated by the American bourgeoisie and plantation owners, who excluded the common people from political life and preserved slavery.

In 1611, the Polish Diet adopted a decision on the unification of the Duchy of Prussia with Brandenburg under Hohenzollern rule. This was done despite the opposition of a group of deputies who supported Poland's rights to East Prussia. However, the Duchy of Prussia remained a territory held in fee by Poland. This decision was implemented in 1618 when the Elector of Brandenburg, Johann Sigismund, received the Duchy of Prussia in fee from the Polish King in return for his promise to take part in the war against Sweden. Under the Wielawa-Bydgoszcz Treaty of 1657 Poland finally renounced its supreme rights to the Duchy of Prussia in favour of Brandenburg.
On October 8-10, 1801, France and Russia signed a secret convention on the regulation of territorial issues in Rhenish Germany in favour of Napoleonic France, using as a pretext the need to compensate those German states whose possessions on the left bank of the Rhine had been seized by France during its wars against the first and second coalitions. This convention found reflection in the Russo-French declaration of June 3, 1802, under which 112 German states (nearly all ecclesiastical possessions and imperial towns) with a total population of three million were handed over to Bavaria, Württemberg and Baden, which were dependent on Napoleonic France, and also to Prussia. Formally this was done under the terms of a resolution adopted by what was known as the Imperial Deputation, a commission made up of representatives of the states incorporated in the German Empire and elected by the Imperial Diet in October 1801. The resolution was adopted on February 25, 1803 after long discussions and under pressure from France and Russia.

Under the terms of the Peace Treaty signed by France and Austria at Pressburg (Bratislava) on December 26, 1805, Bavaria and Württemberg, which took part in the war waged by Napoleonic France against the third coalition, were granted the status of independent kingdoms. Baden, which also fought on France's side, became an independent grand duchy in 1806 after the Holy Roman Empire ceased to exist.

Engels is quoting the Prussian officer, Prince Felix Lichnowsky, who spoke on the Polish question in the Frankfurt National Assembly on July 26, 1848 (see also present edition, Vol. 7, p. 369).

Engels wrote this letter on the advice of Nikolai Danielson who had informed him of the opportunity to have Marx's unpublished letter to the editors of the Otechestvennye Zapiski printed in the magazine Severny Vestnik (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 196-201). However, Marx's letter did not appear in that magazine either and was first published in Russian in 1886 in Geneva in Vestnik Narodnoi Voli, No. 5 and in the Russian legal journal Yuridichesky Vestnik in October 1888.

Engels wrote this work as an introduction to the third German edition of Marx's pamphlet Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 395-457) and had it published first in the newspaper Sozialdemokrat, Nos. 46, 47 and 48 of November 12, 19 and 26, 1885, and also in the book K. Marx, Enthüllungen über den Kommunisten-Prozess zu Köln. Neuer Abdruck mit Einleitung von Friedrich Engels und Dokumenten, that appeared late in November 1885. Besides Marx's pamphlet, the book also contained The Communist Trial in Cologne, the fourth appendix to Marx's Herr Vogt (see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 305-11), Marx's Epilogue to the second German edition of the pamphlet (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 51-54) and Addresses of the Central Authority to the League, March and June 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 277-87 and 371-77).

Wermuth, Stieber, Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des 19. Jahrhunderts, Berlin, Part I, 1853, Part II, 1854. The appendices to Part I of the book which expounded the "history" of the workers' movement in the form of instructions for the police carried several documents of the Communist League which had fallen into the hands of the police. Part II (the "Black List") contained detailed information about people connected with the working-class and democratic movement.

Engels may have had in mind the book by G. Adler, Die Geschichte der ersten
sozialpolitischen Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland, Breslau, 1885. In his letter to August Bebel, dated October 28, 1885, Engels writes the following: "Kautsky has given me Adler's very superficial book which is largely based on Stieber; I shall help him write a review" (see present edition, Vol. 47). The critical analysis of this book, which Karl Kautsky wrote on the basis of Engels' comments, was published in the magazine Die Neue Zeit in February 1886. Engels' remarks on Adler's book are to be found in Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch, 2., Berlin, 1979.

p. 312

184 Babouvism—one of the trends of utopian egalitarian communism based on the ideas of natural right. Founded at the close of the 18th century by François Noël Babeuf (Gracchus). Babouvism played a very important role in shaping the socialist views of secret revolutionary societies in the 1830s and 1840s.

p. 313

185 Société des saisons (Society of the Seasons)—a secret revolutionary organisation that existed in Paris between 1837 and 1839. It was founded by Auguste Blanqui, Armand Barbès and Martin Bernard with the aim of overthrowing the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe, proclaiming a republic and implementing revolutionary egalitarian ideas. An uprising on May 12, 1839 in Paris, in which revolutionary workers played the leading part, had been planned by the Society of the Seasons; it was suppressed by troops and the National Guard.

p. 313

186 Karl Schapper was arrested immediately after the uprising of May 12, 1839 and deported from France after serving seven months in prison; Heinrich Bauer continued his revolutionary activity in Paris, was arrested in December 1841 and also deported.

p. 313

187 The reference is to the Frankfurter Attentat (the Frankfurt Attempt). On April 3, 1833, in response to the police measures undertaken by the Federal Diet, a group of conspirators, mainly students, attempted to seize Frankfurt am Main, overthrow the Diet and proclaim a republic. But the conspirators only managed to take possession of the guard house for a short time, following which they were dispersed by troops.

p. 313

188 The reference is to the march by revolutionary émigrés and members of the "Young Italy" society, organised by Mazzini in February 1834 with a view to inciting a republican uprising in Piedmont. A detachment of insurgent émigrés of various nationalities under the command of Ramorino invaded Savoy from Switzerland but was defeated by Piedmontese troops.

p. 313

189 Demagogues in Germany were the participants in the students' opposition movement after the liberation of the country from Napoleonic rule. The name became current after the Karlsbad Conference of Ministers of the German States in August 1819, which adopted a special resolution on the persecution of the demagogues.

p. 313

190 The German Workers' Educational Society in London was founded in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll and other leaders of the League of the Just (in the 1850s the Society had its premises in Windmill Street, Soho). After the reorganisation of the League of the Just in the summer of 1847 and the founding of the Communist League, the latter's local communities played a leading role in the Society. In 1847 and 1849-50 Marx and Engels took an active part in the Society's work, but on September 17, 1850 they and a
number of their followers withdrew because the Willich-Schapper sectarian and adventurist faction had temporarily increased its influence in the Society and caused a split in the Communist League. Later Schapper realised the errors of his ways and took steps towards a reconciliation with Marx. The resultant weakening of sectarian influence made it possible for Marx and Engels to resume their work in the Educational Society in late 1850. In 1918, the Society was closed down by the British Government.

The reference is to the latter half of 1840 when Weitling returned to Paris after a propaganda trip to Germany begun in the spring of 1839. He made a short visit to Geneva in the summer of 1840 and again came back to Paris. In May 1841 Weitling settled in Switzerland for good.

See Note 140.

The Democratic Association, founded on September 27, 1847 in Brussels, united proletarian revolutionaries, mainly German refugees and advanced bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats. Marx and Engels took an active part in its establishment. On November 15, 1847 Marx was elected its Vice-President (the President was Lucien Jottrand, a Belgian democrat) and under his influence it became a centre of the international democratic movement. During the February 1848 revolution in France, the proletarian wing of the Brussels Democratic Association sought to arm the Belgian workers and to intensify the struggle for a democratic republic. However, when Marx was expelled from Brussels in March 1848 and the most revolutionary elements were repressed by the Belgian authorities, its activity assumed a narrow, purely local character and in 1849 the Association ceased to exist.

The motto was changed at the First Congress of the Communist League in June 1847.

Engels reproduces the main points of the "Demands of the Communist Party in Germany" (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 3-7) which were written by Marx and himself in Paris between March 21 and 24, 1848. This document was discussed by members of the Central Authority, who approved and signed it as the political programme of the Communist League in the revolution that broke out in Germany. In March it was printed as a leaflet, for distribution among revolutionary German émigré workers who were about to return home. The leaflet soon reached members of the Communist League in other countries, notably German émigré workers in London.

Early in April, the "Demands" were published in several democratic German papers.

The reference is to the German Workers’ Club, founded in Paris on March 8-9, 1848, on the initiative of the Communist League leaders. The leading role in it belonged to Marx. The Club’s aim was to unite the German émigré workers in Paris, explain to them the tactics of the proletariat in a bourgeois-democratic revolution and also to counter the attempts of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats to stir up the German workers by nationalist propaganda and make them join the adventurist march of volunteer legions into Germany. The Club was successful in arranging the return of German workers one by one to their own country to take part in the revolutionary struggle there.

From May 3 to 9, 1849 Dresden, the capital of Saxony, was the scene of an armed uprising caused by the refusal of the King of Saxony to approve the
Imperial Constitution drafted by the Frankfurt National Assembly. The insurgents, among whom the workers played a prominent part in fighting on the barricades, gained control of a considerable section of the city and formed a provisional government headed by the radical democrat Samuel Tzschirner. An active part in the uprising was played by Mikhail Bakunin, the Russian revolutionary, Stephan Born and Richard Wagner, the composer. The uprising was suppressed by Saxon and Prussian troops. p. 325

198 The Sonderbund—a separatist union of the seven economically backward Catholic cantons of Switzerland formed in 1843 to resist progressive bourgeois reforms and to defend the privileges of the Church and the Jesuits. p. 325

199 The Workers’ Fraternity was suppressed in all the states belonging to the German Confederation in mid-1850. But some of its groups in North and South Germany existed until 1852. Following the defeat of the Dresden uprising Born fled to Switzerland. p. 326

200 See Note 75. p. 326

201 Joseph Moll was mortally wounded in the stomach (not in the head) during the encounter at the Rothenfels Bridge on the River Murg on June 29, 1849. p. 326

202 The French Party of Order formed in 1848 was a coalition of monarchist groups: the Legitimists (supporters of the Bourbon dynasty), the Orleanists (supporters of the Orleans dynasty) and the Bonapartists. It was the party of the conservative big bourgeoisie. From 1849 until the coup d’état of December 2, 1851 it held sway in the Legislative Assembly of the Second Republic. p. 327

203 Early in May 1851 Peter Nothjung was sent on a tour of Germany as an emissary of the Cologne Central Authority of the Communist League. On May 10 he was arrested in Leipzig. The documents seized from him enabled the authorities of Prussia and other German states to arrest more League members. p. 328

204 The Battle of Murfreesboro, on the Stone River (Tennessee), took place between December 31, 1862 and January 2, 1863, and ended in the defeat of the Confederate army. This was one of the first victories won by the North over the slave-owning states. p. 328

205 The reference is to the Willich-Schapper sectarian group that seceded from the Communist League after the split of September 15, 1850 and formed an independent organisation with its own Central Committee. By its activities it helped the Prussian police uncover the illegal communities of the Communist League in Germany and gave it a pretext for fabricating evidence in a trial against the prominent leaders of the Communist League in Cologne in 1852.

On the Sonderbund see Note 198. p. 329

206 See Note 174. p. 329

207 This is an extract from Engels’ letter to Paul Lafargue. The complete text of the letter has not been traced.

Engels wrote this letter in connection with the first ballot to the French Chamber of Deputies, held on October 4, 1885 amidst general discontent with the home and foreign policy pursued by the party of moderate bourgeois
republicans (the so-called opportunists, see Note 208) who had been in power since 1879.

During this period the country's economic situation had deteriorated (state budget deficit, growing taxes and increased borrowing, etc.); the promises given during the election campaign, such as the abolition of the Senate, separation of the Church from the state, introduction of progressive income tax, and others, were not kept; colonial adventures caused discontent among the popular masses; many of the party's leaders were exposed as corrupt. All this brought victory to the monarchists in the first ballot. The French Socialists regarded this as their own defeat and Lafargue wrote about it to Engels on October 7 and 11. Engels deemed it necessary to explain the situation to them and did so in his letter of which an extract was published in the newspaper of the French Workers' Party.

Similar ideas expressed by Engels in his letter to Eduard Bernstein of October 8, 1885 (see present edition, Vol. 47) were utilised in the leading article of the Sozialdemokrat, No. 42, October 15, 1885.


208 The opportunists—this name was applied to the party of moderate bourgeois republicans in France after its Left wing split away from it in 1881 to form the Radical Party headed by Georges Clemenceau.

The name, proposed by the journalist Henri Rochefort, derived from the words of Party leader Léon Gambetta that reforms should be carried out "at an opportune time".

209 The reference is to the Orleanists, the Bonapartists and the Legitimists. See also Note 202.

210 The expression "the best of the republics" ("Voici la meilleure de république") is attributed to La Fayette, who used it on July 31, 1830 when the members of the Paris Municipal Commission fulfilling the functions of the Provisional Government after the overthrow of Charles X had a meeting with Louis Philippe, the Duke of Orleans, who had been proclaimed King of France.

211 Since at the elections of October 4, 1885, most of the candidates did not receive the required number of votes, a second ballot was fixed for October 18. It brought victory to the deputies from the party of moderate republicans (opportunists) (see Note 208) and the Radical Party (see Note 212). The Chamber of Deputies numbered 382 republicans, among them 180 radicals and 202 monarchists.

212 The radicals—a parliamentary group that emerged from the party of moderate republicans (opportunists, see Note 208) in the 1880s-90s. The radicals relied mainly on the petty bourgeoisie and partly on the middle bourgeoisie and championed such bourgeois-democratic demands as a single-chamber parliamentary system, separation of the Church from the state, introduction of progressive income tax, limitation of the working day and solution of some other social problems. In 1901 the group acquired official status as the Republican Party of Radicals and Radical Socialists (Parti républicain radical et radicalsocialiste).

213 See Note 210.
In this article Engels is making a critical analysis of the English translation of the first and part of the second sections of Chapter I, Vol. I of Marx’s Capital (see present edition, Vol. 35), printed in the magazine To-day, Vol. 4, No. 22, October 1885, pp. 429-36. The translation was the work of Henry Hyndman, leader of the Social-Democratic Federation, who wrote under the pseudonym John Broadhouse. After the appearance of Engels’ article, Hyndman continued to publish his translation; altogether seven chapters and the greater part of the eighth chapter of Vol. I were printed in To-day up to May 1889. The full English translation of Vol. I of Capital, done by Samuel Moore and edited by Engels, appeared in 1887.


See present edition, Vol. 35 (Chapter I). Here Engels translates the expression “in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft” as “in civil society”; in the French authorised edition of 1872-75 and in the 1887 English edition edited by Engels this expression is translated differently: “in the bourgeois society”.

Engels wrote this article as part two of his Introduction to the separate edition of Wilhelm Wolff’s series of articles on the condition of the Silesian peasants (see Note 74) published on his (Engels’) initiative. Part one of the Introduction comprised a considerably abridged version of Engels’ article “Wilhelm Wolff” printed in 1876 (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 129-71).

The reference is to the Teutonic Order—a German Catholic Order of Knights founded in 1190 during the Crusades. The Order had vast possessions in Germany, and in the 13th-14th centuries it conquered extensive territories between the Lower Vistula and the Niemen (East Prussia). During the 15th century the Order gradually declined and lost a considerable part of its possessions; in 1525 the Order ceased to exist as a state. Only small areas scattered throughout Germany remained in its possession until the beginning of the 19th century.

Hereditary copyholders—dependent peasants living in Germany, Bohemia and the Kingdom of Poland in the 13th-15th centuries. They enjoyed personal freedom, and had to pay quit-rent (in money or in kind) to the landlord for using their plots of land.

The Thirty Years’ War (1618-48)—a European war, in which the Pope, the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes rallied under the banner of Catholicism and fought the Protestant countries Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Republic of the Netherlands and a number of Protestant German states. The rulers of Catholic France—rivals of the Habsburgs—supported the Protestant camp. Germany was the main battle arena and the object of plunder and territorial claims. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) sealed the political dismemberment of Germany.

At the Battle of Jena (October 14, 1806) the French army, commanded by Napoleon, routed the Prussian army, thus forcing Prussia to surrender.

Dreschgärtner, Häusler, Insleute—categories of landless peasants in Germany, who, in their status, were close to day-labourers. These peasants were obliged to render the landlord all kinds of services in return for a roof over their heads, a tiny plot of land and, sometimes, meagre remuneration in kind and money.
222 See Note 35 and also this volume, p. 74.

223 To supply the Prussian state with material resources and ensure the recruitment of soldiers Frederick II of Prussia promulgated a number of laws, among them the Statute on the Peasants of 1764, which proscribed the eviction of the peasants from their plots of land. However, these laws were implemented only to a very small extent.

224 At Mollwitz (Malujevice, Silesia) Frederick II's army defeated the Austrians on April 10, 1741, during the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-48).

On September 1-2, 1870, the Châlon Army of the French was routed by the Germans near Sedan. The Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71 brought about the collapse of the Second Empire in France.

225 The reference is to the decrees of February 14, 1808, of March 27 and April 8, 1809 and of January 9, 1810. The decree of April 8, 1809 stated that abolition of personal hereditary dependence should not be interpreted as releasing the peasants from their feudal obligations.

226 In the Battle of Waterloo fought on June 18, 1815, the Anglo-Dutch and Prussian forces commanded by the Duke of Wellington and Blücher defeated Napoleon's army.

227 The Seven Years' War (1756-63)—a war between the Anglo-Prussian and the Franco-Russo-Austrian coalition. The war was caused by the conflict of interests among the feudal absolutist powers (Prussia, Austria, Russia and France) and the colonial rivalry between France and Britain. It resulted in the expansion of the British colonial empire at the expense of the French possessions and in the growth of Russia's might; Austria and Prussia more or less retained their pre-war frontiers.

228 Ackernahrung—a plot of land sufficient to maintain a peasant family.

229 Thaler—a silver coin equal to about three marks; it appeared in the 16th century in Bohemia and circulated in the 19th century in all North German states as well as in Prussia and Saxony.

230 The expression state of intelligence, often used in an ironical sense, originates from a phrase in Hegel's opening lecture in Heidelberg University in October 1816.

231 Scheffel—dry measure used in different German states. Its size varied up to 1872.

232 Engels is referring to the two tables from August Meitzen's book Der Boden und die landwirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse des Preußischen Staates nach dem Gebietsumfang von 1866, Vol. I, Berlin, 1868. The first table sums up the results of the redemption operations from 1816 to 1848; the second table those from 1816 to the end of 1865.

233 This is one of the fundamental works of Marxism. It reveals the relationship between Marxism and its philosophical predecessors as represented by Hegel and Feuerbach, the prominent exponents of German classical philosophy, and provides a systematic exposition of the fundamentals of dialectical and historical materialism. The work was originally published in Die Neue Zeit, the theoretical journal of the German Social-Democratic Party; in 1888 it appeared as a pamphlet for which Engels wrote a special preface (see this volume, pp. 519-20). The supplement to this edition contained Marx's Theses on
Feuerbach, published for the first time. In 1889, the St. Petersburg journal Severny Vestnik, Nos 3 and 4, carried a Russian translation of Engels' work entitled The Crisis of the Philosophy of Classical Idealism in Germany. The author's name was not mentioned, and the text contained many additions and digressions. It was signed G. L. (the initials of the translator—G. Lvovich). In 1890 Engels' work was translated into Polish. In 1892 the Emancipation of Labour group in Geneva published the full Russian translation of this work by Georgy Plekhanov; the same year it was translated into Bulgarian. In 1894 the Paris journal Ère nouvelle, Nos 4 and 5 published the French translation by Laura Lafargue edited by the author. The second (stereotype) German edition appeared in 1895. There were no other editions of this work during Engels' lifetime.

The work was published in English for the first time in 1903 by Kerr Publishers, USA, under the title The Roots of Socialist Philosophy.

234 The reference is to Heinrich Heine's Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland, originally published in French translation in the Paris Revue des deux mondes in March-December 1834.

In his work Heine draws a parallel between the development of German philosophy and the events of the French Revolution of 1789. In conclusion he says: "Our philosophical revolution is concluded. Hegel has closed its great circle.... Such methodical people as we are had to begin with the Reformation; only after that could we occupy ourselves with philosophy, and only after its consummation could we pass on to political revolution."

235 Engels is quoting here, in a slightly changed form, a passage from Hegel's preface to Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts (p. XIX), which reads: "What is rational is real and what is real is rational."

236 The term positive religion was used by Hegel in his Philosophy of Religion where he says: "that it is revealed, is positive religion in the sense that it has come to man from without, has been given to him" ("daß sie geoffenbart ist, positive Religion sei, in dem Sinne, daß sie dem Menschen von Außen gekommen, gegeben worden" (See Hegel, Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion, Vol. II, Part 3, 2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1928, p. 198.)

237 The reference is to German, or "true", socialism which was widespread in Germany in the 1840s, mostly among petty-bourgeois intellectuals. The "true socialists"—Karl Grün, Moses Hess, Hermann Kriege—substituted the sentimental preaching of love and brotherhood for the ideas of socialism and denied the need for a bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany. Marx and Engels criticised this trend in The German Ideology (see present edition, Vol. 5), Circular Against Kriege, German Socialism in Verse and Prose and Manifesto of the Communist Party (ibid., Vol. 6).

238 The planet referred to is Neptune, discovered on September 23, 1846 by the German astronomer Johann Galle.

239 This passage is quoted in C. N. Starcke, Ludwig Feuerbach, Stuttgart, 1885, p. 166. The quotation was taken from K. Grün, Ludwig Feuerbach in seinem Briefwechsel und Nachlaß sowie in seiner Philosophischen Charakterentwicklung, Vol. II, Leipzig and Heidelberg, 1874, p. 308.

240 The phlogiston theory was formulated in 1703 by Georg Stahl, a German
physician and chemist, who asserted that all combustible materials and base metals contained a substance called phlogiston which was emitted during combustion. Towards the end of the 18th century this hypothesis was disproved by Antoine Lavoisier, but it played a considerable role in the development of chemistry as a science.

241 The deists recognise the idea of God as the rational creator of the universe, but deny God’s interference in nature and social life.

242 See Note 236.

243 The state religion — Culte de l’Etre suprême — was decreed by the Convention on May 7, 1794 during the Jacobine dictatorship. Its creed was a powerful supreme being and the immortality of the soul. The new religion was needed, on the one hand, to stop the de-Christianisation of the population connected with the dissemination of the cult of reason rejected by believers, and, on the other, to strengthen the ideological influence of the authorities upon the masses. The cult disappeared together with the Jacobine dictatorship.

244 “The school-master of Sadowa” — an expression first used by Oskar Peschel, editor of the Augsburg journal Ausland, in his article “Die Lehren der jüngsten Kriegsgeschichte”, published in No. 29 of that journal on July 17, 1866, and then widely employed by German journalists, especially after the Prussian victory at Königgrätz in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 (the Battle of Sadowa), the implication being that the Prussian victory was to be attributed to the superiority of the Prussian system of public education.

245 The Council of Nicaea — the first ecumenical council of the Christian Bishops of the Roman Empire, convened by Emperor Constantine I in the town of Nicaea (Asia Minor) in 325. The Council formulated the Nicene Creed and made it obligatory for all Christians. Non-recognition of it was punishable as a state offence.

246 The Albigenses — a religious sect that existed in the 12th and 13th centuries in Southern France (notably in Provence and Toulouse) and in Northern Italy. This movement took the form of a “heresy”, being directed against the power and doctrine of the Catholic Church, and against the secular power of the feudal state. Its adherents were called Albigenses because the city of Albi was one of the sect’s main centres.

247 The reference is to the revolution of 1688 (the overthrow of the House of Stuart and the enthronement of William III of Orange), following which (1689) the constitutional monarchy was consolidated in England on the basis of a compromise between the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie.

248 From the 1620s political and religious repressions of Huguenots (Calvinist Protestants) intensified, and in 1685 Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes which had been enacted by Henry IV in 1598 and granted Huguenots religious freedom and considerable political independence. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes several hundred thousand Huguenots left France.

249 The reference is to the German Empire which was founded in January 1871 under the supremacy of Prussia and did not include Austria.

250 This article was occasioned by the first English edition of Engels’ work The Condition of the Working-Class in England (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 295-596), then in preparation in the USA. Originally Engels intended to
use it as a Preface or Afterword to this edition, but the publication of the book was considerably delayed because Engels could not find a publisher at the time. He therefore deemed it necessary to write a new preface (see this volume, pp. 434-42) and use this article as an Appendix. In 1892 Engels included almost the whole of this article in the Prefaces to the English and second German editions of his work (see present edition, Vol. 27).

251 See Note 154.  

252 The discovery of rich gold deposits in California in 1848 and in Australia in 1851 greatly influenced the economic development of Europe and America.  

