entities in themselves. It transforms fidelity into infidelity, love into hate, hate into love, virtue into vice, vice into virtue, servant into master, master into servant, idiocy into intelligence, and intelligence into idiocy.

Since money, as the existing and active concept of value, confounds and confuses all things, it is the general confounding and confusing of all things—the world upside-down—the confounding and confusing of all natural and human qualities.

He who can buy bravery is brave, though he be a coward. As money is not exchanged for any one specific quality, for any one specific thing, or for any particular human essential power, but for the entire objective world of man and nature, from the standpoint of its possessor it therefore serves to exchange every quality for every other, even contradictory, quality and object: it is the fraternisation of impossibilities. It makes contradictions embrace.

Assume man to be man and his relationship to the world to be a human one: then you can exchange love only for love, trust for trust, etc. If you want to enjoy art, you must be an artistically cultivated person; if you want to exercise influence over other people, you must be a person with a stimulating and encouraging effect on other people. Every one of your relations to man and to nature must be a specific expression, corresponding to the object of your will, of your real individual life. If you love without evoking love in return—that is, if your loving as loving does not produce reciprocal love; if through a living expression of yourself as a loving person you do not make yourself a beloved one, then your love is impotent—a misfortune. ||XLIII|

{CRITIQUE OF THE HEGELIAN DIALECTIC AND PHILOSOPHY AS A WHOLE}

||XI| (6) This is perhaps the place at which, by way of explanation and justification, we might offer some considerations in regard to the Hegelian dialectic generally and especially its exposition in the Phänomenologie and Logik,* and also, lastly, the relation [to it] of the modern critical movement.95

So powerful was modern German criticism's preoccupation with the past—so completely was its development entangled with the

---

* Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Phänomenologie des Geistes and Wissenschaft der Logik.—Ed.
subject-matter—that there prevailed a completely uncritical attitude to the method of criticising, together with a complete lack of awareness about the apparently formal, but really vital question: how do we now stand as regards the Hegelian dialectic? This lack of awareness about the relationship of modern criticism to the Hegelian philosophy as a whole and especially to the Hegelian dialectic has been so great that critics like Strauss and Bruno Bauer still remain within the confines of the Hegelian logic; the former completely so and the latter at least implicitly so in his Synoptiker\(^a\) (where, in opposition to Strauss, he replaces the substance of “abstract nature” by the “self-consciousness” of abstract man), and even in Das entdeckte Christentum. Thus in Das entdeckte Christentum, for example, you get:

“As though in positing the world, self-consciousness does not posit that which is different [from itself] and in what it is creating it does not create itself, since it in turn annuls the difference between what it has created and itself, since it itself has being only in creating\(^b\) and in the movement—as though its purpose were not this movement?” etc.; or again: “They” (the French materialists) “have not yet been able to see that it is only as the movement of self-consciousness that the movement of the universe has actually come to be for itself, and achieved unity with itself.” [Pp. 113, 114-15.]

Such expressions do not even show any verbal divergence from the Hegelian approach, but on the contrary repeat it word for word.

||XII| How little consciousness there was in relation to the Hegelian dialectic during the act of criticism (Bauer, the Synoptiker), and how little this consciousness came into being even after the act of material criticism, is proved by Bauer when, in his Die gute Sache der Freiheit, he dismisses the brash question put by Herr Gruppe—“What about logic now?”—by referring him to future critics.\(^96\)

But even now—now that Feuerbach both in his “Thesen” in the Anekdota\(^c\) and, in detail, in the Philosophie der Zukunft has in principle overthrown the old dialectic and philosophy; now that that school of criticism, on the other hand, which was incapable of accomplishing this, has all the same seen it accomplished and has proclaimed itself pure, resolute, absolute criticism that has come into the clear with itself; now that this criticism, in its spiritual

---

\(^a\) Bruno Bauer, Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker.—Ed.
\(^b\) In the manuscript: “in movement”.—Ed.
\(^c\) Ludwig Feuerbach, “Vorläufige Thesen zur Reformation der Philosophie” in Anekdota zur neuesten deutschen Philosophie und Publicistik.—Ed.
pride, has reduced the whole process of history to the relation between the rest of the world and itself (the rest of the world, in contrast to itself, falling under the category of the "masses") and dissolved all dogmatic antitheses into the single dogmatic antithesis of its own cleverness and the stupidity of the world—the antithesis of the critical Christ and Mankind, the "rabble"; now that daily and hourly it has demonstrated its own excellence against the dullness of the masses; now, finally, that it has proclaimed the critical Last Judgment in the shape of an announcement that the day is approaching when the whole of decadent humanity will assemble before it and be sorted by it into groups, each particular mob receiving its testimonium paupertatis; now that it has made known in print its superiority to human feelings as well as its superiority to the world, over which it sits enthroned in sublime solitude, only letting fall from time to time from its sarcastic lips the ringing laughter of the Olympian Gods—even now, after all these delightful antics of idealism (i.e., of Young Hegelianism) expiring in the guise of criticism—even now it has not expressed the suspicion that the time was ripe for a critical settling of accounts with the mother of Young Hegelianism—the Hegelian dialectic—and even had nothing to say about its critical attitude towards the Feuerbachian dialectic. This shows a completely uncritical attitude to itself.

Feuerbach is the only one who has a serious, critical attitude to the Hegelian dialectic and who has made genuine discoveries in this field. He is in fact the true conqueror of the old philosophy. The extent of his achievement, and the unpretentious simplicity with which he, Feuerbach, gives it to the world, stand in striking contrast to the opposite attitude [of the others].

Feuerbach's great achievement is:

1. The proof that philosophy is nothing else but religion rendered into thought and expounded by thought, i.e., another form and manner of existence of the estrangement of the essence of man; hence equally to be condemned;

2. The establishment of true materialism and of real science, by making the social relationship of "man to man" the basic principle of the theory;

3. His opposing to the negation of the negation, which claims to be the absolute positive, the self-supporting positive, positively based on itself.

---

a Certificate of poverty.—Ed.
b This refers to the Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung.—Ed.
Feuerbach explains the Hegelian dialectic (and thereby justifies starting out from the positive facts which we know by the senses) as follows:

Hegel sets out from the estrangement of substance (in logic, from the infinite, the abstractly universal)—from the absolute and fixed abstraction; which means, put in a popular way, that he sets out from religion and theology.

Secondly, he annuls the infinite, and posits the actual, sensuous, real, finite, particular (philosophy, annulment of religion and theology).

Thirdly, he again annuls the positive and restores the abstraction, the infinite—restoration of religion and theology.

Feuerbach thus conceives the negation of the negation only as a contradiction of philosophy with itself—as the philosophy which affirms theology (the transcendent, etc.) after having denied it, and which it therefore affirms in opposition to itself.

The positive position or self-affirmation and self-confirmation contained in the negation of the negation is taken to be a position which is not yet sure of itself, which is therefore burdened with its opposite, which is doubtful of itself and therefore in need of proof, and which, therefore, is not a position demonstrating itself by its existence—not an acknowledged position; hence it is directly and immediately confronted by the position of sense-certainty based on itself.*

But because Hegel has conceived the negation of the negation, from the point of view of the positive relation inherent in it, as the true and only positive, and from the point of view of the negative relation inherent in it as the only true act and spontaneous activity of all being, he has only found the abstract, logical, speculative expression for the movement of history, which is not yet the real history of man as a given subject, but only the act of creation, the history of the origin of man.

We shall explain both the abstract form of this process and the difference between this process as it is in Hegel in contrast to modern criticism, in contrast to the same process in Feuerbach's Wesen des Christenthums, or rather the critical form of this in Hegel still uncritical process.

Let us take a look at the Hegelian system. One must begin with Hegel's Phänomenologie, the true point of origin and the secret of the Hegelian philosophy.

* Feuerbach also defines the negation of the negation, the definite concept, as thinking surpassing itself in thinking and as thinking wanting to be directly awareness, nature, reality.—Note by Marx.
Phenomenology.
A. Self-consciousness.

I. Consciousness. (a) Certainty at the level of sense-experience; or the "this" and "meaning". (§) Perception, or the thing with its properties, and deception. (γ) Force and understanding, appearance and the supersensible world.

II. Self-consciousness. The truth of certainty of self. (a) Independence and dependence of self-consciousness; lordship and bondage. (b) Freedom of self-consciousness. Stoicism, scepticism, the unhappy consciousness.

III. Reason. Reason's certainty and reason's truth. (a) Observation as a process of reason. Observation of nature and of self-consciousness. (b) Realisation of rational self-consciousness through its own activity. Pleasure and necessity. The law of the heart and the insanity of self-conceit. Virtue and the course of the world. (c) The individuality which is real in and for itself. The spiritual animal kingdom and the deception or the real fact. Reason as lawgiver. Reason which tests laws.

B. Mind.

I. True mind; ethics. II. Mind in self-estrangement, culture.

III. Mind certain of itself, morality.

C. Religion. Natural religion; religion of art; revealed religion.

D. Absolute Knowledge.

Hegel's *Enzyklopädie*, beginning as it does with logic, with *pure speculative thought*, and ending with *absolute knowledge*—with the self-conscious, self-comprehending philosophic or absolute (i. e., superhuman) abstract mind—is in its entirety nothing but the display, the self-objectification, of the essence of the philosophic mind, and the philosophic mind is nothing but the estranged mind of the world thinking within its self-estrangement—i. e., comprehending itself abstractly.

Logic—mind's *coin of the realm*, the speculative or *mental value* of man and nature—its essence which has grown totally indifferent to all real determinateness, and hence unreal—is *alienated thinking*, and therefore thinking which abstracts from nature and from real man: *abstract thinking*.

Then: The externality of this abstract thinking ... nature, as it is for this abstract thinking. Nature is external to it—its self-loss; and it apprehends nature also in an external fashion, as abstract thought, but as alienated abstract thinking. Finally, *mind*, this thinking

---

returning home to its own point of origin—the thinking which as the anthropological, phenomenological, psychological, ethical, artistic and religious mind is not valid for itself, until ultimately it finds itself, and affirms itself, as absolute knowledge and hence absolute, i. e., abstract, mind, thus receiving its conscious embodiment in the mode of existence corresponding to it. For its real mode of existence is abstraction.

There is a double error in Hegel.

The first emerges most clearly in the *Phänomenologie*, the birth-place of the Hegelian philosophy. When, for instance, wealth, state power, etc., are understood by Hegel as entities estranged from the human being, this only happens in their form as thoughts.... They are thought-entities, and therefore merely an estrangement of pure, i. e., abstract, philosophical thinking. The whole process therefore ends with absolute knowledge. It is precisely abstract thought from which these objects are estranged and which they confront with their presumption of reality. The philosopher—who is himself an abstract form of estranged man—takes himself as the criterion of the estranged world. The whole history of the alienation process and the whole process of the retraction of the alienation is therefore nothing but the history of the production of abstract (i. e., absolute) thought—of logical, speculative thought. The estrangement, which therefore forms the real interest of this alienation and of the transcendence of this alienation, is the opposition of in itself and for itself, of consciousness and self-consciousness, of object and subject—that is to say, it is the opposition between abstract thinking and sensuous reality or real sensuousness within thought itself. All other oppositions and movements of these oppositions are but the semblance, the cloak, the exoteric shape of these oppositions which alone matter, and which constitute the meaning of these other, profane oppositions. It is not the fact that the human being objectifies himself inhumanly, in opposition to himself, but the fact that he objectifies himself in distinction from and in opposition to abstract thinking, that constitutes the posited essence of the estrangement and the thing to be superseded.

The appropriation of man's essential powers, which have become objects—indeed, alien objects—is thus in the first place only an appropriation occurring in consciousness, in pure thought, i. e., in abstraction: it is the appropriation of these objects as thoughts and as movements of thought. Consequently, despite its thoroughly negative and critical appearance and despite the genuine criticism contained in it, which often anticipates far later
development, there is already latent in the *Phänomenologie* as a germ, a potentiality, a secret, the uncritical positivism and the equally uncritical idealism of Hegel's later works—that philosophic dissolution and restoration of the existing empirical world.

*In the second place:* the vindication of the objective world for man—for example, the realisation that sensuous consciousness is not an *abstractly* sensuous consciousness but a *humanly* sensuous consciousness, that religion, wealth, etc., are but the estranged world of human objectification, of man's essential powers put to work and that they are therefore but the path to the true human world—this appropriation or the insight into this process appears in Hegel therefore in this form, that *sense, religion, state power,* etc., are *spiritual* entities; for only *mind* is the *true* essence of man, and the true form of mind is thinking mind, the logical, speculative mind. The *human character* of nature and of the nature created by history—man's products—appears in the form that they are *products* of abstract mind and as such, therefore, phases of *mind—thought-entities.* The *Phänomenologie* is, therefore, a hidden, mystifying and still uncertain criticism; but inasmuch as it depicts man's *estrangement,* even though man appears only as mind, there lie concealed in it *all* the elements of criticism, already *prepared* and *elaborated* in a manner often rising far above the Hegelian standpoint. The "unhappy consciousness", the "honest consciousness", the struggle of the "noble and base consciousness", etc., etc.—these separate sections contain, but still in an estranged form, the *critical* elements of whole spheres such as religion, the state, civil life, etc. Just as *entities, objects,* appear as thought-entities, so the *subject* is always *consciousness* or *self-consciousness*; or rather the object appears only as *abstract* consciousness, man only as *self-consciousness:* the distinct forms of estrangement which make their appearance are, therefore, only various forms of consciousness and self-consciousness. Just as *in itself* abstract consciousness (the form in which the object is conceived) is merely a moment of distinction of self-consciousness, what appears as the result of the movement is the identity of self-consciousness with consciousness—absolute knowledge—the movement of abstract thought no longer directed outwards but proceeding now only within its own self: that is to say, the dialectic of pure thought is the result.

The outstanding achievement of Hegel's *Phänomenologie* and of its final outcome, the dialectic of negativity as the moving and generating principle, is thus first that Hegel conceives the self-creation of man as a process, conceives objectifi-
cation as loss of the object, as alienation and as transcendence of this alienation; that he thus grasps the essence of labour and comprehends objective man—true, because real man—as the outcome of man’s own labour. The real, active orientation of man to himself as a species-being, or his manifestation as a real species-being (i.e., as a human being), is only possible if he really brings out all his species-powers—something which in turn is only possible through the co-operative action of all of mankind, only as the result of history—and treats these powers as objects: and this, to begin with, is again only possible in the form of estrangement.

We shall now demonstrate in detail Hegel’s one-sidedness and limitations as they are displayed in the final chapter of the *Phänomenologie*, “Absolute Knowledge”—a chapter which contains the condensed spirit of the *Phänomenologie*, the relationship of the *Phänomenologie* to speculative dialectic, and also Hegel’s consciousness concerning both and their relationship to one another.

Let us provisionally say just this much in advance: Hegel’s standpoint is that of modern political economy. He grasps labour as the essence of man—as man’s essence which stands the test: he sees only the positive, not the negative side of labour. Labour is man’s coming-to-be for himself within alienation, or as alienated man. The only labour which Hegel knows and recognises is abstractly mental labour. Therefore, that which constitutes the essence of philosophy—the alienation of man who knows himself, or alienated science thinking itself—Hegel grasps as its essence; and in contradistinction to previous philosophy he is therefore able to combine its separate aspects, and to present his philosophy as the philosophy. What the other philosophers did—that they grasped separate phases of nature and of human life as phases of self-consciousness, namely, of abstract self-consciousness—is known to Hegel as the doings of philosophy. Hence his science is absolute.

Let us now turn to our subject.

“Absolute Knowledge”. The last chapter of the “Phänomenologie”.

The main point is that the object of consciousness is nothing else but self-consciousness, or that the object is only objectified self-consciousness—self-consciousness as object. (Positing of man = self-consciousness.)

The issue, therefore, is to surmount the object of consciousness. Objectivity as such is regarded as an estranged human relationship which does not correspond to the essence of man, to self-consciousness. The reappropriation of the objective essence of man, produced within the orbit of estrangement as something alien,
therefore denotes not only the annulment of estrangement, but of objectivity as well. Man, that is to say, is regarded as a non-objective, spiritual being.

The movement of surmounting the object of consciousness is now described by Hegel in the following way:

The object reveals itself not merely as returning into the self—this is according to Hegel the one-sided way of apprehending this movement, the grasping of only one side. Man is equated with self. The self, however, is only the abstractly conceived man—man created by abstraction. Man is selfish. His eye, his ear, etc., are selfish. In him every one of his essential powers has the quality of selfishness. But it is quite false to say on that account "self-consciousness has eyes, ears, essential powers." Self-consciousness is rather a quality of human nature, of the human eye, etc.; it is not human nature that is a quality of self-consciousness.

The self-abstracted entity, fixed for itself, is man as abstract egoist—egoism raised in its pure abstraction to the level of thought. (We shall return to this point later.)

For Hegel the human being—man—equals self-consciousness. All estrangement of the human being is therefore nothing but estrangement of self-consciousness. The estrangement of self-consciousness is not regarded as an expression—reflected in the realm of knowledge and thought—of the real estrangement of the human being. Instead, the actual estrangement—that which appears real—is according to its innermost, hidden nature (which is only brought to light by philosophy) nothing but the manifestation of the estrangement of the real human essence, of self-consciousness. The science which comprehends this is therefore called phenomenology. All reappropriation of the estranged objective essence appears, therefore, as incorporation into self-consciousness: The man who takes hold of his essential being is merely the self-consciousness which takes hold of objective essences. Return of the object into the self is therefore the reappropriation of the object.

Expressed in all its aspects, the surmounting of the object of consciousness means:

(1) That the object as such presents itself to consciousness as something vanishing.

(2) That it is the alienation of self-consciousness which posits thinghood.¹⁰¹

(3) That this alienation has not merely a negative but a positive significance.

(4) That it has this meaning not merely for us or intrinsically, but for self-consciousness itself.
(5) For self-consciousness, the negative of the object, or its annul-
ing of itself, has positive significance—or it knows this futility of the
object—because of the fact that it alienates itself, for in this
alienation it posits itself as object, or, for the sake of the indivisible
unity of being-for-self, posits the object as itself.

(6) On the other hand, this contains likewise the other moment,
that self-consciousness has also just as much superseded this
alienation and objectivity and resumed them into itself, being thus at
home in its other-being as such.

(7) This is the movement of consciousness and this is therefore the
totality of its moments.

(8) Consciousness must similarly be related to the object in the
totality of its determinations and have comprehended it in terms of
each of them. This totality of its determinations makes the object
intrinsically a spiritual being; and it becomes so in truth for
consciousness through the apprehending of each one of the
determinations as self or through what was called above the spiritual
attitude to them.102

As to (1): That the object as such presents itself to consciousness as
something vanishing—this is the above-mentioned return of the object
into the self.

As to (2): The alienation of self-consciousness posits thinghood.
Because man equals self-consciousness, his alienated, objective
essence, or thinghood, equals alienated self-consciousness, and thinghood
is thus posited through this alienation (thinghood being that which is
an object for man and an object for him is really only that which is to
him an essential object, therefore his objective essence. And since it is
not real man, nor therefore nature—man being human nature—who
as such is made the subject, but only the abstraction of man, self-
consciousness, so thinghood cannot be anything but alienated self-
consciousness). It is only to be expected that a living, natural being
equipped and endowed with objective (i.e., material) essential
powers should of his essence have real natural objects; and that his
self-alienation should lead to the positing of a real, objective world,
but within the framework of externality, and, therefore, an over-
whelming world not belonging to his own essential being. There is
nothing incomprehensible or mysterious in this. It would be
mysterious, rather, if it were otherwise. But it is equally clear that a
self-consciousness by its alienation can posit only thinghood, i.e., only an
abstract thing, a thing of abstraction and not a real thing. It is
[[XXVI]103] clear, further, that thinghood is therefore utterly
without any independence, any essentiality vis-à-vis self-consciousness;
that on the contrary it is a mere creature—something posited by
And what is posited, instead of confirming itself, is but confirmation of the act of positing which for a moment fixes its energy as the product, and gives it the semblance—but only for a moment—of an independent, real substance.

Whenever real, corporeal man, man with his feet firmly on the solid ground, man exhaling and inhaling all the forces of nature, posits his real, objective essential powers as alien objects by his externalisation, it is not the act of positing which is the subject in this process: it is the subjectivity of objective essential powers, whose action, therefore, must also be something objective. An objective being acts objectively, and he would not act objectively if the objective did not reside in the very nature of his being. He only creates or posits objects, because he is posited by objects—because at bottom he is nature. In the act of positing, therefore, this objective being does not fall from his state of “pure activity” into a creating of the object; on the contrary, his objective product only confirms his objective activity, his activity as the activity of an objective, natural being.

Here we see how consistent naturalism or humanism is distinct from both idealism and materialism, and constitutes at the same time the unifying truth of both. We see also how only naturalism is capable of comprehending the action of world history.

〈Man is directly a natural being. As a natural being and as a living natural being he is on the one hand endowed with natural powers, vital powers—he is an active natural being. These forces exist in him as tendencies and abilities—as instincts. On the other hand, as a natural, corporeal, sensuous, objective being he is a suffering, conditioned and limited creature, like animals and plants. That is to say, the objects of his instincts exist outside him, as objects independent of him; yet these objects are objects that he needs—essential objects, indispensable to the manifestation and confirmation of his essential powers. To say that man is a corporeal, living, real, sensuous, objective being full of natural vigour is to say that he has real, sensuous objects as the object of his being or of his life, or that he can only express his life in real, sensuous objects. To be objective, natural and sensuous, and at the same time to have object, nature and sense outside oneself, or oneself to be object, nature and sense for a third party, is one and the same thing.〉

Hunger is a natural need; it therefore needs a nature outside itself, an object outside itself, in order to satisfy itself, to be stilled. Hunger is an acknowledged need of my body for an object existing outside it, indispensable to its integration and to the expression of its essential being. The sun is the object of the plant—an indispensable object to it, confirming its life—just as the
plante is an object of the sun, being an expression of the life-awakening power of the sun, of the sun's objective essential power.

A being which does not have its nature outside itself is not a natural being, and plays no part in the system of nature. A being which has no object outside itself is not an objective being. A being which is not itself an object for some third being has no being for its object; i.e., it is not objectively related. Its being is not objective.

A non-objective being is a non-being.

Suppose a being which is neither an object itself, nor has an object. Such a being, in the first place, would be the unique being: there would exist no being outside it—it would exist solitary and alone. For as soon as there are objects outside me, as soon as I am not alone, I am another—another reality than the object outside me. For this third object I am thus a different reality than itself; that is, I am its object. Thus, to suppose a being which is not the object of another being is to presuppose that no objective being exists. As soon as I have an object, this object has me for an object. But a non-objective being is an unreal, non-sensuous thing—a product of mere thought (i.e., of mere imagination)—an abstraction. To be sensuous, that is, to be really existing, means to be an object of sense, to be a sensuous object, and thus to have sensuous objects outside oneself—objects of one's sensuousness. To be sensuous is to suffer.

Man as an objective, sensuous being is therefore a suffering being—and because he feels that he suffers, a passionate being.

Passion is the essential power of man energetically bent on its object.

< But man is not merely a natural being: he is a human natural being. That is to say, he is a being for himself. Therefore he is a species-being, and has to confirm and manifest himself as such both in his being and in his knowing. Therefore, human objects are not natural objects as they immediately present themselves, and neither is human sense as it immediately is—as it is objectively—human sensibility, human objectivity. Neither nature objectively nor nature subjectively is directly given in a form adequate to the human being.>

And as everything natural has to come into being, man too has his act of origin—history—which, however, is for him a known history, and hence as an act of origin it is a conscious self-transcending act of origin. History is the true natural history of man (on which more later).

Thirdly, because this positing of thinghood is itself only an illusion, an act contradicting the nature of pure activity, it has to be cancelled again and thinghood denied.

Re 3, 4, 5 and 6. (3) This externalisation of consciousness has not
merely a **negative** but a **positive** significance, and (4) it has this meaning not merely *for us* or intrinsically, but for consciousness itself. (5) *For consciousness* the negative of the object, its annulling of itself, has **positive** significance—i.e., consciousness *knows* this nullity of the object—because it alienates *itself*; for in this alienation it *knows* itself as object, or, for the sake of the indivisible unity of *being-for-itself,* the object as itself. (6) On the other hand, there is also this other moment in the process, that consciousness has also just as much superseded this alienation and objectivity and resumed them into itself, being thus *at home* in its *other-being as such.*

As we have already seen, the appropriation of what is estranged and objective, or the annulling of objectivity in the form of *estrangement* (which has to advance from indifferent strangeness to real, antagonistic estrangement), means likewise or even primarily for Hegel that it is *objectivity* which is to be annulled, because it is not the *determinate* character of the object, but rather its *objective* character that is offensive and constitutes estrangement for self-consciousness. The object is therefore something negative, self-annulling—a *nullity.* This nullity of the object has not only a negative but a **positive** meaning for consciousness, since this *nullity* of the object is precisely the *self-confirmation* of the non-objectivity, of the IIXXVIII! abstraction of itself. For *consciousness itself* the nullity of the object has a positive meaning because it *knows* this nullity, the objective being, as its *self-alienation,* because it knows that it exists only as a result of its own self-alienation....

The way in which consciousness is, and in which something is for it, is *knowing.* Knowing is its sole act. Something therefore comes to be for consciousness insofar as the latter *knows* this something. Knowing is its sole objective relation.

It [consciousness] then knows the nullity of the object (i.e., *knows* the non-existence of the distinction between the object and itself, the non-existence of the object for it) because it *knows* the object as its *self-alienation,* that is, it *knows itself*—*knows* knowing as object—because the object is only the *semblance* of an object, a piece of mystification, which in its essence, however, is nothing else but knowing itself, which has confronted itself with itself and hence has confronted itself with a *nullity*—a something which has no objectivity outside the knowing. Or: knowing *knows* that in relating itself to an object it is only *outside* itself—that it only externalises itself; that it *itself* only *appears* to itself as an object—or that that which appears to it as an object is only itself.

On the other hand, says Hegel, there is here at the same time this other moment, that consciousness has just as much annulled
and reabsorbed this externalisation and objectivity, being thus at home in its other-being as such.

In this discussion all the illusions of speculation are brought together.

First of all: consciousness, self-consciousness, is at home in its other-being as such. It is therefore—or if we here abstract from the Hegelian abstraction and put the self-consciousness of man instead of self-consciousness—it is at home in its other-being as such. This implies, for one thing, that consciousness (knowing as knowing, thinking as thinking) pretends to be directly the other of itself—to be the world of sense, the real world, life—thought surpassing itself in thought (Feuerbach).

This aspect is contained herein, inasmuch as consciousness as mere consciousness takes offence not at estranged objectivity, but at objectivity as such.

Secondly, this implies that self-conscious man, insofar as he has recognised and superseded the spiritual world (or his world’s spiritual, general mode of being) as self-alienation, nevertheless again confirms it in this alienated shape and passes it off as his true mode of being—re-establishes it, and pretends to be at home in his other-being as such. Thus, for instance, after superseding religion, after recognising religion to be a product of self-alienation, he yet finds confirmation of himself in religion as religion. Here is the root of Hegel’s false positivism, or of his merely apparent criticism: this is what Feuerbach designated as the positing, negating and re-establishing of religion or theology—but it has to be expressed in more general terms. Thus reason is at home in unreason as unreason. The man who has recognised that he is leading an alienated life in law, politics, etc., is leading his true human life in this alienated life as such. Self-affirmation, self-confirmation in contradiction with itself—in contradiction with both the knowledge and the essential being of the object—is thus true knowledge and life.

There can therefore no longer be any question about an act of accommodation on Hegel’s part vis-à-vis religion, the state, etc., since this lie is the lie of his principle.

If I know religion as alienated human self-consciousness, then what I know in it as religion is not my self-consciousness, but my alienated self-consciousness confirmed in it. I therefore know my self-consciousness that belongs to itself, to its very nature, confirmed not in religion but rather in annihilated and superseded religion.

In Hegel, therefore, the negation of the negation is not the confirmation of the true essence, effected precisely through
negation of the pseudo-essence. With him the negation of the negation is the confirmation of the pseudo-essence, or of the self-estranged essence in its denial; or it is the denial of this pseudo-essence as an objective being dwelling outside man and independent of him, and its transformation into the subject.

A peculiar role, therefore, is played by the act of superseding in which denial and preservation, i.e., affirmation, are bound together.

Thus, for example, in Hegel's philosophy of law, civil law superseded equals morality, morality superseded equals the family, the family superseded equals civil society, civil society superseded equals the state, the state superseded equals world history. In the actual world civil law, morality, the family, civil society, the state, etc., remain in existence, only they have become moments—modes of the existence and being of man—which have no validity in isolation, but dissolve and engender one another, etc. They have become moments of motion.

In their actual existence this mobile nature of theirs is hidden. It appears and is made manifest only in thought, in philosophy. Hence my true religious existence is my existence in the philosophy of religion; my true political existence is my existence in the philosophy of law; my true natural existence, existence in the philosophy of nature; my true artistic existence, existence in the philosophy of art; my true human existence, my existence in philosophy. Likewise the true existence of religion, the state, nature, art, is the philosophy of religion, of nature, of the state and of art. If, however, the philosophy of religion, etc., is for me the sole true existence of religion then, too, it is only as a philosopher of religion that I am truly religious, and so I deny real religious sentiment and the really religious man. But at the same time I assert them, in part within my own existence or within the alien existence which I oppose to them—for this is only their philosophic expression—and in part I assert them in their distinct original shape, since for me they represent merely the apparent other-being, allegories, forms of their own true existence (i.e., of my philosophical existence) hidden under sensuous disguises.

In just the same way, quality superseded equals quantity, quantity superseded equals measure, measure superseded equals essence, essence superseded equals appearance, appearance superseded equals actuality, actuality superseded equals the concept, the concept superseded equals objectivity, objectivity superseded equals the absolute idea, the absolute idea superseded equals nature, nature superseded equals subjective mind, subjective mind superseded
equals ethical objective mind, ethical mind superseded equals art, art superseded equals religion, religion superseded equals absolute knowledge.

On the one hand, this act of superseding is a transcending of a conceptual entity; thus, private property as a concept is transcended in the concept of morality. And because thought imagines itself to be directly the other of itself, to be sensuous reality—and therefore takes its own action for sensuous, real action—this superseding in thought, which leaves its object in existence in the real world, believes that it has really overcome it. On the other hand, because the object has now become for it a moment of thought, thought takes it in its reality too to be self-confirmation of itself—of self-consciousness, of abstraction.

[XXX] From the one point of view the entity which Hegel supersedes in philosophy is therefore not real religion, the real state, or real nature, but religion itself already as an object of knowledge, i.e., dogmatics; the same with jurisprudence, political science and natural science. From the one point of view, therefore, he stands in opposition both to the real thing and to immediate, unphilosophic science or the unphilosophic conceptions of this thing. He therefore contradicts their conventional conceptions.

On the other hand, the religious, etc., man can find in Hegel his final confirmation.

It is now time to formulate the positive aspects of the Hegelian dialectic within the realm of estrangement.

(a) Supersession as an objective movement of retracting the alienation into self. This is the insight, expressed within the estrangement, concerning the appropriation of the objective essence through the supersession of its estrangement; it is the estranged insight into the real objectification of man, into the real appropriation of his objective essence through the annihilation of the estranged character of the objective world, through the supersession of the objective world in its estranged mode of being. In the same way atheism, being the supersession of God, is the advent of theoretical humanism, and communism, as the supersession of private property, is the vindication of real human life as man's possession and thus the advent of practical humanism, or atheism is humanism mediated with itself through the supersession of religion, whilst communism is humanism mediated with itself through the supersession of private property. Only through the supersession of this mediation—which is itself, however, a necessary

---

3 The conventional conceptions of theology, jurisprudence, political science, natural science, etc.—Ed.
premise—does positively self-deriving humanism, positive humanism, come into being.

But atheism and communism are no flight, no abstraction, no loss of the objective world created by man—of man's essential powers born to the realm of objectivity; they are not a returning in poverty to unnatural, primitive simplicity. On the contrary, they are but the first real emergence, the actual realisation for man of man's essence and of his essence as something real.

Thus, by grasping the positive meaning of self-referred negation (although again in estranged fashion) Hegel grasps man's self-estrangement, the alienation of man's essence, man's loss of objectivity and his loss of realness as self-discovery, manifestation of his nature, objectification and realisation. <In short, within the sphere of abstraction, Hegel conceives labour as man's act of self-genesis—conceives man's relation to himself as an alien being and the manifestation of himself as an alien being to be the emergence of species-consciousness and species-life.>

(b) However, apart from, or rather in consequence of, the reversal already described, this act appears in Hegel:

First as a merely formal, because abstract, act, because the human being itself is taken to be only an abstract, thinking being, conceived merely as self-consciousness. And,

Secondly, because the exposition is formal and abstract, the supersession of the alienation becomes a confirmation of the alienation; or for Hegel this movement of self-genesis and self-objectification in the form of self-alienation and self-estrangement is the absolute, and hence final, expression of human life—with itself as its aim, at peace with itself, and in unity with its essence.

This movement, in its abstract [[XXXI]] form as dialectic, is therefore regarded as truly human life, and because it is nevertheless an abstraction—an estrangement of human life—it is regarded as a divine process, but as the divine process of man, a process traversed by man's abstract, pure, absolute essence that is distinct from himself.

Thirdly, this process must have a bearer, a subject. But the subject only comes into being as a result. This result—the subject knowing itself as absolute self-consciousness—is therefore God, absolute Spirit, the self-knowing and self-manifesting idea. Real man and real nature become mere predicates—symbols of this hidden, unreal man and of this unreal nature. Subject and predicate are therefore related to each other in absolute reversal—a mystical subject-object or a subjectivity reaching beyond the object—absolute subject as a process, as subject alienating itself and returning from alienation
into itself, but at the same time retracting this alienation into itself, and the subject as this process; a pure, incessant revolving within itself.


Hegel having posited man as equivalent to self-consciousness, the estranged object—the estranged essential reality of man—is nothing but consciousness, the thought of estrangement merely—estrangement's abstract and therefore empty and unreal expression, negation. The supersession of the alienation is therefore likewise nothing but an abstract, empty supersession of that empty abstraction—the negation of the negation. The rich, living, sensuous, concrete activity of self-objectification is therefore reduced to its mere abstraction, absolute negativity—an abstraction which is again fixed as such and considered as an independent activity—as sheer activity. Because this so-called negativity is nothing but the abstract, empty form of that real living act, its content can in consequence be merely a formal content produced by abstraction from all content. As a result therefore one gets general, abstract forms of abstraction pertaining to every content and on that account indifferent to, and, consequently, valid for, all content—the thought-forms or logical categories torn from real mind and from real nature. (We shall unfold the logical content of absolute negativity further on.)

Hegel's positive achievement here, in his speculative logic, is that the definite concepts, the universal fixed thought-forms in their independence vis-à-vis nature and mind are a necessary result of the general estrangement of the human being and therefore also of human thought, and that Hegel has therefore brought these together and presented them as moments of the abstraction-process. For example, superseded being is essence, superseded essence is concept, the concept superseded is ... absolute idea. But what, then, is the absolute idea? It supersedes its own self again, if it does not want to perform once more from the beginning the whole act of abstraction, and to satisfy itself with being a totality of abstractions or the self-comprehending abstraction. But abstraction comprehending itself as abstraction knows itself to be nothing; it must abandon itself—abandon abstraction—and so it arrives at an entity which is its exact opposite—at nature. Thus, the entire logic is the demonstration that abstract thought is nothing in itself; that the absolute idea is nothing for itself; that only nature is something.

[XXXII] The absolute idea, the abstract idea, which

"considered with regard to its unity with itself is intuiting" (Hegel, Encyclopédie.
3rd edition, p. 222 [§244]), and which (loc. cit.) “in its own absolute truth resolves to let the moment of its particularity or of initial characterisation and other-being, the immediate idea, as its reflection, go forth freely from itself as nature” (loc. cit.),

this whole idea which behaves in such a strange and bizarre way, and which has given the Hegelians such terrible headaches, is from beginning to end nothing else but abstraction (i.e., the abstract thinker), which, made wise by experience and enlightened concerning its truth, resolves under various (false and themselves still abstract) conditions to abandon itself and to replace its self-absorption (nothingness), generality and indeterminateness by its other-being, the particular, and the determinate; resolves to let nature, which it held hidden in itself only as an abstraction, as a thought-entity, go forth freely from itself: that is to say, this idea resolves to forsake abstraction and to have a look at nature free of abstraction. The abstract idea, which without mediation becomes intuiting, is indeed nothing else but abstract thinking that gives itself up and resolves on intuition. This entire transition from logic to natural philosophy is nothing else but the transition—so difficult to effect for the abstract thinker, who therefore describes it in such a far-fetched way—from abstracting to intuiting. The mystical feeling which drives the philosopher forward from abstract thinking to intuiting is boredom—the longing for a content.

(The man estranged from himself is also the thinker estranged from his essence—that is, from the natural and human essence. His thoughts are therefore fixed mental forms dwelling outside nature and man. Hegel has locked up all these fixed mental forms together in his logic, interpreting each of them first as negation—that is, as an alienation of human thought—and then as negation of the negation—that is, as a superseding of this alienation, as a real expression of human thought. But as this still takes place within the confines of the estrangement, this negation of the negation is in part the restoring of these fixed forms in their estrangement; in part a stopping at the last act—the act of self-reference in alienation—as the true mode of being of these fixed mental forms*; and in part, to the extent that this abstrac-

* (This means that what Hegel does is to put in place of these fixed abstractions the act of abstraction which revolves in its own circle. We must therefore give him the credit for having indicated the source of all these inappropriate concepts which originally appertained to particular philosophers; for having brought them together; and for having created the entire compass of abstraction as the object of criticism, instead of some specific abstraction.) (Why Hegel separates thought from the subject we shall see later; at this stage it is already clear, however, that when man is not, his characteristic expression cannot be human either, and so neither could thought be grasped as an expression of man as a human and natural subject endowed with eyes, ears, etc., and living in society, in the world, and in nature.) — Note by Marx.
tion apprehends itself and experiences an infinite weariness with itself, there makes its appearance in Hegel, in the form of the resolution to recognise nature as the essential being and to go over to intuition, the abandonment of abstract thought—the abandonment of thought revolving solely within the orbit of thought, of thought sans eyes, sans teeth, sans ears, sans everything.)

But nature too, taken abstractly, for itself—nature fixed in isolation from man—is nothing for man. It goes without saying that the abstract thinker who has committed himself to intuiting, intuits nature abstractly. Just as nature lay enclosed in the thinker in the form of the absolute idea, in the form of a thought-entity—in a shape which was obscure and enigmatic even to him—so by letting it emerge from himself he has really let emerge only this abstract nature, only nature as a thought-entity—but now with the significance that it is the other-being of thought, that it is real, intuited nature—nature distinguished from abstract thought. Or, to talk in human language, the abstract thinker learns in his intuition of nature that the entities which he thought to create from nothing, from pure abstraction—the entities he believed he was producing in the divine dialectic as pure products of the labour of thought, for ever shuttling back and forth in itself and never looking outward into reality—are nothing else but abstractions from characteristics of nature. To him, therefore, the whole of nature merely repeats the logical abstractions in a sensuous, external form. He once more resolves nature into these abstractions. Thus, his intuition of nature is only the act of confirming his abstraction from the intuition of nature—at is only the conscious repetition by him of the process of creating his abstraction. Thus, for example, time equals negativity referred to itself (op. cit., p. 238). To the superseded becoming as being there corresponds, in natural form, superseded movement as matter. Light is reflection-in-itself, the natural form. Body as moon and comet is the natural form of the antithesis which according to logic is on the one side the positive resting on itself and on the other side the negative resting on itself. The earth is the natural form of the logical ground, as the negative unity of the antithesis, etc.

---

^a^ The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript: “Let us consider for a moment Hegel’s characteristics of nature and the transition from nature to the mind. Nature has resulted as the idea in the form of the other-being. Since the id [ea]...”—Ed.

^b^ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse.—Ed.
Nature as nature—that is to say, insofar as it is still sensuously distinguished from that secret sense hidden within it—nature isolated, distinguished from these abstractions, is nothing—a nothing proving itself to be nothing—is devoid of sense, or has only the sense of being an externality which has to be annulled.

"In the finite-teleological position is to be found the correct premise that nature does not contain within itself the absolute purpose." P. 225 [§245].

Its purpose is the confirmation of abstraction.

"Nature has shown itself to be the idea in the form of other-being. Since the idea is in this form the negative of itself or external to itself, nature is not just relatively external vis-à-vis this idea, but externality constitutes the form in which it exists as nature." P. 277 [§247].

Externality here is not to be understood as the world of sense which manifests itself and is accessible to the light, to the man endowed with senses. It is to be taken here in the sense of alienation, of a mistake, a defect, which ought not to be. For what is true is still the idea. Nature is only the form of the idea's other-being. And since abstract thought is the essence, that which is external to it is by its essence something merely external. The abstract thinker recognises at the same time that sensuousness—externality in contrast to thought shuttling back and forth within itself—is the essence of nature. But he expresses this contrast in such a way as to make this externality of nature, its contrast to thought, its defect, so that inasmuch as it is distinguished from abstraction, nature is something defective. §§XXXIV An entity which is defective not merely for me or in my eyes but in itself—intrinsically—has something outside itself which it lacks. That is, its essence is different from it itself. Nature has therefore to supersede itself for the abstract thinker, for it is already posited by him as a potentially superseded being.

"For us, mind has nature for its premise, being nature's truth and for that reason its absolute prius. In this truth nature has vanished, and mind has resulted as the idea arrived at being-for-itself, the object of which, as well as the subject, is the concept. This identity is absolute negativity, for whereas in nature the concept has its perfect external objectivity, this its alienation has been superseded, and in this alienation the concept has become identical with itself. But it is this identity, therefore, only in being a return out of nature." P. 392 [§381].

"As the abstract idea, revelation is unmediated transition to, the coming-to-be of, nature; as the revelation of the mind, which is free, it is the positing of nature as the mind's world—a positing which, being reflection, is at the same time a presupposing of the world as independently existing nature. Revelation in conception is the creation of nature as the mind's being, in which the mind procures the affirmation and the truth of its freedom". "The absolute is mind. This is the highest definition of the absolute." [P. 398, § 384.] §§XXXIV
LETTERS

October 1843-August 1844
Kreuznach, October 3, 1843

Dear Sir,

A few months ago while passing through [Bruckberg], Dr. Ruge informed you of our plan to publish Franco-German Jahrbücher and asked at the same time for your collaboration. It has now been already settled that Paris is to be the place for printing and publication and that the first monthly number is to appear by the end of November.

Before I leave for Paris in a few days time I feel obliged to make a brief epistolary approach to you since I have not had the privilege of making your personal acquaintance.

You were one of the first writers who expressed the need for a Franco-German scientific alliance. You will, therefore, assuredly be one of the first to support an enterprise aimed at bringing such an alliance into being. For German and French articles are to be published promiscue* in the Jahrbücher. The best Paris writers have agreed to co-operate. Any contribution from you will be most welcome and there is probably something at your disposal that you have already written.

From your preface to the 2nd edition of Das Wesen des Christenthums, I am almost led to conclude that you are engaged on a fuller work on Schelling or that you have something about this windbag in mind. Now that would be a marvellous beginning.