253 The truck-system—the payment of workers in goods. Engels described this system in his work *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 470-71). The Truck-Act prohibiting the truck-system was adopted in 1831, but many factory owners violated it.  

The *Ten Hours' Bill*, which applied to women and children only, was passed by the British Parliament on June 8, 1847.  


The “Seven Dials”—seven radial streets in the heart of London at that time inhabited mainly by workers.  

255 Under the cottage-system the factory owners leased dwellings to the workers on harsh conditions: rent was deducted from wages (for details see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 471-72).  

256 The reference is to a strike of over 10,000 coal-miners in Pennsylvania (USA) between January 22 and February 26, 1886. Blast and coke furnace workers demanding higher wages and better working conditions managed to secure some of their demands.  


257 Engels wrote this letter in response to a request by the French Socialists that he express publicly his solidarity with them on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Paris Commune. The letter was read out at a meeting in commemoration of the Commune on March 18, 1886 and published in *Le Socialiste* on March 27, 1886 under the title “Lettre d'Engels”.  


258 The reference is to the 1884 elections to the Reichstag, when, under the conditions of the Anti-Socialist Law (see Note 174), the German Social-Democratic Party polled about 550,000 votes, and doubled its representation to 24 members.  

259 Until 1885 France was divided into “small constituencies”, each sending one representative to the Chamber of Deputies. In June 1885, on the initiative of moderate bourgeois republicans, a system of voting by department lists was introduced. Under this system, which operated until 1889, small constituencies were combined to form larger ones each corresponding to a department. Now a voter received a ballot paper with the names of candidates from different
parties, but he was obliged to vote for a total number of candidates to be elected, one deputy from 70,000 people. A deputy was considered elected in the first ballot provided he had received an absolute majority of votes; a relative majority was sufficient in the second ballot. p. 407

On February 11, 1886, the workers' deputies in the French Parliament made an interpellation concerning the government's actions against the miners' strike in Decazeville (see Note 263). Engels regarded this as the formation of the socialist group in the Chamber of Deputies. p. 407

Engels wrote this Statement because he feared McEnnis would not be able to interpret his words correctly. He asked Sorge to have it published in one of the American socialist papers if the interview should appear in the press (see Engels' letter to Friedrich Sorge dated April 29, 1886, present edition, Vol. 47). p. 408

The reference is to the Freycinet Government (January 7-December 3, 1886) consisting mostly of radicals and moderate republicans, as distinct from the majority of the previous cabinets, to which, as a rule, radicals were in opposition. p. 409

In late January 1886 more than 3,000 workers of Decazeville (south of France) went on strike. The reason was their cruel exploitation by the capitalists of the Aveyron Company of coal-mines and foundries; the government despatched troops to Decazeville. The strike continued till mid-June and evoked a broad response throughout the country; under its impact a small workers' group was formed in the Chamber of Deputies which came out in defence of the workers' economic demands. p. 409

The reference is to the by-election to the Chamber of Deputies in Paris on May 2, 1886, when the socialist candidate Ernest Roche received 100,795 votes. p. 409

This article is a letter written by Engels to Paul Lafargue on October 25, 1886 (see present edition, Vol. 47), with slight abridgements and editorial changes. Engels wrote this letter in reply to Lafargue's request for his opinion on the situation in the Balkans and the course the foreign policy of the European powers would take in connection with the growing rivalry between Tsarist Russia and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. This article is the only one Engels wrote for the press in the 1880s on questions of foreign policy. The German translation of the article was published in the New York paper Sozialist on November 20 and 27 and December 4, 1886. It was also translated into Romanian and printed in the magazine Revista Sociala, No. 2, December 1886; an abridged version of the article was published in German translation in the newspaper Sozialdemokrat on December 12, 1886. p. 410

The Preliminary Peace Treaty between Russia and Turkey, which put an end to the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, was concluded on March 3 (February 19), 1878 in San Stefano (near Constantinople). The Treaty envisaged the creation of an autonomous Bulgarian principality nominally dependent on Turkey, state independence for Serbia, Montenegro and Romania as well as their territorial expansion, etc. The Treaty considerably strengthened the position of Russia in the Balkans which caused a sharp reaction on the part of Great Britain and Austria-Hungary, including a show of military force (e.g. the despatch of English warships to the Sea of Marmara and other measures). This forced Russia to agree to the convocation of an international congress for the purpose
of revising the treaty, since it affected "general European" problems. The representatives of Russia, Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, Germany, France and Italy took part in the congress which was held in Berlin between June 13 (1) and July 13 (1), 1878. The Berlin Treaty signed at this Congress radically changed the provisions of the San Stefano Treaty to the detriment of Russia and the Slavs of the Balkan Peninsula. The territory of self-governing Bulgaria, stipulated by the San Stefano Treaty, was cut more than twice; an autonomous province known as "Eastern Rumelia", which remained under the power of the sultan, was formed at the expense of Bulgarian regions lying south of the Balkan Ridge; the territory of Montenegro was substantially curtailed. The Berlin Treaty endorsed the return to Russia of the part of Bessarabia severed from it in 1856, and at the same time sanctioned the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary. The decisions of the Berlin Congress turned the Balkans into the hotbed of conflict which led to the outbreak of the First World War. p. 410

267 The suppression of the Polish national insurrection was followed, in 1795, by the third partition of Poland between Austria, Prussia and Russia, and the final abolition of the Polish state. By decision of the Vienna Congress (1814-15) the Kingdom of Poland was formed within the Russian Empire. It incorporated the greater part of lands seized by Prussia and Austria during the third partition of Poland. p. 410

268 Engels is referring to the reprisals instituted by the Tsarist government against the members of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) organisation in the early 1880s, which practically destroyed it.

Nihilism—a system of views held in the 1860s by the progressive-minded Russian intellectuals of different social estates. The nihilists refused to recognise the dominant ideology and morality, rejected religion and demanded freedom of the personality. In West European writing, the term was applied to participants in the Russian revolutionary movement of the 1870s and 1880s, notably the Narodnaya Volya members. p. 411

269 The reference is to the occupation of Egypt by Great Britain as a result of the Anglo-Egyptian War of 1882.

In the 1870s, capitalising on the financial difficulties facing the Egyptian government, above all, its considerable foreign debt, England and France, its principal creditors, established financial control over the country. This led to the growth of the national liberation movement and attempts to shake off foreign dependence in the early 1880s. In the summer of 1882, Great Britain provoked a conflict with Egypt and launched military operations which terminated in September 1882. To all intents and purposes, Egypt was turned into a British colony, although on paper it was still part of the Ottoman Empire. As a result of Britain's actions, its relations with France deteriorated. p. 411

270 In September 1885, an uprising of Bulgarian patriots took place in Eastern Rumelia. The Turkish governor was overthrown. Rumelia was reunited with Bulgaria. p. 412

271 The reference is to the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, which ended in victory for Prussia (see also notes 171 and 172). The principal theatre of operations was Bohemia (Čechy).

Engels compares this campaign with the military operations conducted by Bulgaria in the war against Serbia, which began on November 14 (2), 1885.
The war was triggered off by the attempt of Serbia, instigated by Austria-Hungary, to reverse the results of the unification of Eastern Rumelia and the Bulgarian Principality that had taken place in September 1885. In the first month of the war, Bulgarian troops defeated the Serbian army and soon entered Serbia. Under pressure from Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria called a halt to the advance of its troops. The frontiers of the united Bulgaria were confirmed by the Bucharest Peace Treaty of 1886.

272 Greeting Alexander III on May 13 (25), 1886, on his return to Moscow from the Crimea, the city mayor Alexeyev said, “Our faith is strengthening that the cross of Christ will shine on St. Sophia” (he meant St. Sophia’s Cathedral in Constantinople).

273 Slavophilism—a trend in Russian social thought in the 1840s-60s, which advocated a special path of historical development for Russia, one differing fundamentally from that of Western Europe.

Engels is referring here to those representatives of Russian society who in the 1880s championed active use of the slogan of Slavic unity in the foreign policy pursued by the Tsarist autocracy.

On the Nihilists, see Note 268.

274 The reference is to the political crisis of 1886-87 in Bulgaria. After the deposition of the Prince of Battenberg and the establishment of the Regency in August 1886, the Russian government sent General Kaulbars to Bulgaria on a special mission to prepare the ground for the election of a Russian candidate to the Bulgarian throne. The mission failed, however, partly because of the stand taken on the Bulgarian issue by West European powers headed by Britain. Kaulbars was recalled, and diplomatic relations between Russia and Bulgaria were broken off in November 1886.

275 The Orleanists were supporters of the Orleans dynasty which held power in France during the July monarchy (1830-48). They upheld the interests of the financial aristocracy and the big industrial bourgeoisie and were members of the so-called Party of Order (see Note 202).

276 Part of this article was published in English for the first time in K. Marx and F. Engels, On Literature and Art, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, pp. 406-07.

277 The reference is to the republican insurrection in Baden, led by the petty-bourgeois democrats Friedrich Hecker and Gustav Struve, which was crushed in April 1848.

278 On February 9, 1849, the Constituent Assembly in Rome abolished the secular power of the Pope and proclaimed a republic. The Roman Republic had to repulse attacks by the counter-revolutionary Neapolitan and Austrian troops and the French expeditionary corps sent to Italy in April 1849 by decision of President Louis Bonaparte to restore Papal power. The republic only survived until July 3, 1849.

279 The reference is to the campaign for the Imperial Constitution adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly on March 27, 1849 but rejected by the majority of German governments. In May 1849, popular uprisings in support of the Constitution broke out in Saxony, Rhenish Prussia, Baden and the Palatinate. The insurgents received no support from the Frankfurt National Assembly and the movement was suppressed in July 1849. Engels devoted his work The
Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution to these events (see present edition, Vol. 10).

280 This refers to the events of June 5-6, 1849 in Karlsruhe, the capital of Baden. The radical wing of the democrats, who were discontented with the capitulatory policy of the Baden Provisional Government headed by Brentano, founded the Club of Resolute Progress in Karlsruhe on June 5, 1849. The Club suggested that Brentano extend the revolution beyond Baden and the Palatinate and introduce radicals into his government. When Brentano refused, the Club tried, on June 6, to force the government to comply by threatening an armed demonstration. But the government, supported by the civil militia and other armed units, proved the stronger party in the conflict. The Club of Resolute Progress was disbanded.

281 The reference is to the volunteer unit of the Gymnastics Society of Hanau (in the vicinity of Frankfurt am Main) which took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849.

282 On September 28, 1864, an international meeting was held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London. It was organised by the London trade union leaders and a group of Paris Proudhonist workers jointly with representatives of German, Italian and other foreign workers then living in London, and a number of prominent European democratic émigrés. The meeting resolved to found an International Working Men's Association (later known as the First International) and elected a Provisional Committee, which shortly afterwards constituted itself as the leading body of the Association.

283 L'Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste (The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy) was founded by Mikhail Bakunin in Geneva in September 1868. Alongside Bakunin, its Provisional Committee comprised Brosset, Duval, Guétat, Perron, Zagorsky and Johann Philipp Becker. In 1868, the Alliance published in Geneva leaflets in French and German containing its Programme and Rules. Shortly afterwards, Becker broke with Bakunin.

The Alliance incorporated a secret conspiratorial union that Bakunin had set up previously.

In December 1868, the Alliance applied to the General Council requesting admission to the First International. The Central Bureau of the Alliance joined the International as its Geneva section under the name Alliance de la démocratie socialiste.

In the International, the Bakuninists formed a bloc with anti-Marxian elements and openly campaigned against Marx and Engels, seeking to establish their supremacy over the international working-class movement. The Alliance fell apart soon after Bakunin's expulsion from the International in 1872.

284 See Note 81.

285 The reference is to the five-milliard-franc contribution imposed on France under the Frankfurt Peace Treaty of 1871 signed after the Franco-Prussian War.

286 The reference is to the ban on the printing and distribution of socialist literature in Germany (Engels' work The Housing Question included). It was introduced under the Anti-Socialist Law passed in October 1878 (see Note 174).

287 The Nueva Federación Madrileña (New Madrid Federation) was formed on
July 8, 1872 by the members of La Emancipacion editorial board expelled from the Madrid Federation by the anarchist majority for the paper's exposure of the activities of the secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 283) in Spain. A major part in its foundation was played by Paul Lafargue. On August 15, 1872, the General Council admitted the New Madrid Federation to the First International.

The New Madrid Federation fought against the spread of anarchist influence in Spain, popularised ideas of scientific socialism, and helped establish the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party in 1879. p. 426

288 During the revolution of 1848, Proudhon advanced several concrete projects of social and economic reforms. In very general terms, they were expounded in the book: P. J. Proudhon, Idée générale de la Révolution au XIX-e siècle, Paris, 1851. p. 427

289 Armchair socialism (Kathedersozialismus), a trend in the German bourgeois political economy that emerged in the last third of the 19th century as a reaction to the growth of the workers' movement and the spread of scientific socialism in it. Its representatives advocated bourgeois reformism from university rostrums under the pretence of commitment to socialism. They asserted, among other things, that the state, specifically the German Empire, had a supra-class character and could be used to improve the position of the working class through social reforms. p. 427

290 See Note 174. p. 428

291 Eifel (the Rhine Province of Prussia), a mountainous area with vast swamps and wastelands, had a harsh climate and barren soil. Engels refers to the events of 1882, when, following a series of crop failures and the earlier drop in prices for agricultural produce, the area was struck by famine. p. 428

292 See Note 220. p. 429

293 The reference is to the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. See also Note 169. p. 430

294 This article was printed as a Preface to the American edition of Engels' work The Condition of the Working-Class in England which appeared in New York in May 1887 (see Note 250). In the same year, it was published in the author's German translation in Der Sozialdemokrat (June 10 and 17) under the title "Die Arbeiterbewegung in Amerika", as separate offprints in German and English in New York in July and in French translation in the Socialiste (July 9, 16 and 23). Even before the book appeared, the article had been translated into German without the author's knowledge or permission and printed in the New Yorker Volkszeitung in April 1887. Engels launched an official protest against this because he was not satisfied with the quality of the translation (see Engels to Friedrich Sorge, April 23, 1887, present edition, Vol. 48). p. 434

295 The reference is to the conflict between Edward Aveling and the Executive of the Socialist Labor Party of North America, which accused Aveling of overspending when touring the USA together with Eleanor Marx-Aveling and Wilhelm Liebknecht for the purpose of propaganda. The conflict, which lasted for several months, was resolved with Engels' active participation. For more details, see this volume, pp. 617-18.

The Socialist Labor Party of North America was formed in 1876 at the Unity Congress in Philadelphia by the members of the American sections of the First International and other socialist organisations in the USA. Most of its members
were immigrants (chiefly Germans), who had little contact with American-born workers. There was a struggle inside the Party between the reformist leaders, who were mostly Lassalleans, and the Marxist wing headed by Marx's and Engels' comrade-in-arms Friedrich Adolph Sorge. The Party proclaimed as its programme the fight for socialism but did not become a truly revolutionary Marxist mass organisation owing to the sectarian policy of its leaders, who disregarded the need for work in the mass organisations of the American proletariat.

296 See Note 256.

297 The reference is to the general strike in the USA for an eight-hour working day which began on May 1, 1886 and continued for several days. The strike spread to the chief industrial centres, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Louisville, Saint Louis, Milwaukee and Baltimore, and ended with nearly 200,000 workers winning shorter hours. The employers, however, soon launched a counter-attack. On May 4, a bomb exploded at a police station in Chicago, and the police seized this opportunity to use arms against workers and make several hundred arrests. Court proceedings were instituted and harsh sentences meted out to the leaders of the Chicago working-class movement. Four of them were hanged in November 1887.

298 The reference is probably to John McEnnis, a reporter on the Missouri Republican, who visited Engels in April 1886.

299 During the preparations for the municipal elections in New York in the autumn of 1886, a United Labor Party was founded to rally the workers for political action. The initiative was taken by the New York Central Workers' Union, an association of New York trade unions formed in 1882. Similar parties were set up in many other cities. Led by the new parties, the working class achieved substantial success in the elections in New York, Chicago, and Milwaukee: Henry George, the United Labor Party candidate for Mayor of New York, received 31 per cent of the vote; in Chicago, the adherents of the Labor Party succeeded in getting ten Party members elected to the Legislative Assembly of the State: one senator and nine members of the Lower Chamber. The Labor Party candidate to the US Congress lost by just 64 votes. In Milwaukee, the Labor Party's candidate was elected Mayor of the city, one candidate was elected to the Senate, six to the Lower Chamber of the Legislative Assembly of this State, and one to the US Congress.

300 The Knights of Labor (the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor), an American workers' organisation founded in Philadelphia in 1869. It was a secret society up to 1878. Its members were mostly unskilled workers. Its aim was the establishment of cooperatives and organisation of mutual aid; it took part in a number of working-class campaigns. But its leaders in fact opposed the workers' participation in the political struggle and stood for class collaboration. They opposed the 1886 general strike, forbidding the organisation's members to take part in it; however, the rank and file joined in the strike. After those events, it began to lose its influence among the workers and disintegrated by the end of the 1890s.

301 Engels wrote this letter on the occasion of the international festival of brotherhood held in Paris on February 19, 1887 on the initiative of a number of organisations of foreign socialists in France. Taking part in it were German, Scandinavian, Polish and Russian socialist émigrés. The purpose of the festival was to voice protest against the military build-up and war preparations in
Europe. Engels' letter was read out at the festival and printed in the Socialist on February 26. A German translation was carried by Der Sozialdemokrat on March 11, by the Austrian paper Gleichheit on March 5, and by the New York Socialist on March 19.

Engels addressed this message of greetings to the meeting organised by the Federation of the Centre of the French Workers' Party on the occasion of the 16th anniversary of the Paris Commune. It was read out at the meeting.

The pamphlet was published on Engels' initiative as issue XXIV of The Social-Democratic Library. Even before the pamphlet appeared the second half of the introduction was published in Der Sozialdemokrat on January 15, 1888 under the heading "Was Europa bevorstehnt".

On June 14, 1848, Berlin workers and craftsmen, outraged by the National Assembly's disavowal of the March revolution, took the arsenal by storm in an attempt to uphold the revolutionary gains. This action was, however, spontaneous and unorganised, and army reinforcements and units of the bourgeois civil militia were soon able to push back and disarm the people.

The reference is to the invasion of Baden from Swiss territory by detachments of German republican refugees led by Gustav Struve on September 21, 1848. Supported by the local republicans, Struve proclaimed a German Republic and formed a provisional government. The insurgent detachments, however, were shortly afterwards scattered by the troops. Struve and other leaders of the uprising were imprisoned by decision of a court martial. They were released during another republican uprising in Baden in May 1849.

The Brimstone Gang (Schwefelbande), the name of a students' association at Jena University in the 1770s whose members were notorious for their brawls; subsequently, the expression gained wide currency.

In 1859, Karl Vogt published a pamphlet Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung (Geneva, 1859) spearheaded against Marx and his associates in the Communist League. Distorting the facts, Vogt referred to Marx and his associates as the Brimstone Gang, which he depicted as a society engaged in unseemly political machinations. In actual fact, a group of German refugees in Geneva in 1849-50, including Borkheim among its members, was jokingly known under the name of Brimstone Gang. Marx and his associates had no connection with the group, which, incidentally, was far removed from political activity being a harmless circle of revellers.

In February 1860, Marx requested Borkheim to give him some information about the Geneva Brimstone Gang and used the latter's reply of February 12 (see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 29-32) to expose Vogt and his allegations concerning the Brimstone Gang in his pamphlet Herr Vogt (see ibid., pp. 21-329).

Engels is referring to the final stage of the Danish-Prussian War of 1848-50 for the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Prussia entered the war on the side of the duchies, seeking to use the national liberation movement there to promote its own ends. However, the war ended in the restoration of Danish rule in Schleswig-Holstein.
In the autumn of 1850, the struggle between Austria and Prussia for supremacy in Germany was aggravated as a result of the conflict over Hesse-Cassel. Revolutionary actions there were used by Austria and Prussia as a pretext for interfering in the electorate's internal affairs, with each party claiming the right to suppress them. The Prussian government reacted to the entry of Austrian troops into Hesse-Cassel by mobilising and sending its own troops there in November 1850. In October 1850, Warsaw hosted a peace conference, as a result of which Austria and Prussia signed an agreement in Olmütz on November 29. Prussia yielded on the issues of Schleswig-Holstein and Hesse-Cassel.

310 See Note 293.

p. 450

311 See Note 220.

p. 451

312 The Role of Force in History was intended for a pamphlet of the same title that Engels planned to write but did not complete. It was to become Chapter 4, a sequel to the three chapters of Anti-Dühring devoted to a critique of the theory of force. Engels planned to elaborate the main ideas of the three chapters mentioned above using German history between 1848 and 1888 as an example and to make a critical analysis of Bismarck's policies. The work was begun late in 1887 and continued into the first months of 1888 (see Engels' correspondence with Hermann Schlüter, head of a social-democratic publishing house, present edition, vols 47-48). Engels interrupted work in March 1888 and, most probably, never resumed it.

After Engels' death, an envelope inscribed "The Theory of Force" was found in his archive. It contained the three chapters from Anti-Dühring, an unfinished manuscript of the fourth chapter of the planned pamphlet, a draft preface to it, a plan of the fourth chapter as a whole and one of its last part, which remained unwritten, as well as chronological notes on the history of Germany of the 1870s and 1880s, specifically excerpts from the book by C. Bulle, Geschichte der neuesten Zeit, 1815-1885, 2 ed., vols I-IV, Berlin, 1888.

The manuscript of the unfinished chapter, the rough draft of the preface and part of the preparatory materials were published by Eduard Bernstein in the Neue Zeit magazine, Vol. 1, Nos. 22-26, 1895-96 under the heading "Gewalt und Oekonomie bei der Herstellung des neuen Deutschen Reichs". Preparing the manuscript for publication, Bernstein divided it into sections in his own hand, supplying each with a subtitle invented by himself, marking the notes and actually making his own insertions in Engels' text. Until recently, several pages (from the words "Alsace had been conquered", this volume, p. 491 and up to the phrase "Bismark had reached his objective", this volume, p. 497) were printed according to the Neue Zeit publication. Not long ago, when preparing Vol. 1/31 of MEGA, researchers in the GDR discovered the missing pages in the archive of the International Institute of Social History (Amsterdam). In the present edition, this text is for the first time published according to the manuscript, which has made possible a number of corrections (this volume, pp. 493 and 494). In 1896, the work was translated into French and appeared in the Devenir Social, Nos. 6-9, together with the three pertinent chapters from Anti-Dühring. In 1898, this work was published in Russian, in an incomplete form, in St. Petersburg by the Nauchnoye Obozreniye (Scientific Review), No. 5. In 1899, it appeared in Rome in Italian as a separate edition, which completely followed the Neue Zeit.

Alongside of the manuscript of the fourth chapter of the pamphlet *The Role of Force in History*, this volume also features the rough draft of its preface and, in the section "From the Preparatory Materials" the plan of Chapter 4 as a whole and the plan of its final section which throws light on the content of the part of the work that remained unfinished.  

p. 453

318 The reference is to the meeting of the emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia in Warsaw in October 1850. It was called on the initiative of Emperor Nicholas I of Russia to regulate the relations between Austria and Prussia (see also Note 309).

On the Federal Diet, see Note 171.  

p. 456

314 The expression the "crazy year" ("das tolle Jahr") was first used by Johann Heinrich von Falkenstein in a chronicle published in 1739 to describe the popular unrest in Erfurt in 1509. Later, it was widely applied to the revolutionary year 1848.  

p. 456

315 See Note 252.  

p. 456

316 The *local settlement laws (Heimatgesetzgebung)* established the right of citizens to permanently reside in a certain locality, as well as the right of impoverished families to receive material aid from the communities to which they belonged.  

p. 457

317 The *Prussian taler* was equal to \( \frac{1}{14} \) Mark of sterling silver; had currency in Prussia between 1750 and 1857. It was also recognised by North German and some other states.  

The *gold taler*, a monetary unit of the free city of Bremen which retained the gold standard up to 1872, as distinct from other German monetary systems. See also Note 229.  

The "*new two-third* taler", a silver coin that had currency in North German states.  

*Bank Mark (Mark Banko)*, a coin introduced by the Hamburg Bank and used in settling international accounts.  