Schelling, as you know, is the 38th member of the [German] Confederation. The entire German police is at his disposal as I myself once experienced when I was editor of the Rheinische Zeitung. That is, a censorship order can prevent anything against

---

* Mixed, alternately. — Ed.
the holy Schelling [...] from getting through. Hence it is almost impossible in Germany to attack Schelling except in books of over 21 sheets, and books of over 21 sheets are not books read by the people. Kapp's book is very commendable but it is too circumstantial and rather inaptly separates judgment from facts. Moreover, our governments have found a means of making such works ineffective. They must not be mentioned. They are ignored or the few official reviews dismiss them with a few contemptuous words. The great Schelling himself pretends he knows nothing about these attacks and he succeeded in diverting attention from Kapp's book by making a tremendous fiscal to-do about old Paulus' soup. That was a diplomatic master stroke!

But just imagine Schelling exposed in Paris, before the French literary world! His vanity will not be able to restrain itself, this will wound the Prussian Government to the quick, it will be an attack on Schelling's sovereignty abroad, and a vain monarch sets much greater store by his sovereignty abroad than at home.

How cunningly Herr von Schelling enticed the French, first of all the weak, eclectic Cousin, then even the gifted Leroux. For Pierre Leroux and his like still regard Schelling as the man who replaced transcendental idealism by rational realism, abstract thought by thought with flesh and blood, specialised philosophy by world philosophy! To the French romantics and mystics he cries: "I, the union of philosophy and theology", to the French materialists: "I, the union of flesh and idea", to the French sceptics: "I, the destroyer of dogmatism", in a word, "I... Schelling!"

Schelling has not only been able to unite philosophy and theology, but philosophy and diplomacy too. He has turned philosophy into a general diplomatic science, into a diplomacy for all occasions. Thus an attack on Schelling is indirectly an attack on our entire policy, and especially on Prussian policy. Schelling's philosophy is Prussian policy sub specie philosophiae.

You would therefore be doing a great service to our enterprise, but even more to truth, if you were to contribute a characterisation of Schelling to the very first issue. You are just the man for this because you are Schelling in reverse. The sincere thought—we may believe the best of our opponent—of the young Schelling for the realisation of which however he did not possess the necessary

---

* A word here is indecipherable. — Ed.

[Ch. Kapp,] Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling. — Ed.

H. E. G. Paulus, Die endlich offenbar gewordene positive Philosophie der Offenbarung. — Ed.
qualities except imagination, he had no energy but vanity, no
driving force but opium, no organ but the irritability of a feminine
perceptivity, this sincere thought of his youth, which in his case
remained a fantastic youthful dream, has become truth, reality,
manly seriousness in your case. Schelling is therefore an anticipated
caricature of you, and as soon as reality confronts the caricature
the latter must dissolve into thin air. I therefore regard you as the
necessary, natural—that is, nominated by Their Majesties Nature
and History—opponent of Schelling. Your struggle with him is
the struggle of the imagination of philosophy with philosophy
itself.

I confidently expect a contribution from you in the form you
may find most convenient. My address is: "Herr Mäurer. Rue
Vanneau No. 23, Paris, for the attention of Dr. Marx." Although
she does not know you, my wife sends greetings. You would not
believe how many followers you have among the fair sex.

Yours very truly,

Dr. Marx

First published in part in: K. Grün,
Ludwig Feuerbach in seinem Briefwechsel
und Nachlass, sowie in seiner Philosophischen
Charakterentwicklung, Bd. 1, Leipzig und
Heidelberg, 1874; in full in: Karl Marx
and Frederick Engels, Collected Works,
second Russ. ed., Vol. 27, 1962
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TO JULIUS FRÖBEL

IN ZURICH

Paris, November 21, 1843
rue Vanneau, No. 31, Faub. St. Germain

Dear Friend,

Your letter has just arrived, but with some very strange
symptoms.

1) Everything which you say you enclosed is missing with the
exception of Engels’ article. This, however, is all in pieces and is
therefore useless. It begins with No. 5.

* Frederick Engels, ”Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy” (see this volume,
pp. 418-43).—Ed.
2) The letters for Mäurer and myself were wrapped up in the enclosed envelope which is post-marked St. Louis. The few pages of Engels' article were in the same wrapper.

3) Mäurer's letter, which, like mine, I found open in the enclosed envelope, is also superscribed in a strange hand. I enclose the page with the writing.

Hence there are only two possibilities.

Either the French Government opened and seized your letters and your packet. In which case return the enclosed addresses. We will then not only initiate proceedings against the French Post-Office but, at the same time, publicise this fact in all the opposition papers. In any event it would be better if you addressed all packets to a French bookshop. However, we do not believe that the French Government has perpetrated the kind of infamy which so far only the Austrian Government has permitted itself.

There thus remains the second possibility, that your Bluntschli and associates have played this police-spy trick. If this is so, then (1) You must bring proceedings against the Swiss and (2) Mäurer as a French citizen will protest to the Ministry.

As far as the business itself is concerned, it is now necessary:

α) To ask Schüller not to issue the aforesaid document for the time being, as this must be the principal ornament of our first number.\(^a\)

β) Send the whole of the contents to Louis Blanc's address: No. 2 or 3, rue Taitbout.

γ) Ruge is not yet here. I cannot very well begin with the printing until he has arrived. I have had to reject the articles so far sent to me by the local people (Hess, Weill, etc.) after many protracted discussions. But Ruge is probably coming at the end of this month, and if at that time we also have the document you promised, we can begin with the printing. I have written to Feuerbach,\(^b\) Kapp and Hagen. Feuerbach has already replied.\(^{113}\)

δ) Holland seems to me to be the most suitable place providing that your police spies have not already been in direct touch with the government.

If your Swiss people have perpetrated the infamy I will not only attack them in the Réforme, the National, the Démocratie pacifique, the Siècle, Courrier, La Presse, Charivari, Commerce and the Revue indépendante, but in the Times as well, and, if you wish, in a pamphlet written in French.

\(^a\) Of the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.— Ed.

\(^b\) See previous letter.— Ed.
To Julius Fröbel, November 21, 1843

These pseudo-Republicans will have to learn that they are not dealing with young cowhands, or tailors' apprentices.

As to the office I will try to acquire one along with the new lodging into which I intend moving. This will be convenient from the business and financial viewpoint.

Please excuse this scraggy letter. I can't write for indignation.

Yours, Marx

In any case, whether the Paris doctrinaires or the Swiss peasant lads were responsible for the trick, we will get Arago and Lamartine to make an intervention in the Chamber. If these gentlemen want to make a scandal, ut scandalum fiat. Reply quickly for the matter is pressing. Since Mäurer is a French citizen, the plot on the part of the Zürichers would be a violation of international law, with which the cowhands shall not get away.

First published in German and Russian in the journal Voprosy istorii KPSS No. 4, 1958

Printed according to the original

Scandal they shall have.— Ed.
Dear Sir,

Since I just have the opportunity, I take the liberty of sending you an article of mine in which some elements of my critical philosophy of law are outlined. I had already finished it once but have since revised it in order to make it more generally comprehensible. I don't attribute any exceptional value to this essay but I am glad to have an opportunity of assuring you of the great respect and—if I may use the word—love, which I feel for you. Your Philosophie der Zukunft, and your Wesen des Glaubens, in spite of their small size, are certainly of greater weight than the whole of contemporary German literature put together.

In these writings you have provided—I don't know whether intentionally—a philosophical basis for socialism and the Communists have immediately understood them in this way. The unity of man with man, which is based on the real differences between men, the concept of the human species brought down from the heaven of abstraction to the real earth, what is this but the concept of society!

Two translations of your Wesen des Christenthums, one in English and one in French, are in preparation and almost ready for printing. The first will be published in Manchester (Engels has been supervising it) and the second in Paris (the Frenchman Dr. Guerrier and the German Communist Ewerbeck have translated it with the help of a French literary expert).

At present, the French will immediately pounce on the book, for

---

a "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Law. Introduction" (see this volume, pp. 175-87).—Ed.

b This paragraph is in square brackets in the original.—Ed.
both parties—priests, and Voltairians and materialists—are looking about for help from outside. It is a remarkable phenomenon that, in contrast to the eighteenth century, religiosity has now passed to the middle and upper classes while on the other hand irreligiosity—but an irreligiosity of men regarding themselves as men—has descended to the French proletariat. You would have to attend one of the meetings of the French workers to appreciate the pure freshness, the nobility which burst forth from these toil-worn men. The English proletarian is also advancing with giant strides but he lacks the cultural background of the French. But I must not forget to emphasise the theoretical merits of the German artisans in Switzerland, London and Paris. The German artisan is still however too much of an artisan.

But in any case it is among these “barbarians” of our civilised society that history is preparing the practical element for the emancipation of mankind.

For me the difference between the French character and our German character was never demonstrated so sharply and convincingly as in a Fourierist work which begins with the following sentences:

“It is in his passions that man reveals himself completely.” “Have you ever met a person who thought in order to think, who remembered in order to remember, who imagined in order to imagine, who wished in order to wish? Has this ever happened to you?... No, obviously not!”

The main driving force of nature as of society is, therefore, the magical, the passionate, the non-reflecting attraction and

“everything which exists, man, plant, animal or planet, has received an amount of power corresponding to its mission in the system of the universe”.

From this there follows: “The attractive powers are proportional to the destinies.”

Do not all these sentences give the impression that the Frenchman has deliberately set his passion against the pure activity of German thought? One does not think in order to think, etc.

---

a “L’homme est tout entier dans ses passions.” “Avez-vous jamais rencontré un homme qui pensât pour penser, qui se ressouvint pour se ressouvenir, qui imaginât pour imaginer? qui voulait pour vouloir? cela vous est-il jamais arrivé à vous même? ... non, évidemment non!”

All French passages occurring in this letter are translated in the text and the French original given in footnotes. The quotations are taken from Exposition de la science sociale, constituée par C. Fourier, by E. de Pompery, Paris, 1840, pp. 13 and 29.—Ed.

b “Tout être, homme, plante, animal ou globe a reçu une somme des forces en rapport avec sa mission dans l’ordre universel”.—Ed.

c “Les attractions sont proportionnelles aux destinées.”—Ed.
In his critical Berlin *Literatur-Zeitung*, Bruno Bauer, my friend of many years standing—but now rather estranged—has provided fresh proof of how difficult it is for Germans to extricate themselves from the contrary one-sidedness. I don't know if you have read the journal. It contains much covert polemic against you.

The character of the *Literatur-Zeitung* can be reduced to the following: “Criticism” is transformed into a transcendental being. These Berliners do not regard themselves as *men* who *criticise*, but as *critics* who, *incidentally*, have the misfortune of being *men*. They therefore acknowledge only one *real* need, the need of *theoretical* criticism. People like Proudhon are therefore accused of having made some “*practical*” “*need*” their point of departure. This criticism therefore lapses into a sad and supercilious intellectualism. *Consciousness* or *self-consciousness* is regarded as the *only* human quality. Love, for example, is rejected, because the loved one is only an “*object*”. Down with the object. This criticism thus regards itself as the only *active* element in history. It is confronted by the whole of humanity as a *mass*, an inert mass, which has value only as the antithesis of intellect. It is therefore regarded as the greatest crime if the critic displays *feeling* or *passion*, he must be an *ironical* *ice-cold* σοφός.

Thus Bauer says literally:

“The critic should participate neither in the sufferings nor in the joys of society; he should know neither friendship and love, nor hate and envy; he should be enthroned in a solitude, where only the laughter of the Olympian Gods over the topsy-turvy of the world resounds occasionally from his lips.”

The tone of Bauer’s *Literatur-Zeitung* is therefore one of dispasionate *contempt* and he makes it all the easier for himself by flinging the results of your work and of our time as a whole at other people’s heads. He only exposes contradictions and, satisfied with this occupation, he departs with a contemptuous “Hm”. He declares that criticism does not *give* anything, it is far too spiritual for that. Indeed, he plainly expresses the hope:

“the time is not distant when the whole of degenerate mankind will rally against criticism”—and *criticism* means Bauer and company—“they will then sort out this mass into different groups and distribute the *testimonium paupertatis* to all of them”.

It seems that Bauer has fought against Christ out of *rivalry*. I am going to publish a small booklet attacking this aberration of criticism. It would be of the *greatest* value to me if you would let me know in

---

*a* *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung.*—*Ed.*

*b* Sage.—*Ed.*

advance your opinion, and in general some speedy sign of life from you would make me happy. The German artisans in Paris, i.e., the Communists amongst them, several hundreds, have been having lectures twice a week throughout this summer on your Wesen des Christenthums from their secret leaders, and have been remarkably responsive. The short extract from the letter of a German lady which appeared in the feuilleton of Vorwärts! (No. 64) without the knowledge of the writer, is taken from a letter of my wife, who is now visiting her mother in Trier.

With best wishes for your well-being.

Yours,

Karl Marx

First published in the journal Probleme des Friedens und des Sozialismus No. 2, 1958

Printed according to the original

Translated from the German and French

--- Ed.

Of the League of the Just.

See this volume, p. 580.

Karoline von Westphalen.
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
"So what we today assume to have been the frenzy of a few excited maniacs, was the general feeling of a whole people and in a way its manner of life." P. 21.

"Later one saw different opinions dividing the nation; but it was not like this in 1788: all those in France who were not making a living out of abuses were united in a unanimous wish to destroy a rule of the sword; all those who were not devourers of the national wealth wished to see its management entrusted to the representatives of the people; all those who were not members of the privileged castes wished to see the law applied equally to all and to make all citizens liable to the same burdens." P. 27.

"The Constitution was revised" (after the King's flight) "in a less popular way than it had been originally drawn up; the changes made were not very important but they sufficed to make the Assembly lose all its popularity and the Constitution its most desirable sanction, that of the nation." P. 32.

"The session of the Legislative Assembly was nothing but a barely concealed war of the popular power against the royal authority. A war in which each of the two contenders used the Constitution in turn either as a sword or as a shield. An implacable war in which the Constitution, ceaselessly invoked by both sides, was for both sides only an empty word in which nobody believed. For the rest, this impotent Assembly, wrapped by the Constitution in swaddling-clothes, was unable to do anything useful... consequently the numerous events which happened during its lifetime did not originate from this body. Constitutionally speaking, or according to the limits of their legal powers, the court and the Assembly could do nothing, and they did nothing. These two great colossi regarded one another in silence and demanded of secret conspiracies what they could not expect from the law." Pp. 37, 38.

"Neither the one nor the other" (party) "was honest.... Hence the crisis in which France had been left by the Constituent Assembly could only be solved in one of two ways: the toppling of the throne or the return to the old regime. Thus for each of the two parties it was a question of their very existence." P. 38.

"This great epoch of 1791 to 1792 which decided France's destiny was not marked by outstanding parliamentary struggles. It was between the people and the rulers that the battle continued to be waged. June 20, Pétion's triumph on July 14, and the movements which marked the entry of the volunteers from Marseilles into Paris, these events led to important results without the Assembly playing the least part in them."
The deputies acted as conspirators and not as deputies. Even the declaration of war, the major event of this period, was decided by the Jacobins.

La Fayette. P. 40.

August 10. P. 41.

"The insurrection, which had replaced all existing authorities on August 10, continued... it was an active force and it crushed the enemies of liberty." P. 43.

"The only force which existed in France during the interregnum which began on August 10 was the popular élan, insurrection, anarchy... The only means of salvation still remaining was, therefore, to make use of the resources offered by anarchy and to direct against our enemies the brutal force which it aroused." Pp. 43, 44.

"The decrees which it" (the Legislative Assembly) "issued had not the slightest authority. The Ministry, product of an impotent Assembly, was not itself a real power... The government therefore passed into the hands of those who knew how to separate themselves from it, that is, to the popular societies and the municipalities. But these improvised centres of government, products of anarchy itself and having no basis in law or in the Constitution, were simply the leaders of the people, powerful as long as they restricted themselves to directing the line of march of the people and giving effect to its wishes; they would not have been able to enforce obedience had they come into conflict with the people and wished to impose on it the rule of law." Pp. 44, 45.

"It is the Girondists which has separated itself from us. It is Buzot who left the place he had occupied in the Constituent Assembly; it is Vergniaud who abandoned the seat he had recently occupied in the Legislative Assembly" (i.e., on the left). P. 49. "We were far from seeking divisions... Pétion was nominated President [of the Convention] almost unanimously; the other members of the committee were chosen from amongst the most influential deputies of the previous Assembly." P. 49.

The new deputies (belonging to the Mountain) knew nothing of the internal split. P. 50.

"Thus when we met, the new deputies... who formed the great majority in the Mountain, did not even know that there were two camps and that the Republicans were not all inspired by the same sentiments and the same aspirations." P. 51.

"The Centre was made up of all those who have the constant habit of declaring themselves in favour of the winning side and who, before they show their colours, look for ways of not compromising themselves and without incurring any risk await further developments. This kind of deputy, who first concealed himself in the Centre, later became an ardent Montagnard and then an even more ardent reactionary. There were also... men of talent: Barrère... Sieyès, Dulaure... Boissy d'Anglas." P. 52.

"The only party which came to the Convention with a complete system and a previously worked-out plan took their place on the seats on the right." (The Girondists.) P. 52. "By swarming on to the seats opposite ours, they declared war on us, before they even knew us." P. 53.

The main speakers for the Girondists [were] lawyers from the Bordeaux Bar; the Girondists [were] all-powerful in the Legislative Assembly where they [had] controlled the majority; they also dominated the Jacobin Club, that is, public opinion; at the time of the insurrection of August 10 [they] believed they had France in their...

---

\(^9\) i.e., the Legislative Assembly.— Ed.
hands; when the National Convention was convoked they concluded therefore that no majority independent of them could come about. But the forty-two-day interregnum changed the position. The energy which the Legislative Assembly, that is, the Girondists, had displayed in the struggle with the Crown vanished after August 10. "Feeble and irresolute as soon as the helm of the state was indisputably in their hands"... [In their] speeches, declamations, they divorced themselves from public opinion without being able to prevent disorder, "merely depriving themselves of the means available to them for controlling the torrent. The Jacobin Club then became the thermometer of public opinion. It very rarely happened that the majority of Frenchmen opposed its decisions". For a long time the word of the Girondists had been law in the Jacobin Club; even before the end of the Constituent Assembly they expelled the Lameths and drove the Constitutionalists "into the unpopular precincts of the Feuillants". After August 10 they were superseded and went into opposition to the Jacobins. The Provisional Council of Ministers, entrusted with executive power by the Girondists on August 10, was powerless "since the party on which it depended had made itself unpopular"; "executive power was in fact exercised by the Communes, especially by the Commune of Paris, composed of men of vigour and beloved of the people. The elections in the capital took place under the influence of the Commune whose leading members were elected". Pp. 53, 54. Hence the hostile attitude of the Girondists. "On their arrival in Paris all the deputies who were known to have energy and patriotism were admitted to the Jacobin Club in which the Commune had great influence. These deputies sat on the left-hand side, which was sufficient to make the men of the Gironde take their seats on the right. The Jacobins, having spurned their authority, had become their enemies", and also those deputies who sat on the side of the Commune and the deputies of Paris. P. 55.

"Thus at the beginning of the session, the Convention was not divided into parties. But there arose in its midst an ambitious clique which wished to impose its opinions on the assembly and prepared to fight to avenge the wounds which its self-conceit had suffered and to satisfy its particular resentments." P. 55

Danton, pp. 56, 57. Robespierre, Marat, pp. 57, 58.

"The majority of the party of the Gironde were by no means traitors but some were concealed in its ranks. No, it did not desire the ruin of the Republic, but its theories led in that direction." P. 59. The Girondists were the aggressors, the Montagnards were at first on the defensive. ibid.

On September 21, 1792, the session of the Convention begins. The President is Pétion.

Danton, pp. 60, 61, 62.

The first two decrees passed by the assembly had been proposed by Danton: 1) "No Constitution without the approval of the people." 2) "Safety of persons and property to be protected by the nation." Unanimous adoption of Grégoire's motion: 3) Abolition of the monarchy.

The Girondists begin the struggle. P. 63.

"On September 24, Kersaint, speaking of the dangers facing the Convention in the capital, proposes to surround it [the Convention] with a force drawn from the Departments. P. 63. The Girondists are against the Commune, which has been

---

a This refers to a speech of Danton (see this volume, p. 368).—Ed
b This sentence is in German in the manuscripts.—Ed.
effacing them since August 10, as well as against Danton, who dominated the Executive Council. [P. 64.] Before the convocation of the Convention the [members of the] deputation of Paris had nearly all been part of the Commune of August 10. P. 53.

Hence the wrath of the Girondists "against that redoubtable Commune and particularly against the deputation of Paris". Pp. 63, 64.

Thus one sees: the Girondists wanted to avenge themselves for their defeat and insignificance during the interregnum beginning on August 10.

Joseph Egalité [Duke of] Orléans and Jean Paul Marat. Pp. 64, 65. a

"Such a man" (Marat) "would never have exercised the least influence if the Girondists had not increased his importance by attacking in his person the very principle of energy and provided him with the opportunity at least to display the calmness, the consistency, sang-froid and contempt for insults characteristic of real conviction and devotion." P. 65.

September 24. Concealed attack on the Commune and on a number of Paris deputies "for seeking to organise a dictatorship".


Marat, pp. 68, 69.185

The dissensions continue every day: "the differences between the Ministers Roland and Danton, the offences ascribed to the Commune of Paris, Marat's posters, were the pretexts for these useless struggles". P. 69. Victory seemed almost always to go to the Girondists. P. 70. The majority are as yet not firmly organised and vacillate undecidedly. "Thus for a long time a large number of firm Republicans voted with the Right—they included Philippeaux, Cambon, Cambacérès, etc." P. 70. c

September 29. Roland, elected deputy of the Somme Department, announces to the Convention his intention of resigning his position as Minister of the Interior. Buzot demands "that the Minister be invited to remain at his post; all the Girondists support him". Philippeaux proposes "to ask Danton to support this invitation". Danton is against this: "the only possible way in which Roland can be retained in his post is to pronounce his election invalid".

Struggle, Roland's letter, etc. Pp. 70, 71. d

Decree dissolving the Commune of Paris. Pp. 73, 74, 75. d

"The mutual accusations were repeated each day with renewed fury. The Right always began the attack, basing itself on facts that occurred prior to the meeting of the Convention, constantly exploiting the kind of repugnance which Marat aroused in the assembly as a whole in order to incriminate the entire Mountain." P. 78, cf. p. 79. "... inter-party strife in the course of which the elected representatives of the people wasted precious time and consumed energies which they ought to have directed entirely against the enemies of France." P. 79.

---

a Cf. this volume, pp. 368-69.— Ed.
b Cf. this volume, p. 369.— Ed.
c Cf. this volume, p. 369.— Ed.
d Cf. this volume, p. 369.— Ed.
October 29. Roland's, Louvet's accusation against Robespierre. P. 80 sqq.

"... he" (Louvet) "and Barbaroux were, quite undoubtedly, the only men of action in their party". P. 81.

"The long-winded and garrulous eloquence of the latter" (Robespierre). P. 82.127

"The committees of the Convention and the Convention itself dealt with all the branches of administration and performed through decrees numerous and frequent acts of executive authority. On the other hand, the municipalities had also taken over a large section of the administration. Civil power, military power, even judicial power, nothing was properly organised... As soon as, for any reason whatsoever, a gathering of citizens was called upon to deal with a matter of public concern, it would at the same time interfere in matters quite unconnected with the task it had been given... If there existed an infinity of powers in practice, a single collective entity, the Convention, legally united in itself all the authority of the social body, and it frequently used it: it acted as the legislative authority through its decrees, as the administration through its committees, and besides it exercised judicial power through the manner in which it extended the right of indictment." P. 85.

"As a transitional state between the monarchy which had been destroyed and the Republic which was being organised, as a weapon of war against the aristocracy, the emigration and foreign invaders, this concentration of all powers was a happy symptom and, I would say, even indispensable." P. 86.

"It is they" (the Girondists) "who demanded bills of indictment against their colleagues; it is they who in handing over Marat to the Revolutionary Tribunal violated the immunity of the elected representatives of the people." P. 87.a

December 16. Buzot's motion for the expulsion of [the Duke of] Orléans and his sons; Buzot was supported by Louvet and Lanjuinais.128

Roland's intrigues, Pp. 88, 89.b

"In spite of their prejudices against us, Louvet, Roland, Guadet, Pétion, Gensonné were true and sincere Republicans." P. 90.

About the Girondists, pp. 90, 91.129

"The dissensions which hampered the deliberations of the National Convention soon manifested themselves in the Executive Council. When Servan was compelled to relinquish the Ministry of War on account of ill health, the Convention, on Roland's suggestion, unhesitatingly appointed citizen Pache, then working in the Ministry of the Interior, to take his place. The new Minister did not share the aversions and the views of his patron." P. 91.

"During these interminable quarrels, the committees of the Convention were not as inactive as the Convention itself. The Committee of National Defence, under the influence of Carnot, assisted our armies and paved the way for our victories; the Committee of Accounts, for which Cambon was the regular reporter, created resources with the aid of the paper money, which under the name of assignats was so greatly and so frequently devalued, and by the sale of national property." Pp. 92, 93.

"By the end of January 1793... the Montagnards had abandoned the defensive which they had maintained perhaps too long and gone over in their turn to the attack on the Gironde." P. 100.

a Cf. this volume, p. 373.—Ed.
b Cf. this volume, p. 370-371.—Ed.
The struggle between the Montagnards and the Girondists

An interregnum begins on August 10, 1792. Impotence of the Legislative Assembly, impotence of the Ministry to which it had given rise. Government passes over to the public meetings and municipalities; improvised centres of government, products of anarchy, they were bound to be the expression of the popular movement, for their power was only the power of popular opinion (pp. 44, 45). From now on division amongst those with influence.

One party wishes to re-establish the order disrupted by August 10 and to ensure the implementation of the existing laws. The principal members of the Ministry and of the Legislative Assembly are the leaders of this party.

The other party sees in anarchy the only mobile d'action, in the enthusiasm which it produces the substitute for a ready-made organisation, the only power of resistance externally and internally. These men are the masters of the Commune of Paris and of nearly all other municipalities in France, they possess one voice (Danton) in the Ministry (pp. 45, 46).

The Girondists (the first party) do not oppose any effective means to the popular movement. Their theories are limited in practice to speeches and declamations, which make their unpopularity almost universal without having the slightest effect on developments.

“During this period, the Commune of Paris drives the citizens towards the frontiers; the alarm guns, thundering away hour after hour, proclaim the public danger; all citizens enrol in the sections in order to march against the enemy.”

During this period occur the September days.

Had they been quelled, all public life would have been extinguished (pp. 46, 47).

The provinces detest the September murders but they are grateful to the men who are maintaining the insurrectionary fever in order to fill the army camps with citizen soldiers.

The Girondists are despised; lacking the courage to drive the citizens against the foreign troops, they do not even know how to organise an energetic resistance to the crimes which they denounce and which they use as a means of recrimination against their vigorous enemy.

---

a Cf. this volume, p. 373-74.—Ed.

b Driving force.—Ed.
The elections took place during this stormy period.

When the Convention opened, Paris was still in the grip of the insurrectionary movement and the Commune was all-powerful.

_The Girondists were the first to separate themselves from the Montagnards._ The almost unanimous election of Pétion as President of the Convention shows how little the newly-arrived men of the Mountain were looking for divisions; the other members of the committee were likewise elected from amongst the most influential members of the previous Assembly. Almost all the newly-arrived deputies knew nothing of the inner dissensions. Robespierre and Pétion, Danton and Guadet equally enjoyed their respect.

The only party which came to the assembly with a complete system and a previously worked-out plan (the Girondists), took their place on the right-hand side. By leaving their former seats (on the left) and rushing _en masse_ to the right-hand side, they declared war on the newly-arrived Republicans who surged on to the left as the traditional side of patriotism.

The Girondists had controlled the majority in the _assemblée législative_ as well as in the Jacobin Club. They thought they had France in their hands at the time of August 10. In summoning the National Convention they never suspected for a moment that a majority independent of them could arise. But the forty-two-day interregnum altered the state of affairs and the character of the elections.

"The Legislative Assembly, that is, the Girondists, had displayed some energy in the struggle against the Court. They showed themselves to be weak and irresolute as soon as they obtained undisputed control of the state. They did not know how to restrain the current unleashed by August 10; they were inept enough to oppose it with declamations. They isolated themselves from public opinion without being able to prevent any disorder whatsoever. They only deprived themselves of the means they had to direct events. The Jacobin Club was the thermometer of public opinion at that time. [...] The word of the Gironde had been law there for a long time. Even before the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly they had dethroned the Lameths and driven the Constitutionals into the unpopular precincts of the Feuillants. After August 10, they allowed themselves in their turn to be superseded: they lost their popularity, nearly all of them left a society whose merits they had loudly proclaimed as long as it applauded their views but which they regarded as nothing more than a den of rebels as soon as it thought differently than they did.

"The Gironde had, moreover, on August 10 vested executive power in a Provisional Council of Ministers. Without any support in the nation, this Council was powerless as soon as the party to which it belonged became unpopular. The executive power was in fact exercised by the Communes, and especially by the Commune of Paris, composed of vigorous men of the people. The elections in the capital took place under the influence of the Commune. Its leading members were elected [to the Convention]."

---

*a i.e., the Legislative Assembly.— Ed.*
Hence the hostile attitude of the Girondists from the very first moments of the Convention.

"All new deputies who were known to have energy or patriotism, were admitted on their arrival to the Jacobin Club, in which the Commune had great influence. These deputies took their seats on the left side. This sufficed to drive the Girondists to the right. The Jacobins [...] had become their enemies [...] they called their new opponents Jacobins. [...] Originally only enemies of the Commune and of the deputation of Paris, they extended their hatred to include all who sat on the side used by the Jacobins and who were ardent Republicans. Thus at the beginning of the session, the Convention was not divided; a solid mass of Republicans united by a common feeling, in other respects however differing on many points. But an ambitious clique arose in its midst, which wished to impose its opinions on the assembly and prepared to fight to avenge the wounds which its self-conceit had suffered and to satisfy its private resentments."

The majority of the Girondists were not traitors, but there were traitors in their ranks; the ruin of the Republic was not their aim but the consequence of their theories; the few Royalists in the Convention therefore joined forces with them. They were the attackers; the Mountain was on the defensive for a long time; the Girondists were unable to sacrifice their egotism for the public cause (pp. 47-59).

On September 21, 1792, opening of the Convention. Pétion President. Danton resigns his post as Minister of Justice. A conciliatory speech. No Constitution could exist unless it was accepted by a majority of the primary meetings. A declaration regarding security of property ought to be decreed. Both Danton's proposals became decrees (the first decrees promulgated by the Convention). In his speech Danton declared that the popular agitation was temporarily necessary; now, however, the constituted power of the Convention should replace it, excesses should be abandoned.

Unanimous abolition of the monarchy on Grégoire’s motion.

The first session of the Convention shows the desire of the Mountain for general reconciliation in the interests of order and of freedom. The Girondists immediately demonstrate their urge to take revenge.

On September 24, Kersaint, speaking of the dangers in the capital, proposes to surround it [the Convention] with force recruited from the Departments. This is the first declaration of war by the Girondists who are full of anger against the deputation of Paris because the Girondists who had been members of the Legislative Assembly were annihilated as a result of the activities of the Commune and because of Danton's domination in the Executive Council.

Jean Paul Marat and Joseph Egalité in particular gave the Girondists the opportunity of making spiteful charges against the
Mountain, charges of blood-thirstiness and anarchy on the one side and of ambition and Royalism on the other.

**September 24.** Indirect accusations that the Commune of Paris is striving for a dictatorship.

**September 25:** Rebecqui and Barbaroux name Robespierre as the candidate of the dictatorship. Danton again preaches concord and defends the Commune: an extra-legal power had been necessary under the weak leadership of the *assemblée législative*, now there should be a return to order. Girondists do not pay attention to Danton’s admonitions; they keep returning to the past in order to seek continual grounds for recrimination.

Vergniaud and Boileau attack Marat. Marat’s courageous reply. The assembly turns to the business of the day. But the hostilities already initiated are continued.

“While [the Assembly] waited for a decisive act and a split between Roland and Danton, the alleged outrages by the Commune of Paris and Marat’s posters served as pretexts for these useless conflicts. Victory seemed almost always to favour the side of the Girondists. The majority was not yet organised during these first conflicts, swaying uncertainly this way and that. For a considerable time many firm Republicans, e. g., Philippeaux, Cambon, Cambacérès, voted with the Right.

**September 29:** Roland, elected deputy of the Somme Department, informs the Assembly that he would relinquish his position as Minister of the Interior. Those on the right express their regrets. Buzot proposes to request Roland to remain at his post; Philippeaux would like Danton to support this request; Danton opposes; an invitation is below the dignity of the Convention; the only way to keep Roland at his post is to declare his election null and void. The Girondists insist on an invitation. Valazé declares that Roland’s name is holy to him. Louvet, Barbaroux overwhelm him with praise. This time the men of the Centre, Barère, Lacroix, Tureau, who often provided the Right with a majority without actually belonging to them, are against Buzot’s proposal.

**September 30:** Roland writes a letter to the Convention in which he states that he wants to remain Minister, he praises himself a great deal in this letter, lectures his opponents, accuses Danton indirectly; all these reproaches against Danton and the Commune refer to facts which occurred prior to the meeting of the Convention; evidence of the hatred of a vanquished party for the victors.

Each day the Right persecutes the Commune, which is defended by the deputies of Paris. Finally this revolutionary authority is ordered to dissolve; it is requested to give an account of itself. New source of strife emerges. The *comité de surveillance* of the Commune gives notice to the Convention of the seizure of important papers

---

a This is evidently a misprint, it refers to Thuriot.—Ed.
which will throw light on the treacheries of the Court, in which several deputies will find themselves compromised. It asks that it should not be compelled to part with these documents and to be allowed to continue to function until a favourable moment for their use. [...] The Girondists regard this as an open wish on the part of the Commune to perpetuate its functions; the Montagnards see in their opponents people interested in stifling the truth. The discussion confirms each party in its prejudices. [...] The documents are finally handed over to a commission of 25 representatives, which comprises no members either of the Commune and the deputation of Paris, or of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies.

Nothing emerges either against the Commune or against the Gironde. Even the report of Joseph Delaunay (a Girondist deputy) comes out, in the main, in favour of the Commune.

"The mutual accusations are repeated daily with renewed fury, the Right always initiating the attack, basing themselves on facts which occurred before the convocation of the Convention. [...] Freedom of opinion is always misconstrued when a representative of the Left wishes to speak; Robespierre was driven from the rostrum by uproar and insults."

Marat was only able to make his reply by dint of perseverance.

Up to now the Right has always had a majority; the Mountain votes with it whenever questions of principle, establishment of order, implementation of laws, etc., are involved.

In his reports to the Convention, Roland constantly repeats that the crimes of the interregnum still have to be punished, and introduces indirect accusations against Robespierre and Danton, and also against the deputation of Paris.

Roland is furious because Danton's supremacy in the Council has crushed him.

On October 29 Roland makes a report to the Convention in which Robespierre is again accused. While on the rostrum seeking to defend himself, Robespierre is interrupted by the clamour of the Girondists and by constant interjections by President Guadet.

Louvet's attack on Robespierre.

November 5. Robespierre's reply.

"Return to the order of the day demanded on all sides, even Vergniaud, Guadet and Pétion support this. Only Salles, Barbaroux, Lanjuinais, Lariviére stand by Louvet [...]. The return to the agenda is adopted almost unanimously. Barbaroux still demands the floor in order to support the accusations [...] and then goes down to the bar and wants to speak as plaintiff and even as the accused. This unseemly scene is prolonged and, as usual, ends without the assembly having made any decisions whatsoever" (pp. 60-83).

December 16. Thuriot brings about the proclamation of the unity and indivisibility of the Republic. Buzot proposes a motion for the expulsion of the Duke of Orléans and his sons and is supported by Louvet and Lanjuinais. In this way the Girondists make the first attempt to decimate the National Assembly. Incidentally, the

---

Marx has: "November 6", apparently a slip of the pen.—Ed.
Girondists are on friendly terms with Orléan's creatures—Dumouriez, Sillery, Biron, Valence.

The Ministers showed open bias in favour of the Girondists.

"When Louvet accused Robespierre, the Convention ordered the printing of both the indictment and the defence. Roland had Louvet's speech distributed in large quantities with the words: Imprimé par ordre de la Convention," and restricted the distribution of Robespierre's speech to members of the Convention. Thus the impression was to be produced among the public that a kind of censure had been pronounced on Robespierre. A similar knavish trick was repeated over the decree concerning the banishment of the Bourbons. Before the reading of the minutes, which signified its adoption, i.e., before the final wording had been approved by majority decision as was the rule, its printing was speeded up and its dispatch to the 84 Departments carefully arranged by Roland, while the postponement of any decision regarding the fate of Philippe Egalité was not given the same publicity. Thus one could believe that the supporters of Orléans brought about the repeal of a decree which concerned him by a surprise move on the next morning [...]."

The dissensions which interfered with the deliberations of the National Convention soon crept into the Executive Council itself. Servan retiring on account of ill health, the Convention on Roland's recommendation appointed Pache, then working in the Ministry of the Interior. Pache wanted to be independent, in addition he associated with the Jacobins. Pache was a good patriot but a bad Minister of War. By accusing him of treason, the Girondists caused a redoubling of the recriminations which for a long time had been levelled against Roland.

Assignats, law concerning the practice of worship (cf. p. 93), decree concerning food, compare Levasseur's speech, p. 94 sqq.¹³¹

Shortly after the decree on means of subsistence, discussions in connection with the trial of Louis XVI. This occasioned further acrimony.

End of January 1793. Baseless animosities, just as at the beginning of the Convention. But a big change has taken place in the temper of the assembly. The Mountain has now gone over from the defensive to the offensive. The war of the parties is at fever heat.

"There is a feeling that from now on it is impossible to advance towards any organisation of the Republic without the complete destruction of one of the two parties.

"The assassination of Michel de Le Peletier Saint-Fargeau led to an argument and an open breach between the two extremes."

The Marsh, tired of the capricious intrigues and the conceit of the Girondists, frequently allies itself with the Mountain against them. Roland's resignation accepted.

January 28: Buzot denounces the comité de sûreté généraleb (in

¹ Printed by order of the Convention.— Ed.

b Committee of Public Safety.— Ed.
which apart from the Girondists there are several Montagnards—Tallien, Chabot, Bazire) on account of the arrest of a journalist and demands its dissolution.

"The Girondists were in the habit of sacrificing any institution rather than allow it to flourish in the hands of their opponents" (pp. 84-103).

March 8. Great agitation because of the military set-backs in Belgium under Dumouriez. Commissioners are sent to all the sections [of] Paris to call the citizens to arms, and also to the Departments.

March 9. The Commissioners present their reports. Guarantees are demanded against internal conspiracies. Decree for the establishment of an extraordinary criminal court, from whose findings there is no appeal, for the hearing of all cases involving traitors, conspirators and counter-revolutionaries. Great excitement in the capital. The printing-presses belonging to Gorsas are smashed up; he is forced to flee. The people were so worked up that it required a decree of the Convention to get the bakers to return to the bakeries and the Post-Office clerks to the telegraph office.

March 10. Debates about the organisation of the Revolutionary Tribunal.

Great excitement in Paris. Evening session of the Convention at 9 o'clock. The seats on the right almost empty. After midnight the combined crowds in the Champs Elysées assume a rebellious character. They go to the Jacobin and Cordeliers Clubs, they preach insurrection against the Convention. These proposals are rejected by the Montagnards.132

March 11. Decree relating to the Revolutionary Tribunal.

March 12. Marat speaks against the assaults made on the 10th.


"The rebellious movements of March 10 in Paris were nurtured by all the parties, because all of them took part in the agitation—an agitation stirred up in order to drive the people to the frontiers; the scenes on March 10 were a necessary consequence of this impassioned state. The Mountain, sitting alone in the Chamber, had quietened the threatening disorders in a few hours. Pache and Santerre [...] were praised for their ardour; Marat and Dubois-Crancé pacified both the Jacobin and the Cordeliers Clubs and persuaded them to abandon their sinister plans. Marat first of all denounced the March 10 disorders, he initiated a decree of indictment against Fournier l'Américain, one of their instigators; La Source, an impassioned Girondist, addressed eulogies to him during the March 12 session. Finally, [...] a member of the Right who had insulted Marat during the same sitting [...] was censured and it was unanimously decided to enter this in the official record despite the revolting partisanship against the ami du peuple which people were in the habit of displaying" [pp. 122-23].

When it was first established, the comité de sûreté générale was composed overwhelmingly of Girondists.
A few days after March 10, the Girondists wanted to shift responsibility for it on to the Mountain.

"Stormy sessions became the customary state of affairs in the Convention. Tumultuous scenes. [...] The galleries often participated in these scandalous interruptions. Then the Girondists screamed that they were no longer safe in Paris, they called the Departmental forces to their aid. The Mountain, from their side, accused their opponents of preaching civil war. Sometimes whole days and nights passed in these wretched debates" [p. 127].

Nevertheless the immunity of deputies was still respected on all sides until now. The Right was the first to depart from this rule. On Guadet's motion, Marat was committed for trial. The Legislation Committee prepared a bill of indictment in which his condemnation was anticipated. Marat was unanimously acquitted by the Revolutionary Tribunal, and led back to the Convention by the people in triumph [pp. 127-29].

This event had important results. Party conflicts of the deputies assumed the form of legal proceedings. The persecution of Marat was the immediate prelude to May 31. 133

March 18. Defeat of Dumouriez near Neerwinden; his letters to the Executive Council contain insults against the Convention (Danton's opinion regarding Dumouriez, p. 133). 134 The Girondists applauded his insolent letters.

March 29. A letter from Dumouriez evokes the greatest indignation. Decree ordering Dumouriez to appear before the bar of the House, etc. The treason of Dumouriez.

April 3. La Source dares to denounce Danton as an accomplice of Dumouriez. (Cf. p. 137.) Danton declares war on the Girondists. Danton's speech makes great impression. Danton had tried to bring about a reconciliation between the two sides of the assembly.

"Although he was sitting on the summit of the Mountain, he was, to some extent, the leader of the Marsh. He had often criticised the passion of the Montagnards, fought against Robespierre’s suspicions, maintained that instead of fighting the Girondists one should compel them to support the Mountain in order jointly to save the common cause. Even a few days before La Source's attack, Danton had had a conference with the chief leaders of the Right at which agreement was reached to work together in harmony and to concentrate on the struggle against the foreigners and the aristocrats. The whole of the Mountain loved Danton but the majority thought that he misjudged the situation if he hoped to establish an alliance between the Mountain and the Gironde." [p. 143].

"The discussions assumed a much more serious character toward the end of April and the beginning of May. No more parliamentary bickering but a life and death struggle. Each side began to seek help from outside in order to win. But [...] the Mountain, in spite of this internal discord, paid serious attention to matters concerning France while the Gironde only thought about the destruction of its opponents and abandoned completely the direction of the state. During these two months the question of the maximum was dealt with. 135 [...] The Right fought [...] this measure by means of slanders. It made accusations about violation of the right to own property and threats to the life of property owners. These declamations
were aimed at turning the middle classes against the Mountain. The maximum was adopted" [p. 147, 150].