*Current Mark (Mark Kurant)*, a silver coin; from the 17th century, this was the name of silver money with a value of up to half a mark, as distinct from gold coins, small change and paper money. The *20 gulden piece* and the *24 gulden piece* (Zwanzig-Guldenfuss; Vierundzwanzig-Guldenfuss), a system under which one Mark of sterling silver was used to mint either 20 or 24 gulden. It was introduced in 1748 in Austria and later in the Electorate of Saxony and the states of Western and Southern Germany.  

p. 457

318 The *Wartburg festival* was held on the initiative of Jena University students on October 18, 1817 to commemorate the tercentenary of the Reformation and the fourth anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig. The festival was a demonstration of the students' opposition to the Metternich regime.  

The *Burschenschaften* were German student organisations formed during the liberation struggle against Napoleon. They advocated the unification of Germany and combined progressive ideas with extreme nationalism.  

p. 458

319 The *Hambach festival* was a political demonstration held by members of South German liberal and radical bourgeoisie at the Hambach Castle (in the Rhineland Palatinate) on May 27, 1832 to urge the unification of Germany,
constitutional reforms and the transformation of Germany into a federal republic.

320 Under the Hohenstaufen dynasty (1138-1254), the Holy Roman Empire (founded in 962) was an unstable union of feudal principalities and free cities, it incorporated Germany and several other Central European states, part of Italy and East European regions captured by German feudal lords from the Slavs.

321 Engels ironically paraphrases the refrain of Ernst Moritz Arndt's well-known poem "Des Teutschen Vaterland" written in 1813. Arndt's refrain is "Sein Vaterland muß größer seh'n" (His fatherland must be greater).

322 See Note 220.

323 On the Peace of Westphalia, see Note 220.

The Peace of Teschen (Silesia) between Austria, on one side, and Prussia and Saxony, on the other, was signed on May 13, 1779 and concluded the War of the Bavarian Succession (1778-79). Prussia and Austria received parts of Bavarian territory, and Saxony was granted financial compensation. Russia acted as mediator in the conclusion of the treaty, and together with France, as its guarantor.

324 Silesia, part of the Austrian Empire since 1526, was seized by Prussia during the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-48) caused by the claims of several European rulers, above all, King Frederick II of Prussia, to the Habsburg domains, which, in default of a male heir on the death of Emperor Charles VI, went to his daughter, Marie Theresa.

Initially adopting a stance of benevolent neutrality towards Prussia, France openly sided with the anti-Austrian coalition after Prussia's first victories over Austria. In that war, Frederick II twice betrayed his allies by concluding separate peace treaties with Austria in 1742 and 1745; in 1742, Prussia received the major part and, after the war, the whole of Silesia.

325 See Note 177.

326 The reference is to the debate on and approval by the Regensburg Imperial Diet of the decision proposed by France and Russia to settle territorial issues in Rhenish Germany (see Note 177). The Diet was the supreme body of the Holy Roman Empire and consisted of representatives of the German states. It was in session almost uninterruptedly between 1663 and 1806.

327 See Note 171.

328 Here Engels uses the expression "Mehrer des Reiches" which was part of the official title of the Holy Roman Emperors.

329 The reference is to the secret Paris treaty of February 19 (March 3), 1859 concluded by France and Russia. Russia undertook to adopt a "political and military stand which most easily proves its benevolent neutrality towards France", and not to object to the enlargement of the Kingdom of Sardinia in the event of a war between France and Sardinia, on the one hand, and Austria, on the other. France pledged to encourage a revision of the articles of the Paris peace treaty of 1856 which ended the Crimean War, since they restricted Russian sovereignty on the Black Sea.

330 On December 2, 1851, Louis Bonaparte carried out a coup d'état by dissolving the Legislative Assembly and declared himself President of France in violation of the 1848 constitution.
The Carbonari were members of secret political societies in Italy and France in the first half of the 19th century. In Italy, they fought for national independence, unification of the country and liberal constitutional reforms. Louis Napoleon was a member of the Carbonari organisation in 1831.

As special constable, Louis Napoleon approved the preventive measures taken against the Chartist demonstration on April 10, 1848. p. 462

The so-called "nationalities principle" was advanced by the ruling circles of the Second Empire and extensively used by them as an ideological screen for their aggressive plans and adventurist foreign policy. Posing as a "defender of nations", Napoleon III exploited the national interests of the oppressed peoples to strengthen France's hegemony and extend its frontiers. The "nationalities principle" was designed to stir up national hatred and to turn the national movements, especially those of small nations, into a tool for the counter-revolutionary policy of the rival powers. p. 462

The reference is to the French frontiers established by the Luneville peace treaty concluded by France and Austria on February 9, 1801 after the defeat of the second anti-French coalition. The treaty extended France's frontiers by annexing the left bank of the Rhine, Belgium and Luxemburg, and sanctioned its actual rule over the republics created in 1795-98: Batavia (Holland), Helvetia (Switzerland), Liguria (Genoa) and Cisalpine (Lombardy). p. 462

Engels is referring to an attempt on the life of Napoleon III by the Italian revolutionary Felice Orsini on January 14, 1858. In this way Orsini hoped to encourage revolutionary action in Europe and advance the campaign for Italy's unification. The attempt failed, and Orsini was executed on March 13 of that year. p. 462

The two monarchs, the Austrian Emperor and the Russian Tsar, took joint action against revolutionary Hungary. In mid-June 1849, the Tsarist army entered Hungary to assist the Austrian counter-revolutionary forces. The intervention was tacitly endorsed by the ruling quarters of France and England. The combined forces of the Habsburgs and the Tsar suppressed the Hungarian revolution. p. 462

The war of the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and France against Austria, which lasted from April 29 to July 8, 1859, was launched by Napoleon III, who, under the banner of "liberating Italy" (in his manifesto on the war, he promised to make it "free up to the Adriatic"), sought territorial gains and needed a successful military campaign to shore up his regime in France. Piedmont's ruling circles were hoping that French support would enable them to unite Italy under the aegis of the Savoy dynasty. The war caused an upsurge of the national liberation movement in Italy. The Austrian army suffered a series of defeats. However, Napoleon III, frightened by the scale of the liberation movement in Italy, abruptly ceased hostilities. On July 11, the French and Austrian emperors concluded a separate preliminary peace treaty in Villafranca. France received Savoy and Nice. Lombardy was annexed to Sardinia; Venetia remained under Austria. p. 463

The Basle Peace was concluded on April 5, 1795 separately between France and Prussia, the latter being a member of the first anti-French coalition. Prussia's refusal to unconditionally assist Austria against France in 1859 generally made a bad impression in Germany. p. 463
The free-hand policy (die Politik der freien Hand)—a phrase coined by the Prussian Foreign Minister Alexander von Schleinitz during the Austro-Franco-Italian War of 1859, which defined Prussian policy at that time, neither to align with any of the warring powers nor to declare neutrality. p. 463

The Crédit Mobilier, short for the Société générale du Crédit Mobilier—a French joint-stock bank founded in 1852 by the Péreire brothers. The bank was closely connected with the Government of Napoleon III and, protected by it, engaged in speculation. It went bankrupt in 1867 and was wound up in 1871.

The bank's activities were described in a number of Marx's articles published in the New-York Daily Tribune (see present edition, Vol. 15, pp. 8-24, 270-77 and 357-60). p. 464

The Confederation of the Rhine (Rheinbund)—an association of sixteen states in Southern and Western Germany established in July 1806 under the protection-rate of Napoleon I, after the latter had defeated Austria in 1805. Later, twenty other states in Western, Central and Northern Germany joined the Confederation. It fell apart in 1813 after the defeat of Napoleon's army in Germany. p. 464

After the defeat of Austria by Napoleonic France in July 1805 and the formation of the Confederation of the Rhine (see Note 340), which announced its separation from the German Empire, Francis II, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, who had earlier accepted the title of Emperor of Austria under the name of Francis I, on August 6, 1806 rejected the German imperial crown. The German Empire ceased to exist. p. 465

The reference is to the fortresses of the German Confederation located mostly along the French border. Their garrisons were formed from armed units of major member-states, mostly Austria and Prussia. p. 466

The reference is to the reactionary government of Prince Schwarzenberg formed in November 1848 after the defeat of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, which had been launched by the popular insurrection of March 13, 1848 in Vienna. p. 466

In August 1863, a conference of German princes was convened in Frankfurt-am-Main on the initiative of Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria to discuss a plan for the reform of the German Confederation providing for Austrian supremacy. King William I of Prussia refused to attend; several minor states also failed to extend full support to Austria, and the conference proved fruitless. p. 466

The term Realpolitik was used to describe Bismarck's policy, which, his contemporaries believed, was based entirely on cool calculation. p. 466

The reference is to Frederick II's conversation with Beauvau, the French envoy to Berlin, not long before the War of the Austrian Succession (see Note 324). p. 469

When territorial issues were settled by the so-called Imperial Deputation in 1803 (see Note 177), Prussia received as compensation the secularised Münster bishopric and some other possessions in Western Germany. p. 469

The reference is to the events of the wars waged by the third and the fourth coalitions of European powers against Napoleonic France. The third coalition was formed in 1805 and embraced Britain, Austria, Russia, Sweden and the Kingdom of Naples. Prussia refused to join it, declaring its neutrality, and in
November 1805 concluded a treaty with Russia pledging to act as a mediator between the coalition and France, and, should its efforts fail, to join the campaign against Napoleon. However, after Austria's defeat at Austerlitz on December 12, 1805, Prussia signed a treaty with France, under which it received the Electorate of Hanover, for certain territorial concessions on the Rhine. The establishment of Napoleon's rule in Western and Southern Germany and his action to the detriment of Prussia again prompted the latter to side with Russia and Britain, who were still in a state of war with France. The fourth coalition was formed and encompassed Britain, Russia, Prussia and Sweden. In October 1806, in the battles of Jena (see Note 220) and Auerstedt, the Prussian army was routed by French troops which then occupied Prussia.

The Customs Union (Zollverein) of German states (initially embracing 18 states), which established a common customs frontier, was founded in 1834 and headed by Prussia. By the 1840s, the Union embraced all German states with the exception of Austria, the Hanseatic towns (Bremen, Lübeck, Hamburg) and some of the smaller states. Formed due to the need for a single German market, the Customs Union subsequently promoted Germany's political unification. It ceased to exist in 1871.

Landwehr—the army reserve formed in Prussia in 1813 during the struggle against Napoleon. In the 1840s, it consisted of men under forty who had done three years of active service and not less than two years in the reserve. In contrast to the regular army, the Landwehr was called up only in case of extreme emergency (war, or threat of war).

Kulturkampf—the term used to designate the campaign of the Bismarck government in 1871-75 against the Catholic Church and the Party of the Centre closely associated with it, which expressed separatist and anti-Prussian tendencies widespread in Western and South-Western Germany. A number of laws were passed for the purpose of weakening the influence of the Centre and the Catholic clergy which supported it. However, the Church refused to comply. In the second half of the 1870s and early 1880s, against the background of the growing workers' movement, Bismarck, seeking to unite all reactionary forces, effected a reconciliation with the Catholic Church; the majority of the laws were repealed.

Here Engels has in mind the liberals who advocated the transformation of Germany into a federative state after the model of Switzerland, which was divided into self-governing cantons.

The song about Burgomaster Tschech (Tschech's Attentat)—a folk satire mocking Frederick William IV of Prussia in the context of the abortive attempt on his life staged on July 26, 1844 by Heinrich Tschech, former burgomaster of Storkow (Prussia).

The song about the Baroness von Droste-Fischering—a folk satire of the Catholic clergy mocking the tricks played by the so-called "healers" who operated in Trier in the 1840s.

The reference is to the coup d'état in Prussia in November-December 1848. On November 2 of that year, the counter-revolutionary Brandenburg-Manteuffel government came to office; on November 8, by a royal edict, sessions of the Prussian National Assembly were transferred from Berlin to Brandenburg; the majority of the Assembly, which continued meeting in Berlin, were dispersed on November 15 by General Wrangel's troops; the coup d'état ended.
when on December 5, the Assembly was disbanded and a Constitution granted. It introduced a two-chamber system and empowered the King not only to revoke the chambers' decisions but also to revise some of the articles of the Constitution itself. In April 1849, Frederick William disbanded the chamber elected on the basis of the imposed Constitution, and on May 30 passed new electoral legislation which introduced a three-class voting system based on high property qualifications and unequal representation of the various groups of the population. The King managed to get the new Constitution adopted with the support of the majority in the new chamber of representatives, and it came into force on January 31, 1850. Prussia retained the upper chamber, which consisted mostly of representatives of the feudal nobility (chamber of the gentry). The Constitution gave the government the right to set up special courts to deal with cases of high treason. In December 1850, the Brandenburg-Manteuffel ministry was replaced by the Manteuffel ministry, which remained in office until November 1858.

Since Frederick William IV of Prussia suffered from a mental illness, his brother, Prince William, was appointed his deputy in 1857, and regent in October 1858. In January 1861, following the death of the former, the Prince was proclaimed king under the name of William I. In November 1858, the Prince Regent dismissed the Manteuffel ministry and brought to power moderate liberals headed by Karl August Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. The term of this ministry's office (up to March 1862) came to be known as "the New Era". However, the liberal ministry did not introduce any radical reforms and was replaced by a conservative cabinet headed by Prince Adolf von Hohenlohe. In September 1862, Otto von Bismarck became Prussian Prime Minister.

In February 1860, the lower chamber (chamber of representatives) of the Prussian Provincial Diet refused to approve the plan for the army's reorganisation proposed by the War Minister von Roon. The government however managed to secure from the chamber of representatives the means to maintain the army already in existence, and this allowed it to begin the reorganisation. When in March 1862 the liberal majority in the chamber refused to approve the military budget and demanded the establishment of a ministry accountable to the Provincial Diet, the government disbanded the latter and announced new elections. In late September 1862, Bismarck's ministry was formed, which in October of that year dissolved the Diet and launched the military reform without waiting for it to approve the expenditure. This constitutional conflict, as it was called, between the Prussian government and the bourgeois-liberal majority of the Diet was settled only in 1866, when, after Prussia's victory over Austria, the Prussian bourgeoisie capitulated before Bismarck.

On Prussia's war against Denmark in 1848-50 and the mobilisation of 1850, see Note 309.

Under the London Protocol on the integrity of the Danish monarchy, signed on May 8, 1852 by Russia, Austria, Britain, France, Prussia, Sweden and representatives of Denmark, Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark could be bound only by personal union. Holstein remained a member of the German Confederation. In 1855, a constitution was published which was valid for all parts of the Danish Kingdom and covered both these duchies; only in 1858, under pressure from the German Federal Diet, did the Danish government
agree to exclude Holstein from the provisions of the Constitution, but on condition that it make a contribution to national expenditure. On November 13, 1863, the Danish parliament approved a new constitution which declared the annexation of Schleswig to Denmark. p. 474

The National Association (Deutscher National-Verein) was a party of the German liberal bourgeoisie which advocated the unification of Germany (without Austria) in a strong centralised state under the aegis of the Prussian monarchy. Its inaugural congress was held in Frankfurt in September 1859. After the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and the formation of the North German Confederation, the National Association announced its dissolution in November 1867. p. 474

The reference is to the Russo-Prussian convention initiated by Bismarck and signed on February 8 (January 27), 1863 by Russian Foreign Minister Alexander Gorchakov and the Prussian representative Gustav von Alvensleben. Under the convention, Prussia undertook to render Tsarist Russia comprehensive assistance in suppressing the Polish uprising of 1863. p. 477

The reference is to Austria's role in the Danish-Prussian War of 1848-50 (see Note 309), especially in its final stage, when Prussia sided with the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, which were waging an armed liberation struggle against Danish rule. Together with Tsarist Russia and other European states, Austria supported Denmark and brought pressure to bear on Prussia to make peace. On July 2, 1850 a treaty was signed which preserved Danish supremacy over the duchies. Advocates of their secession continued hostilities, but Prussia did not support them, and the Schleswig-Holstein army was routed. In the winter of 1850-51, on Austria's initiative, a commission of the German Confederation (see Note 171) escorted by Austrian and Prussian troops was sent to the duchies. The Schleswig-Holstein army was disbanded, and Danish rule over the duchies restored. p. 477

The war of Austria and Prussia against Denmark, caused by the latter's refusal to give up its plans to annex Schleswig, began in February 1864 and ended in July with a total defeat of the Danish army. Under the peace treaty signed in Vienna on October 30, 1864, Denmark lost its rights to the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, as well as to the small principality of Lauenburg, which were declared the joint possession (condominium) of Austria and Prussia. p. 477

In the original, Engels used the term *Haupt- und Staatsaktion* ("principal and spectacular action", "main and state action"), which has a double meaning. First, in the 17th and the first half of the 18th century, it denoted plays performed by German touring companies. But this term can also denote major political events. p. 479

The Warsaw Protocol of June 5 (May 24), 1851, signed by Russia and Denmark, as well as the London Protocol of May 8, 1852 (see Note 358), established the principle of the integrity of the Danish Crown's territorial possessions, including the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. p. 479

The reference is to the armed intervention in Mexico by Britain, France and Spain in late 1861-early 1862. Its aim was to suppress the Mexican revolution and turn the country into a colony of the European powers. Hostilities were
conducted by the French troops, as Britain and Spain soon recalled theirs. By mid-1863, the capital, Mexico City, and a number of other major centres were captured. Mexico was proclaimed an empire with the Austrian Archduke Maximilian at its head. However, the insurgents managed to win several important victories. The French troops sustained heavy losses and were forced to leave the country in early 1867.

See Note 171.

The phrase "a refreshing jolly war" ("ein frischer fröhlicher Krieg") was coined by the historian and writer Heinrich Leo in June 1853 in the Volksblatt für Stadt und Land, No. 61 and used later also in a militarist and chauvinist context.

The North German Confederation (Norddeutscher Bund)—a federative state formed in 1867 after Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian war to replace the disintegrated German Confederation (see Note 171). The North German Confederation included nineteen states and three free cities, which were formally recognised as autonomous. The Confederation ceased to exist in January 1871, when the German Empire was formed.

The reference is to Bismarck's diplomatic preparations for the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 (see Note 172). In early March 1866, Robert Goltz, the Prussian Ambassador in Paris, obtained Napoleon III's consent to observe benevolent neutrality towards Prussia in the event of it becoming involved in a war with Austria. Simultaneously, Bismarck conducted negotiations in Berlin to explore the possibility of forming a Prusso-Italian coalition spearheaded against Austria. The other party in the negotiations was the Italian general Giuseppe Govone, who was given to understand that, France being agreeable, Bismarck would not oppose Italy annexing the German territories lying between the Rhine and the Mosel. The treaty on a defensive and offensive alliance between Prussia and Italy signed on April 8, 1866 provided for Italy to receive Venetia in the event of victory over Austria.

Fighting in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 on the side of Austria were Saxony, Hanover, Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg, the Electorate of Hesse, Hesse-Darmstadt, Nassau and other member-states of the German Confederation; on the side of Prussia—Mecklenburg, Oldenburg and other North German states, as well as the three free cities.

In early June 1866, Austria lodged a complaint with the Federal Diet against Prussia's violation of the treaty on the joint administration of the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Bismarck refused to comply with the decision of the Diet which, on Austria's proposal, declared war on Prussia. During the war, the headway made by the Prussian troops forced the Diet to move from Frankfurt to Augsburg, where on August 24, 1866, it announced its dissolution.

The Austro-Prussian war ended in the signing of the peace treaty in Prague on August 23, 1866.

On Prussia's annexation of three member-states of the German Confederation and one free city, see Note 172.

Louis Bonaparte was nicknamed "the Little" by Victor Hugo in a speech in the Legislative Assembly in November 1851; the nickname became popular after the publication of Hugo's pamphlet Napoléon le Petit (1852).
In September 1866, the Prussian Chamber of Deputies voted 230 against 75 for the so-called indemnity bill proposed by Bismarck on exempting the government from responsibility for the expenditure that had not been legally approved at the time of the constitutional conflict (see Note 356).

The Prussians defeated the Austrians on July 3, 1866 near the village of Sadowa, in the vicinity of the town of Königgrätz in Bohemia.

The Customs Parliament (Zollparlament) was formed following the signing of a treaty between Prussia and the South German states on July 8, 1867. It consisted of members of the North German Confederation's Reichstag and specially elected deputies from South German states: Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg and Hesse. It was to deal exclusively with trade issues and the customs policy. Bismarck's wish to gradually broaden its prerogatives extending them to political questions, met with stubborn resistance from the South German representatives.

The river Main formed the boundary between the North German Confederation and the South German states.

Under the peace treaty with Austria concluded in Vienna on October 3, 1866 Italy, which fought on the side of Prussia in the Austro-Prussian War, annexed Venetia. However, as a result of Prussia's opposition, its claims to the South Tyrol and Trieste, the property of Austria, were not satisfied.

In his despatch of August 6, 1847 to Count Apponyi in Paris, the Austrian Chancellor Metternich wrote "L'Italie est une expression géographique". Later he applied the expression to Germany as well.

The London Conference of diplomatic representatives of Austria, Russia, Prussia, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Great Britain and Luxemburg on the issue of Luxemburg was held between May 7 and 11, 1867. Under the treaty signed on May 11, the Duchy of Luxemburg was declared neutral. Prussia undertook to promptly withdraw its troops from the Luxemburg Fortress, and Napoleon III was to renounce his claims for annexing Luxemburg.

On August 6, 1870, in the battles of Spicheren (Lorraine) and Wörth (Alsace), Prussian troops defeated several French corps. These victories, won at the initial stage of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, allowed the Prussian command to launch an offensive, in the course of which the French army was broken up into two groups and then surrounded and smashed to pieces.

On the Battle of Sedan, see Note 224.

The news of the defeat of the French army at Sedan gave rise to mass revolutionary action in Paris, on September 4, 1870 which led to the fall of the Second Empire and the proclamation of a republic. Power, however, was captured by bourgeois republicans. The provisional government headed by General Louis Trochu declared itself "the Government of National Defence" but, scared by the revolutionary outburst, in fact chose a policy of national betrayal and collusion with the enemy.

The reference is probably to the proclamation addressed to the French nation on August 11, 1870 and signed by King William I of Prussia.
The Landsturm Statute, passed in Prussia on April 21, 1813, provided for the organisation of volunteer units ("francs-tireurs"), without a uniform, who were to carry on guerrilla warfare in the rear and on the flanks of Napoleon's army. All able-bodied men not in active service were urged to join the Landsturm.

The brutalities perpetrated against the French francs-tireurs by the Prussian army that occupied France at the time of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71 are described by Engels in a series of articles "Notes on the War" (see present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 163, 167 and 198-202).

Engels is referring to the Battle of Héricourt (near Belfort) on January 15-17, 1871 between German troops and the French Eastern Army under Charles Bourbaki, which advanced to the southern Vosges planning to deal a flank strike at the main communication line of the German army besieging Paris. The attacks of the Eastern Army were rebuffed by the Germans, it was forced to retreat to the Swiss border and was interned on that country's territory. In the meantime, on January 28, 1871, Bismarck and Jules Favre, a representative of the National Defence Government, signed a convention on the armistice and the capitulation of Paris.

Several hundred civilians were killed and many wounded in street fighting on March 18, 1848 in Berlin. The insurgents took over the guarding of the Palace, and on the morning of March 19 forced the King to go out onto the balcony and bare his head before the corpses of the fallen fighters.

After the signing of a convention on the armistice and the capitulation of Paris on January 28, 1871, the hostilities between France and Prussia were not resumed. On February 26, 1871, the French government headed by Thiers concluded a preliminary peace on the terms dictated by Bismarck. The final peace treaty was signed on May 10, 1871 in Frankfurt-am-Main. It confirmed Germany's annexation of Alsace and eastern Lorraine. Under the Frankfurt Treaty, the terms on which France was to pay the 5-milliard francs contribution were made harsher, and the German occupation of the French territory was prolonged. That was the cost of Bismarck's assistance to the Versailles government in the suppression of the Commune.

See Note 220.

Under the Peace of Westphalia, which concluded the European Thirty Years' War (1618-48), Strassburg remained incorporated in the German Empire, although Alsace became part of France. By order of Louis XIV issued on September 30, 1681, French troops occupied the city as belonging to Alsace. The Catholic Party of Strassburg headed by Bishop Fürstenberg hailed the annexation and did its best to prevent resistance to the French troops.

Reunion chambers (Chambres de réunion) set up by Louis XIV in 1679-80 were to give juridical and historical grounds for France's claims to territories of neighbouring states, which were then occupied by French troops.

See Note 337.

The reference is to the preliminary peace treaty signed on October 5, 1735 in Vienna by Austria and France. It ended the War of the Polish Succession (1733-35) between Russia, Austria and Saxony, on the one hand, and France, on the other. Russia and Austria supported the claims to the Polish throne of
Elector Friedrich August of Saxony (the future King August III of Poland), while France promoted Stanislaus Leszczyński, Louis XV's father-in-law. Under the treaty, Louis XV recognised August III as King of Poland provided the Duchy of Lorraine was given over to Stanislaus Leszczyński. On his death, it was to pass over to the French crown. The terms of the preliminary treaty were confirmed by the Vienna Treaty of 1738. On Stanislaus Leszczyński's demise in 1766, Lorraine was incorporated into France.

395 The reference is to the strong fortified position formed by North Italian fortresses of Verona, Legnago, Mantua and Peschiera. Engels wrote about the role of these fortresses as a stronghold of Austrian rule in Northern Italy in his works "The Austrian Hold on Italy" and "Po and Rhine" (see present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 183-89 and 227-29).

396 In his speech in the Reichstag on February 6, 1888 during the discussion of the bill on the reorganisation of Germany's armed forces, Bismarck, who insisted on the need to boost the country's military might and who actually recognised the possibility of an anti-German coalition between France and Tsarist Russia, extolled Alexander III's policies towards Germany, counterposing them to the anti-German campaign launched by the Russian press.

397 In the winter of 1886-87, Bismarck capitalised on a slight deterioration in relations with France and demanded that the Reichstag pass a law providing for a substantial increase of the army and approve a military budget for the next seven years. The majority of the deputies refused to approve the budget proposed by Bismarck and suggested a three-year budget, after which the Reichstag was dissolved. At the elections of February 21, 1887, a majority vote was received by the pro-Bismarck parties—conservatives, "free conservatives" (see Note 403) and National Liberals (see Note 170), who formed a so-called cartel. The new Reichstag approved the budget proposed by Bismarck.

398 Engels is referring to the conferral of the title German Emperor on King William I of Prussia in Versailles on January 18, 1871.

399 See Note 252.

400 The reference is to the economic crisis which struck Germany in May 1873. It was preceded by rapid economic advance accompanied by the feverish establishment of new enterprises and extensive speculations.

401 The reference is to the bourgeois-liberal Party of Progress (Fortschrittspartei), formed in 1861 in Prussia. It voiced the interests of petty bourgeoisie and the sections of middle bourgeoisie engaged in foreign trade. The party supported the idea of the country's unification under the aegis of Prussia, but demanded that a parliamentary system be established. In 1866, its Right wing split off and formed the National Liberal Party (see Note 170). In 1884, the men of Progress entered into a union with the Left wing of the National Liberal Party and formed the German Party of Free Thinkers (Deutsche Freisinnige Partei).

402 The reference is to the General Association of German Workers (Lassalleans) set up by Ferdinand Lassalle in 1863, and the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (the Eisenachers), whose inaugural congress took place in Eisenach in 1869. The former was a nationwide political organisation of the working class which employed mostly legal forms of class struggle. The latter
was set up with Marx's and Engels' assistance and was headed by Bebel and Liebknecht; it was affiliated to the First International. Despite a number of erroneous propositions in its programme, it pursued a revolutionary and proletarian line on the issue of Germany's unification and on other questions. At the Gotha Congress in 1875, the two trends merged into a single party, which up to 1890 was called the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany.

The Conservative Party (the so-called Kreuz-Zeitung's Party, see Note 168) was set up in 1848 and promoted the interests of the Junkers, the aristocracy, the generals, the Lutheran clergy and top officials. In the first years after the unification of Germany, it was in opposition to Bismarck's government, believing that Prussian supremacy in Germany was not secure enough. In 1866, a Free Conservative Party split off from it which expressed the interests of big landowners and a section of industrial tycoons, and unconditionally supported Bismarck. In 1876, the Party was reorganised into an all-German Conservative Party.

The treaties with the South German states (Baden, Hesse, Bavaria and Württemberg) on their joining the North German Confederation were signed in November 1870. They accorded a greater measure of independence to the Confederation's member-states, the relevant provisions being incorporated into the Constitution of the German Empire of April 16, 1871. Bavaria and Württemberg retained the special tax on beer and spirits and special rights in the management of the postal and telegraphic service; Bavaria, moreover, retained a degree of independence in administering its army and railways.

Under the Constitution of the North German Confederation, which came into force on July 1, 1867, the Reichstag, which had a right to approve the budget, was elected by universal suffrage. The Federal Council, whose functions were confined to approval of laws, consisted of representatives nominated by governments of all member-states of the Confederation.

Engels uses the term Manteuffelism alluding to the constant violations of the Prussian Constitution that occurred under the Ministry of Otto von Manteuffel (1850-58).

On the constitutional conflict, see Note 356.

On the Battle of Sadowa, see Note 375.

Under the Law on Imperial Treasury Notes of April 30, 1874, banknotes to the total sum of 120 million marks were issued. All member-states of the German Empire were obliged to exchange and withdraw their paper money from circulation.

The Law on the Imperial Bank passed on March 14, 1875 regulated the emission operations of all banks on the territory of the German Empire.

The reference is to courts (Schöffengerichte) that sprang up in the Middle Ages in the part of Germany where Frankish law was in force (Westphalia, Saxony, cities on the Lower Rhine and Mosel). They disappeared by the 18th century but were resurrected after Germany's unification in 1871 as "an innately German institution". They consisted of a judge and two Schöffen (assessors)
who, unlike juries, took full part in passing sentences, in other words, defined the extent of the punishment together with the judge as their chairman. To fulfil a Schöffen's functions, a person had to meet certain age, property and residential qualifications.

410 See Note 69. p. 507

411 The reference is to the Imperial Press Law of May 7, 1874. p. 507

412 The reference is to the administrative reform of 1872 in Prussia which abolished landowners' hereditary rule in rural districts and introduced elements of local self-government: elective elders in the communities, district councils under the Landrats, elected in conformity with the estates system, etc. The purpose of the reform was to strengthen the state apparatus and to promote centralisation in the interests of the class of Junkers as a whole. p. 507

413 The reference is to the local government reform in England. The Local Government Bill was introduced by the Salisbury government (1886-92) in March 1888 and approved by Parliament that August. Under the reform, the sheriff's functions were given over to the elective county councils in charge of taxation, local budgets, etc. All persons who enjoyed the right to take part in parliamentary elections, among them women over 30, could take part in council elections. p. 508

414 See Note 351. p. 509

415 Ultramontanism, an extremely reactionary religious and political trend in Catholicism, which emerged in the 15th century. Its adherents opposed the independence of the national churches and advocated the idea of the Pope's supremacy and his right to interfere in the affairs of any state. Its mounting influence in the second half of the 19th century led to the formation of Catholic parties in some of the European states and the declaration of Papal infallibility at the first Council of the Vatican in 1870. p. 509

416 On September 20, 1870, troops of the Italian Kingdom entered Rome, which until then had been under the Pope's rule. On the basis of the plebiscite held on October 2 in the Papal States in which the majority voted for annexation to Italy, the government announced that it was henceforth incorporated into the Italian Kingdom. This completed the country's political unification. The Pope's secular rule was abolished. The Guarantee Law passed in 1871 secured the Pope's state sovereignty only within the boundaries of the Vatican and Lateran palaces and his country residence. The Pope reciprocated by excommunicating the instigators of the occupation of Rome, refused to recognise the Guarantee Law and declared himself “the Vatican prisoner”. p. 509

417 The reference is to the small groups of deputies representing the Poles and Alsatians in the Reichstag, as well as the so-called German-Hanover separatist party formed after 1866 and embracing champions of the independent Hanover monarchy headed by the Guelph dynasty, which had ruled there prior to Hanover's annexation to Prussia in 1866. p. 510

418 See Note 312. p. 511


420 Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly published the Manifesto of the Communist Party on December 30, 1871 in an abridged form.
Le Socialiste also printed an abridged version of the Manifesto in January-February 1872.

421 The first Russian translation of the Manifesto of the Communist Party appeared in 1869 in Geneva in the Volnaya Russkaya Tipografiya (the Free Russian Press) publishing house, the ownership of which Herzen handed over to Chernetsky, a staff member, in 1867.

422 The 1882 Russian edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party appeared as a third instalment of the Social-Revolutionary Library published by Pyotr Lavrov. Engels made a mistake, naming Vera Zasulich as the author of the translation: it was the work of Georgy Plekhanov. In 1894, in an afterword to the article “On Social Relations in Russia” (see present edition, Vol. 27), Engels himself wrote that the translation was that of Plekhanov.

Marx and Engels wrote a special preface to the 1882 edition (see present edition, Vol. 24).

423 The Danish translation in question (K. Marx og F. Engels, Det Kommunistiske Manifest, København, 1885) had some omissions and inaccuracies, which was noted by Engels in the preface to the fourth German edition of the Manifesto (see present edition, Vol. 27). The French translation appeared in Le Socialiste between August 29 and November 7, 1885, and was reprinted as an appendix in the book: Mermeix, La France socialiste, Paris, 1886. The Spanish translation was published in the Socialista in July-August 1886, and also as a separate edition: Manifesto de Partido Communista par Carlos Marx y F. Engels, Madrid, 1886.

424 Owenites—followers of Robert Owen, the English utopian socialist whose ideas gained particularly wide currency in the 1820s-30s. According to his system for transforming the life of all mankind, “the communities” established on voluntary principles were to become a model for the development of the new productive forces (including the science of chemistry), the education of a new harmoniously developed man, and the establishment of new social relations. His most prominent followers were John Grey, Thomas Hodgskin, William Thompson and John Bray. Engels wrote in The Condition of the Working-Class in England: “English socialism arose with Owen” (see present edition, Vol. 4, p. 525).

Fourierists—followers of Charles Fourier, the French utopian socialist whose doctrine became especially widespread in the 1830s-40s. Advocating the establishment of a harmonious social system on the basis of the 18th-century materialists’ ideas, Fourier admitted the presence in it of private property, classes and unearned incomes. He believed that the principal condition for the success of the new society was the growth of labour productivity that would secure universal wealth.

Fourier’s doctrine made a major impact on the social and philosophical thought in a number of countries in Europe and North America.

425 Sturm und Drang—a literary movement which evolved in Germany in the early 1770s and got its name from Friedrich Klinger’s play of the same title. It conveyed the mounting general discontent with the feudal practices.

426 This article was written by Engels in English as a preface to the American
Note 685

An edition of Marx's speech on the question of free trade delivered in Brussels on January 9, 1848 (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 450-65). Engels also looked through the translation of the speech made by Florence Kelly-Wischnewetzky and translated his preface into German. It was first published in that language in Die Neue Zeit, No. 7, July 1888. In the second half of August, it was published in the English original in The Labor Standard in New York. The publication of Marx's speech in pamphlet form was delayed, as many publishers refused to accept it, and it was not printed until September 1888 by Lee and Shepard Publishers, Boston. The concluding part of the article was also published in German in Der Sozialist (New York) on October 27, 1888.


See Note 154.

See Note 193.

The physiocratic school, Physiocrats—a trend in bourgeois classical political economy that emerged in France in the 1750s. The Physiocrats held Nature to be the only source of wealth, and agriculture the only sphere of the economy where value was created. Although they underestimated the role of industry and commerce, the Physiocrats rendered an important service by shifting the search for the origins of surplus value from the sphere of circulation to that of production, thereby laying the basis for the analysis of capitalist production. Advocates of large-scale capitalist farming, they showed the moribund nature of the feudal economy and thus contributed to the ideological preparation of the bourgeois revolution in France.

The reference is to the American Civil War of 1861-65. The Southern slave-holders rose against the Union and formed a Confederacy of the Southern states. The war was caused mainly by the conflict between the two social systems: the capitalist system of wage labour established in the North and the slave system dominant in the South. The Civil War, which had the nature of a bourgeois-democratic revolution, passed two stages in its development: the period of a constitutional war for maintaining the Union and the period of a revolutionary war for the abolition of slavery. The decisive role in the defeat of the Southerners was played by workers and farmers.

"Manifest destiny", an expression widely used in the 19th century by the ideologists of the expansionist policy pursued by the US ruling quarters to vindicate this policy. It was first used by John O'Sullivan, editor of the U.S. Magazine and Democratic Review, in the July-August issue of 1845, Vol. XVII, p. 5.

Parliamentary train—a name for third-class trains in England which, under the law of 1844, each railway company was obliged to run once a day at a speed of 12 miles per hour, fares not exceeding one penny per mile.

In 1823, William Huskisson became President of the Board of Trade. On his initiative, a series of measures were introduced in the 1820s to reorganise the obsolete customs system. The prohibitive duties on corn were replaced by a
sliding tariff scale, under which import duties rose or fell depending on the fall or rise in grain prices inside the country.

The tariff reform of 1842 lowered customs duties on corn and other imported goods, but introduced income tax as a compensation for the treasury.

The reference is to the Ten Hours' Bill of 1847, which came into force on May 1, 1848. In August 1850, Parliament introduced an additional factory act which prolonged the working day for women and adolescents to ten-and-a-half hours on the first five days of the week and reduced it to seven-and-a-half hours on Saturday. See also Note 161.

The need for a reform of the customs tariff so as to raise the duties on imported industrial and agricultural goods was stated by a group of Reichstag deputies in October 1878. In December, Bismarck submitted his initial rough draft of a reform to a specially established commission. The final version was debated in the Reichstag beginning in May 1879 and was approved on July 12 of that year. The new customs tariff provided for a substantial increase of import duties on iron, machinery, textile, grain, cattle, fats, flax, timber, etc.

The reference is to the trade agreement between Britain and France signed on January 22, 1860. The principal figure on the British side was free trader Richard Cobden. Under the agreement, France renounced its prohibitive customs policy and introduced duties that could not exceed 30, and later 25 per cent of the cost of the goods. The agreement granted France the right to export the bulk of its goods to England tax-free. One consequence of the agreement was mounting competition on the home market caused by the influx of English goods, which provoked displeasure among the French manufacturers and industrialists.

The Standard Oil Company was founded by John D. Rockefeller in the state of Ohio in 1870 with an initial capital of $1 million. In the 1870s, the company dominated the refining and transportation of oil and came to control almost the entire US oil industry. In 1882, the company was transformed into a trust of the same name, operating on a capital of $75 million. Later, the Standard Oil grew into one of the world's largest corporations.

The American Sugar Company (trust) was set up in 1887 and became the American Sugar Refining Company in 1891. In the first years of its existence, the trust came to dominate nearly all of the US sugar industry. Later, despite the formation of major competing companies, the trust managed to retain its position as the largest corporation in the branch by establishing control over some of its competitors and cooperating with others on a profit-sharing basis.

The Manchester School—a trend in economic thinking which reflected the interests of industrial bourgeoisie. Its adherents, known as Free Traders, advocated freedom of trade and non-interference by the government in economic life. The centre of the Free Traders' activities was Manchester, where the movement was headed by two textile manufacturers, Richard Cobden and John Bright, who founded the Anti-Corn Law League in 1838. In the 1840s and 1850s, the Free Traders formed a separate political group which later constituted the Left wing of the Liberal Party.
This letter written by Engels (see Engels to Laura Lafargue, May 7, 1889, present edition, Vol. 48) in connection with the preparations for the international socialist congress was published in The Labour Elector on behalf of the French socialist Charles Bonnier, who was actively involved in the work. The decisive role in the convocation of the congress belonged to Marxist organisations, the German Social-Democratic and French Workers' parties, which acted under Engels' guidance. Opportunists, mostly French Possibilists (see Note 444) supported by the British Social-Democratic Federation, sought to prevent the consolidation of revolutionary Marxist forces and tried to take the organisation of the congress into their hands, but in vain. The International Socialist Workers' Congress, which took place in Paris in July 1889, highlighted the Marxists' victory. It paved the way for a new international proletarian association, the Second International. The alternative congress convened by the Possibilists and their allies failed to win the support of the majority of socialist organisations and proved a flop. p. 537

Possibilism—an opportunist trend in the French socialist movement that existed from the 1880s to the early 20th century. It was headed by Paul Brousse and Benoît Malon, who in 1882 effected a split in the French Workers' Party. The dissenters adopted the name of the Workers' Social- Revolutionary Party. Its ideological foundation was the reformist theory of municipal socialism. The Possibilists declared the "policy of possibilities" ("la politique des possibilités") their principle. In the early 20th century, they joined the French Socialist Party.

On the opportunists, see Note 208. p. 537

The Parliamentary Committee—the executive of the British Trade Union Congress (up to 1921). p. 538

The International Workers' Congress was convened in London in November 1888 by the British trade union leadership. Represented at it were trade unions from several European countries. p. 538

This is Engels' letter to James Keir Hardie, editor of the Labour Leader magazine, where it was published without a heading in the "Mining Notes" section and supplied with the following introductory note: "The great miners' strike in Germany is over, and the men have succeeded in establishing their demand for an 8-hour day from bank to bank. Mr. Frederick Engels, the eminent historian of the labour movement, and the life-long friend of the great Karl Marx, sends me the following interesting note on the strike."

The Ruhr miners' strike was one of the major events in the German working-class movement in late 19th century. It began on May 4, 1889 in the GelsenKirchen mining district and spread to the entire Dortmund area. Up to 90,000 people were taking part at its peak. Some of the strikers were under the influence of Social-Democrats. The main demands of the strikers were: higher wages, reduction of the working day to 8 hours, and recognition of workers' committees. The industrialists promised to meet some of the workers' demands, as a result of which work was partially resumed in mid-May. However, as the employers went back on their word, a miners' delegates' meeting held on May 24 passed a decision to continue the strike. Repressive measures, on the one hand, and fresh promises by mine-owners, on the other, prompted the workers to call off the strike in early June. p. 539

See Note 253. p. 539
A three-man delegation of the striking miners was formed through the effort of some of the Reichstag liberal deputies who sought to curtail the influence of Social-Democratic ideas on the miners and used their relatively low level of political awareness. The delegation was received by William II on May 14.

In mid-May 1889, the strike movement launched by the Ruhr miners spread to Upper and Lower Silesia, where it involved a large part of the mines (20,000 people) and lasted from May 14 to 24, and to Saxony, where 10,000 people took part in it. In the Saar area, workers at some of the mines went on strike on May 14-16, and by May 23, the number of strikers reached 12,000. Somewhat earlier, strikes began in the Wurm mining district, involving about 8,000 men. Work was not resumed until May 31. A major miners' strike also took place in Bohemia, in the district of Kladno, on May 24.

At the end of May, strikes for higher wages and, in some cases, shorter working hours, were held in various towns and districts of Germany. On May 25, about 20,000 masons went on strike in Berlin; in Freienwalde, a strike was launched by railway workers, and in Stettin and Königsberg, by house painters and carpenters.

This article was occasioned by the campaign launched by the Possibilists (see Note 444) in France and their adherents in the Social-Democratic Federation in Britain in order to discredit the International Socialist Workers' Congress held in Paris between July 14 and 21, 1889, at which the Marxist parties of European countries clearly dominated. Initially, the Possibilists tried to take preparations for the congress into their hands and thus secure themselves a leading role but, having failed to do so, they convened an alternative congress in Paris, attended by only a few foreign delegates, their representation in most cases being purely fictitious. The attempt to unite the two congresses failed, since the Possibilist Congress made unification conditional on re-verification of the credentials of the delegates to the Marxist congress.

Three tailors of Tooley Street, a well-known phrase originating from John Canning, a British statesman, who said that three tailors of Tooley Street had addressed the House of Commons in a petition opened with the words: “We, the people of England”.

The Carlists—a reactionary clerical absolutist group in Spain uniting adherents of the pretender to the Spanish throne Don Carlos, the brother of Ferdinand VII. They relied on the army and the Catholic clergy, as well as on the more backward peasants in some regions of Spain.

This is an excerpt from Engels' letter apparently addressed to Eleanor Marx. The excerpt was printed by The Labour Elector and published in German translation in the New Yorker Volkszeitung on September 25, 1889 and the Berliner Volks-Tribüne on October 26, 1889.

The London dockers' strike from August 12 to September 14, 1889 was a major event in the British working-class movement of the late 19th century. Taking part in it were 30,000 dockers and over 30,000 workers of other trades; the majority were unskilled labourers who did not belong to any trade union. The strikers obtained higher wages and better working conditions. The dockers' strike introduced more organisation into the movement: a dockers' and some other unions were set up which embraced a large number of unskilled workers and came to be known as the New Trade Unions.
This article carried by the *Sozialdemokrat* aroused profound interest in the socialist quarters in many countries: on October 11, 1889, it was reprinted by the Vienna *Arbeiter-Zeitung*; on October 12, in a slightly abridged English translation, by *The Labour Elector*, on October 26 (with insignificant editorial changes and under the heading, "Was die Bourgeoisie nicht kann und was die Arbeiter können"), by the *Berliner Volks-Tribüne*, as well as by other newspapers in Germany and the USA. In 1890, the article was translated into Russian and published in the *Социал-демократ*, No. 1, 1890.

This article was published in English in full for the first time in: Marx and Engels, *Articles on Britain*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971. p. 546

The reference is to the first ballot to the French Chamber of Deputies on September 22, 1889, when the republicans received only 215, and the various monarchist groups (Legitimists, Bonapartists and Boulangists), 140 seats.

p. 547

See Note 454.

Engels probably wrote this passage when working on *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. In content, it relates to the passage in Chapter IX of the book which deals with the survival of the gentle system in medieval aristocratic, patrician and peasant associations (see this volume, pp. 268-69). However, due to the absence of any other information, the dating of this fragment, written in longhand on a separate sheet, is only provisional. The title has been supplied by the editors.

p. 553

*Polis* (a city state)—a typical socio-economic and political organisation in Ancient Greece and Ancient Italy. The Greek polis emerged in the 8th-6th cent. B.C. It included the city proper and the adjacent agricultural settlements. Only its indigenous inhabitants who owned land and slaves possessed full civic rights. There were also free citizens who did not enjoy full rights, such as metoikos (see Note 108), they engaged in trades and commerce.

p. 553

Engels wrote these notes when preparing the new edition of his book *The Peasant War in Germany*. As is clear from his letters, specifically, to Friedrich Adolph Sorge of December 31, 1884, he intended to revise it completely presenting the peasant war of 1525 as "the pivot for the whole history of Germany" (see present edition, Vol. 47). This demanded that substantial historical data be added. The notes written on a separate sheet are probably a fragment and a draft plan for the introduction to the book. Engels' intention to publish a revised edition of *The Peasant War in Germany* was not realised.

p. 554

*Interregnum*—the period between 1254 and 1273 in Germany after the Hohenstaufen dynasty had ceased to exist. It witnessed the struggle between various pretenders to the Imperial crown, incessant strife between princes, knights and cities, and the mounting arbitrary rule of the princes in their estates. In 1273, Rudolf Habsburg was elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.

p. 555

The *Hundred Years' War*—a series of wars between England and France lasting from 1337 to 1453. It was caused by the dispute between the two countries over the possession of the commercial and industrial towns of Flanders, the main consumer of English wool, and the English kings' claims to the French throne. During the war, the English managed to seize a considerable part of
France. However, as a result of a popular war against the foreign invaders, the English were driven out of French territory with the exception of Calais.

The reference is to the so-called *reconquista*, in the course of which the peoples inhabiting the Peninsula recaptured the territories conquered in the 8th-15th centuries by the Arabs and the Berbers collectively known as the Moors. By the mid-13th century, the Moors retained only the Emirate of Granada, which fell in 1492.

The reference is to the final period of Tartar-Mongol rule in Russia, which lasted throughout the 13th and 15th centuries. The popular struggle against the invaders resulted in the formation of the Russian centralised state. This enabled Prince Ivan III of Muscovy to refuse to pay tribute to the Golden Horde in 1476. After the unsuccessful campaign against Russia undertaken by Khan Ahmed in 1480, the country set itself completely free from the Tartar-Mongol yoke.