The Girondists always had the majority when party wrangling was involved, as, for example, when such questions as the impeachment of Marat, the March disorders, the petitions of the sections, the Commission of the Twelve, were being discussed. The Mountain had the majority when big questions of general interest were involved, such as the maximum, means for revolutionary recruitment, the extraordinary tribunal, forced loans, etc.

An incident occurred during the discussion of the maximum. Ducos was on the rostrum criticising the proposed measure, counterposing the sansculottes to the middle classes, when a violent uproar broke out in one of the public galleries. Guadet demands the transfer of the Convention to Versailles. Acclamation on the right. Levasseur demands that the rules should be observed and the galleries cleared. Resistance by the Right. Philippeaux, Danton, Lacroix vainly call on the assembly to remember its dignity and its urgent obligations. In vain they demand that matters of the greatest importance should not be interrupted on account of an insignificant incident. The Girondists had to give vent to their rage. Animated discussion, attacks on the Paris authorities, threats that the provinces would take vengeance.

Thus the tocsin of civil war was sounded at the very moment when it was a question of interests which had roused the people. The intention was to incite the two classes of the people against one another. The Mountain went with the party of the popular masses, where the sinewy arms and strong devotion are to be found [pp. 152-53].

Disorders in the Vendée had developed into a real civil war. New enrolments and renewed expenditure of funds became necessary. Danton, Desmoulins, Philippeaux, Couthon tried to find means to make this possible. The only possible means of meeting the urgent expenditure was the mobilisation of the national wealth, an *emprunt force* (cf. p. 161 sqq.), which was derived from superfluous wealth in the hands of citizens.

The Girondists, who denounced the measures of the Mountain, did not even propose an alternative plan. They did nothing at all.

Written at the end of 1843 and the beginning of 1844


---

* A forced loan.—*Ed.
Private property. Its immediate consequence—trade—like every activity, is a direct source of gain for the trader. The next category to which trade gives rise is value. Abstract real value and exchange-value. For Say utility is the determining feature of real value, for Ricardo and Mill the cost of production. For the Englishmen, competition as against the cost of production represents utility; for Say, it is the cost of production. Value is the ratio of the production costs to utility. Its immediate application: the decision whether to produce at all, whether utility outweighs the cost of production. The practical application of the concept of value is limited to the decision about production. The distinction between real value and exchange-value is based on the fact that the equivalent given in trade is no equivalent. Price: the relationship [between] cost of production and competition. Only that which can be monopolised has price. Ricardo's definition of rent of land is incorrect because it presupposes that a fall in demand instantly reacts on rent and at once puts out of cultivation a corresponding quantity of the worst cultivated land. This is incorrect. This definition leaves out competition, that of Adam Smith leaves out fertility. Rent is the relationship between productivity of the soil and competition. The value of land is to be measured by the productive-ness of equal areas using equal amounts of labour.

The separation of capital from labour. The separation of capital and profit. The division of profit into profit and interest.... Profit, the weight that capital puts in the scales when the costs of

---

a Engels writes "McCulloch" (see this volume, p. 424).—Ed.
b Engels stipulates: provided private property is abolished (see this volume, pp. 429-30).—Ed.
production are determined, remains inherent in capital, and the latter reverts to labour\textsuperscript{a}. The separation of labour and wages. The significance of wages. The significance of labour in determining the production costs. The split between land and the human being. Human labour\textsuperscript{b} divided into labour and capital.

Written in the first half of 1844
First published in: Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, Abt. 1, Bd. 3, 1932

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

\textsuperscript{a} Engels discusses the role of profit after the abolition of private property (see this volume, p. 431).—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Engels has: “human activity” (see this volume, p. 432).—\textit{Ed.}
FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

May 1843-June 1844
The democratic party in England is making rapid progress. While Whiggism and Toryism, the moneyed aristocracy and the landed aristocracy are engaged in a boring verbal battle over trifles in the "national talkshop", as the Tory Thomas Carlyle calls it, or in the "House which claims to represent the parishes of England", as the Chartist Feargus O'Connor says, while the Established Church exerts all its influence on the bigoted inclinations of the nation in order to maintain its decaying edifice a little longer, while the Anti-Corn Law League squanders hundreds of thousands in the irrational hope to see in return millions flowing into the pockets of the cotton-manufacturing lords — during this time despised and derided socialism marches forward calmly and confidently and gradually compels the attention of public opinion. During this time, too, a new party of countless numbers has taken shape in a few years under the banner of the People's Charter and has carried out such vigorous agitation that compared with it O'Connell and the League are bunglers and blunderers. It is well known that in England parties coincide with social ranks and classes; that the Tories are identical with the aristocracy and the bigoted, strictly orthodox section of the Church of England; that the Whigs consist of manufacturers, merchants and dissenters, of the upper middle class as a whole; that the lower middle class constitute the so-called "radicals", and that, finally, Chartism has its strength in the working men, the proletarians. Socialism does not form a closed political party, but on the whole it derives its supporters from the lower middle class and the proletarians. Thus, in England, the remarkable fact is seen that the lower the
position of a class in society, the more "uneducated" it is in the usual sense of the word, the more closely is it connected with progress, and the greater is its future. In general, this is a feature of every revolutionary epoch, as was seen in particular in the religious revolution of which the outcome was Christianity: "blessed are the poor," "the wisdom of this world is foolishness," etc. But this portent of a great revolution has probably never been so clearly expressed and so sharply delineated as now in England. In Germany, the movement proceeds from the class which is not only educated but even learned; in England, for three hundred years the educated and all the learned people have been deaf and blind to the signs of the times. Well known throughout the world is the pitiful routine of the English universities, compared with which our German colleges are like gold, but on the Continent people cannot even imagine the kind of works produced by the foremost English theologians and even by some of the foremost English natural scientists, and what miserable reactionary publications form the bulk of the weekly "list of new books". England is the homeland of political economy, but what about the level of scholarship among professors and practical politicians? Adam Smith's free trade has been pushed to the insane conclusions of the Malthusian theory of population and has produced nothing but a new, more civilised form of the old monopoly system, a form which finds its representatives among the present-day Tories, and which successfully combated the Malthusian nonsense, but in the end arrived once more at Malthus' conclusions. Everywhere there is inconsistency and hypocrisy, while the striking economic tracts of the Socialists and partly also of the Chartists are thrown aside with contempt and find readers only among the lower classes. Strauss' Das Leben Jesu was translated into English. Not a single "respectable" book publisher wanted to print it; finally it appeared in separate parts, 3d. per part, and that was done by the publishing house of a minor but energetic antiquarian. The same thing occurred with translations of Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, etc. Byron and Shelley are read almost exclusively by the lower classes; no "respectable" person could have the works of the latter on his desk without his coming into the most terrible disrepute. It remains true: blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven and, however long it may take, the kingdom of this earth as well.

---

\textsuperscript{a} Matthew 5:3.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} 1 Corinthians 1:20.—Ed.
Parliament now has before it Sir James Graham’s Bill on the education of children working in factories, in accordance with which their hours of work are to be restricted, compulsory education introduced, and the High Church entrusted with supervision of the schools. This Bill has, of course, given rise to general commotion and has provided the parties with a fresh opportunity for testing their strength. The Whigs want to have the Bill rejected completely because it ousts the dissenters from the education of the young and, by restricting the working hours of children, causes difficulties for the manufacturers. Among the Chartists and Socialists, on the other hand, there is considerable agreement with the general humane tendency of the Bill, except for the provisions relating to the High Church. Lancashire, the main factory centre, is also, of course, the main centre of agitation in regard to the Bill. Here, the Tories are quite powerless in the towns; moreover, their meetings in this connection were not held in public. The congregations of the dissenters first of all met in order to put forward a petition against the Bill, and then arranged for town meetings in alliance with the liberal manufacturers. A town meeting of this kind is summoned by the highest urban official, is completely public, and every inhabitant has the right to speak at it. Here, therefore, if the meeting hall is sufficiently large, only the strongest and most energetic party can be victorious. And at all the town meetings so far convened, the Chartists and Socialists have won. The first such meeting was in Stockport, where the resolutions put forward by the Whigs received only one vote, while the entire meeting voted for those of the Chartists, so that the Mayor of Stockport, a Whig, as chairman of the meeting had to sign a Chartist petition and send it to a Chartist M.P. (Duncombe) for presentation to Parliament. The second meeting was in Salford, a sort of suburb of Manchester, with a population of about 100,000; I attended it. The Whigs had taken every precaution to ensure victory for themselves. The borough reeve took the chair and talked a great deal about impartiality; but when a Chartist asked whether a discussion would be allowed, he was given the reply: yes, when the meeting is over! It was intended to have the first resolution smuggled through, but the Chartists were on the alert and prevented this. When one of the Chartists climbed on to the platform, a clergyman dissenter came forward and tried to throw him off! However, everything went well until, finally, a petition on Whig lines was proposed. Then a Chartist

* Engels uses the English term.—Ed.
spoke and proposed an amendment; thereupon the chairman and
his whole retinue of Whigs rose and left the hall. But the meeting
continued, and the Chartist petition was put to the vote; but police
officers, who had already intervened several times on the side of
the Whigs, put out the lights just at the right moment and forced
the meeting to disperse. Nevertheless, the Whigs caused all their
resolutions to be published, as carried, in the next issue of the
local newspaper, and the borough reeve* was dishonest enough to
sign his name “on behalf of and on the instructions of the
meeting”! So much for Whig fairness! The third meeting took
place two days later in Manchester, and here the radical parties
likewise achieved a most brilliant victory. Although the time was so
chosen that the majority of the factory workers could not be
present, there was nevertheless a considerable majority of Chart­
tists and Socialists in the hall. The Whigs confined themselves
solely to the points which they had in common with the Chartist;
a Socialist and a Chartist spoke from the platform and bore
witness that the Whigs on this occasion had behaved like good
Chartists. The Socialist told them frankly that he had come with
the intention of creating opposition if there was the slightest
occasion for it, but everything had gone according to his wishes.
So it has turned out, therefore, that Lancashire, and particularly
Manchester, the stronghold of Whiggism, the centre of the
Anti-Corn Law League, is able to show a brilliant majority in
favour of radical democracy and thereby the power of the
“liberals” is completely held in check.

II

The Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung has a liberal correspondent (*) in
London who writes favourably about the manoeuvres of the Whigs
in horribly long and boring articles. “The Anti-Corn Law League is
now the power in the land,” declares this oracle and thereby utters
the greatest lie ever told by a partisan correspondent.42 The
League—the power in the land! Where is this power? In the
Ministry? In it are Peel, Graham and Gladstone, the bitterest enemies
of the League. In Parliament? But there every one of its proposals is
rejected by a majority rarely equalled in the annals of the English
Parliament. Where then is this power? In the public, in the nation?
This question can only be answered in the affirmative by such an

a Engels gives this term in English.—Ed.
empty-headed, frivolous correspondent, for whom Drury Lane is the public and a drummed-up meeting is public opinion. If this sagacious correspondent is so blind as to be incapable of seeing in broad daylight—this is the legacy of the Whigs—then I will tell him how matters stand with the power of the League. It has been driven out of the Ministry and Parliament by the Tories, and out of public opinion by the Chartists. Feargus O'Connor has triumphantly routed it in all the towns of England, everywhere he has challenged it to a public debate and the League has never picked up the gage. The League cannot call a single public meeting without being most ignominiously trounced by the Chartists. Or does the Augsburg correspondent really not know that the pompous January meetings in Manchester and the meetings now being held in the Drury Lane theatre in London, where the liberal gentlemen tell one another lies and try to deceive themselves about their inner instability—does he really not know these are "whited sepulchres"? Who are admitted to these meetings? Only members of the League or persons to whom the League gives tickets. Hence no hostile party can have a chance of successful opposition there, and therefore no one applies for tickets; no matter what cunning it resorted to, it could not manage to smuggle in even a hundred of its supporters. The League has been organising such meetings, which are afterwards called "public", for some years past and at them it congratulates itself on its "progress". It is very becoming that at these "public" ticket meetings, the League rails against the "spectre of Chartism", especially since it knows that at truly public meetings O'Connor, Duncombe, Cooper, etc., are giving a straightforward reply to those attacks. Up to now the Chartists have shattered every public meeting of the League by a brilliant majority, but the League has never been able to disrupt a Chartist meeting. Hence the League's hatred of the Chartists, hence the clamour about the "disorder" caused by the Chartists at a meeting—that is to say, the rebellion of the majority against the minority, which from the platform tries to make use of the majority for its own ends. Where then is the power of the League?—In its imagination and—in its purse. The League is wealthy, by the abolition of the Corn Laws it hopes to conjure up a trade boom and therefore throws a sprat to catch a mackerel. Its subscriptions bring in considerable sums of money which cover the expenditure on all the pompous meetings and the rest of the appearance and tawdry finery. But behind this glittering exterior there is nothing real. The National Charter Association—a—the Chartists' organisation¹⁴³—has

¹ Engels gives this name in English.—Ed.
a greater number of members, and it will soon be seen that it can also collect more money, although it consists only of poor workers, while the League has all the rich manufacturers and merchants in its ranks. And the reason is that the Chartist Association gets its money—even if only in pennies—from nearly every one of its members, whereas although considerable sums of money are contributed to the League, they come only from certain individuals. The Chartists can easily collect a million pennies weekly; it is very questionable whether the League could sustain this. The League opened a subscription list for £50,000 and received about £70,000. Feargus O'Connor is about to open a subscription list of £125,000 for one project and soon afterwards perhaps another for an equal amount—he will certainly get it—and what does the League then intend to do with its “huge funds”?

Why the Chartists are in opposition to the League will be dealt with on another occasion. For the present only one further remark, viz., that the efforts and work of the League have one good side. This is the movement which is being aroused by the Anti-Corn Law agitation in a hitherto entirely stable class of society—the agricultural population. Up to now the latter has taken no interest in public affairs; dependent on the landowners who can put an end to the lease agreement any year, the farmers, phlegmatic and ignorant, have sent only Tories to Parliament year after year—251 out of the 658 members of the House of Commons—and up to now this has been the strong basis of the reactionary party. If an individual farmer wanted to come out against this traditional vote, he found no support among his fellow farmers and the landlord could easily give him notice. Now, however, a considerable alertness among this class of the population is evident; there already exist liberal farmers, and among them there are people who realise that in very many cases the interests of the landlord and those of the tenant are directly opposed. Three years ago, particularly in England herself, no one could have said this to a tenant without being laughed at or even beaten up. Among this class the work of the League will bear fruit, but quite certainly the fruit will be different from what the League expects, for while it is probable that the mass of the tenants will gradually go over to the Whigs, it is still more probable that the mass of the agricultural labourers will be impelled to take the side of the Chartists. One without the other is impossible, and thus here, too, the League will obtain only feeble compensation for the decisive and total withdrawal from it of the working class which the League has suffered during the past five years in the towns and factory districts owing to Chartism. The kingdom of the juste-milieu has had its day.
and the "power in the land" has become divided into two extremes. In view of these undeniable facts, however, I ask the correspondent of the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung: Where is the "power of the League"?

III

[Schweizerischer Republikaner No. 46, June 9, 1843]

The English Socialists are far more principled and practical than the French, which is especially due to the fact that they are engaged in an open struggle against the various churches and do not want to have anything to do with religion. In the larger towns they usually maintain a hall where every Sunday they listen to speeches which are often polemical against Christianity and atheistic, but often also deal with some aspect of the workers' life; of their lecturers (preachers) Watts in Manchester seems at any rate to be an outstanding man, who has written some very talented pamphlets on the existence of God and on political economy. The lecturers have a very good manner of arguing; they always start out from experience and from verifiable or obvious facts and at the same time the exposition is carried out in such a systematic way that it is very difficult to fight them on the ground they have chosen. If anyone tries to carry the argument into a different sphere they laugh in his face. If, for example, I say: For man the existence of God does not depend on facts for its proof, they retort: "What a ridiculous proposition you put forward: if God does not manifest Himself through facts, why should we want to trouble ourselves about Him? From your proposition it follows directly that it is a matter of indifference to people whether God exists or does not exist. And since we have thousands of other things to care about, we leave to you the good God above the clouds, where perhaps He exists, or perhaps does not exist. What we do not know through facts does not concern us at all; we keep to the basis of 'real facts', where there can be no question of such fantastic things as God and religious theories." So the rest of their communist propositions are supported by proof based on facts, in accepting which they are indeed careful. The stubbornness of these people is indescribable, and how the clergy are going to win them over—heaven alone knows. In Manchester, for instance, the communist community has 8,000 members openly registered at

---

* This word is in English in the original.—Ed.
the hall and paying their subscriptions to it. The assertion that half of the working classes of Manchester share their views on property is no exaggeration; because when Watts says from the platform (for the Communists the platform is what the pulpit is for the Christians): Today I am going to one or other meeting, you can count on it that the motion put by the lecturer will have a majority.

But among the Socialists, too, there are theoreticians or, as the Communists call them, complete atheists, while the former are called practical atheists. Of these theoreticians the most famous is Charles Southwell in Bristol, who published a polemical journal *The Oracle of Reason* and was punished for that by a year’s imprisonment and a fine of about £100. Of course, the fine was quickly covered by subscriptions, for every Englishman subscribes to his newspaper, helps his leaders to pay fines, pays for his chapel or hall, attends his meetings. But Charles Southwell is already in prison again; in fact the hall in Bristol had to be sold because there are not so many Socialists in Bristol and among them few are rich, whereas such a hall is a fairly expensive thing. It was bought by a Christian denomination and converted into a chapel. When this new chapel was consecrated, the Socialists and Chartists crowded into it to see and hear the ceremony. But when the clergymen began to praise God that all the wicked doings had been ended, and that where formerly God had been defamed, praises would now be sung to the Almighty, they regarded this as an attack, and since according to English notions every attack demands resistance, they raised a shout of Southwell, Southwell! Let Southwell speak in opposition! Southwell therefore got up and began to make a speech. Now, however, clergymen of the Christian denomination put themselves at the head of the columns of their parishioners and hurled themselves on Southwell; other members of the denomination called in the police, because Southwell was said to have disturbed a Christian religious service; the clergymen laid hold of him, struck him (as often happens in such cases) and handed him over to a policeman. Southwell himself ordered his supporters not to offer physical resistance; when he was led away, some 6,000 people followed him crying “hurrah” and cheering him.

The founder of the socialist movement, Owen, writes in his numerous booklets like a German philosopher, i.e., very badly, but at times he has his lucid moments and then his obscure writings become readable; moreover, his views are comprehensive. According to Owen “marriage, religion and property are the sole causes
of all the calamity that has existed since the world began” (!!), all his writings teem with outbursts of rage against the theologians, lawyers and doctors, all of whom he lumps together. “The law-courts are the seat of a class of people which is still completely theological and therefore prejudiced; the laws also are imbued with theology and must therefore be abolished together with the jury.”

While the Church of England lived in luxury, the Socialists did an incredible amount to educate the working classes in England. At first one cannot get over one’s surprise on hearing in the Hall of Science the most ordinary workers speaking with a clear understanding on political, religious and social affairs; but when one comes across the remarkable popular pamphlets and hears the lecturers of the Socialists, for example Watts in Manchester, one ceases to be surprised. The workers now have good, cheap editions of translations of the French philosophical works of the last century, chiefly Rousseau’s *Contrat social*, the *Système de la Nature* and various works by Voltaire, and in addition the exposition of communist principles in penny and twopenny pamphlets and in the journals. The workers also have in their hands cheap editions of the writings of Thomas Paine and Shelley. Furthermore, there are also the Sunday lectures, which are very diligently attended; thus during my stay in Manchester I saw the Communist Hall, which holds about 3,000 people, crowded every Sunday, and I heard there speeches which have a direct effect, which are made from the special viewpoint of the people, and in which witty remarks against the clergy occur. It happens frequently that Christianity is directly attacked and Christians are called “our enemies”.

In their form, these meetings partly resemble church gatherings; in the gallery a choir accompanied by an orchestra sings social hymns; these consist of semi-religious or wholly religious melodies with communist words, during which the audience stands. Then, quite nonchalantly, without removing his hat, a lecturer comes on to the platform, on which there is a table and chairs; after raising his hat by way of greeting those present, he takes off his overcoat and then sits down and delivers his address, which usually gives much occasion for laughter, for in these speeches the English intellect expresses itself in superabundant humour. In one corner of the hall is a stall where books and pamphlets are sold and in another a booth with oranges and refreshments, where everyone can obtain what he needs or to

---

*This term is given in English in the original.—Ed.*
which he can withdraw if the speech bores him. From time to time tea-parties are arranged on Sunday evenings at which people of both sexes, of all ages and classes, sit together and partake of the usual supper of tea and sandwiches; on working days dances and concerts are often held in the hall, where people have a very jolly time; the hall also has a café.

How does it happen that all this kind of thing is tolerated? Firstly, under the Whig Ministry the Communists secured the passage of an Act of Parliament and in general achieved such a strong position at that time that now, as being a corporation, it is no longer possible to take any steps against them. Secondly, the authorities would very much like to attack prominent individuals, but they know that this would only redound to the advantage of the Socialists by drawing public attention to them, which is what the Socialists want. If they were to become martyrs for their cause (and how many of them would be ready for that at any time), it would give rise to agitation. But agitation is a means of making their cause still more widely known, whereas at present a large part of the nation takes no notice of them, regarding them as a sect like any other. The Whigs knew very well that repressive measures have a stronger effect in favour of a cause than agitation for the cause itself, and hence they gave the Communists an opportunity to exist and take form; but every form is a bond. The Tories, on the other hand, take some action against them when the atheistic publications seem too outrageous, but every time it is to the advantage of the Communists. In December 1840, Southwell and others were punished for blasphemy; immediately three new periodicals appeared: one was The Atheist, another The Atheist and Republican, and the third, published by the lecturer Watts, The Blasphemer. A few issues of The Blasphemer caused a great sensation, and the authorities tried in vain to discover how this trend could be suppressed. They left it alone, and lo and behold, all three papers ceased to exist!