The *Wars of the Roses* (1455-85)—wars between the feudal houses of York and Lancaster competing for the throne, the white rose being the badge of the House of York, and the red one of the House of Lancaster. The wars almost completely wiped out the ancient feudal nobility and brought Henry VII to power to form a new dynasty, that of the Tudors, who set up an absolute monarchy in England. p. 555

463 Engels may have written this unfinished work when he was preparing the new edition of *The Peasant War in Germany* (see Note 460). Its content shows that it was to serve as part of the introduction to the new edition. Engels also used his earlier notes on the history of Germany, namely the manuscript *Varia on Germany* (present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 599-610). The title has been supplied by the editors. p. 556

464 *Municipium*—at the time of the Roman Republic, a city tied to Rome by a treaty. Municipia were of two categories, depending on the nature of the treaty with Rome, equal or unequal. The former usually enjoyed self-government and their citizens enjoyed full civil and political rights in Rome. The citizens of the latter did not have political rights in Rome but performed the duties of Roman citizens. A municipium had no permanent status. p. 556

465 *The Lay of Ludwig* (*Das Ludwigslied*) was written in the Franconian dialect by an anonymous poet in the late 9th century. It is a panegyric of the West Frankish King Ludwig III celebrating his victory over the Normans at Sancourt in 881 (*Hauschatz der Volkspoesie*, Leipzig, 1846). p. 560

466 The reference is to the extant texts in the Old High German and the Romance (Old French) languages—oaths of allegiance exchanged by the East Frankish King Louis the German and the West Frankish King Charles the Bald, as well as by their vassals in Strassburg in 842. p. 560

467 The *Slavs of the Elbe (Laba)*—a large group of West Slavic peoples which at the end of the first and beginning of the second millennium A.D. inhabited the territory between the Laba and its tributary, the Sala (Saale), in the West, and the Odra (Oder) in the East. Beginning in the 10th century, German feudal lords launched a systematic campaign to capture the Slavic lands and set up military districts, the marks, on conquered territories. Despite the resistance of the indigenous population, in the second half of the 12th century the Germans managed to capture the last free territories of the Slavs of the Elbe. Some of the Slavs were annihilated, some were forcibly Germanised, and others managed to retain their ethnic and cultural features. p. 560
Lotharingia (Lorraine)—a state on the left bank of the Rhine established in 855 during the division of Emperor Lothair I's possessions and named after his son Lothair II, to whom it was handed over as an independent kingdom. Its position between the West and the East Frankish kingdom made it unstable and was one of the causes of the struggle for its territory. After the death of Lothair II in 870, Lotharingia was divided (roughly along the language frontier) between his brothers, the East Frankish King Louis the German and the West Frankish King Charles the Bald. p. 560

The reference is to the English victories over the French in the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) (see Note 462). p. 563

The reference is to Wellington's campaign against France in the Peninsular War of 1808-13 and his victory at Waterloo (Belgium) on June 18, 1815. The best-known victories won by Wellington in Spain in the way described by Engels were the battles of Talavere in 1809 and of Salamanca in 1812. p. 563

Engels is referring to the refusal of the German Emperor Albrecht I of the Austrian Habsburgs to recognise the freedoms of the Swiss cantons confirmed by his predecessor, Adolf of Hassau. In the 14th-15th centuries, in their continued struggle for independence, the cantons managed to defeat the troops of the Austrian feudal lords and to secure for Switzerland the position of a state free from Austrian rule and subordinate only formally to the German Empire. p. 563

At the battle of Crécy on August 26, 1346, the English, using a combination of knights and archers, defeated the French army, whose main force was cavalry. This battle was fought during the Hundred Years' War between England and France (see Note 462). On the Battle of Waterloo, see Note 226. p. 564

The reference is to the printing with movable type invented by Johann Gutenberg in the mid-15th century. This invention was one of the main factors which promoted science and literature in the 15th and 16th centuries, and eventually led to the growth of the productive forces throughout the world. p. 564

The Duchy of Burgundy, which was formed in the 9th century in the basins of the Saône, Seine and Loire and later annexed considerable territories (Franche-Comté, part of Northern France, the Netherlands), became an independent feudal state in the 14th-15th centuries. It reached the peak of its might in the second half of the 15th century under Duke Charles the Bold (1467-77). He sought to expand his possessions and this hindered the formation of a centralised French monarchy. King Louis XI of France managed to form a coalition of the Swiss and the Lotharingians against Burgundy. As a result of the Burgundian wars of 1474-77, the troops of Charles the Bold were defeated, and he himself was killed in the Battle of Nancy (1477). His lands were divided between Louis XI and Maximilian of Habsburg, the son of the German Emperor. p. 564

Capitalising on Italy's political fragmentation and the discord between the Italian states, King Charles VIII of France invaded Italy in 1494 and occupied the Kingdom of Naples. Charles VIII's campaign was the start of the Italian Wars (1494-1559) during which Italy was repeatedly invaded by French,
Spanish and German troops and became the scene of a prolonged struggle for supremacy in the middle Mediterranean peninsula. p. 564

Here Engels has in mind the Huguenots' movement which unfolded in the 16th century under the religious banner of Calvinism and led to the Huguenot, or religious wars between the Catholics and the Protestants (Huguenots), which continued, with interruptions, throughout the second half of the 16th century. They produced economic dislocation and political anarchy, which worsened the conditions of the masses and provoked peasant revolts. Frightened by them, the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie rallied round Henry of Navarre, a former Huguenot leader, representative of the new Bourbon dynasty, who adopted Catholicism and became king under the name of Henry IV. p. 564

See Note 462. p. 565

The first attempt at unification of Poland and Lithuania was made in 1385, when the two states concluded a dynastic Krewo Union (after Krewo Castle, where it was signed), which was aimed mainly at joint defence against the mounting aggression on the part of the Teutonic Order (see Note 218). At the same time, it promoted the interests of both states, which sought to expand their territories at the expense of Ukrainian and Byelorussian lands. In 1569, the Lublin Union was concluded, under which Poland and Lithuania formed a single state under the name of Rzecz Pospolita. Lithuania retained its autonomy. The Union existed up to 1795. p. 565

This original research is based on materials carried by Chartist papers, Engels' own notes and personal reminiscences. In fact, it is a detailed synopsis of a work on the history of Chartism. It highlights the role of its Left wing, the influence on each other of Chartist agitation in England and the Irish people's liberation movement. Engels compiled the table at the request of the German socialist Hermann Schlüter to help him write a history of the Chartist movement. The chronology drawn up by Engels by late August 1886 probably provided the basis for Schlüter's book Die Chartistenbewegung in England which appeared in Zurich a year later. p. 566

"A sacred month"—the slogan advanced by Chartist in 1839, a call for a general strike. p. 567

The Union with England was imposed on Ireland by the English government after the suppression of the Irish rebellion in 1798. The Union, which came into force on January 1, 1801, abolished the autonomous Irish Parliament and made Ireland still more dependent on England. The demand for the repeal of the Union became widespread in Ireland from the 1820s. p. 572

The reference is to the Bill moved by James Graham for discussion in the House of Commons on March 8, 1843. It provided for the regulation of child and adolescent employment in factories, specifically, reduction of children's working day to six and a half hours. The Bill met with strong opposition on the part of MPs and the various public groups, e.g., the Dissenters (see Note 486). Graham withdrew his motion. On the factory legislation, see also Note 161. p. 573

An Act to amend and continue for Two Years, and to the End of the next Session of Parliament, the Laws in Ireland relative to the registering of Arms, and the Importation, Manufacture, and Sale of Arms, Gunpowder, and Ammunition was passed by the House of Commons in August 1843 following an upsurge
in Ireland in the movement for the repeal of the Union (see Note 481).

p. 573

484 **Rebecca Riots**—popular unrest in 1839 and 1842-43 in South Wales. They were triggered off by the imposition of charges at the toll-gates on the public roads. The name was borrowed from the Bible: “And they blessed Rebekah, and said unto her, Thou art our sister, be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the gate of those which hate them” (Genesis 24: 60). Many participants in the movement were associated with Chartism.

p. 573

485 **Educational Clauses**—a component part of the Factory Bill proposed by James Graham (see Note 482). Under these clauses, the children living in the industrial regions of Great Britain were to attend school not more than three times a week. However, this was opposed by the Dissenters (see Note 486), who constituted a significant part of the population there and were against the teaching at schools of the Scriptures based on the dogmas of the Anglican Church.

p. 573

486 **Dissenters** were members of Protestant religious sects and trends in England who rejected the dogmas and the rites of the official Anglican Church.

p. 573

487 The **Court of Queen's Bench** is one of the high courts in England; in the 19th century (up to 1873), it was an independent supreme court for criminal and civil cases, competent to reconsider the decisions of lower judicial bodies.

p. 574

488 The **Young Ireland** group was formed in 1842 by the Irish bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectuals.

p. 575

489 The reference is to **An Act for the Better Security of the Crown and Government of the United Kingdom** introduced in the House of Commons by the Home Secretary George Grey and passed on April 19, 1848.

p. 575

490 **Repealers**—supporters of the repeal of the Anglo-Irish Union of 1801, which had abrogated the autonomy of the Irish Parliament. In January 1847, the radical elements of this movement formed an Irish Confederation. Representatives of its revolutionary Left wing, who stood at the head of the national liberation movement, were subjected to severe repression in 1848. See also Note 481.

p. 576

491 The reference is to the **Habeas Corpus Act of 1679**. It introduced a writ of Habeas Corpus, the name given in the English judicial procedure to a document enjoining the pertinent authorities to present an arrested person before a court on the demand of the persons desiring to check the legitimacy of the arrest. The procedure does not apply to persons accused of high treason and can be suspended by decision of Parliament. The British authorities frequently made use of this exception in Ireland.

p. 576

492 See Note 351.

p. 578

493 The reference is to court proceedings instituted by Bismarck in 1876-77 against a number of conservative journalists and politicians, who exposed his involvement in the stock-exchange machinations, on the charge of insulting him in the press. The incident revealed the mounting tension between Bismarck's government and the conservatives, who criticised his policies from a Right-wing standpoint.

46*
On the Anti-Socialist Law, see Note 174.

The expression "to go to Canossa" dates back to the humiliating pilgrimage to the Canossa Castle in Northern Italy undertaken by the German Emperor Henry IV in 1077 for the purpose of persuading Pope Gregory VII to revoke his excommunication. It became a current phrase after Bismarck said in the Reichstag in May 1872: "We shall not go to Canossa."

In the late 1870s, needing the support of the Catholic Party of the Centre, because his old stronghold, the National Liberal Party (see Note 170) was losing its influence, Bismarck repealed nearly all anti-Catholic laws passed during the Kulturkampf (see Note 351) and forced the principal adherents of the anti-Catholic policy to retire. By using the expression "going to Canossa", Engels ironically alludes to Bismarck's concessions to the clerical circles in 1878-87, which in fact amounted to giving up the Kulturkampf.

Septennate (a seven-year period)—the German law on army credits, fixed for seven years ahead. It also approved an increase in the numerical strength of the standing army in peacetime (401,000) for the same term.

Engels may have written these notes in the second half of September 1888, when sailing on the City of New York from America, where he had spent over a month (August 17 to September 19, 1888) together with Eleanor Marx-Aveling, Edward Aveling and his friend Carl Schorlemmer. They travelled from New York to Boston, nearby towns, and the Niagara Falls, and took a voyage across Lake Ontario stopping over in Canada. Judging by the concise form of the notes, Engels probably intended to write an article about the trip. However, this plan was never carried out. The fragment "Impressions of a Journey Round America" (see this volume, pp. 584-86) is only the beginning of this work.

The reference is to the establishment of a National Park near the Niagara Falls recounted by Engels in his letter to Laura Lafargue of September 5, 1888: "The State of New York bought up all the grounds (on the American side) about the falls, turned out all the touts, hucksters and exhortionists, and transformed the whole into a public park. ...And the simple fact of the Americans having done this compelled the Canadian government to do the same on their side..." (present edition, Vol. 48).

The reference is to the American Civil War of 1861-65. See also Note 432.

The fragment is probably the beginning of Engels' proposed article on his trip to the United States (see Note 496).

This is a draft reply, written by Engels on behalf of Eleanor Marx-Aveling to the To-Day editors over the publication (No. 1, April 14, 1883) of an English translation from the French of Chapter XXIII of Capital (corresponds to Chapter XXI of the German original). Its heading, "I.—The Serfdom of Work" was the editor's invention. In the letter, permission to publish the translation of one more chapter was made conditional on certain terms. They were fulfilled, as may be seen from the editorial note to the publication of Chapter "II.—The Lordship of Wealth" in the To-Day, No. 2, June 1883. "This chapter is translated from the second and third sections of Chapter X of the original. The selection published in our last issue was translated from
Chapter XXIII of the original. The translations are, of course, our own, and not those of the late Karl Marx." The sub-heading noted that the translation was from the French edition of 1872.

The reference is to the first authorised French edition of Volume One of *Capital*. Under the agreement between Marx and publisher M. Lachâtre in February 1872, the work was to be published in instalments. It appeared between September 1872 and November 1875. When preparing this edition, Marx made changes and additions to nearly all parts of his work.

This excerpt from the letter by Hermann Lopatin, a Russian revolutionary, to Maria Oshanina, a member of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) Executive, recounts his talk with Engels, naturally in his own interpretation, which bears the stamp of his Narodnik views based on utopian peasant socialism and revolutionary democratism directed against autocracy. However, writing under a fresh impression from the talk, Lopatin obviously gives an accurate account of some of Engels' ideas. Lopatin and Engels met on September 19, 1883, several months after the former had escaped abroad from exile in Vologda. The excerpt was first published on Pyotr Lavrov's initiative and with Engels' permission in the book: *The Foundations of Theoretical Socialism as Applied to Russia* (in Russian), Geneva, 1893.

*Zemsky Sobor*—a central representative institution of social estates in Russia in the mid-16th-late 17th centuries. Its composition, convocation and sessions were not strictly fixed and changed in the course of time.

The interest in the convocation of the Zemsky Sobor at the end of the 19th century was evoked by hopes of limiting autocratic power and of changing the political system with the help of such representative institutions.

The reference is to the letter addressed by the People's Will Executive to Tsar Alexander III on March 10, 1881 (after the events of March 1 of that year, when Tsar Alexander II had been assassinated by members of the organisation). The Executive agreed to renounce violence as a means of struggle on two conditions: 1) a general political amnesty, and 2) convocation of representatives of all the Russian people "to reconsider the existing forms of state and public life". The elections to the proposed Constituent Assembly were to be held on the basis of universal suffrage and guaranteed freedom of the press, speech, assembly and election manifestoes. The Executive further stated that it would comply with the decision of the future People's Assembly.

The reference is to the Marx's ironic comment in the early 1880s on some sectarian and dogmatic mistakes made by the French Marxists in the struggle against the opportunist trend—Possibilism. Recollecting it, Engels wrote to Paul Lafargue on August 27, 1890 (present edition, Vol. 49) that Marx had said about these mistakes: "All I know is that I'm not a Marxist."

This article was based on Engels' letter to Paul Lafargue of November 14, 1885 (see present edition, Vol. 47). On November 13 Engels was requested to write it by Lafargue, who was preparing Engels' biography for a series on outstanding international socialists carried by *Le Socialiste*. The article was anonymously printed by the newspaper on November 21, 1885 as the second part of Engels' biography. The paper also carried Engels' portrait by Clarus sent to Engels by Lafargue together with the letter of November 13.
Part of this article was published in English for the first time in Marx K., Engels F., *Writings on the Paris Commune*, New York-London, 1971, p. 234.

508 See Note 350.  p. 594

509 See Note 432.  p. 596

510 Engels thought of writing this article in October 1886, when the book by the Austrian bourgeois sociologist and lawyer Anton Menger, *Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag in geschichtlicher Darstellung*, was issued. Menger attempted to prove that Marx's economic theory was not original and that he had allegedly borrowed his conclusions from English utopian socialists of the Ricardian school (Thompson et al.). Unable to ignore Menger's allegations and his falsification of the very essence of Marx's doctrine, Engels decided to reply in the press. However, fearing that a personal rebuttal may serve to give this third-rate scholar undeserved publicity, Engels considered it expedient to rebuke Menger through a *Neue Zeit* editorial or through a book review signed by the magazine's editor Karl Kautsky, and enlisted Kautsky's help in writing a piece against Menger. At first he intended to write the main part of the text himself, but fell ill and had to interrupt his work, so the piece was completed by Kautsky under Engels' instructions. It appeared anonymously in the *Neue Zeit*, No. 2, 1887; later, in the index to the magazine published in 1905, Engels and Kautsky were named as its authors. In 1904, the work was translated into French and printed by the *Mouvement socialiste*, No. 132, with Engels named as the author. The manuscript is not extant. Since it is impossible to ascertain which part of the work was written by Engels, and which by Kautsky, in the present edition it is published in full in the Appendices.  p. 597


In January 1849, Proudhon made an attempt to establish a "People's Bank" founded on the utopian principles of "free" credit that he was expounding. The bank, through which Proudhon intended to effect peaceful social reform by abolishing loan interest and introducing money-free exchange based on the producer's receiving a full equivalent of his earned income, collapsed two months after its establishment.  p. 606

512 The reference is to the hostile campaign against Marx conducted in the 1870s by the German bourgeois economist Lujo Brentano, a leading representative of armchair socialism (see Note 289). He accused Marx of deliberately falsifying the phrase from Gladstone's speech delivered on April 16, 1863, which appeared on April 17 in almost all London newspaper reports of this parliamentary session (*The Times, The Morning Star, The Daily Telegraph*), but was omitted in Hansard's semi-official publication of parliamentary debates, in which the text was corrected by the speakers themselves. This gave Brentano a pretext for accusing Marx of unscrupulous misquotation. Marx retaliated in his letters to the *Volksstaat* editors on May 23 and July 28, 1872 (see present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 164-67 and 190-97). After Marx's death, the same accusation was made in November 1883 by the English bourgeois economist Taylor. It was disproved by Eleanor Marx in February and March 1884 in two letters to the *To-Day* magazine, and by Engels in June 1890 in his preface to the fourth German edition of *Capital* (see present edition, Vol. 35) and in 1891 in the pamphlet *Brentano Contra Marx* (present edition, Vol. 27).  p. 613
This inaccuracy in Marx's book was set right by Engels in the second German edition of *The Poverty of Philosophy* published in 1892. It also gave a more precise wording of the quotation used by Engels in the preface to the first German edition (see this volume, p. 280), and the correct date of the publication of Thompson's book. p. 613

The letter to the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* printed on March 30, 1887 and signed by Edward Aveling was written by Engels, as is seen from the rough copy. It was prompted by the conflict between Aveling and the Executive of the Socialist Labor Party of North America (see Note 295). p. 617

The reference is to Aveling's letter of February 26, 1887 printed at the press and sent out to the sections of the Socialist Labor Party of North America and other socialist organisations. It was a detailed reply to the charges advanced against Aveling. p. 618

Engels made the amendments to the programme of the North of England Socialist Federation at the request of John Lincoln Mahon, an English worker and socialist. In a letter to him of June 22, 1887, Engels voiced his appreciation of the programme, saying: "I consider it very good as a spontaneous working-class declaration of principles" (present edition, Vol. 48). Engels' amendments relate mainly to the introductory part of the programme; he made them on the leaflet containing the text of the programme.

The North of England Socialist Federation—a workers' organisation set up in Northumberland (Northern England) on April 30, 1887 during a major miners' strike that lasted from late February to June 24, 1887. The organisation was sponsored by John Mahon, Thomas Binning, Alexander Donald, et al. Throughout 1887, the Federation conducted active work among the workers but failed to consolidate its initial success and soon ceased to exist. p. 619

This letter, the original of which has recently been discovered by GDR researchers in the archive of the International Institute of Social History (Amsterdam), was written by Engels on the occasion of the expulsion from Switzerland, under pressure of the German authorities, of four leading editors and publishers of *Der Sozialdemokrat*, newspaper of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany, which was published in Zurich after the promulgation of the Anti-Socialist Law (see Note 174). The letter was to be sent out to the editorial boards of various newspapers for the purpose of informing English readers about the real causes and circumstances of this action by the Swiss Federal Council. When writing the letter, Engels most probably had the full text of the resolution on the expulsion, which he repeatedly quotes and which did not appear in *Der Sozialdemokrat* until April 28.

Engels apparently believed that the letter should originate with German Social-Democrats, and so it was despatched bearing Kautsky's signature. Apart from *Justice*, on April 28, 1888 *The Commonweal*, press organ of the Socialist League, featured a note about "an interesting letter from a comrade on this subject" and gave a summary of it. Publications in other English papers have not been found. p. 623

Engels gave this interview to a representative of the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* on September 19, 1888 at the end of his tour of the USA. Unwilling to meet certain members of German socialist organisations in America, towards which he had a negative attitude, Engels travelled incognito and did his best to avoid any kind of contacts with the press. However, Jonas, editor of the *New Yorker
Volkszeitung, who had learned about Engels' stay in New York, arranged an appointment for him with Theodor Cuno, former activist of the First International, as his representative. The interview was published by the newspaper without obtaining Engels' approval of the text. It was reprinted by the Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung on September 25 and Wochenblatt der New Yorker Volkszeitung on September 29. Later, on October 13, it was also reprinted by the Sozialdemokrat.

The Landsturm—an armed force, a second-rate militia, organised in Tyrol in 1809. In the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, the Landsturm existed in Germany, Austria-Hungary, Holland, Switzerland and Sweden. It was called up in the event of national emergency (see also Note 386).
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A

Adler, Victor (1852-1918)—a founder and leader of the Austrian Social-Democrats.—542-43

Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.)—Greek dramatist and tragic poet.—171, 210

Agassiz, Louis Jean Rodolphe (1807-1873)—Swiss naturalist, lived in the USA from 1846, opponent of Darwinism.—160

Agrippa, Marcus Vipsanius (c. 63-12 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman.—19-20, 22

Albedyll, Emil (1824-1897)—Prussian general, commander of the 7th Corps in Münster (Westphalia) in 1888-93.—540

Albrecht I (c. 1255-1308)—Austrian duke; German Emperor from 1298.—563

Albrecht, Karl (1788-1844)—German merchant; convicted for his involvement in the oppositional movement of “demagogues”; in 1841 he settled in Switzerland, where he propagated in a religious mystical form ideas close to Weitling’s utopian communism.—320

Alexander I (1777-1825)—Russian Emperor (1801-25).—455, 490

Alexander II (1818-1881)—Russian Emperor (1855-81).—414, 477, 480

Alexander III (1845-1894)—Russian Emperor (1881-94).—406, 411-16, 593

Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great) (356-323 B.C.)—general and statesman of antiquity.—168

Alexeyev, Nikolai Alexandrovich (1852-1893)—Mayor of Moscow (1886-93).—413

Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 330-c. 400)—Roman historian, author of Rerum Gestarum covering the history of the Roman Empire from 96 to 378.—59, 177, 199

Anacreon—Greek lyric poet (second half of the 6th century B.C.).—184

Anastasius I (c. 430-518)—Byzantine Emperor (491-518).—39

Anaxandridas (6th cent. B.C.)—King of Sparta from 560 B.C., shared the throne with Aristones.—171

Anaximander of Miletus (c. 610-546 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—612

Appian (end of the 1st cent.—c. 170)—Roman historian.—393

Appius Claudius Caecus (died c. 448 B.C.)—Roman consul.—224

Ariovistus (1st half of the 1st cent.
B.C.)—chief of the Germanic tribe of Suebi, fought against Caesar.—11, 12
Aristides (c. 540-467 B.C.)—Athenian statesman and general during the Greco-Persian wars.—219
Aristodemes (6th cent. B.C.)—King of Sparta (574-520 B.C.), shared the throne with Anaxandridas.—171
Aristophanes (c. 446-c. 385 B.C.)—Greek comic dramatist and poet.—172
Aristotle (384-322 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—212
Arkwright, Sir Richard (1732-1792)—English industrialist, invented the cotton spinning machine named after him.—573
Arminius (Hermann, or Armin), the Cheruscan (18 or 16 B.C.-A.D. 19 or 21)—leader of the resistance of Germanic tribes against Roman rule, annihilated a Roman army in the Teutoburg Forest in A.D. 9.—25-29, 31
Arnold, Wilhelm Christoph Friedrich (1826-1883)—German lawyer and historian.—82, 95-97, 100-02
Asprenas (Lucius Nonius Asprenas) (c. 28 B.C.-A.D. 30)—Roman statesman and general, fought in the wars against the Germans.—25, 28
Attwood, Thomas (1783-1856)—English banker, economist and radical politician, adhered to the Right wing of the Chartist movement until 1839—566, 567
Auerwald, Hans Adolf Erman von (1792-1848)—Prussian general, Right-wing deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly; killed during Frankfurt uprising in September 1848.—109
Augustenburg, Friedrich (Frederick) (1829-1880)—Prince of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, pretender to the throne of Schleswig-Holstein from 1852; Duke of Schleswig-Holstein under the name of Friedrich VIII from 1863.—478
Augustus, Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus (63 B.C.-A.D. 14)—Roman Emperor (27 B.C.-A.D. 14).—11, 12, 18, 21, 22, 28-31, 35, 36, 38, 116, 223, 225, 246
Aveling, Edward (1851-1898)—English socialist, writer and journalist; one of the translators into English of Marx's Capital, Volume One; member of the Social-Democratic Federation from 1884; subsequently one of the founders of the Socialist League; an organiser of a mass movement of unskilled workers and unemployed in the late 1880s and early 1890s; husband of Marx's daughter Eleanor.—434, 617, 618