Thirdly, the Socialists, like all the other parties, save themselves by circumventing the law and resorting to verbal quibbles, which is the regular practice here.

Thus everything here displays life and cohesion, a solid basis and action; thus everything here is assuming a definite external shape; whereas we imagine that we know something if we have swallowed the dull, miserable contents of Stein's book, or that we

---

3 Lorenz von Stein, Der Socialismus und Communismus des heutigen Frankreichs. — Ed.
are of some importance if somewhere or other we utter an opinion perfumed with attar of roses.

In the Socialists, English energy is very clearly evident, but what astonished me more was the good-natured character of these people, I almost called them lads, which, however, is so far removed from weakness that they laugh at the mere Republicans, because a republic would be just as hypocritical, just as theological, just as unjust in its laws, as a monarchy; but for the reform of society they are ready to sacrifice their worldly goods and life itself together with their wives and children.

IV

[Schweizerischer Republikaner No. 51, June 27, 1843]

One hears nothing now but talk about O'Connell and the Irish Repeal (abolition of the Union of Ireland and England). O'Connell, the cunning old lawyer, who during the Whig government sat calmly in the House of Commons and helped to pass "liberal" measures in order to be rejected by the House of Lords, O'Connell has suddenly left London and absented himself from the parliamentary debates and is now raising again his old question of repeal. No one was thinking about it any more; and then Old Dan turns up in Dublin and is again raking up the stale obsolete lumber. It is not surprising that the old yeast is now producing remarkable air-bubbles. The cunning old fox is going from town to town, always accompanied by a bodyguard such as no king ever had—two hundred thousand people always surround him! How much could have been done if a sensible man possessed O'Connell's popularity or if O'Connell had a little more understanding and a little less egoism and vanity! Two hundred thousand men—and what men! People who have nothing to lose, two-thirds of whom are clothed in rags, genuine proletarians and sansculottes and, moreover, Irishmen, wild, headstrong, fanatical Gaels. One who has never seen Irishmen cannot know them. Give me two hundred thousand Irishmen and I will overthrow the entire British monarchy. The Irishman is a carefree, cheerful, potato-eating child of nature. From his native heath, where he grew up, under a broken-down roof, on weak tea and meagre food, he is suddenly thrown into our civilisation. Hunger drives

---

a Here and later Engels uses the English word "repeal".—Ed.

b In the original "Old Dan", i.e., Daniel O'Connell.—Ed.
him to England. In the mechanical, egoistic, ice-cold hurly-burly of the English factory towns, his passions are aroused. What does this raw young fellow—whose youth was spent playing on moors and begging at the roadside—know of thrift? He squanders what he earns, then he starves until the next pay-day or until he again finds work. He is accustomed to going hungry. Then he goes back, seeks out the members of his family on the road where they had scattered in order to beg, from time to time assembling again around the teapot, which the mother carries with her. But in England the Irishman saw a great deal, he attended public meetings and workers’ associations, he knows what Repeal is and what Sir Robert Peel stands for, he quite certainly has often had fights with the police and could tell you a great deal about the heartlessness and disgraceful behaviour of the “Peelers” (the police). He has also heard a lot about Daniel O'Connell. Now he once more returns to his old cottage with its bit of land for potatoes. The potatoes are ready for harvesting, he digs them up, and now he has something to live on during the winter. But here the principal tenant appears, demanding the rent. Good God, where’s the money to come from? The principal tenant is responsible to the landowner for the rent, and therefore has his property attached. The Irishman offers resistance and is thrown into gaol. Finally, he is set free again, and soon afterwards the principal tenant or someone else who took part in the attachment of the property is found dead in a ditch.

That is a story from the life of the Irish proletarians which is of daily occurrence. The half-savage upbringing and later the completely civilised environment bring the Irishman into contradiction with himself, into a state of permanent irritation, of continually smouldering fury, which makes him capable of anything. In addition he bears the burden of five centuries of oppression with all its consequences. Is it surprising that, like any other half-savage, he strikes out blindly and furiously on every opportunity, that his eyes burn with a perpetual thirst for revenge, a destructive fury, for which it is altogether a matter of indifference what it is directed against, so long as it can strike out and destroy? But that is not all. The violent national hatred of the Gaels against the Saxons, the orthodox Catholic fanaticism fostered by the clergy against Protestant-episcopal arrogance—with these elements anything can be accomplished. And all these elements are in O'Connell’s hands. And what a multitude of people are at his disposal!

---

3 This word is in English in the original.—Ed.
The day before yesterday in Cork—150,000 men, yesterday in Nenaph—200,000, today in Kilkenny—400,000, and so it goes on. A triumphal procession lasting a fortnight, a triumphal procession such as no Roman emperor ever had. And if O'Connell really had the welfare of the people in view, if he were really concerned to abolish poverty—if his miserable, petty *juste-milieu* aims were not behind all the clamour and the agitation for Repeal—I should truly like to know what Sir Robert Peel could refuse him if he demanded it while at the head of such a force as he now has. But what does he achieve with all his power and his millions of valiant and desperate Irishmen? He is unable to accomplish even the wretched Repeal of the Union; of course solely because he is not serious about it, because he is misusing the impoverished, oppressed Irish people in order to embarrass the Tory Ministers and to put back into office his *juste-milieu* friends. Sir Robert Peel, too, knows this well enough, and hence 25,000 soldiers are quite enough to keep all Ireland in check. If O'Connell were really the man of the people, if he had sufficient courage and were not himself afraid of the people, i.e., if he were not a double-faced Whig, but an upright, consistent democrat, then the last English soldier would have left Ireland long since, there would no longer be any idle Protestant priest in purely Catholic districts, or any Old-Norman baron in his castle. But there is the rub. If the people were to be set free even for a moment, then Daniel O'Connell and his moneyed aristocrats would soon be just as much left high and dry as he wants to leave the Tories high and dry. That is the reason for Daniel's close association with the Catholic clergy, that is why he warns his Irishmen against dangerous socialism, that is why he rejects the support offered by the Chartists, although for appearances sake he now and again talks about democracy—just as Louis Philippe in his day talked about Republican institutions—and that is why he will never succeed in achieving anything but the political education of the Irish people, which in the long run is to no one more dangerous than to himself.

Written in May-June 1843
First published in *Schweizerischer Republikaner* Nos. 39, 41, 46 and 51, May 16 and 23 and June 9 and 27, 1843
Printed according to the journal
The full text is published in English for the first time
It has always been in some degree surprising to me, ever since I met with English Socialists, to find that most of them are very little acquainted with the social movement going on in different parts of the continent. And yet there are more than half a million of Communists in France, not taking into account the Fourierists, and other less radical Social reformers; there are Communist associations in every part of Switzerland, sending forth missionaries to Italy, Germany, and even Hungary; and German philosophy, after a long and troublesome circuit, has at last settled upon Communism.

Thus, the three great and civilised countries of Europe—England, France, and Germany, have all come to the conclusion, that a thorough revolution of social arrangements, based on community of property, has now become an urgent and unavoidable necessity. This result is the more striking, as it was arrived at by each of the above nations independently of the others; a fact, than which there can be no stronger proof, that Communism is not the consequence of the particular position of the English, or any other nation, but that it is a necessary conclusion, which cannot be avoided to be drawn from the premises given in the general facts of modern civilisation.

It must, therefore, appear desirable, that the three nations should understand each other, should know how far they agree, and how far they disagree; because there must be disagreement also, owing to the different origin of the doctrine of Community in each of the three countries. The English came to the conclusion practically, by the rapid increase of misery, demoralisation, and pauperism in their own country; the French politically, by first
asking for political liberty and equality; and, finding this insufficient, joining social liberty, and social equality to their political claims: the Germans became Communists \textit{philosophically}, by reasoning upon first principles. This being the origin of Socialism in the three countries, there must exist differences upon minor points; but I think I shall be able to show that these differences are very insignificant, and quite consistent with the best feeling on the part of the Social reformers of each country towards those of the other. The thing wanted is, that they should know each other; this being obtained, I am certain, they all will have the best wishes for the success of their foreign brother Communists.

I

FRANCE

France is, since the Revolution, the exclusively political country of Europe. No improvement, no doctrine can obtain national importance in France, unless embodied in some political shape. It seems to be the part the French nation have to perform in the present stage of the history of mankind, to go through all the forms of political development, and to arrive, from a merely political beginning, at the point where all nations, all different paths, must meet at Communism. The development of the public mind in France shows this clearly, and shows at the same time, what the future history of the English Chartists must be.

The \textit{French Revolution} was the rise of democracy in Europe. Democracy is, as I take all forms of government to be, a contradiction in itself, an untruth, nothing but hypocrisy (theology, as we Germans call it), at the bottom. Political liberty is sham-liberty, the worst possible slavery; the appearance of liberty, and therefore the reality of servitude. Political equality is the same; therefore democracy, as well as every other form of government, must ultimately break to pieces: hypocrisy cannot subsist, the contradiction hidden in it must come out; we must have either a regular slavery—that is, an undisguised despotism, or real liberty, and real equality—that is, Communism. Both these consequences were brought out in the \textit{French Revolution}; Napoleon established the first, and Babeuf the second. I think I may be short upon the subject of Babouvism, as the history of his conspiracy, \cite{Ph. Buonarroti, Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf, suivie du procès auquel elle donna lieu, et des pièces justificatives, etc.—Ed.} has been translated into the English language.\footnote{Ph. Buonarroti, \textit{Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf, suivie du procès auquel elle donna lieu, et des pièces justificatives, etc.—Ed.}} The Communist plot did not succeed, because
the then Communism itself was of a very rough and superficial kind; and because, on the other hand, the public mind was not yet far enough advanced.

The next French Social reformer was Count de Saint-Simon. He succeeded in getting up a sect, and even some establishments; none of which succeeded. The general spirit of the Saint-Simonian doctrines is very much like that of the Ham-Common Socialists, in England; although, in the detail of the arrangements and ideas, there is a great difference. The singularities and eccentricities of the Saint-Simonians very soon became the victims of French wit and satire; and everything once made ridiculous is inevitably lost in France. But, besides this, there were other causes for the failure of the Saint-Simonian establishments; all the doctrines of this party were enveloped in the clouds of an unintelligible mysticism, which, perhaps, in the beginning, attract the attention of the people; but, at last, must leave their expectations disappointed. Their economical principles, too, were not unexceptionable; the share of each of the members of their communities in the distribution of produce was to be regulated, firstly, by the amount of work he had done; and, secondly, the amount of talent he displayed. A German Republican, Boerne, justly replied to this principle, that talent, instead of being rewarded, ought rather to be considered as a natural preference; and, therefore, a deduction ought to be made from the share of the talented, in order to restore equality.

Saint-Simonism, after having excited, like a brilliant meteor, the attention of the thinking, disappeared from the Social horizon. Nobody now thinks of it, or speaks of it; its time is past.

Nearly at the same time with Saint-Simon, another man directed the activity of his mighty intellect to the social state of mankind—Fourier. Although Fourier's writings do not display those bright sparks of genius which we find in Saint-Simon's and some of his disciples; although his style is hard, and shows, to a considerable extent, the toil with which the author is always labouring to bring out his ideas, and to speak out things for which no words are provided in the French language—nevertheless, we read his works with greater pleasure; and find more real value in them, than in those of the preceding school. There is mysticism, too, and as extravagant as any, but this you may cut off and throw it aside, and there will remain something not to be found among the Saint-Simonians—scientific research, cool, unbiased, systematic thought; in short, social philosophy; whilst Saint-Simonism can only be called social poetry. It was Fourier, who, for the first time, established the great axiom of social philosophy, that every indi-
vidual having an inclination or predilection for some particular kind of work, the sum of all these inclinations of all individuals must be, upon the whole, an adequate power for providing for the wants of all. From this principle, it follows, that if every individual is left to his own inclination, to do and to leave what he pleases, the wants of all will be provided for, without the forcible means used by the present system of society. This assertion looks bold, and yet, after Fourier's mode of establishing it, is quite unassailable, almost self-evident—the egg of Columbus. Fourier proves, that every one is born with an inclination for some kind of work, that absolute idleness is nonsense, a thing which never existed, and cannot exist: that the essence of the human mind is to be active itself, and to bring the body into activity; and that, therefore, there is no necessity for making the people active by force, as in the now existing state of society, but only to give their natural activity the right direction. He goes on proving the identity of labour and enjoyment, and shows the irrationality of the present social system, which separates them, making labour a toil, and placing enjoyment above the reach of the majority of the labourers; he shows further, how, under rational arrangements, labour may be made, what it is intended to be, an enjoyment, leaving every one to follow his own inclinations. I cannot, of course, follow Fourier through the whole of his theory of free labour, and I think this will be sufficient to show the English Socialists that Fourierism is a subject well worthy of their attention.

Another of the merits of Fourier is to have shown the advantages—nay, the necessity of association. It will be sufficient only to mention this subject, as I know the English to be fully aware of its importance.

There is one inconsistency, however, in Fourierism, and a very important one too, and that is, his nonabolition of private property. In his Phalanstères or associative establishments, there are rich and poor, capitalists and working men. The property of all members is placed into a joint stock, the establishment carries on commerce, agricultural and manufacturing industry, and the proceeds are divided among the members; one part as wages of labour, another as reward for skill and talent, and a third as profits of capital. Thus, after all the beautiful theories of association and free labour; after a good deal of indignant declamation against commerce, selfishness, and competition, we have in practice the old competitive system upon an improved plan, a poor-law bastile on more liberal principles! Certainly, here we cannot stop; and the French, too, have not stopped here.
The progress of Fourierism in France was slow, but regular. There are not a great many Fourierists, but they count among their numbers a considerable portion of the intellect now active in France. Victor Considérant is one of their cleverest writers. They have a newspaper, too, the Phalange, published formerly three times a week, now daily.¹⁶⁶

As the Fourierists are now represented in England also by Mr. Doherty, I think I may have said enough concerning them, and now pass to the most important and most radical party in France, the Communists.

I said before, that everything claiming national importance in France must be of a political nature, or it will not succeed. Saint-Simon and Fourier did not touch politics at all, and their schemes, therefore, became not the common property of the nation, but only subjects of private discussion. We have seen how Babeuf's Communism arose out of the democracy of the first revolution. The second revolution, of 1830, gave rise to another and more powerful Communism. The "great week" of 1830² was accomplished by the union of the middle and working classes, the liberals and the republicans. After the work was done, the working classes were dismissed, and the fruits of the revolution were taken possession of by the middle classes only. The working men got up several insurrections, for the abolition of political monopoly, and the establishment of a republic,¹⁵⁷ but were always defeated; the middle class having not only the army on their side, but forming themselves the national guard besides. During this time (1834 or 1835) a new doctrine sprang up among the republican working men. They saw that even after having succeeded in their democratic plans, they would continue [to be] the dupes of their more gifted and better educated leaders, and that their social condition, the cause of their political discontent, would not be bettered by any political change whatsoever. They referred to the history of the great revolution, and eagerly seized upon Babeuf's Communism. This is all that can, with safety, be asserted concerning the origin of modern Communism in France; the subject was first discussed in the dark lanes and crowded alleys of the Parisian suburb, Saint-Antoine, and soon after in the secret assemblies of conspirators. Those who know more about its origin are very careful to keep their knowledge to themselves, in order to avoid the "strong arm of the law". However, Communism spread rapidly over Paris, Lyons, Toulouse, and the other large and

¹ That is, from July 27 to August 20, the peak of the July revolution.—Ed.
manufacturing towns of the realm; various secret associations followed each other, among which the "Travailleurs Égalitaires", or Equalitarian Working Men, and the Humanitarians,\textsuperscript{158} were the most considerable. The Equalitarians were rather a "rough set", like the Babouvists of the great revolution; they purposed making the world a working-man's community, putting down every refinement of civilisation, science, the fine arts, etc., as useless, dangerous, and aristocratic luxuries, a prejudice necessarily arising from their total ignorance of history and political economy. The Humanitarians were known particularly for their attacks on marriage, family, and other similar institutions. Both these, as well as two or three other parties, were very short-lived, and the great bulk of the French working classes adopted, very soon, the tenets propounded by M. Cabet, "Père Cabet" (Father C.), as he is called, and which are known on the continent under the name of Icarian Communism.

This sketch of the History of Communism in France shows, in some measure, what the difference of French and English Communism must be. The origin of Social reform, in France, is a political one; it is found, that democracy cannot give real equality, and therefore the Community scheme is called to its aid. The bulk of the French Communists are, therefore, republicans besides; they want a community state of society, under a republican form of government. Now, I do not think that the English Socialists would have serious objections to this; because, though they are more favourable to an elective monarchy, I know them to be too enlightened to force their kind of government upon a people totally opposed to it. It is evident, that to try this would involve this people in far greater disorders and difficulties than would arise from their own democratic mode of government, even supposing this to be bad.

But there are other objections that could be made to the French Communists. They intend overthrowing the present government of their country by force, and have shown this by their continual policy of secret associations. This is true. Even the Icarians, though they declare in their publications that they abhor physical revolutions and secret societies, even they are associated in this manner, and would gladly seize upon any opportunity to establish a republic by force.\textsuperscript{159} This will be objected to, I dare say, and rightly, because, at any rate, secret associations are always contrary to common prudence, inasmuch as they make the parties liable to unnecessary legal persecutions. I am not inclined to defend such a line of policy, but it has to be explained, to be accounted for; and
it is fully done so by the difference of the French and English national character and government. The English constitution has now been, for about one hundred and fifty years, uninterruptedly, the law of the land; every change has been made by legal means, by constitutional forms; therefore the English must have a strong respect for their laws. But, in France, during the last fifty years, one forced alteration has followed the other; all constitutions, from radical democracy to open despotism, all kinds of laws were, after a short existence, thrown away and replaced by others; how can the people then respect their laws? And the result of all these convulsions, as now established in the French constitution and laws, is the oppression of the poor by the rich, an oppression kept up by force—how can it be expected that the oppressed should love their public institutions, that they should not resort to the old tricks of 1792? They know that, if they are anything, they are it by meeting force by force, and having, at present, no other means, why should they hesitate a moment to apply this? It will be said further; why do not the French Communists establish communities, as the English have done? My reply is, because they dare not. If they did, the first experiment would be put down by soldiers. And if they were suffered to do so, it would be of no use to them. I always understood the Harmony Establishment to be only an experiment, to show the possibility of Mr. Owen’s plans, if put into practice, to force public opinion to a more favourable idea of the Socialist schemes for relieving public distress. Well, if that be the case, such an experiment would be of no avail in France. Show the French, not that your plans are practical, because that would leave them cool and indifferent. Show them that your communities will not place mankind under an “iron-bound despotism”, as Mr. Bairstow the Chartist said, in his late discussion with Mr. Watts. Show them that real liberty and real equality will be only possible under Community arrangements, show them that justice demands such arrangements, and then you will have them all on your side.

But to return to the social doctrines of the Icarian Communists. Their “holy book” is the *Voyage en Icarie* (Travels in Icaria) of Father Cabet, who, by-the-by, was formerly Attorney-General, and Member of the Chamber of Deputies. The general arrangements for their Communities are very little different to those of Mr. Owen. They have embodied in their plans everything rational they found in Saint-Simon and Fourier; and, therefore, are very much superior to the old French Communists. As to marriage, they perfectly agree with the English. Everything possible is done
to secure the liberty of the individual. Punishments are to be abolished, and to be replaced by education of the young, and rational mental treatment of the old.

It is, however, curious, that whilst the English Socialists are generally opposed to Christianity, and have to suffer all the religious prejudices of a really Christian people, the French Communists, being a part of a nation celebrated for its infidelity, are themselves Christians. One of their favourite axioms is, that Christianity is Communism, "le Christianisme c'est le Communisme". This they try to prove by the bible, the state of community in which the first Christians are said to have lived, etc. But all this shows only, that these good people are not the best Christians, although they style themselves so; because if they were, they would know the bible better, and find that, if some few passages of the bible may be favourable to Communism, the general spirit of its doctrines is, nevertheless, totally opposed to it, as well as to every rational measure.

The rise of Communism has been hailed by most of the eminent minds in France; Pierre Leroux, the metaphysician; George Sand, the courageous defender of the rights of her sex; Abbé de Lamennais, author of the Words of a Believer, and a great many others, are, more or less, inclined towards the Communist doctrines. The most important writer, however, in this line is Proudhon, a young man, who published two or three years ago his work: What is Property? (Qu'est ce que la Propriété?) where he gave the answer: "La propriété c'est le vol", Property is robbery. This is the most philosophical work, on the part of the Communists, in the French language; and, if I wish to see any French book translated into the English language, it is this. The right of private property, the consequences of this institution, competition, immorality, misery, are here developed with a power of intellect, and real scientific research, which I never since found united in a single volume. Besides this, he gives very important remarks on government, and having proved that every kind of government is alike objectionable, no matter whether it be democracy, aristocracy, or monarchy, that all govern by force; and that, in the best of all possible cases, the force of the majority oppresses the weakness of the minority, he comes, at last, to the conclusion: "Nous voulons l'anarchie!" What we want is anarchy; the rule of nobody, the responsibility of every one to nobody but himself.

---

4 F. R. de Lamennais, Paroles d'un croyant, 1833.—Ed.
Upon this subject I shall have to speak more, when I come to the German Communists. I have now only to add, that the French Icarian Communists are estimated at about half a million in number, women and children not taken into account. A pretty respectable phalanx, isn’t it? They have a monthly paper, the *Populaire*, edited by Father Cabet; and, besides this, P. Leroux publishes a periodical, the *Independent Review*, in which the tenets of Communism are philosophically advocated.