B

Babeuf, François Noël (Gracchus) (1760-1797)—French revolutionary, advocate of utopian egalitarian communism, organiser of the "Conspiracy of Equals", executed.—604
Bachofen, Johann Jakob (1815-1887)—Swiss historian and lawyer.—142, 150, 151, 158-61, 165, 188
Bailly, Jean Sylvain (1736-1793)—French astronomer, prominent in the French Revolution, a leader of the liberal constitutional bourgeoisie; as
Mayor of Paris (1789-91) ordered troops to open fire on a republican demonstration on the Field of Mars (1791), for which he was executed by sentence of the revolutionary tribunal in 1793.—126

Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich (1814-1876)—Russian revolutionary and journalist, participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; later an ideologist of Narodism and anarchism; opposed Marxism in the First International.—382, 422, 449, 516

Bancroft, Hubert Howe (1832-1918)—American historian, author of several works on the history and ethnography of North and Central America.—146, 159, 161, 259

Bang, Anton Christian (1840-1913)—Norwegian theologian, author of works on Scandinavian mythology and history of Christianity in Norway.—258

Barbès, Armand (1809-1870)—French revolutionary, a leader of secret societies during the July monarchy; played a prominent part in the 1848 revolution.—313

Baring, Thomas (1799-1873)—head of the bankers' house in London, Conservative M.P.—574

Battenberg, Alexander, Prince of (1857-1893)—son of the Prince of Hesse, in 1879-86 sat on the Bulgarian throne as Prince Alexander I, pursued a pro-Austrian policy.—411, 412, 414

Bauer, Andreas Heinrich—German shoemaker, a leader of the League of the Just, member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; emigrated to Australia in 1851.—313, 314, 323, 327, 328

Bauer, Bruno (1809-1882)—German philosopher and journalist, Young Hegelian.—363, 365, 381

Baur, Ferdinand Christian (1792-1860)—German theologian and historian of Christianity, professor in Tübingen, leader of the Tübingen School.—112

Bayle, Pierre (1647-1706)—French sceptic philosopher, critic of religious dogmatism.—396

Beauvau, Louis Charles Antoine (1710-1744)—French marshal, sent on a diplomatic mission to the court of Frederick II of Prussia in 1740.—469

Beck, Alexander—German tailor, member of the League of the Just, at the end of 1846 was arrested for involvement in the League's case; a witness at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—315

Becker, August (1814-1871)—German journalist, member of the League of the Just in Switzerland, adherent of Weitling; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; in 1853 emigrated to the USA where he contributed to democratic papers.—315

Becker, Hermann Heinrich (“Red Becker”) (1820-1885)—German lawyer and journalist, member of the Communist League from 1850; sentenced to five years' imprisonment at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); in his later years a National Liberal.—329

Becker, Johann Philipp (1809-1886)—German revolutionary, participant in the democratic movement of the 1830s-50s and the international working-class movement; fought as an officer of the Swiss army in the war against the Sonderbund; prominent figure in the 1848-49 revolution; commanded the Baden people's militia during the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; active member of the First International; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—418-23, 446, 447

Becker, Wilhelm Adolf (1796-1846)—German historian, professor at Leipzig University, author of works on ancient history.—206
Beda (Bede, Venerable) (c. 673-735)—English historian and theologian.—235

Benary, Franz Simon Ferdinand (1805-1880)—German orientalist and an expert on the Bible, professor at Berlin University.—115, 117

Benedetti, Vincent, comte (1817-1900)—French diplomat, ambassador in Berlin in 1864-70.—487

Berends, Julius (b. 1817)—owner of a printing-house in Berlin, deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848.—125

Berkeley, Francis Henry Fitzhardinge (1794-1870)—British liberal politician, M.P. from 1837, advocated electoral reform.—576

Bernstein, Eduard (1850-1932)—German Social-Democrat, journalist, editor of the Sozialdemokrat (1881-90); subsequently revisionist.—521

Berthelot, Pierre Eugène Marcelin (1827-1907)—French chemist and politician.—376

Besant, Annie (1847-1933)—English politician, theosophist; adhered to the socialist movement in the 1880s-90s.—542

Beust, Friedrich von (1817-1899)—teacher and school reformer in Zurich.—99

Bevan, W.—Chairman of the Trades Council in Swansea, presided at the Congress of trade unions held in that town in 1887.—515

Bismarck-Schönhausen, Otto Eduard Leopold, Prince von (1815-1898)—statesman in Prussia and Germany, diplomat; ambassador to St. Petersburg (1859-62) and Paris (1862); Prime Minister of Prussia (1862-72 and 1873-90); Chancellor of the North German Confederation (1867-71) and of the German Empire (1871-90); carried out the unification of Germany; introduced Anti-Socialist Law in 1878.—171, 271, 272, 292, 297, 307, 316, 330, 406-08, 410, 413-15, 417, 464, 474-84, 480-89, 491, 494-505, 508-09, 541, 578-80

Blanc, Jean Joseph Charles Louis (1811-1882)—French socialist, historian; member of the Provisional Government and Chairman of the Luxembourg Commission in 1848; pursued a policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie; a leader of the petty-bourgeois emigration in London from August 1848.—325, 328, 375

Blanqui, Louis Auguste (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian communist.—313

Bleichröder, Gerson (1822-1893)—German financier, head of a big Berlin bank, Bismarck's private banker, unofficial adviser on financial matters and mediator in black market dealings.—272, 476, 480

Bonaparte—see Napoleon III

Böning, Georg (c. 1788-1849)—German army officer, participant in the war of liberation against Napoleonic rule; commanded a volunteer legion of insurgents during the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; following its suppression sentenced to death by a Prussian court martial and executed by firing squad.—419

Borkheim, Sigismund Ludwig (1825-1885)—German journalist, democrat; participant in the 1848-49 revolution, emigrated after its defeat; London merchant from 1851, was on friendly terms with Marx and Engels.—446-50

Born, Stephan (real name Buttermilch, Simon) (1824-1898)—German typesetter, member of the Communist League; leaned towards reformism during the 1848-49 revolution; turned his back on the workers' movement after the revolution.—325, 326

Börne, Ludwig (1786-1837)—German critic and writer, author of Schilderungen aus Paris (1822 und 1823),
adherent of Christian socialism towards the end of his life.—106

Bornstedt, Adalbert von (1808-1851)—German journalist, supported the adventurer plan for the invasion of Germany by a revolutionary legion; member of the Communist League until his expulsion in March 1848; a secret agent of the Prussian police in the 1840s.—324

Börnstein, Arnold Bernhard Karl (1808-1849)—German democrat, a leader of the volunteer legion of German refugees in Paris (1848).—324

Bougeart, Alfred (1815-1882)—French journalist of the Left, author of works on the history of the French Revolution of the late 18th century.—126

Boulanger, Georges Ernest Jean Marie (1837-1891)—French general, War Minister (1886-87); strove to establish his military dictatorship in France.—416

Bourbaki, Charles Denis Sauter (1816-1897)—French general, commanded the Guard and later the 18th Corps and the Army of the East during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.—490

Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15 and 1815-30).—389

Bourgeois, Paul Louis Marie (1844-1912)—French socialist, physician; participant in the Paris Commune, lived in emigration after its suppression; close to the anarchists; joined the French Workers' Party in 1879, a leader and ideologist of possibilism, an opportunist trend in the French socialist movement.—593

Büchner, Georg (1813-1837)—German dramatist and writer, revolutionary democrat, one of the founders of Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Eisenachers), associate of Marx and Engels.—309

Büchner, Ludwig (1824-1899)—German physiologist and philosopher, a vulgar materialist.—369

Bückler, Johann (c. 1780-1803)—German robber nicknamed Hans the Flayer (Schinderhannes); in a number of literary works depicted as a "noble robber" and defender of the poor.—294

Bugge, Elseus Sophus (1833-1907)—Norwegian philologist, professor in Christiania (now Oslo), researched into ancient Scandinavian literature and mythology.—238
Bürgers, Heinrich (1820-1878)—German journalist, contributor to the Rheinische Zeitung (1842-43); member of the Cologne community of the Communist League, an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League from 1850; one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—123, 328

Burrows, Herbert (1845-1922)—English official, radical, a founder of the Social-Democratic Federation.—542, 543

Cabet, Étienne (1788-1856)—French lawyer and writer, utopian communist, author of Voyage en Icarie.—516, 604

Caesar (Gaius Julius Caesar) (c. 100-44 B.C.)—Roman general, statesman and writer.—6, 10-17, 18, 29-30, 35, 44, 53-55, 138, 139, 151, 196, 234, 236, 241-44, 246

Caligula (A.D. 12-41)—Roman Emperor (A.D. 37-41).—116

Calvin, John (real name Jean Chauvin) (1509-1564)—prominent figure of the Reformation, founder of Calvinism, a trend in Protestantism, characterised by particular intolerance towards Catholicism as well as other trends in Protestantism.—395

Camphausen, Ludolf (1803-1890)—German banker, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prussian Prime Minister (March-June 1848).—471

Carloman (715-754)—elder son of the Frankish major-domo Charles Martel; ruler of Austrasia, Alamannia and Thuringia (741-47).—86

Carolingians—Frankish royal dynasty which ruled in France (751-987), Germany (till 911) and Italy (till 887).—48, 58, 62, 67, 72, 73, 74, 82

Cavour, Camillo Benso, conte di (1810-1861)—Italian statesman, head of the Sardinian government (1852-59 and 1860-61); relying on the support of Napoleon III pursued a policy of Italian unification under the supremacy of the Savoy dynasty; headed the first government of the newly united Italy in 1861.—464

Charlemagne (Charles the Great) (c. 742-814)—Frankish King (768-800) and Roman Emperor (800-814).—59, 63, 65-67, 72, 74, 76-81, 252, 254, 346, 554

Charles VIII (1470-1498)—King of France (1483-98).—564

Charles, Archduke—see Charles Louis Johann

Charles Louis Johann (1771-1847)—Archduke of Austria, field marshal, commander-in-chief in the wars with France (1796, 1799, 1805 and 1809), War Minister (1805-09).—492

Charles Martel (c. 688-741)—Frankish major-domo, became actual ruler of the Frankish state in 715.—61, 65, 67, 72

Charles the Bold (823-877)—King of West Frankish Kingdom (840-77), Emperor of the Franks and King of Italy (875-77).—68

Charles ("the Bold") (1433-1477)—Duke of Burgundy (1467-77).—560

Chernyavskaya-Bokhanovskaya, Galina Fyodorovna (1854-d. after 1926)—Russian revolutionary, member of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) organisation.—592

Chilperic I (539-584)—King of the Franks (561-84).—62

Christian, Prince of Glücksburg (1818-1906)—heir to the Danish throne from 1852, King of Denmark as Christian IX in 1863-1906.—456

Civilis, Julius (A.D. 1st cent.)—chief of the Germanic tribe of Batavi; headed the uprising of Germanic and
Gaulish tribes against Rome (69-70 or 71).—240
Claudia—Roman patrician family.—223
Claudius (10 B.C.-A.D. 54)—Roman Emperor (41-54).—31, 116
Clausewitz, Karl von (1780-1831)—Prussian general and military theoretician.—450
Cleisthenes—Athenian politician, in 510-507 B.C. carried out reforms aimed at abolishing the remnants of the gentile system and establishing a democracy based on slaveownership.—220
Clemenceau, Georges (Eugène Benjamin) (1841-1929)—French politician and journalist, leader of the Radicals from the 1880s; Prime Minister (1906-09 and 1917-20).—331
Clovis I (465 or 466-511)—King of the Salian Franks from the Merovingian dynasty (481-511).—95
Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—English manufacturer and politician, a leader of the Free Traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League, M.P.—533, 572, 573
Constantine I, the Great (c. 285-337)—Roman Emperor (306-37).—39
Copernicus, Nicolaus (1473-1543)—Polish astronomer, originator of the heliocentric theory of the universe.—368
Cosijn, Pieter Jakob (1840-1899)—Dutch philologist, expert on the Germanic languages.—84
Cotton, Sir Robert Bruce, Bart (1571-1631)—English collector of ancient manuscripts, books, coins, etc., founder of the Cottonian library transferred to the British Museum on its foundation (1753).—82-83
Coulanges, de—see Fustel de Coulanges
Crassus (Marcus Licinius Crassus) (c. 115-53 B.C.)—Roman politician and general, crushed the revolt of slaves under Spartacus in 71 B.C.; twice consul.—11, 15
Crawford, Emily (1831-1915)—Irish journalist, Paris correspondent of several English papers.—484
Cuno, Friedrich Theodor (1846-1934)—socialist, active member of the German and international working-class movement and of the First International; after the Hague Congress (1872) emigrated to the USA, contributed to the New Yorker Volkszeitung.—626
Cunow, Heinrich Wilhelm Karl (1862-1936)—German Social-Democrat, historian, sociologist and ethnographer.—168
Cuvier, Georges Léopold Chrétien Frédéric Dagobert, baron de (1769-1832)—French naturalist, author of works on comparative anatomy, palaeontology and the classification of animals.—141

D
Dahmann, Friedrich Christoph (1785-1860)—German historian and liberal politician; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre) in 1848-49; author of works on the history of Denmark and Germany.—49
Daniels, Roland (1819-1855)—German physician, member of the Communist League, defendant at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); acquitted by the jury; friend of Marx and Engels.—329
Dante Alighieri (1265-1321)—Italian poet.—545
Dawkins, Sir William Boyd (1837-1929)—English geologist, anthropologist, palaeontologist and archaeologist; researched into the lives
of the cave dwellers of Europe.—6, 33

Demosthenes (384-322 B.C.)—Athenian orator and statesman.—205

Descartes, René (1596-1650)—French philosopher, mathematician and naturalist.—368

Dicaearchus (4th cent. B.C.)—Greek scholar, disciple of Aristotle, author of historical, political, philosophical, geographical and other works.—206

Diderot, Denis (1713-1784)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist, leader of the Encyclopaedists.—373

Dietzen, Joseph (1828-1888)—German Social-Democrat; philosopher who arrived at main premises of dialectical materialism independently; leathermaker.—384

Dio Cassius Cocceianus (c. 155-c. 235)—Roman historian and statesman, representative of the Senate aristocracy, wrote Historia Romana running to 80 books in Greek.—11, 20-22, 24, 27, 29, 47

Diodorus Siculus (c. 80-29 B.C.)—Greek historian, author of Bibliothecae historicae.—238, 246

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st cent. B.C.-A. D. 1st cent.)—Greek historian and rhetorician, author of Roman Antiquities.—209

Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881)—British statesman and author, a Tory leader; Prime Minister (1868, 1874-80).—410

Domitian (Titus Flavius Domitianus) (A.D. 51-96)—Roman Emperor (81-96).—32

Domitianus Ahenobarbus, Lucius (d. A.D. 25)—Roman general and statesman; in the early 1st century undertook expeditions to Germany.—11, 22, 23

Drusus, Nero Claudius (38-9 B.C.)—Roman general; headed expeditions against the Germans in 12-9 B.C.—19-21, 23, 31

Dühring, Eugen Karl (1833-1921)—German eclectic philosopher and vulgar economist, his philosophical views were a mixture of idealism, vulgar materialism, positivism and metaphysics; a lecturer at Berlin University from 1863 to 1877.—511

Duncombe, Thomas Slingsby (1796-1861)—British radical politician; participated in the Chartist movement in the 1840s; M. P. (1826-61).—569, 570

Dureau de la Malle, Adolph Jules Cesar Auguste (1777-1857)—French poet and historian.—230

Eccarius, Johann Georg (1818-1889)—German tailor, prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, journalist; member of the League of the Just and later of the Communist League; a leader of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, member of the General Council of the First International; subsequently took part in the British trade union movement.—320

Edmonds, Thomas Rowe (1803-1889)—English economist, utopian socialist, drew socialist conclusions from Ricardo's theory.—280

Einhard (c. 770-840)—historian of the Franks, biographer of Charlemagne.—61

Eisenbart, Johann Andreas (1661-1727)—German physician, served as the prototype of Doctor Eisenbarth in German folklore.—288

Elliott, Ebenezer (1781-1849)—English poet, supporter of the Anti-Corn Law League; in his works described the hard life of the English workers.—568

Elser, Karl Friedrich Moritz (1809—1894)—Silesian journalist and radical politician, deputy to the Prussian
National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848.—125

Engelhardt, Helvig Conrad Christian (1825-1881)—Danish archaeologist, manager of the Museum of North Antiquities in Flensburg.—40


Erhardt(t), Johann Ludwig Albert (born c. 1820)—German shop assistant, member of the Communist League, one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852), acquitted by the jury.—329

Espinas, Alfred Victor (1844-1922)—French philosopher and sociologist, advocate of the theory of evolution.—144

Euripides (c. 480-c. 406 B.C.)—Greek dramatist.—172

Ewerbeck, August Hermann (1816-1860)—German physician and man of letters, leader of the Paris communities of the League of the Just, member of the Communist League (till 1850).—319, 328

F

Fabian—Roman patrician family.—228

Fairchild, Charles Stebbins (1842-1924)—American lawyer and financier, Secretary of the Treasury (1887-89).—528

Fecenia Hispala—Roman freed woman.—225

Ferdinand V (the Catholic) (1452-1516)—King (1479-1504) and ruler (1504-16) of Castilia, King of Aragon under the name of Ferdinand II (1479-1516).—161

Ferguson, Adam (1723-1816)—Scottish historian, philosopher and sociologist.—339

Ferry, Jules François Camille (1832-1899)—French lawyer, journalist and politician, a leader of the moderate republicans; member of the Government of National Defence, Mayor of Paris (1870-71), Prime Minister (1880-81 and 1883-85).—331

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804-1872)—German philosopher.—364-65, 367-68, 371-73, 374-82, 519, 520

Fison, Lorimer (1832-1907)—English ethnographer specialising in Australia, missionary in the Fiji Islands (1863-71, 1875-84) and in Australia (1871-75 and 1884-88); author of a number of works on Australian and Fijian tribes.—153, 155

Flocon, Ferdinand (1800-1866)—French politician, journalist, democrat, an editor of La Réforme; member of the Provisional Government in 1848.—324

Florus, Lucius Annaeus (2nd cent.)—Roman historian.—20, 21

Fould, Achille (1800-1867)—French banker and politician, Orleanist, subsequently Bonapartist; Minister of Finance several times (between 1849 and 1867), Minister of State and Minister of the Imperial Court (1852-60).—476

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837)—French utopian socialist.—179, 255, 276, 599

Francis I (1768-1835)—Emperor of Austria (1804-35).—465

Francis Joseph I (1830-1916)—Emperor of Austria (1848-1916).—466

Frederick II (the Great) (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86).—309, 346, 347, 459, 469, 475

Frederick VII (1808-1863)—King of Denmark (1848-63).—477
Frederick William (1620-1688)—Elector of Brandenburg (1640-88).—309, 475

Frederick William III (1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840).—346, 347, 358, 361, 469, 473

Frederick William IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—363, 491

Freeman, Edward Augustus (1823-1892)—English historian, liberal, professor at Oxford University.—193

Freiligrath, Ferdinand (1810-1876)—German revolutionary poet, member of the Communist League; an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (1848-49).—110, 111, 329

Frost, John (1784-1877)—English radical, joined the Chartist movement in 1838; deported for life to Australia for organising a miners' uprising in Wales in 1839, pardoned in 1856 and returned to England.—567-69, 575

Fustel de Coulanges (Numa Denis) (1830-1889)—French historian, author of works on the history of antiquity and medieval France.—208

G

Gaius (Caius) (2nd cent.)—Roman lawyer; systematised Roman law.—166

Galba, Servius Sulphicius (5 B.C.-A.D. 69)—Roman statesman, proclaimed Emperor in June 68, slain by the Praetorian conspirators, led by Othon in January 69 during the rebellion of troops and people against his rule.—116

Galle, Johann Gottfried (1812-1910)—German astronomer, discovered the planet Neptune in 1846, drawing on Leverrier's calculations.—368

Garibaldi, Giuseppe (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary democrat; led the struggle of the Italian people for national liberation and the unification of the country in the 1850s and 1860s; headed the revolutionary march to Southern Italy; participated in wars against Austria (1848-49, 1859, 1866).—307, 421, 463

George, Henry (1839-1897)—American journalist, economist and politician.—437-39

Germanicus (Julius Caesar Germanicus) (15 B.C.-A.D. 19)—Roman general, made several campaigns against the Germans, suppressed an uprising of Rhenish legions in 14 B.C.—15, 28, 51

Gervinus, Georg Gottfried (1805-1871)—German historian and politician, liberal; professor in Heidelberg.—470

Gfrörer, August Friedrich (1803-1861)—German theologian and historian, author of works on the history of Christianity and the Church, for some time a follower of the Tübingen School; professor at Freiburg University from 1846.—112

Giers, Nikolai Karlovich de (1820-1895)—Russian diplomat, Minister for Foreign Affairs (1882-95).—414

Giffen, Robert (1837-1910)—English economist and statistician, head of the statistical department at the Board of Trade (1876-97).—299

Giraud-Teulon, Alexis (b. 1839)—professor of history in Geneva.—143, 144, 170

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory and later Peelite, a leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the 19th century; Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94).—210, 292, 411, 626

Godwin, William (1756-1836)—English writer and journalist, rationalist, one of the fathers of anarchism.—607, 614

Goegg, Amand (1820-1897)—German democratic journalist, member of the Baden Provisional Government
(1849); emigrated after the revolution; later member of the First International.—328

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832)—German poet, dramatist and philosopher.—111, 148, 359, 361, 371, 496

Gould, Jay (1836-1892)—American millionaire, financier who gained control of several large railway systems.—475

Govone, Giuseppe (1825-1872)—Italian general and statesman, participated in the wars against Austria (1848-49, 1859 and 1866), negotiated with Bismarck in April 1866, War Minister (1869-70).—480, 482

Gray, John (1798-1850)—English economist, utopian socialist, follower of Robert Owen; an author of the “labour money” theory.—283-85, 289, 291

Gregory I (the Great) (c. 540-604)—Pope (590-604); canonised after his death.—63

Gregory of Tours (Georgius Florentius) (c. 540-594)—Christian priest, theologian and historian; Bishop of Tours (from 573), canonised after his death.—62, 240

Grey, Sir George (1799-1882)—British statesman, Whig; Home Secretary (1846-52, 1855-58, 1861-66) and Colonial Secretary (1854-55).—575

Grey, Sir Henry George, Viscount Howick, Earl of (1802-1894)—British statesman, Whig, Secretary of War (1835-39), Colonial Secretary (1846-52).—573

Grimm, Jacob Ludwig Carl (1785-1863)—German philologist, author of a historical grammar of the German language and of folklore adaptations; professor in Göttingen and then in Berlin.—18, 46-55, 80, 85, 87, 99, 237

Gröben, Karl Joseph, Count (1788-1876)—Prussian general, commanded a corps which took part in the suppression of the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; member of the Prussian Upper Chamber from 1854.—420

Grosvenor, Richard, Marquis of Westminster (1795-1869)—English aristocrat, Whig.—574

Grote, George (1794-1871)—English historian, M.P. (1832-40), championed electoral reform.—205-08, 567

Grün, Karl Theodor Ferdinand (pen name Ernst von der Haide) (1817-1887)—German journalist, “true socialist” in the mid-1840s, petty-bourgeois democrat during the revolution of 1848-49, deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing).—365

Guérard, Benjamin Edme Charles (1797-1854)—French historian.—64, 80

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman.—389

Guntram, or Gontran (c. 525-592)—King of Burgundy (561-92).—62, 67

Gustav I (Vasa) (c. 1496-1560)—King of Sweden (1523-60).—554

H

Habsburgs (or Hapsburgs)—dynasty of the Holy Roman emperors from 1273 to 1806 (with interruptions), Austrian (1804-67) and Austro-Hungarian emperors (1867-1918).—127

Hadrian (Publius Aelius Hadrianus) (76-138)—Roman Emperor (117-138).—32

Hall, Charles (c. 1745-c. 1825)—English economist, utopian socialist.—607, 613

Hansemann, David Justus (1790-1864)—German capitalist, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Finance Minister of Prussia (from March to September 1848).—471

Harey, George Julian (1817-1897)—a leader of the Left-wing Chartists,
editor of *The Northern Star*, *Red Republican* and other Chartist periodicals; was on friendly terms with Marx and Engels.—319, 512, 566

**Harring, Harro Paul** (1798-1870) — German writer, radical, emigrated in 1828.—319

**Hartmann, Lev Nikolayevich** (1850-1913) — Russian revolutionary, Narodnik, in 1879 participated in one of the terrorist acts of the People’s Will against Alexander II, after that he emigrated to France, then to Britain, and in 1881 to the USA.—292