Manchester, Oct. 23, 1843

II

GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND

[The New Moral World No. 21, November 18, 1843]

Germany had her Social Reformers as early as the Reformation. Soon after Luther had begun to proclaim church reform and to agitate the people against spiritual authority, the peasantry of Southern and Middle Germany rose in a general insurrection against their temporal lords. Luther always stated his object to be, to return to original christianity in doctrine and practice; the peasantry took exactly the same standing, and demanded, therefore, not only the ecclesiastical, but also the social practice of primitive christianity. They conceived a state of villainy and servitude, such as they lived under, to be inconsistent with the doctrines of the Bible; they were oppressed by a set of haughty barons and earls, robbed and treated like their cattle every day, they had no law to protect them, and if they had, they found nobody to enforce it. Such a state contrasted very much with the communities of early christians and the doctrines of Christ, as laid down in the Bible. Therefore they arose and began a war against their lords, which could only be a war of extermination. Thomas Münzer, a preacher, whom they placed at their head, issued a proclamation, full, of course, of the religious and superstitious nonsense of the age, but containing also among others, principles like these: That according to the Bible, no christian is entitled to hold any property whatever exclusively for himself; that community of property is the only proper state for a society of christians; that it is not allowed to any good christian to have any authority or command over other christians, nor to hold any office of government or hereditary power, but on the contrary, that, as all men

---

*La Revue indépendante.— Ed.*
are equal before God, so they ought to be on earth also. These doctrines were nothing but conclusions drawn from the Bible and from Luther's own writings; but the Reformer was not prepared to go as far as the people did; notwithstanding the courage he displayed against the spiritual authorities, he had not freed himself from the political and social prejudices of his age; he believed as firmly in the right divine of princes and landlords to trample upon the people, as he did in the Bible. Besides this, he wanted the protection of the aristocracy and the protestant princes, and thus he wrote a tract against the rioters, disclaiming not only every connection with them, but also exhorting the aristocracy to put them down with the utmost severity, as rebels against the laws of God. "Kill them like dogs!" he exclaimed. The whole tract is written with such an animosity, nay, fury and fanaticism against the people, that it will ever form a blot upon Luther's character; it shows that, if he began his career as a man of the people, he was now entirely in the service of their oppressors. The insurrection, after a most bloody civil war, was suppressed, and the peasants reduced to their former servitude.

If we except some solitary instances, of which no notice was taken by the public, there has been no party of Social Reformers in Germany, since the peasants' war, up to a very recent date. The public mind during the last fifty years was too much occupied with questions of either a merely political or merely metaphysical nature—questions, which had to be answered, before the social question could be discussed with the necessary calmness and knowledge. Men, who would have been decidedly opposed to a system of community, if such had been proposed to them, were nevertheless paving the way for its introduction.

It was among the working class of Germany that Social Reform has been of late made again a topic of discussion. Germany having comparatively little manufacturing industry, the mass of the working classes is made up by handicraftsmen, who previous to their establishing themselves as little masters, travel for some years over Germany, Switzerland, and very often over France also. A great number of German workmen is thus continually going to and from Paris, and must of course there become acquainted with the political and social movements of the French working classes. One of these men, William Weitling, a native of Magdeburg in

---

*a This is a reference to Luther's Wyder die mördische unnd reubischenn Rotenn der Paurenn.—Ed.*
Prussia, and a simple journeyman-tailor, resolved to establish communities in his own country.

This man, who is to be considered as the founder of German Communism, after a few years' stay in Paris, went to Switzerland, and, whilst he was working in some tailor's shop in Geneva, preached his new gospel to his fellow-workmen. He formed Communist Associations in all the towns and cities on the Swiss side of the lake of Geneva, most of the Germans who worked there becoming favourable to his views. Having thus prepared the public mind, he issued a periodical, the Young Generation, for a more extensive agitation of the country. This paper, although written for working men only, and by a working man, has from its beginning been superior to most of the French Communist publications, even to Father Cabet's Populaire. It shows that its editor must have worked very hard to obtain that knowledge of history and politics which a public writer cannot do without, and which a neglected education had left him deprived of. It shows, at the same time, that Weitling was always struggling to unite his various ideas and thoughts on society into a complete system of Communism. The Young Generation was first published in 1841; in the following year, Weitling published a work: Guarantees of Harmony and Liberty, in which he gave a review of the old social system and the outlines of a new one. I shall, perhaps, some time give a few extracts from this book.

Having thus established the nucleus of a Communist party in Geneva and its neighbourhood, he went to Zurich, where, as in other towns of Northern Switzerland, some of his friends had already commenced to operate upon the minds of the working men. He now began to organise his party in these towns. Under the name of Singing Clubs, associations were formed for the discussion of Social reorganisation. At the same time Weitling advertised his intention to publish a book,—The Gospel of the Poor Sinners. But here the police interfered with his proceedings.

In June last, Weitling was taken into custody, his papers and his book were seized, before it left the press. The Executive of the Republic appointed a committee to investigate the matter, and to report to the Grand Council, the representatives of the people. This report has been printed a few months since. It appears from it, that

---

a Die junge Generation.—Ed.
b Wilhelm Weitling, Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit.—Ed.
c J. C. Bluntschli, Die Kommunisten in der Schweiz nach den bei Weitling vorgefundenen Papieren.—Ed.
a great many Communist associations existed in every part of Switzerland, consisting mostly of German working men; that Weitling was considered as the leader of the party, and received from time to time reports of progress; that he was in correspondence with similar associations of Germans in Paris and London, and that all these societies, being composed of men who very often changed their residence, were so many seminaries of these "dangerous and Utopian doctrines", sending out their elder members to Germany, Hungary, and Italy, and imbuing with their spirit every workman who came within their reach. The report was drawn up by Dr. Bluntschli, a man of aristocratic and fanatically christian opinions, and the whole of it therefore is written more like a party denunciation, than like a calm, official report. Communism is denounced as a doctrine dangerous in the extreme, subversive of all existing order, and destroying all the sacred bonds of society. The pious doctor, besides, is at a loss for words sufficiently strong to express his feelings as to the frivolous blasphemy with which these infamous and ignorant people try to justify their wicked and revolutionary doctrines, by passages from the Holy Scriptures. Weitling and his party are, in this respect, just like the Icarians in France, and contend that Christianity is Communism.

The result of Weitling's trial did very little to satisfy the anticipations of the Zurich government. Although Weitling and his friends were sometimes very incautious in their expressions, yet the charge of high treason and conspiracy against him could not be maintained; the criminal court sentenced him to six months' imprisonment, and eternal banishment from Switzerland; the members of the Zurich associations were expelled the Canton; the report was communicated to the governments of the other Cantons and to the foreign embassies, but the Communists in other parts of Switzerland were very little interfered with. The prosecution came too late, and was too little assisted by the other Cantons; it did nothing at all for the destruction of Communism, and was even favourable to it, by the great interest it produced in all countries of the German tongue. Communism was almost unknown in Germany, but became by this an object of general attention.

Besides this party there exists another in Germany, which advocates Communism. The former, being thoroughly a popular party, will no doubt very soon unite all the working classes of Germany; that party which I now refer to is a philosophical one,
unconnected in its origin with either French or English Communists, and arising from that philosophy which, since the last fifty years, Germany has been so proud of.

The political revolution of France was accompanied by a philosophical revolution in Germany. Kant began it by overthrowing the old system of Leibnitzian metaphysics, which at the end of last century was introduced in all Universities of the Continent. Fichte and Schelling commenced rebuilding, and Hegel completed the new system. There has never been, ever since man began to think, a system of philosophy as comprehensive as that of Hegel. Logic, metaphysics, natural philosophy, the philosophy of mind, the philosophy of law, of religion, of history, all are united in one system, reduced to one fundamental principle. The system appeared quite unassailable from without, and so it was; it has been overthrown from within only, by those who were Hegelians themselves. I cannot, of course, give here a complete development either of the system or of its history, and therefore must restrain myself to the following remarks. The progress of German philosophy from Kant to Hegel was so consistent, so logical, so necessary, if I may say so, that no other systems besides those I have named could subsist. There are two or three of them, but they found no attention; they were so neglected, that nobody would even do them the honour to overthrow them. Hegel, notwithstanding his enormous learning and his deep thought, was so much occupied with abstract questions, that he neglected to free himself from the prejudices of his age—an age of restoration for old systems of government and religion. But his disciples had very different views on these subjects. Hegel died in 1831, and as early as 1835 appeared Strauss' Life of Jesus, the first work showing some progress beyond the limits of orthodox Hegelianism. Others followed; and in 1837 the Christians rose against what they called the New Hegelians, denouncing them as Atheists, and calling for the interference of the state. The state, however, did not interfere, and the controversy went on. At that time, the New, or Young Hegelians, were so little conscious of the consequences of their own reasoning, that they all denied the charge of Atheism, and called themselves Christians and Protestants, although they denied the existence of a God who was not man, and declared the history of the gospels to be a pure mythology. It was not until last year, in a pamphlet, by the writer of these lines, that the charge of Atheism was allowed to be just. But the development went

\* Frederick Engels, Schelling and Revelation (see this edition, Vol. 2).—Ed.
The Young Hegelians of 1842 were declared Atheists and Republicans; the periodical of the party, the *German Annals*, a was more radical and open than ever before; a political paper b was established, and very soon the whole of the German liberal press was entirely in our hands. We had friends in almost every considerable town of Germany; we provided all the liberal papers with the necessary matter, and by this means made them our organs; we inundated the country with pamphlets, and soon governed public opinion upon every question. A temporary relaxation of the censorship of the press added a great deal to the energy of this movement, quite novel to a considerable part of the German public. Papers, published under the authorisation of a government censor, contained things which, even in France, would have been punished as high treason, and other things which could not have been pronounced in England, without a trial for blasphemy being the consequence of it. The movement was so sudden, so rapid, so energetically pursued, that the government as well as the public were dragged along with it for some time. But this violent character of the agitation proved that it was not founded upon a strong party among the public, and that its power was produced by the surprise and consternation only of its opponents. The governments, recovering their senses, put a stop to it by a most despotic oppression of the liberty of speech. Pamphlets, newspapers, periodicals, scientific works were suppressed by dozens, and the agitated state of the country soon subsided. It is a matter of course that such a tyrannical interference will not check the progress of public opinion, nor quench the principles defended by the agitators; the entire persecution has been of no use whatever to the ruling powers; because, if they had not put down the movement, it would have been checked by the apathy of the public at large, a public as little prepared for radical changes as that of every other country; and, if even this had not been the case, the republican agitation would have been abandoned by the agitators themselves, who now, by developing farther and farther the consequences of their philosophy, became Communists. The princes and rulers of Germany, at the very moment when they believed to have put down for ever republicanism, saw the rise of Communism from the ashes of political agitation; and this new doctrine appears to them even more dangerous and formidable than that in whose apparent destruction they rejoiced.

---

a *Deutsche Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst.—Ed.*
b *Rheinsche Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe.—Ed.*
As early as autumn, 1842, some of the party contended for the insufficiency of political change, and declared their opinion to be, that a Social revolution based upon common property, was the only state of mankind agreeing with their abstract principles. But even the leaders of the party, such as Dr. Bruno Bauer, Dr. Feuerbach, and Dr. Ruge, were not then prepared for this decided step. The political paper of the party, the Rhenish Gazette, published some papers advocating Communism, but without the wished-for effect. Communism, however, was such a necessary consequence of New Hegelian philosophy, that no opposition could keep it down, and, in the course of this present year, the originators of it had the satisfaction of seeing one republican after the other join their ranks. Besides Dr. Hess, one of the editors of the now suppressed Rhenish Gazette, and who was, in fact, the first Communist of the party, there are now a great many others; as Dr. Ruge, editor of the German Annals, the scientific periodical of the Young Hegelians, which has been suppressed by resolution of the German Diet; Dr. Marx, another of the editors of the Rhenish Gazette; George Herwegh, the poet whose letter to the King of Prussia was translated, last winter, by most of the English papers, and others: and we hope that the remainder of the republican party will, by-and-by, come over too.

Thus, philosophical Communism may be considered for ever established in Germany, notwithstanding the efforts of the governments to keep it down. They have annihilated the press in their dominions, but to no effect; the progress parties profit by the free press of Switzerland and France, and their publications are as extensively circulated in Germany, as if they were printed in that country itself. All persecutions and prohibitions have proved ineffectual, and will ever do so; the Germans are a philosophical nation, and will not, cannot abandon Communism, as soon as it is founded upon sound philosophical principles: chiefly if it is derived as an unavoidable conclusion from their own philosophy. And this is the part we have to perform now. Our party has to prove that either all the philosophical efforts of the German nation, from Kant to Hegel, have been useless—worse than useless; or, that they must end in Communism; that the Germans must either reject their great philosophers, whose names they hold up as the glory of their nation, or that they must adopt Communism. And this will be proved; this dilemma the Germans will be forced into, and there can scarcely be any doubt as to which side of the question the people will adopt.

a Rheinische Zeitung.—Ed.
There is a greater chance in Germany for the establishment of a Communist party among the educated classes of society, than anywhere else. The Germans are a very disinterested nation; if in Germany principle comes into collision with interest, principle will almost always silence the claims of interest. The same love of abstract principle, the same disregard of reality and self-interest, which have brought the Germans to a state of political nonentity, these very same qualities guarantee the success of philosophical Communism in that country. It will appear very singular to Englishmen, that a party which aims at the destruction of private property is chiefly made up by those who have property; and yet this is the case in Germany. We can recruit our ranks from those classes only which have enjoyed a pretty good education; that is, from the universities and from the commercial class; and in either we have not hitherto met with any considerable difficulty.

As to the particular doctrines of our party, we agree much more with the English Socialists than with any other party. Their system, like ours, is founded upon philosophical principle; they struggle, as we do, against religious prejudices whilst the French reject philosophy and perpetuate religion by dragging it over with themselves into the projected new state of society. The French Communists could assist us in the first stages only of our development, and we soon found that we knew more than our teachers; but we shall have to learn a great deal yet from the English Socialists. Although our fundamental principles give us a broader base, inasmuch as we received them from a system of philosophy embracing every part of human knowledge; yet in everything bearing upon practice, upon the facts of the present state of society, we find that the English Socialists are a long way before us, and have left very little to be done. I may say, besides, that I have met with English Socialists with whom I agree upon almost every question.

I cannot now give an exposition of this Communist system without adding too much to the length of this paper; but I intend to do so some time soon, if the Editor of the New Moral World\(^a\) will allow me the space for it.\(^{166}\) I therefore conclude by stating that, notwithstanding the persecutions of the German governments (I understand that, in Berlin, Mr. Edgar Bauer is being prosecuted for a Communist publication\(^{167}\); and in Stuttgart another gentleman has

\(^a\) G. A. Fleming.—*Ed.*
been committed for the novel crime of "Communist correspondence"!), notwithstanding this, I say, every necessary step is taken to bring about a successful agitation for Social Reform, to establish a new periodical, and to secure the circulation of all publications advocating Communism.

Written on October 23 and at the beginning of November 1843

First published in *The New Moral World*, Third Series, Nos. 19 and 21, November 4 and 18, 1843

Signed: F. Engels
Frankfort, November 26. The associations of the working classes for the purpose of introducing practically the ideas of socialism, or rather communism, by means of revolutionary reform, become daily more frequent and more dangerous. The governments are daily issuing decrees against the wandering customs of artisans and apprentices; they especially prohibited their visiting Switzerland, which is considered as the home of these revolutionary ideas. Several apostles of socialism have been arrested.  

* * *

The Basle Gazette of the 29th states the Supreme Tribunal of Zurich has passed judgment on the appeal of M. Weitling, who was found guilty in the first instance of disaffection, and sentenced to several months' imprisonment\(^b\) and five years' banishment; first, for having excited the people to revolt; and, secondly, for having entered into secret associations\(^1\) notwithstanding the laws of the country concerning refugees. He was acquitted of the charges brought against him of bringing religion into contempt.


---

\(^a\) In The New Moral World the following paragraph was added: "Several apostles of Socialism have been arrested; but a better means than those of compulsion has been thought of; it consists in the organisation of a great association for the purpose of bestowing sound instruction to the working classes by propagating useful lectures among them. A reading company (Leseverein) has been established here in Frankfort, and several hundreds of the working classes are already enrolled in it."

\(^b\) See this volume, p. 408.—Ed.
Sir.—Seeing the paper from the Times on the Communists in Germany, republished in The New Moral World, I thought it better not to let it pass without some commentary remarks, which you perhaps will find worth inserting.

The Times hitherto enjoyed on the continent the reputation of a well-informed newspaper, but a few more articles like that on German Communism must very soon destroy that opinion. Every one who has the slightest knowledge of the social movements in France and Germany, must at once perceive that the author of the paper alluded to speaks of a subject of which he is thoroughly ignorant. He knows not even so much about it as would enable him to expose the weaker parts of the party he attacks. If he wanted to decry Weitling, he could have found in his writings passages much more fitted for his purpose than those he translates. If he only would have given himself the trouble to read the report of the Zurich committee, which he professes to have read, but evidently has not, he would have found plenty of matter for slander, lots of garbled passages collected expressly for the purpose. It is very curious, after all, that the Communists themselves must furnish their opponents with arms for the combat; but, standing upon the broad base of philosophical argument, they can afford to do so.

The correspondent of the Times begins by describing the Communist party as very weak in France, and doubts whether the insurrection of 1839, in Paris, was got up by them, or, which he

* [J. C. Bluntschli,] Die Kommunisten in der Schweiz nach den bei Weitling vorgefundenen Papiere (see also this volume, pp. 402-03).—Ed.
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thinks very likely, by the "powerful" republican party. My well-informed informer of the English public, do you consider a party very weak which numbers about half a million of adult males? Do you know that the "powerful" republican party in France is, and has been these last nine years, in a state of utter dissolution and increasing decay? Do you know that the National newspaper, the organ of this "powerful" party, has a more limited circulation than any other Paris paper? Must I, a foreigner, remind you of the republican subscription for the Irish repeal fund, got up by the National last summer, and amounting to less than one hundred pounds, although the republicans affected considerable sympathy for the Irish repealers? Do you not know that the mass of the republican party, the working classes, have seceded from their richer partisans long since, and not joined, no, established the Communist party, long before Cabet commenced to advocate Communism? Do you not know that all the "power" of the French republicans consists in the reliance they have in the Communists, who wish to see a republic established before they begin putting Communism into practice? It seems you are ignorant of all these things, and yet you ought to know them, in order to form a correct opinion of continental Socialism.

As to the insurrection of 1839, I do not consider such things creditable to any party; but I have it from parties actively engaged in this émeute, that it was plotted and executed by the Communists.

The well-informed correspondent goes on to state that

"Fourier's and Cabet's doctrines seemed more to occupy the minds of some literary and scientific characters, than to gain general favour with the people".

Of Fourier this is true, as I had occasion to show in a former number of this paper; but Cabet! Cabet, the author of almost nothing but small pamphlets,—Cabet, who is always called Father Cabet, a name not likely to be given by "literary and scientific characters",—Cabet, whose greatest fault is superficiality and want of regard for the just claims of scientific research,—Cabet, the editor of a paper calculated for the information of those who are able to read only—that this man's doctrines should occupy the mind of a professor of the Parisian university, like Michelet, or Quinet, whose boast is a deepness deeper than mysticism? It is too ludicrous.

---

a See this volume, pp. 394-96.—Ed.
b Le Populaire de 1841.—Ed.
The correspondent then speaks of the celebrated German nocturnal meeting at Hambach and Steinholzli, and expresses his opinion

"that this bore rather a political than a social revolutionary character".

I hardly know where to begin in exposing the blunders of this sentence. Firstly, "nocturnal meetings" are quite unknown on the continent: we have no torch-light Chartists' or nocturnal Rebeccaite assemblages. The Hambach meeting was held in open day, under the eyes of the authorities. Secondly, Hambach is a place in Bavaria, and Steinholzli in Switzerland, some hundred miles from Hambach; yet our correspondent speaks of the "Hambach and Steinholzli meeting". Thirdly, these two meetings were separated by a considerable extent, not only of space, but of time also. The Steinholzli meeting took place several years after the other. Fourthly, these meetings not only seemed, but in reality did bear a merely political character; they were held before the Communists appeared in the field.

The sources from which our correspondent got his invaluable information, were "the report of the (Zurich) Commission, the published and unpublished Communist writings discovered at the arrest of Weitling, and personal inquiry". Now it is evident, from the ignorance of our correspondent, that he never read the report; it is evident that "published communistical writings" could not be "discovered" at the arrest of anybody, as the very fact of their "publication" destroys every possibility of a "discovery". The attorney-general of Zurich certainly would not boast of the "discovery" of books which every bookseller could have furnished him with! As to the "unpublished" writings, for the suppression of which the prosecution was commenced, the Zurich senators would have been inconsistent indeed, had they, as our correspondent appears to believe, afterwards published them themselves! They did no such thing. In fact, in all the report of our correspondent, there is nothing produced, which he could have procured from this source and from that of personal inquiry, if it be not the two novel facts, that the German Communists got their doctrine chiefly from Cabet and Fourier, whom they attack; as our correspondent could have read in the same book from which he so extensively quotes (Weitling's Garantien, p. 228); and that "they consider as their four evangelists, Cabet, Proudhon, Weitling, and— and— Constant"! Benjamin Constant, the friend of Madame de Staël, died long ago, and never thought of anything connected with...
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social reform. Evidently our correspondent means Considérant, the Fourierist, editor of the Phalange, now the Démocratie Pacifique, who is not at all connected with the Communists.

"The Communist doctrine is at present more negative than positive"

and immediately after this assertion is given, our correspondent cuts its throat by laying down, in twelve paragraphs, an outline of Weitling's proposed arrangements for a new social state, which arrangements are altogether positive, and do not even mention the destruction of the present social system.