**Haupt, Hermann Wilhelm** (born c. 1831) — German business clerk, member of the Communist League; was arrested with other Cologne communists, gave evidence against them and was released before the trial; fled to Brazil.—328

**Häusser, Ludwig** (1818-1867) — German historian and politician, liberal, professor in Heidelberg.—470

**Hecker, Friedrich Karl Franz** (1811-1881) — German democrat, a leader of the Baden republican uprising in April 1848; after its suppression emigrated to Switzerland and later to the USA where he fought in the Civil War on the side of the Union.—418

**Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich** (1770-1831) — German philosopher.—269, 357-69, 371, 373, 377-78, 382-84, 386, 388, 391, 519-20

**Heine, Heinrich** (1797-1856) — German revolutionary poet.—109, 110, 357, 493

**Henry IV** (1553-1610) — King of France (1589-1610).—491

**Herod** (73-4 B.C.) — King of Judaea (40-4 B.C.).—229

**Herodotus** (c. 484-c. 424 B.C.) — Greek historian.—9, 151, 172

**Herrfurth, Ernst Ludwig** (1830-1900) — Prussian statesman, Minister of the Interior (1888-92).—540

**Herwegh, Georg Friedrich** (1817-1875) — German democratic poet, an organiser of the German legion in Paris in 1848.—324

**Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich** (1812-1870) — Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher and writer; emigrated in 1847.—449, 516

**Hetherington, Henry** (1792-1849) — English printer and publisher of workers’ papers; took part in the organisation of trade unions, and later in the Chartist movement; was fined for his publishing activities and imprisoned on a charge of blasphemy.—569, 570

**Heusler, Andreas** (1834-1921) — Swiss lawyer, professor in Basle, author of works on Swiss and German law.—167

**Heyne, Moritz** (1837-1906) — German philologist, author of several works on the history of the German language; published items belonging to the Old German and Gothic literary heritage.—81-82, 89

**Hildebrand, Hans Olof** (1842-1913) — Swedish archaeologist, historian and numismatist.—38

**Hildebrannus** (8th cent.) — Charles Martel’s beneficiary.—67

**Hincmar** (c. 806-882) — archbishop of Reims (France) from 845; author of the third part of *Annales Bertiniani* (861-82).—64, 78

**Hincmar** (830-882) — archbishop of Lyons (France) (858-79).—68

**Hinkel, Karl** (1794-1817) — German student, participant in the opposition student movement for the unification of Germany.—458

**Hirschfeld, Karl Ulrich Friedrich Wilhelm Moritz von** (1791-1859) — Prussian general, commanded a corps which took part in the suppression of the Baden-Palatinate uprising (1849).—420
Hobbes, Thomas (1588-1679)—English philosopher.—368

Hodgskin, Thomas (1787-1869)—English economist and journalist, utopian socialist, drew socialist conclusions from the Ricardian theory.—280, 613

Hoffmann von Fallersleben, August Heinrich (1798-1874)—German poet and philologist.—458, 555

Hohenstaufens—dynasty of the Holy Roman emperors (1138-1254).—458, 555

Hohenzollern, Leopold, Prince (1835-1905)—pretender to the Spanish throne in 1870.—487

Hohenzollerns—dynasty of electors of Brandenburg (1415-1701), Prussian kings (1701-1918) and German emperors (1871-1918).—124, 127, 464

Homer—semi-legendary Greek epic poet to whom are attributed the Iliad and the Odyssey.—111, 138-39, 170, 171, 208, 209

Höpfner, Friedrich Eduard Alexander von (1797-1858)—Prussian general, military writer.—449-50

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) (65-8 B.C.)—Roman poet.—111, 536

Howick—see Grey, Sir Henry George

Howitt, Alfred William (1830-1908)—English ethnographer specialising in Australia, colonial official in Australia (1862-1901); author of several works on Australian tribes.—155

Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—French writer.—590

Hume, David (1711-1776)—Scottish philosopher, historian and economist.—367

Huschke, Georg Philipp Eduard (1801-1886)—German lawyer, author of works on Roman law.—227

Huskisson, William (1770-1830)—British statesman, Tory, President of the Board of Trade (1823-27), reduced import duties on some goods.—528

Hyndman, Henry Mayers (pseudonym John Broadhouse)—English socialist, reformist; founder (1881) and leader of the Democratic Federation, which became Social-Democratic Federation in 1884.—335-40

Im Thurn, Everard Ferdinand (1852-1932)—English colonial official, traveller and anthropologist.—365

Irenaeus, St. (c. 130-c. 202)—Christian theologian, Greek from Asia Minor by birth, Bishop of Lyons from 177.—116

Irminon(n), Guérard (died c. 826)—abbot of the Saint-Germain de Prés Monastery (812-17).—253

Ivan III (1440-1505)—Grand Duke of Muscovy.—565

Jacobi, Abraham (1830-1919)—German physician, member of the Communist League, defendant at the Cologne Communist trial (1852), acquitted by the jury; later emigrated to the USA.—329

John VIII—Pope (872-82).—64

Jones, Ernest Charles (1819-1869)—English proletarian poet and journalist, Left-wing Chartist leader; friend of Marx and Engels.—575-77

Jones, William (c. 1808-1873)—English watch-maker, Chartist, an organiser of a miners’ uprising in Wales in 1839; deported for life to Australia.—568, 569, 575, 577

Jordanes (Jornandes, Jordanis) (born c. 500)—Gothic historian.—36

Julia gens—patrician clan in Ancient Rome.—236

Juvenal (Decimus Junius Juvenalis) (born c. 60—died after 127)—Roman satirical poet.—111
K

Kalnoky, Gustav Sigismund, Count (1832-1898)—Austro-Hungarian statesman, ambassador to St. Petersburg (1880-81), Chairman of the Imperial Council of Ministers and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1881-95).—414

Kamensky, Gavriil Pavlovich (1824-1898)—Russian economist, agent of the Tsarist government abroad, sentenced in his absence to imprisonment by a Swiss court for counterfeiting (1872).—293

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804)—German philosopher.—359, 367, 370, 373, 381

Kaulbars, Nikolai Vasilyevich (1842-1905)—Russian general, military commissioner of the Tsarist government in Bulgaria in 1886.—414

Kautsky, Karl Johann (1854-1938)—German Social-Democrat; journalist, economist and historian, editor of Die Neue Zeit (1883-1917), author of several Marxist theoretical works; ideologist of Centrism among the German Social-Democrats and in the Second International.—521

Kaye, Sir John William (1814-1876)—British military historian and colonial official.—151


Kern, Jan Hendrik (1833-1917)—Dutch philologist, Orientalist and Sanskritist.—83, 86, 89

Kinkel, Gottfried (1815-1882)—German poet and democratic journalist; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; sentenced to life imprisonment by Prussian court; in 1850 escaped and emigrated to London, a leader of the petty-bourgeois refugess; opposed Marx and Engels.—328

Klapka, György (Georg) (1820-1892)—general of the Hungarian revolutionary army (1848-49), emigrated in 1849; during the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 commanded a Hungarian legion organised by the Prussian Government in Silesia and intended for participation in the war; after the amnesty returned to Hungary in 1867.—307, 481

Klein, Johann Jacob (born c. 1818-died between 1895 and 1897)—Cologne physician, member of the Communist League, a defendant at the Cologne Communist trial (1852), acquitted.—329

Kolb, Georg Friedrich (1808-1884)—German politician, journalist and statistician.—530

Kopp, Hermann (1817-1892)—German chemist and historian of chemistry.—376

Korff, Hermann—former Prussian army officer, democrat; manager of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (1848-49); later emigrated to the USA.—306

Kossuth, Lajos (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement, headed the bourgeois-democratic elements in the 1848-49 revolution and later the Hungarian revolutionary government; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey and then to Britain and the USA.—328

Kotzebue, August Friedrich Ferdinand von (1761-1819)—German writer and journalist, extreme monarchist.—422

Kovalevsky, Maxim Maximovich (1851-1916)—Russian sociologist, historian, ethnographer and lawyer; politician, liberal; author of a number of works on the history of primitive communal system.—165, 167, 168, 232, 236, 241
Kravchinsky, Sergei Mikhailovich (pseudonym Stepnyak) (1851-1895)—Russian writer and journalist, prominent in the revolutionary Narodnik movement of the 1870s; emigrated in 1878; lived in England from 1884.—292

Kriege, Hermann (1820-1850)—German journalist; "true" socialist; founder and editor of the New York refugees' newspaper Der Volks-Tribun.—319, 320

Kropotkin, Pyotr Alexeyevich, Prince (1842-1921)—Russian revolutionary, journalist, geographer and traveller, a prominent figure and ideologist of anarchism; lived in emigration from 1876 to 1917.—292

Kuhlmann, Georg (b. 1812)—agent provocateur of the Austrian government; preached "true socialism" in the 1840s among the German Weitlingian artisans in Switzerland, using religious terminology and passing himself off as a "prophet".—320

Lacomblet, Theodor Joseph (1789-1866)—German historian, French by birth, archivist in Düsseldorf.—95

Lafayette (La Fayette), Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert Motier, marquis de (1757-1834)—French general, prominent figure in the French revolution, a leader of the moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants); took part in the July 1830 revolution.—126

Lamarck, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet, chevalier de (1744-1829)—French naturalist, developed the first complete theory of evolution in biology, forerunner of Darwin.—371

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician; Foreign Minister and de facto head of the Provisional Government in 1848.—324

Lange, Christian Konrad Ludwig (1825-1885)—German philologist and historian.—227

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German journalist and lawyer, socialist; took part in the democratic movement in the Rhine Province (1848-49); founder of the General Association of German Workers (1863); an initiator of the opportunist trend in the German Social-Democratic movement.—275, 515

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French journalist and politician, a leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats; editor of La Réforme; Minister of the Interior in the Provisional Government (February-May 1848); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (leader of the Montagnards); emigrated to England after the demonstration of June 13, 1849.—328

Leo Africanus (al-Hassan ibn-Mohammed) (1483 or 1485-1552 or 1554)—Arab scholar and traveller, writer on Africa.—45

Leopold Karl Friedrich (1790-1852)—Grand Duke of Baden (1830-52).—594

Lessner, Friedrich (1825-1910)—German tailor; member of the Communist League; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; defendant at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); refugee in London from 1856; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the General Council of the First International; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—321, 329

Letourneau, Charles Jean Marie (1831-1902)—French sociologist and ethnographer.—143-44, 146

Leverrier, Urbain Jean Joseph (1811-1877)—French astronomer and mathematician; in 1846 computed the orbit of the then unknown planet Neptune and determined its position.—368
Levi, Leone (1821-1888)—English economist, statistician and lawyer.—299

Lichnowski, Felix Maria, Prince von (1814-1848)—Prussian army officer, deputy to the Frankfurth National Assembly (Right wing); killed during the Frankfurth uprising in September 1848; he was the prototype for the satirical characters in Heine's poem Atta Troll and Georg Weerth's Leben und Thaten des berühmten Ritters Schnapphahnski.—109, 310

Liebknecht, Wilhelm (1826-1900)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Communist League; one of the founders and leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—448, 483

Lipsius, Justus (1547-1606)—Dutch philologist, Latin scholar, professor in Jena, Cologne, Louvain and Leyden.—84

Liutprand (c. 922-c. 972)—historian, bishop of Cremona from 961.—249

Livy (Titus Livius) (59 B.C.-A.D. 17)—Roman historian.—225-26, 227

Lochner, Georg (born c. 1824)—German Social-Democrat, carpenter; member of the Communist League and German Workers' Educational Society in London; later a member of the General Council of the First International; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—321

Longus (late 2nd cent.-early 3rd cent.)—Greek author.—184

Lopatin, Hermann Alexandrovich (1845-1918)—Russian revolutionary, Narodnik, member of the General Council of the First International; was arrested several times and kept in solitary confinement from 1897 to 1905; one of the translators into Russian of Marx's Capital, Volume I; friend of Marx and Engels.—591-93

Lothair I (795-855)—Roman Emperor (840-55), after the division of the Empire in 843 ruled Italy, Provence, and what is now Alsace and Lorraine and retained the title of Emperor, eldest son of Louis I the Pious.—67

Louis, nicknamed the German (804-876)—King of the East Franks (817-43), King of Germany (843-76), third son of Louis I the Pious.—67

Louis I, nicknamed the Pious (778-840)—Frankish Emperor (814-40).—67, 76, 81

Louis II (the Stammerer) (846-879)—King of Aquitania from 867, Frankish King (877-79).—77

Louis XI (1423-1483)—King of France (1461-83).—564

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—396, 491-92, 497

Louis Bonaparte—see Napoleon III

Louis Napoleon—see Napoleon III

Louis Philippe I (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of France (1830-48).—313, 332, 333

Louis Philippe Albert d'Orléans, comte de Paris (1838-1894)—grandson of Louis Philippe I, pretender to the French throne under the name of Philippe VII.—416

Lovett, William (1800-1877)—English craftsman, democrat; a leader of the Chartist movement (moderate wing) in the 1830s.—567

Luther, Martin (1483-1546)—German theologian and writer, leader of the Reformation; founder of Protestantism (Lutheranism) in Germany.—395

Luxembourgs—dynasty of Holy Roman emperors (1308-1437, with interruptions), also ruled in Bohemia (1310-1437) and Hungary (1387-1437).—485
Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Baron (1800-1859)—English historian and politician, Whig, M.P.—308

Macfarlane, Helen (pseudonym Howard Morten)—contributor to Chartist newspapers Democratic Review (1849-50) and Red Republican (1850), translator of the Manifesto of the Communist Party into English.—512

M(a)clennan, John Ferguson (1827-1881)—Scottish lawyer and historian.—140, 157, 169, 192, 232

Maine, Sir Henry James Sumner (1822-1888)—English jurist and historian of law.—186

Malon, Benoît (1841-1893)—French socialist, member of the First International, member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; after the Commune was defeated emigrated to Italy and later to Switzerland where he adhered to the anarchists; a leader and ideologist of Possibilism, an opportunist trend in the French socialist movement.—593

Manteuffel, Otto Theodor, Baron von (1805-1882)—Prussian statesman; Minister of the Interior (1848-50), Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1850-58).—304, 349, 472, 504

Marat, Jean Paul (1743-1793)—a Jacobin leader during the French Revolution.—126

Marcianus (c. 5th cent.)—Greek geographer.—35

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (121-180)—Roman Emperor (161-180), Stoic philosopher.—35, 38

Marius, Gaius (c. 156-86 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman, consul (107, 104-100, 86 B.C.)—11, 30

Marobodius (second half of the 1st cent. B.C.-A.D. 19)—leader of the Germanic tribe of Marcomanni (8 B.C.-A.D. 19), brought together the Germanic tribes of the Rhine area; fought against Rome, from A.D. 6 maintained neutrality towards Rome.—12, 22, 23, 28, 34

Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen) (1814-1881)—Karl Marx’s wife.—320


Marx-Aveling, Eleanor (1855-1898)—took part in English and international working-class movement in the 1880s-90s; journalist; Marx’s daughter, Edward Aveling’s wife from 1884; member of the Social-Democratic Federation and later of the Socialist League; active in organising the mass movement of unskilled workers; an organiser of the dockers’ strike in London in 1889.—434, 589

Maurer, Georg Ludwig (1790-1872)—German historian, studied the social system of ancient and medieval Germany.—78, 201, 239, 241

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805-1872)—leader of the national liberation movement in Italy; an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London (1850).—313, 316, 328

Meitzen, August (1822-1910)—German statistician, historian and economist; worked in statistical departments in Prussia and in Germany (1867-82).—348, 350-51

Melbourne, William Lamb, Viscount (1779-1848)—English statesman, Whig, Home Secretary (1830-34), Prime Minister (1834 and 1835-41).—566, 570

Menger, Anton (1841-1906)—Austrian lawyer, professor at Vienna University.—600-09, 610-16
Menke, Heinrich Theodor von (1819-1892)—German geographer, revised Spruner’s Hand-Atlas für die Geschichte des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit.—96, 559

Mentel, Christian Friedrich (b. 1812)—German tailor, member of the League of the Just; in 1846-47 was imprisoned in Prussia for his involvement in the League’s case.—315

Merovingians—the first royal dynasty in the Frankish state, (mid-5th cent.-751).—58, 61, 63, 65, 71, 73, 76

Mestorf, Johanna (1829-1909)—German historian and archaeologist.—34, 37

Mettemich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Prince von (1733-1859)—Austrian statesman and diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1809-21) and Chancellor (1821-48), an organiser of the Holy Alliance.—465, 486

Mieroslawski, Ludwik (1814-1878)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement, took part in the Polish uprising of 1830-31 and in the 1848-49 revolution; commander of the revolutionary army during the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849.—420

Mignet, François Auguste Marie (1796-1884)—French historian.—389

Mikhailovsky, Nikolai Konstantinovich (1842-1904)—Russian sociologist, journalist and literary critic, ideologist of the liberal Narodniki; an editor of the magazines Otechestvennye Zapiski and Russkoye Bogatstvo.—311

Milde, Karl August (1805-1861)—Silesian manufacturer, moderate liberal; Minister of Trade in the Auerswald-Hansemann Ministry (from June to September 1848), President of the Prussian National Assembly (Right wing).—471

Morn, Joseph (1813-1849)—German watch-maker, a leader of the League of the Just, member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; President of the Cologne Workers’ Association (from July to September 1848), member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats; killed in battle during the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849.—314, 321, 323, 326

Mommsen, Theodor (1817-1903)—German historian of Ancient Rome.—206, 225-29

Mone, Franz Joseph (1796-1871)—German historian and philologist.—99

Moore, Samuel (1838-1911)—English lawyer, member of the First International; translated into English Volume I of Marx’s Capital (together with Edward Aveling) and the Manifesto of the Communist Party; associate of Marx and Engels.—518

Morgan, Lewis Henry (1818-1881)—American ethnographer, archaeologist and historian of primitive society.—131-35, 139-43, 147, 152, 156, 189-92, 194, 206, 207, 210, 211, 213

Morny, Charles August Louis Joseph, duc de (1811-1865)—French politician,
Bonapartist; an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of the Interior (December 1851-January 1852).—476

Moschus (mid-2nd cent. B.C.)—Greek poet.—184

Motteler, Julius (1838-1907)—German Social-Democrat; deputy to the Reichstag in 1874-79; an émigré in Zurich and later in London at the time of the Anti-Socialist Law; was responsible for transportation of the Sozialdemokrat and illegal Social-Democratic literature to Germany.—623

Moxon, Edward (1801-1858)—English publisher; for publishing Shelley’s poems, was brought to trial in 1840 on a charge of blasphemy levelled by Hetherington; found guilty in June 1841 but was not punished.—570

Müller, Arthur (1847-1907)—German journalist, physician.—425

Müllenhoff, Karl Victor (1818-1884)—German philologist and historian, expert in Germanic antiquities, mythology and medieval literature.—10

Nadler, Karl Christian Gottfried (1809-1849)—German poet, wrote in the Palatinate dialect.—105

Napoleon I Bonaparte (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14 and 1815).—123, 175, 192, 309, 347, 375, 415, 455, 459, 463, 465, 469, 495, 506

Napoleon III (Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte) (1808-1873)—Napoleon I’s nephew; President of the Second Republic (1848-51), Emperor of the French (1852-70).—29, 109, 297, 302, 411, 412, 421, 460, 461, 463, 464, 475-77, 479-82, 484-89, 494, 498, 578, 580

Napoleon the Little—see Napoleon III

Nearchus (c. 360-c. 312 B.C.)—Macedonian navigator, a fellow cam-
1848 after an unsuccessful attempt to organise an uprising, commuted to life deportation; amnestied in 1856.—573, 576

O'Connell, Daniel (1775-1847)—Irish lawyer and politician, leader of the liberal wing of the national liberation movement.—572, 574-76

O'Connor, Feargus Edward (1794-1855)—a Left-wing Chartist leader, editor-in-chief of The Northern Star; reformist after 1848.—566-70, 572-75

Odoacer (c. 434-493)—German military leader in the service of West Roman emperors; dethroned Emperor Romulus Augustus in 476 and became king of the first "barbarian" kingdom in Italy.—245

Olga (d. 969)—Grand Princess of Kiev, Regent of the Russian state from 945, after the death of her husband Igor, her son Svyatoslav being still a minor.—235

Orleans—branch in the royal house of Bourbons (1830-48).—416

Orosius, Paulus (c. 380-c. 420)—Roman historian, Spaniard by birth; author of Historiarum adversum paganos.—20

Orsini, Felice (1819-1858)—Italian democrat, republican; prominent figure in the struggle for Italy's national liberation and unification; executed for his attempt on the life of Napoleon III.—462

Oshanina, Maria Nikolayevna (née Olovenikova) (1853-1898)—Russian revolutionary, member of the Executive of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) organisation; emigrated to Paris in 1882; representative of the Narodnaya Volya's Executive abroad.—591-93

Otfried (9th cent.)—monk from Wissembourg in Alsace; wrote a poem entitled Liber Evangeliorum domini gratia theotisce conscriptus (c. 868), which included all four Gospels.—86, 105

Otho, Marcus Salvius (32-69)—Roman statesman, legate in the province Lusitania; in January 69 organised praetorians' plot against Emperor Galba, had him murdered and proclaimed himself emperor; took his own life in April 69.—116

Otto, Karl Wunsibald (born c. 1810)—German chemist; member of the Cologne Workers' Association and of the Communist League (1848-49); one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—329

Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso) (43 B.C.-A.D. 18)—Roman poet.—29

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—British utopian socialist.—599

P

Palgrave, Sir Robert Harry Inglis (1827-1919)—English banker and economist, editor of The Economist (1877-83).—300

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman, Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41, 1846-51), Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58 and 1859-65).—461, 477

Pare, William (1805-1873)—British economist, active in the co-operative movement, follower of Owen.—609

Pattison, James (1786-1849)—English politician, liberal M.P. (1835-41 and 1843-47).—574

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850)—British statesman, moderate Tory; Home Secretary (1822-27, 1828-30), Prime Minister (1834-35, 1841-46); repealed the Corn Laws in 1846.—528, 570-73

Pepin (or Pippin) III (the Short) (714-768)—Frankish mayor of the palace (741-751), first king of the Carolingian dynasty (751-768); son of Charles Martel.—64, 65-67
Perseus of Macedonia (c. 213-166 B.C.)—last king of Macedonia (179-168 B.C.).—10, 246

Persius (Aulus Persius Flaccus) (34-62)—Roman satirist.—114

Pett, Sir William (1623-1687)—English economist and statistician, founder of the classical school of political economy in Britain.—612

Peucker, Eduard von (1791-1876)—Prussian general, War Minister in the so-called Imperial Government in Frankfurt am Main (1848-49); commanded counter-revolutionary troops suppressing the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising.—420

Pisistratus (c. 600-527 B.C.)—tyrant of Athens (560-527 B.C. with interruptions).—222

Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878)—Pope (1846-78).—419

Plato (c. 427-347 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—111

Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus) (A.D. 23 or 24-79)—Roman scholar, author of Natural History in 37 volumes.—16, 18, 33, 36, 46-49, 54, 56, 243, 246

Plutarch (c. 46-c. 125)—Greek writer, historian and philosopher.—10, 171

Pollux, Julius (2nd cent.)—Greek scholar, compiled Onomasticon, an encyclopaedic dictionary.—208

Probus, Marcus Aurelius (232-282)—Roman Emperor (276-282).—43

Procopius of Caesarea (end of 5th cent.-after 562)—Byzantine writer, author of an eight-volume history of Justinian's wars against the Persians, Vandals and Goths.—47, 177


Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus) (2nd cent.)—Greek mathematician, astronomer and geographer.—33-35, 38, 41, 45-49, 54, 56

Puttkamer, Robert Victor von (1828-1900)—German Minister of the Interior (1881-88); helped to instigate the persecution of Social-Democrats under the Anti-Socialist Law.—472, 624

Pytheas of Marseilles (Massilia) (4th cent. B.C.)—Greek traveller and astronomer; sailed to the shores of north-western Europe c. 325 B.C.—10, 14

Quinctilia—Roman patrician gens.—223

Q

R

Racine, Jean Baptiste (1639-1699)—French dramatist.—496

Regnauld, Étias Georges Soulange Oliva (1801-1868)—French historian and journalist.—293

Reiff, Wilhelm Joseph (b. 1824)—member of the Cologne Workers' Association and of the Communist League, expelled from the League in 1850; one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—329
Remigius, St. (c. 437-c. 533)—archbishop in Reims from 459.—64

Renan, (Joseph) Ernest (1823-1892)—French philologist and historian of Christianity.—112, 326, 382

Reymann, Daniel Gottlob (1759-1837)—German cartographer.—96-98

Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—English economist.—279-83, 290, 522, 612

Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessi, duc de (1585-1642)—French statesman, Cardinal in the period of absolutism.—491

Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-1794)—prominent figure in the French Revolution, leader of the Jacobins, head of the revolutionary Government.—376

Rodbertus-Jagetzow, Johann Karl (1805-1875)—German economist and politician; subsequently theoretician of “state socialism”.—279-81, 283-90, 608, 611

Röser, Peter Gerhardt (1814-1865)—German cigar-maker; Vice-President of the Cologne Workers’ Association (1848-49); member of the Communist League and from 1850 of its Cologne Central Authority; one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); later a Lassallean.—328

Roth, Paul Rudolf von (1820-1892)—German lawyer and law historian; author of works on the origins of feudalism in Western Europe.—61-64, 68, 71, 72, 77, 79-81

Rotteck, Karl Wenzeslaus Rodecker von (1775-1840)—German historian and politician, liberal.—471

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—French philosopher and writer of the Enlightenment.—373

Ruge, Arnold (1802-1880)—German radical journalist and philosopher, Young Hegelian; deputy to the Frankfurt Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; German petty-bourgeois refugee leader in England in the 1850s.—328

Russell, John, Earl of (1792-1878)—British statesman, Whig leader; Prime Minister (1846-52, 1865-66), Foreign Secretary (1852-53, 1859-65), President of the Council (1854-55).—477, 569, 574, 576

S

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—599, 606

Salvianus (c. 390-c. 484)—Christian preacher and writer, Marseilles clergyman.—250, 253

Sand, Karl Ludwig (1795-1820)—German student, participated in the liberal movement of German intelligentsia; executed for the assassination of the reactionary writer Kotzebue.—422

Saturninus, Sentius (1st cent.)—Roman soldier, participated in campaigns against the Germans.—22

Saussure, Henri de (1829-1905)—Swiss zoologist.—143

Savoy, House of—Italian dynasty which ruled the Kingdom of Sardinia (1720-1861) and the united Italian Kingdom (1861-1946).—464

Sax, Emil (1845-1927)—Austrian economist.—425

Schaffhausen, Hermann (1816-1893)—German anthropologist and physician.—8

Schapper, Karl (1812-1870)—German socialist; a leader of the League of the Just; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; a leader of the sectarian group during the split in the Communist League in 1850; again became a close associate of Marx in 1856; member of the General Council of the First
International.—305, 313-14, 319, 323, 326, 328, 329

Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von (1759-1805)—German poet, dramatist, historian and philosopher.—373, 606

Schinderhannes—see Bückler, Johann

Schloëffel, Gustav Adolph (1828-1849)—German student and journalist, took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany and Hungary; killed in action.—123

Schlosser, Friedrich Christoph (1776-1861)—German historian, democrat.—470

Schlueter, Friedrich Hermann (1851-1919)—German Social-Democrat, historian; in the 1880s headed a Social-Democratic publishing house in Zurich and then in London; emigrated to the USA in 1889; wrote several works on the history of the working-class movement in Great Britain and the United States.—623

Schnapphahnski-Lichnowski—see Lichnowski, Felix Maria, Prince von

Schneider II, Karl—German lawyer, democrat; President of the Cologne Democratic Society and member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats; defended Marx and Engels at the trial of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung on February 7, 1849; counsel for the defence at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—305, 306

Schneider, Jacob (1818-1898)—German archaeologist and historian.—32

Schöemann, Georg Friedrich (1793-1879)—German philologist and historian.—171, 210

Scholefield, Joshua (1774-1844)—English financier and manufacturer; radical M.P. (1832-44); favoured parliamentary reform and free trade.—566

Schulze-Delitzsch, Franz Hermann (1808-1883)—German economist and politician; a deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left Centre) in 1848; a leader of the bourgeois-liberal Party of Progress in the 1860s; advocated co-operative societies of mutual assistance as a means of improving the condition of the working class.—125

Schurz, Karl (1829-1906)—German democrat, journalist; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to the USA, participated in the Civil War on the side of the North; a Republican leader, Home Secretary (1877-81).—327

Schweitzer, Johann Baptist (1833-1875)—prominent figure in the German working-class movement, Lassallean; an editor of the Social-Democrat (1864-67); President of the General Association of German Workers (1867-71).—278

Scott, Sir Walter (1771-1832)—Scottish poet and novelist.—235

Sebastian (died c. 288)—a captain in the praetorian guard under the emperor Diocletian; executed for being a Christian; was canonised after death.—63

Segestes (early 1st cent.)—a chief of the Germanic tribe of Cheruscii.—27

Segimerus (Sigimerus) (late 1st cent. B.C.-A.D. early 1st cent.)—a chief of the Germanic tribe of Cheruscii, Arminius' father.—26, 27

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus (c. 4 B.C.-A.D. 65)—Roman philosopher.—113

Serno-Solovyevich, Alexander Alexandrovich (1838-1869)—Russian revolutionary democrat, follower of Chernyshevsky; participated in the Russian revolutionary movement in the early 1860s; emigrated to Geneva; member of the First International.—449

Servius Tullius (578-534 B.C.)—sixth King of Rome.—230

Severus, Lucius Septimius (146-211)—Roman Emperor (193-211).—37, 39, 40
Shelley, Percy Bysshe (1792-1822)—English romantic poet.—570, 614
Sirmond, Jacques (1559-1651)—French historian, Jesuit; published early medieval documents.—73
Sismondi, Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de (1773-1842)—Swiss economist, representative of economic romanticism.—612
Smith, Adam (1723-1790)—Scottish economist.—522, 599, 608, 611-12
Smith, Adolph (Smith Headingley)—English socialist, journalist; member of the Social-Democratic Federation; was close to the French Possibilists.—542
Soetbeer, Adolf Georg (1814-1892)—German economist and statistician.—506
Solon (c. 638-c. 558 B.C.)—Athenian legislator; carried out several reforms directed against the aristocracy.—207, 215, 218-19, 230, 275
Soulouque, Faustin Elie (c. 1782-1867)—president of the Republic of Haiti (1849-59); proclaimed himself Emperor Faustin I in 1849.—110
Spruner von Merz, Karl (1803-1892)—German historian and cartographer.—96, 559
Starcke, Carl Nikolaus (1858-1926)—Danish philosopher and sociologist.—357, 368, 372-74, 378, 379, 520
Steenstrand—Dutch merchant in England.—549
Stein, Julius (1813-1889)—Silesian teacher and journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848.—125
Stephen III (II) (d. 757)—Pope (752-757).—66
Stephens, Joseph Rayner (1805-1879)—English clergyman; active in the Chartist movement in Lancashire (1837-39).—568
Stepnyak—see Kravchinsky, Sergei Mikhailovich

Stieber, Wilhelm (1818-1882)—Prussian police officer, one of the organisers of the Cologne Communist trial (1852); chief of the Prussian political police (1850-60).—312, 322
Stirner, Max (real name Schmidt, Johann Caspar) (1806-1856)—German Young Hegelian philosopher, an ideologist of individualism and anarchism.—364, 381-82
Stoecker, Adolf (1835-1909)—German clergyman and reactionary politician; founder (1878) and leader of the Christian-Social Party, preached anti-Semitism.—507
Strabo (c. 63 B.C.-A.D. c. 20)—Greek geographer and historian.—14, 16, 29, 45
Strauss, David Friedrich (1808-1874)—German philosopher and publicist, Young Hegelian.—112, 363, 365, 381-82
Struve, Gustav von (1805-1870)—German democratic journalist; a leader of the Baden uprisings in April and September 1848 and of the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; one of the leaders of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in England; fought in the US Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—446
Suetonius Tranquillus, Gaius (c. 70-after 122)—Roman historian.—21
Sugenheim, Samuel (1811-1877)—German historian.—161
Sybel, Heinrich von (1817-1895)—German historian and politician; National Liberal from 1867; an advocate of the unification of Germany under Prussian supremacy; director of Prussian state archives.—478

Tacitus, Publius Cornelius (c. 55-c. 120)—Roman historian, orator and politician.—6, 12, 15-18, 25, 27, 30-37, 39-42, 44-48, 53-54, 99, 116, 132, 138-39, 176, 199, 238, 245
Tarquinius, Lucius (nicknamed Superbus) (534-c. 509 B.C.)—last (seventh) semi-legendary King of Rome; according to the legend, was exiled from Rome after a popular uprising which proclaimed a republic.—229, 231

Tauscher, Leonard (1840-1914)—German Social-Democrat, composer; at the time of the Anti-Socialist Law helped to publish the Sozialdemokrat in Zurich and then in London (1888-90), later an editor of the Social-Democratic publications in Stuttgart.—623

Taylor, Sedly (second half of the 19th-beginning of the 20th cent.)—participant in the co-operative movement in Britain, favoured a share of capitalist profits for workers.—613

Theocritus (3rd cent. B.C.)—Greek poet.—184

Theodorich—name of three kings of the Goths; two kings of the Visigoths, Theodorich I (reigned c. 418-51) and Theodorich II (reigned c. 453-66) and king of the Ostrogoths, Theodorich the Great (reigned 474-526).—229

Thierry, Jacques Nicolas Augustin (1795-1856)—French historian.—389

Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836 and 1840); head of the Orleanists after 1848; organised the suppression of the Paris Commune (1871); President of the Republic (1871-73).—389, 490, 497

Thile, Karl Hermann von (1812-1889)—German diplomat, Deputy-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Prussia (1862-71), and of the German Empire (1871-73).—487

Thompson, William (c. 1785-1833)—Irish economist, follower of Owen.—280, 607-12, 614

Thucydides (c. 460-c. 395 B.C.)—Greek historian.—212

Tiberius (Tiberius Claudius Nero Caesar) (42 B.C.-A.D. 37)—Roman Emperor (14-37).—21, 22, 31, 32, 40, 116, 229

Trajan (Marcus Ulpius Traianus) (53-117)—Roman Emperor (98-117).—39

Tschech, Heinrich Ludwig (1789-1844)—Prussian official, burgomaster of Storkow (Prussia) (1832-41); democrat; executed for an attempt on the life of Frederick William IV.—471

Tudors—royal family in England (1485-1603).—565

U

Ulfila (Wulfila) (c. 311-383)—Visigothic bishop, founder of the Gothic alphabet, translator of the Bible into Gothic.—229

V

Vanderbilts—family of big financial and industrial magnates in the USA.—401, 475

Varus, Publius Quintilius (c. 53 B.C.-A.D. 9)—Roman politician and general; proconsul of Syria (7 B.C.), general in Germany (6-9); killed in battle in the Teutoburg Forest during the uprising of the Germanic tribes.—24-30, 55, 223

Veleda (A.D. 1st cent.)—priestess and prophetess of the Germanic tribe of Bructeri, took an active part in the uprising (led by Civilis) of Germanic and Gaulish tribes against Rome (69-70).—239

Velleius Paternculus, Marcus (c. 19 B.C.-A.D. c. 31)—Roman historian; took part in military expeditions to Germany, Pannonia and Dalmatia.—21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 46

Venedey, Jakob (1805-1871)—German radical journalist; deputy to the Frankfurter National Assembly (Left wing); liberal after the 1848-49 revolution.—313
Vercingetorix (c. 72-46 B.C.)—chief of the Gauls who headed their uprising against Rome (52-51 B.C.); was executed.—30

Victoria (1819-1901)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901).—567, 569, 572

Villiers, Charles Pelham (1802-1898)—English politician, lawyer, Free Trader, M.P.—571, 573

Vincent, Henry (1813-1878)—Chartist, leader of London Workers’ Association.—567

Vinicio, Marcus (died c. 20)—Roman general, consul, took part in wars in Pannonia and Germany.—22

Virchow, Rudolf (1821-1902)—German naturalist, founder of cellular pathology; politician, a leader of the Party of Progress.—8

Vogt, Karl (1817-1895)—German naturalist, petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; one of the five imperial regents (June 1849); emigrated in 1849; later received subsidies from Napoleon III; slandered proletarian revolutionaries.—369, 447, 448

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet (1694-1778)—French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment.—373, 396

W

Wachsmuth, Ernst Wilhelm Gottlieb (1784-1866)—German historian, professor in Leipzig.—172

Wagner, Adolf Heinrich Gotthilf (1835-1917)—German economist, representative of the so-called socio-legal trend in political economy; armchair socialist.—284

Wagner, Richard (1813-1883)—German composer.—147

Waitz, Georg (1813-1886)—German historian, professor in Göttingen.—50, 241

Waldemar, Friedrich Gustav, Count (1795-1864)—Prussian general and military writer, War Minister (1854-58).—473

Walter, John (1776-1847)—owner and publisher of The Times, M.P. (1832-37, 1841-42), moderate liberal.—573

Walter, John (1818-1894)—owner and publisher of The Times, M.P. (1847-65, 1868-85), liberal; son of the above.—574

Watson, John Forbes (1827-1892)—English physician, colonial official, Director of the London Museum of India (1858-79), wrote a number of works on India.—151

Weerth, Ferdinand (1774-1836)—German pastor; district inspector of church administration in the principality of Lippe; father of Georg Ludwig Weerth.—109

Weerth, Georg Ludwig (1822-1856)—German proletarian poet and journalist, member of the Communist League, an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848-49; friend of Marx and Engels.—108-11, 458

Weitling, Wilhelm Christian (1808-1871)—German tailor; one of the early leaders of the working-class movement in Germany; theorist of utopian egalitarian communism; emigrated to the USA in 1849.—279, 315-17, 219-20, 326, 328, 516

Welcker, Carl Theodor (1790-1869)—German lawyer, liberal writer, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre) in 1848-49.—471

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (1769-1852)—British general and statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1828-30) and Foreign Secretary (December 1834-April 1835).—490, 563
Wermuth—police superintendant in Hanover; witness at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—312, 322

Westermarck, Edward Alexander (1862-1939)—Finnish ethnographer and sociologist.—144-47, 159-60

Westminster—see Grosvenor, Richard

White, George (d. 1868)—Chartist, contributed to The Northern Star, associate of Feargus O’Connor, later of Harney, agitated in Birmingham (1842), Leeds (1850) and in other cities; was arrested several times.—572

Wiberg, Carl Fredrik (1813-1881)—Swedish historian.—34, 36

Wigand, Paul (1786-1886)—German jurist and law historian.—85

William I (1797-1888)—Prince of Prussia, Prince Regent (1858-61), King of Prussia (1861-88); German Emperor (1871-88).—417, 466, 472, 491, 580

William II (1859-1914)—King of Prussia and German Emperor (1888-1918).—540, 541, 627

William III (1817-1890)—King of the Netherlands (1849-90).—485

Williams, Zephaniah (c. 1794-1874)—Chartist, an organiser of the miners’ uprising in Wales in 1839; deported for life to Australia.—568, 569, 575, 577

Willich, August (1810-1878)—retired Prussian army officer, member of the Communist League, participated in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; a leader of a sectarian group which split away from the League in 1850; emigrated to the USA in 1853, fought in the Civil War on the side of the North.—128, 326, 328-29, 419, 596

Wilson, James (1805-1860)—Scottish economist and politician, Free Trader, founder and editor of The Economist, M.P. (1847-59).—572

Wolff, Wilhelm (Lupus) (1809-1864)—German teacher, proletarian revolutionary, leading figure in the Communist League, an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848 and 1849; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—110, 127, 128, 321, 323, 325, 341, 348-49

Wolfram von Eschenbach (c. 1170-c. 1220)—German poet.—178

Worsaae, Jens Jacob Asmussen (1821-1885)—Danish archaeologist and historian; Minister of Education (1874-75).—35

Wright, Asher (1803-1875)—a US missionary, lived among the Seneca Indians (1831-75); compiled a dictionary of their language.—158

Y

Yaroslav the Wise (978-1054)—Grand Prince of Kiev (1019-1054).—167

Yor(c)k von Wartenburg, Hans David Ludwig, Count (1759-1830)—Prussian general, field-marshall general (from 1821); participated in wars against Napoleonic France.—29

Z

Zeuß, Johann Kaspar (1806-1856)—German linguist, made a detailed comparative description of Celtic languages.—43-49, 54

Zhukovsky, Yuli Galaktionovich (1822-1907)—Russian economist and journalist, manager of the State Bank, wrote “Karl Marx and His Book on Capital”, an article containing attacks on Marxism.—311

Zurita, Alonso—Spanish colonial officer in Central America in the mid-16th century.—168
INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

Abraham (Bib.)—patriarch of the Hebrews.—163

Achilles (Gr. myth.)—the bravest Greek warrior in the Trojan War, a hero of Homer’s Iliad.—170, 211

Agamemnon (Gr. myth.)—legendary King of Argos, leader of the Greeks in the Trojan War, a hero of Homer’s Iliad.—170, 208, 211

Althaea (Gr. myth.)—daughter of King Thesius, mother of Meleager.—238

Anaitis—Greek name of Anahita—Persian goddess of waters and fertility. Her cult spread from Persia to Asia Minor. She was worshipped mostly in Armenia.—160, 174

Aphrodite (Gr. myth.)—goddess of love and beauty.—174

Argonauts (Gr. myth.)—sailors who, in a ship called Argos, made a voyage to Colchis in quest of the Golden Fleece guarded by the dragon.—238

Astarte—Greek name of Ashtoreth—Phoenician goddess of fertility and love.—159

Atta Troll—bear, the title character in Heine’s satirical poem.—109

Boreadi (Gr. myth.)—children of Boreas (god of the North Wind) and Oreithyia (Queen of Athens).—238

Brunhild—a character in the Old German epic and in the German medieval poem, Nibelungenlied, Queen of Iceland, wife of Gunther, King of the Burgundians.—185

Cassandra (Gr. myth.)—daughter of Priam, King of Troy, prophetess; at the conquest of Troy was carried off by Agamemnon as his slave and mistress; a character in Aeschylus’ Agamemnon.—171

Chloe—an enamoured shepherdess in the novel Daphnis and Chloe by the Greek author Longus (2nd-3rd cent.).—184

Christ (Jesus Christ) (Bib.)—114

Cinderella—heroine of a popular fairy-tale, a despised and neglected but diligent and gentle girl.—315

Cleopatra (Gr. myth.)—daughter of Boreas, god of the North Wind.—238

Daniel (Bib.)—a ‘great prophet’, author of the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament.—115

Daphnis—an enamoured shepherd in Daphnis and Chloe by the Greek author Longus (2nd-3rd cent.).—184

Demodocus—a character in Homer’s Odyssey, blind minstrel of the mythical King of Phaeacians Alcinous.—211

Don Quixote—the title character in Cervantes’ novel.—502

Droste-Fischering—a character in a German satirical folk song.—471

Egeria (Rom. myth.)—nymph, prophetess, secret adviser of Numa Pompilius, Roman King.—613

Enoch (Bib.)—author of the apocryphal Book of Enoch.—115

Ermin (Ger. myth.)—one of the three sons of Mannus, legendary ancestor of the Germans.—47

Eteocles (Gr. myth.)—a son of Oedipus, who usurped power in Thebes; a character in Aeschylus’ tragedy Seven Against Thebes.—209

Etel—character in Old German epic and in the Nibelungenlied, King of the Huns.—185

Freya (Sc. myth.)—goddess of fertility and love, wife of god Freyr, her brother; character in the Scandinavian epic the Elder Edda.—147
Ganymede (Gr. myth.)—handsome youth who was carried off by the gods to Olympus where he became Zeus' lover and cup-bearer.—173

George Dandin—title character in a farce by Molière George Dandin ou le mari confondu; rich simple-minded peasant married to a ruined aristocrat who deceives him.—266

Gunther—a character in the Old German epic and also in the German medieval poem Nibelungenlied, King of the Burgundians.—184-85

Gutrun (Kudrun)—a character in the Old German epic and in the 13th-century German poem, Gutrun; daughter of Hettel, King of the Hegelungen, and Hilde; fiancée of Herwig, King of Seeland; carried off by King Hartmut of Normandy, was his prisoner for 13 years but refused to marry him; set free by Herwig, she married the latter.—185

Hadubrand—one of the characters in the Old German epic, the Hildebrandslied (Lay of Hildebrand), son of Hildebrand, the main character.—237

Hartmut—a character in the Old German epic and in the 13th-century German poem, Gutrun; son of the King of Ormány (Normandy); one of Gutrun's unrequited fiancés.—185

Heracles (Greek and Roman myth.)—a hero known for his physical strength and heroic deeds.—238

Herwig—a character in the Old German epic and in the 13th-century German poem, Gutrun; King of Seeland, fiancé and later husband of Gutrun.—185

Hettel—a character in the Old German epic and in the 13th-century German poem, Gutrun; King of the Hegelungen.—185

Hilde—a character in the Old German epic and in the 13th-century German poem, Gutrun; daughter of the King of Ireland; wife of Hettel, King of the Hegelungen.—185

Hildebrand—main character of the Old German heroic epic Hildebrandslied (Lay of Hildebrand).—237, 262

Ing (Ger. myth.)—one of the three sons of Mannus, legendary ancestor of the Germans.—47

Isk (Ger. myth.)—one of the three sons of Mannus, legendary ancestor of the Germans.—47

Jezebel—according to the Old Testament, despotic and cruel Queen of Israel, tried to have Hebrew religion replaced by the worship of Astarte. She is mentioned in the New Testament. The name is used in The Revelation of St. John the Divine (Apocalypse), to personify depravity and blasphemy.—113

John (Bib.)—author of The Revelation of St. John the Divine (Apocalypse), a book of the New Testament.—115, 117

John (Bib.)—author of one of the four Gospels.—115

John (Bib.)—author of the three Epistles.—115

John Bull—the main character in John Arbuthnot's book The History of John Bull (18th cent.), the name is often used to personify England or Englishmen.—522

Kriemhild—a character in the Old German epic and in the German medieval poem Nibelungenlied; sister of Gunther, King of the Burgundians; fiancée and wife of Siegfried; after his death, married Etzel, King of the Huns.—184-85

Loki (Sc. myth.)—god of evil and of fire; character in the Scandinavian epic the Elder Edda.—147

Mannus—according to Tacitus, son of the Old German god Tuisto, had
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardenwik</td>
<td>Bardowick</td>
<td>Greifswalde</td>
<td>Greifswald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barmen</td>
<td>Wuppertal</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Guiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bečva</td>
<td>Bečzwa</td>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>Habana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemian Forest</td>
<td>Šumava, Český Les</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Halle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branibor</td>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td>Halscheid</td>
<td>Halscheidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breslau</td>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>Homburg</td>
<td>Bad Homburg vor der Höfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britlinga</td>
<td>Brietlingen</td>
<td>Horsadal</td>
<td>Roßtal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromberg</td>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>Jaxartes</td>
<td>Syr Darya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrop</td>
<td>Castrop-Rauxel</td>
<td>Karninschesberg</td>
<td>Kaninchensberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Kerprich</td>
<td>Kerprich-Heimersdorfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crastlingi</td>
<td>Krassum</td>
<td>Königgrätz</td>
<td>Hradec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crettenach</td>
<td>Crettbach</td>
<td>Lestines</td>
<td>Estinnes du Mont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene</td>
<td>Cyrenaica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danzig</td>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drontheim</td>
<td>Trondheim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edingahûsun</td>
<td>Edemissen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ems</td>
<td>Bad Ems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* This glossary includes geographical names occurring in Engels' articles in the form customary in the press of the time but differing from the national names or from those given in modern maps. The left column gives geographical names as used in the original; the right column gives corresponding names as used on modern maps and in modern literature.—*Ed.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Polish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Silesia</td>
<td>Dolny Śląsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lützelstein</td>
<td>La Petite-Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Morava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massel</td>
<td>Maslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mederiacum</td>
<td>Brück</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memel</td>
<td>Neman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merzig</td>
<td>Messancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montabaurer Höhe</td>
<td>Montabaurer Wald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mülhausen</td>
<td>Mulhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neufahrwasser</td>
<td>Nowy Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimwegen</td>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberbarmen</td>
<td>Wuppertal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oesel</td>
<td>Saaremaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ölandsund</td>
<td>Kalmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olgütz</td>
<td>Olomouc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otlinga</td>
<td>Ötingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxus</td>
<td>Amu Darya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillau</td>
<td>Baltiisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomerania</td>
<td>Pomorze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reekheim</td>
<td>Reckheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riesengebirge</td>
<td>Karkonosze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarburg</td>
<td>Sarrebourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Leningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silesia</td>
<td>Śląsk, Slezsko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinkfal</td>
<td>De Honte or Wester-schelde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound (Kalmarsund)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebnitz</td>
<td>Trzebnica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Ilium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Silesia</td>
<td>Górny Śląsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widau</td>
<td>Wied Au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>