These extracts, however, are given in a very confused manner, showing that our correspondent did in several cases fail to hit upon the vital point of the question, and gave in its stead some rather insignificant details. Thus he omits to state the chief point in which Weitling is superior to Cabet, namely, the abolition of all government by force and by majority, and the establishment in its stead of a mere administration, organising the different branches of labour, and distributing its produce; he omits the proposal to nominate all officers of this administration, and in every particular Branch, not by a majority of the community at large, but by those only who have a knowledge of the particular kind of work the future officer has to perform; and, one of the most important features of the plan, that the nominators are to select the fittest person, by means of some kind of prize essays, without knowing the author of any of these essays; the names to be sealed up, and that paper only to be opened which contains the name of the successful competitor; obviating by this all personal motives which could bias the minds of the electors.

As to the remainder of the extracts from Weitling, I leave it to the readers of this periodical to judge, whether they contain such contemptible stuff as our correspondent thinks them to be; or whether they do not advocate in most, if not in all cases, the same principles and proposals, for the propagation of which this paper was established. At any rate, if the Times should wish to comment again on German Communism, it would do well to provide another correspondent.

I am, Sir, yours truly,

F. Engels

Written on January 13, 1844

First published in The New Moral World, Third Series, No. 30, January 20, 1844

Printed according to the newspaper
To the Editor of the New Moral World

Manchester, January 28, 1844

DEAR SIR,—In my letter to you in the New Moral World of the 13th instant I committed an error. I considered the correspondent of the Times wrong in naming a M. Constant as a Communist; but since I wrote, I have received some French Communist publications, in which an Abbé Constant is named as a partisan of the Community System. At the same time, Mr. Goodwyn Barmby had the kindness to give me some further information about the Abbé Constant, who, he says, has been imprisoned for his principles, and is the author of several Communist works. His creed is thus expressed in his own words: I am a christian and I take christianity to be community only.

Requesting you, therefore, to correct the above error in your next number,

I am, dear Sir, yours respectfully,

F. Engels

Written on January 28, 1844
First published in The New Moral World, Third Series, No. 32, February 3, 1844

---

See this volume, pp. 412-13.—Ed.
CONTINENTAL MOVEMENTS

The well-known novel of Eugène Sue, *The Mysteries of Paris*, has made a deep impression upon the public mind, especially in Germany; the forcible manner in which this book depicts the misery and demoralisation falling to the share of the "lower orders" in great cities, could not fail to direct public attention to the state of the poor in general. The Germans begin to discover, as the Allgemeine Zeitung, the Times of Germany, says, that the style of novel writing has undergone a complete revolution during these last ten years; that instead of kings and princes, who formerly were the heroes of similar tales, it is now the poor, the despised class, whose fates and fortunes, joys and sufferings, are made the topic of romance; they are finding out at last that this new class of novel writers, such as G. Sand, E. Sue, and Boz, is indeed a sign of the times. The good Germans always thought, that misery and destitution existed in Paris and Lyons, London and Manchester only, and that Germany was entirely free from such excrescences of over-civilisation and of excessive manufacturing industry. Now, however, they begin to see that they also may muster a considerable amount of social disease; the Berlin papers confess, that the "Voigland" of that town is not inferior in this respect to St. Giles or any other abode of the pariahs of civilisation; they confess, that, although trades' unions and strikes have hitherto been unknown in Germany, yet help is much needed, in order to avoid the occurrence of similar things among their own countrymen. Dr. Mundt, a lecturer at the Berlin university, has commenced a course of public lectures on the different systems of Social Re-organisation; and although he is not

---

*Charles Dickens.—Ed.*
the man to form a correct and impartial judgment upon such things, yet these lectures must do a great deal of good. It may easily be conceived, how favourable this moment is for the commencement of a more extensive social agitation in Germany, and what will be the effect of a new periodical advocating a thorough social reform. Such a periodical has been established in Paris under the title of German and French Annals; its editors, Dr. Ruge and Dr. Marx, as well as its other contributors, belong to the "learned Communists" of Germany, and are supported by the most distinguished Socialist authors of France. The periodical, which is to be published in monthly numbers, and to contain French as well as German articles, could not, indeed, commence at a more favourable moment, and its success may be considered as certain, even before the first number is issued.\footnote{Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.—Ed.}

F. E.

Written late in January 1844

First published in The New Moral World, Third Series, No. 32, February 3, 1844

Printed according to the newspaper
Our readers are aware of the rapid progress in Germany of Republican and Communist principles, which progress has of late excited unusual terror amongst the crowned brigands and their advisers of that great confederation of nations. Additional measures of repression are, therefore, being called into operation to check the growth of these "dangerous doctrines", particularly in Prussia. It appears that in the year 1834, a secret Conference of Plenipotentiaries was held at Vienna, when a Protocol was agreed to, but which has only recently been published, imposing most absolute restrictions upon the press, and proclaiming and enforcing the "right divine" of Princes over all legislative and other popular bodies whatsoever. As a specimen of the "Holy Alliance" principle of this atrocious Protocol, we may state that the eighteenth article provides that

"Princes who are menaced on the part of their states by any infringement of the orders laid down by the decree of the Diet of 1832, are to dissolve these states, and to obtain military aid in support from the rest of the confederation."

We may add, as a proof of how the fairness and freedom of the press is understood in Prussia, that strict orders have been given to the censors at Cologne, Münster, and other Catholic towns, not to permit the republication of any parts of the Irish trials now in progress. One German journal wished to send a reporter or correspondent to Dublin; but there was no hope of being allowed to publish even his letter. No matter, liberty shall yet be triumphant, despite their dungeons and bayonets.

Written at the end of January and the beginning of February 1844

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in The Northern Star
No. 325, February 3, 1844

\*\* i.e., the German Confederation.—Ed.\*
Political economy came into being as a natural result of the expansion of trade, and with its appearance elementary, unscientific huckstering was replaced by a developed system of licensed fraud, an entire science of enrichment.

This political economy or science of enrichment born of the merchants' mutual envy and greed, bears on its brow the mark of the most detestable selfishness. People still lived in the naive belief that gold and silver were wealth, and therefore considered nothing more urgent than the prohibition everywhere of the export of the "precious" metals. The nations faced each other like misers, each clasping to himself with both arms his precious money-bag, eyeing his neighbours with envy and distrust. Every conceivable means was employed to lure from the nations with whom one had commerce as much ready cash as possible, and to retain snugly within the customs-boundary all which had happily been gathered in.

If this principle had been rigorously carried through trade would have been killed. People therefore began to go beyond this first stage. They came to appreciate that capital locked up in a chest was dead capital, while capital in circulation increased continuously. They then became more sociable, sent off their ducats as call-birds to bring others back with them, and realised that there is no harm in paying A too much for his commodity so long as it can be disposed of to B at a higher price.

On this basis the mercantile system was built. The avaricious character of trade was to some extent already beginning to be hidden. The nations drew slightly nearer to one another, concluded trade and friendship agreements, did business with one
another and, for the sake of larger profits, treated one another with all possible love and kindness. But in fact there was still the old avarice and selfishness and from time to time this erupted in wars, which in that day were all based on trade jealousy. In these wars it also became evident that trade, like robbery, is based on the law of the strong hand. No scruples whatever were felt about exacting by cunning or violence such treaties as were held to be the most advantageous.

The cardinal point in the whole mercantile system is the theory of the balance of trade. For as it still subscribed to the dictum that gold and silver constitute wealth, only such transactions as would finally bring ready cash into the country were considered profitable. To ascertain this, exports were compared with imports. When more had been exported than imported, it was believed that the difference had come into the country in ready cash, and that the country was richer by that difference. The art of the economists, therefore, consisted in ensuring that at the end of each year exports should show a favourable balance over imports; and for the sake of this ridiculous illusion thousands of men have been slaughtered! Trade, too, has had its crusades and inquisitions.

The eighteenth century, the century of revolution, also revolutionised economics. But just as all the revolutions of this century were one-sided and bogged down in antitheses—just as abstract materialism was set in opposition to abstract spiritualism, the republic to monarchy, the social contract to divine right—likewise the economic revolution did not get beyond antithesis. The premises remained everywhere in force: materialism did not attack the Christian contempt for and humiliation of Man, and merely posited Nature instead of the Christian God as the Absolute confronting Man. In politics no one dreamt of examining the premises of the state as such. It did not occur to economics to question the validity of private property. Therefore, the new economics was only half an advance. It was obliged to betray and to disavow its own premises, to have recourse to sophistry and hypocrisy so as to cover up the contradictions in which it became entangled, so as to reach the conclusions to which it was driven not by its premises but by the humane spirit of the century. Thus economics took on a philanthropic character. It withdrew its favour from the producers and bestowed it on the consumers. It affected a solemn abhorrence of the bloody terror of the mercantile system, and proclaimed trade to be a bond of friendship and union among nations as among individuals. All was pure splendour and magnificence—yet the premises reasserted themselves soon enough,
and in contrast to this sham philanthropy produced the Malthusian population theory — the crudest, most barbarous theory that ever existed, a system of despair which struck down all those beautiful phrases about philanthropy and world citizenship. The premises begot and reared the factory system and modern slavery, which yields nothing in inhumanity and cruelty to ancient slavery. Modern economics — the system of free trade based on Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* — reveals itself to be that same hypocrisy, inconsistency and immorality which now confront free humanity in every sphere.

But was Smith's system, then, not an advance? Of course it was, and a necessary advance at that. It was necessary to overthrow the mercantile system with its monopolies and hindrances to trade, so that the true consequences of private property could come to light. It was necessary for all these petty, local and national considerations to recede into the background, so that the struggle of our time could become a universal human struggle. It was necessary for the theory of private property to leave the purely empirical path of merely objective inquiry and to acquire a more scientific character which would also make it responsible for the consequences, and thus transfer the matter to a universally human sphere. It was necessary to carry the immorality contained in the old economics to its highest pitch, by attempting to deny it and by the hypocrisy introduced (a necessary result of that attempt). All this lay in the nature of the case. We gladly concede that it is only the justification and accomplishment of free trade that has enabled us to go beyond the economics of private property; but we must at the same time have the right to expose the utter theoretical and practical nullity of this free trade.

The nearer to our time the economists whom we have to judge, the more severe must our judgment become. For while Smith and Malthus found only scattered fragments, the modern economists had the whole system complete before them: the consequences had all been drawn; the contradictions came clearly enough to light; yet they did not come to examining the premises, and still accepted the responsibility for the whole system. The nearer the economists come to the present time, the further they depart from honesty. With every advance of time, sophistry necessarily increases, so as to prevent economics from lagging behind the times. This is why Ricardo, for instance, is more guilty than Adam Smith, and McCulloch and Mill more guilty than Ricardo.

Even the mercantile system cannot be correctly judged by modern economics since the latter is itself one-sided and as yet burdened with that very system's premises. Only that view which
rises above the opposition of the two systems, which criticises the premises common to both and proceeds from a purely human, universal basis, can assign to both their proper position. It will become evident that the protagonists of free trade are more inveterate monopolists than the old mercantilists themselves. It will become evident that the sham humanity of the modern economists hides a barbarism of which their predecessors knew nothing; that the older economists’ conceptual confusion is simple and consistent compared with the double-tongued logic of their attackers, and that neither of the two factions can reproach the other with anything which would not recoil upon themselves.

This is why modern liberal economics cannot comprehend the restoration of the mercantile system by List, whilst for us the matter is quite simple. The inconsistency and ambiguity of liberal economics must of necessity dissolve again into its basic components. Just as theology must either regress to blind faith or progress towards free philosophy, free trade must produce the restoration of monopolies on the one hand and the abolition of private property on the other.

The only positive advance which liberal economics has made is the elaboration of the laws of private property. These are contained in it, at any rate, although not yet fully elaborated and clearly expressed. It follows that on all points where it is a question of deciding which is the shortest road to wealth—i.e., in all strictly economic controversies—the protagonists of free trade have right on their side. That is, needless to say, in controversies with the monopolists—not with the opponents of private property, for the English Socialists have long since proved both practically and theoretically that the latter are in a position to settle economic questions more correctly even from an economic point of view.

In the critique of political economy, therefore, we shall examine the basic categories, uncover the contradiction introduced by the free-trade system, and bring out the consequences of both sides of the contradiction.

The term national wealth has only arisen as a result of the liberal economists’ passion for generalisation. As long as private property exists, this term has no meaning. The “national wealth” of the English is very great and yet they are the poorest people under the sun. One must either discard this term completely, or accept such premises as give it meaning. Similarly with the terms...
national economy and political or public economy. In the present circumstances that science ought to be called private economy, for its public connections exist only for the sake of private property.

The immediate consequence of private property is trade—exchange of reciprocal requirements—buying and selling. This trade, like every activity, must under the dominion of private property become a direct source of gain for the trader; i.e., each must seek to sell as dear as possible and buy as cheap as possible. In every purchase and sale, therefore, two men with diametrically opposed interests confront each other. The confrontation is decidedly antagonistic, for each knows the intentions of the other—knows that they are opposed to his own. Therefore, the first consequence is mutual mistrust, on the one hand, and the justification of this mistrust—the application of immoral means to attain an immoral end—on the other. Thus, the first maxim in trade is secretiveness—the concealment of everything which might reduce the value of the article in question. The result is that in trade it is permitted to take the utmost advantage of the ignorance, the trust, of the opposing party, and likewise to impute qualities to one’s commodity which it does not possess. In a word, trade is legalised fraud. Any merchant who wants to give truth its due can bear me witness that actual practice conforms with this theory.

The mercantile system still had a certain artless Catholic candour and did not in the least conceal the immoral nature of trade. We have seen how it openly paraded its mean avarice. The mutually hostile attitude of the nations in the eighteenth century, loathsome envy and trade jealousy, were the logical consequences of trade as such. Public opinion had not yet become humanised. Why, therefore, conceal things which resulted from the inhuman, hostile nature of trade itself?

But when the economic Luther, Adam Smith, criticised past economics things had changed considerably. The century had been humanised; reason had asserted itself; morality began to claim its eternal right. The extorted trade treaties, the commercial wars, the strict isolation of the nations, offended too greatly against advanced consciousness. Protestant hypocrisy took the place of Catholic candour. Smith proved that humanity, too, was
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rooted in the nature of commerce; that commerce must become “among nations, as among individuals, a bond of union and friendship” instead of being “the most fertile source of discord and animosity” (cf. Wealth of Nations, Bk. 4, Ch. 3, § 2); that after all it lay in the nature of things for trade, taken overall, to be advantageous to all parties concerned.

Smith was right to eulogise trade as humane. There is nothing absolutely immoral in the world. Trade, too, has an aspect wherein it pays homage to morality and humanity. But what homage! The law of the strong hand, the open highway robbery of the Middle Ages, became humanised when it passed over into trade; and trade became humanised when its first stage characterised by the prohibition of the export of money passed over into the mercantile system. Then the mercantile system itself was humanised. Naturally, it is in the interest of the trader to be on good terms with the one from whom he buys cheap as well as with the other to whom he sells dear. A nation therefore acts very imprudently if it fosters feelings of animosity in its suppliers and customers. The more friendly, the more advantageous. Such is the humanity of trade. And this hypocritical way of misusing morality for immoral purposes is the pride of the free-trade system. “Have we not overthrown the barbarism of the monopolies?” exclaim the hypocrites. “Have we not carried civilisation to distant parts of the world? Have we not brought about the fraternisation of the peoples, and reduced the number of wars?” Yes, all this you have done—but how! You have destroyed the small monopolies so that the one great basic monopoly, property, may function the more freely and unrestrictedly. You have civilised the ends of the earth to win new terrain for the deployment of your vile avarice. You have brought about the fraternisation of the peoples—but the fraternity is the fraternity of thieves. You have reduced the number of wars—to earn all the bigger profits in peace, to intensify to the utmost the enmity between individuals, the ignominious war of competition! When have you done anything out of pure humanity, from consciousness of the futility of the opposition between the general and the individual interest? When have you been moral without being interested, without harbouring at the back of your mind immoral, egoistical motives?

By dissolving nationalities, the liberal economic system had done its best to universalise enmity, to transform mankind into a horde of ravenous beasts (for what else are competitors?) who devour one another just because each has identical interests with all the others—after this preparatory work there remained but one step
to take before the goal was reached, the dissolution of the family. To accomplish this, economy's own beautiful invention, the factory system, came to its aid. The last vestige of common interests, the community of goods in the possession of the family, has been undermined by the factory system and—at least here in England—is already in the process of dissolution. It is a common practice for children, as soon as they are capable of work (i.e., as soon as they reach the age of nine), to spend their wages themselves, to look upon their parental home as a mere boarding-house, and hand over to their parents a fixed amount for food and lodging. How can it be otherwise? What else can result from the separation of interests, such as forms the basis of the free-trade system? Once a principle is set in motion, it works by its own impetus through all its consequences, whether the economists like it or not.

But the economist does not know himself what cause he serves. He does not know that with all his egoistical reasoning he nevertheless forms but a link in the chain of mankind's universal progress. He does not know that by his dissolution of all sectional interests he merely paves the way for the great transformation to which the century is moving—the reconciliation of mankind with nature and with itself.

The next category established by trade is value. There is no dispute between the old and the modern economists over this category, just as there is none over all the others, since the monopolists in their obsessive mania for getting rich had no time left to concern themselves with categories. All controversies over such points stem from the modern economists.

The economist who lives by antitheses has also of course a double value—abstract or real value and exchange-value. There was a protracted quarrel over the nature of real value between the English, who defined the costs of production as the expression of real value, and the Frenchman Say, who claimed to measure this value by the utility of an object. The quarrel hung in doubt from the beginning of the century, then became dormant without a decision having been reached. The economists cannot decide anything.

The English—McCulloch and Ricardo in particular—thus assert that the abstract value of a thing is determined by the costs of production. Nota bene the abstract value, not the exchange-value,
the *exchangeable value*,\(^a\) value in exchange—that, they say, is something quite different. Why are the costs of production the measure of value? Because—listen to this!—because no one in ordinary conditions and leaving aside the circumstance of competition would sell an object for less than it costs him to produce it. Would sell? What have we to do with “selling” here, where it is not a question of value in *exchange*? So we find trade again, which we are specifically supposed to leave aside—and what trade! A trade in which the cardinal factor, the circumstance of competition, is not to be taken into account! First, an abstract value; now also an abstract trade—a trade without competition, i.e., a man without a body, a thought without a brain to produce thoughts. And does the economist never stop to think that as soon as competition is left out of account there is no guarantee at all that the producer will sell his commodity just at the cost of production? What confusion!

Furthermore: Let us concede for a moment that everything is as the economist says. Supposing someone were to make with tremendous exertion and at enormous cost something utterly useless, something which no one desires—is that also worth its production costs? Certainly not, says the economist: Who will want to buy it? So we suddenly have not only Say’s much decried utility but alongside it—with “buying”—the circumstance of competition. It can’t be done—the economist cannot for one moment hold on to his abstraction. Not only what he painfully seeks to remove—competition—but also what he attacks—utility—crops up at every moment. Abstract value and its determination by the costs of production are, after all, only abstractions, nonentities.

But let us suppose once more for a moment that the economist is correct—how then will he determine the costs of production without taking account of competition? When examining the costs of production we shall see that this category too is based on competition, and here once more it becomes evident how little the economist is able to substantiate his claims.

If we turn to Say, we find the same abstraction. The utility of an object is something purely subjective, something which cannot be decided absolutely, and certainly something which cannot be decided at least as long as one still roams about in antitheses. According to this theory, the necessities of life ought to possess more value than luxury articles. The only possible way to arrive at a more or less objective, *apparently* general decision on the greater

\(^a\) English term quoted by Engels.—*Ed.*
or lesser utility of an object is, under the dominion of private property, by competition; and yet it is precisely that circumstance which is to be left aside. But if competition is admitted production costs come in as well; for no one will sell for less than what he has himself invested in production. Thus, here, too, the one side of the opposition passes over involuntarily into the other.

Let us try to introduce clarity into this confusion. The value of an object includes both factors, which the contending parties arbitrarily separate—and, as we have seen, unsuccessfully. Value is the relation of production costs to utility. The first application of value is the decision as to whether a thing ought to be produced at all; i.e., as to whether utility counterbalances production costs. Only then can one talk of the application of value to exchange. The production costs of two objects being equal, the deciding factor determining their comparative value will be utility.

This basis is the only just basis of exchange. But if one proceeds from this basis, who is to decide the utility of the object? The mere opinion of the parties concerned? Then in any event one will be cheated. Or are we to assume a determination grounded in the inherent utility of the object independent of the parties concerned, and not apparent to them? If so, the exchange can only be effected by coercion, and each party considers itself cheated. The contradiction between the real inherent utility of the thing and the determination of that utility, between the determination of utility and the freedom of those who exchange, cannot be superseded without superseding private property; and once this is superseded, there can no longer be any question of exchange as it exists at present. The practical application of the concept of value will then be increasingly confined to the decision about production, and that is its proper sphere.

But how do matters stand at present? We have seen that the concept of value is violently torn asunder, and that each of the separate sides is declared to be the whole. Production costs, distorted from the outset by competition, are supposed to be value itself. So is mere subjective utility—since no other kind of utility can exist at present. To help these lame definitions on to their feet, it is in both cases necessary to have recourse to competition; and the best of it is that with the English competition represents utility, in contrast to the costs of production, whilst inversely with Say it introduces the costs of production in contrast to utility. But what kind of utility, what kind of production costs, does it introduce? Its utility depends on chance, on fashion, on the whim
of the rich; its production costs fluctuate with the fortuitous relationship of demand and supply.

The difference between real value and exchange-value is based on a fact—namely, that the value of a thing differs from the so-called equivalent given for it in trade; i.e., that this equivalent is not an equivalent. This so-called equivalent is the price of the thing, and if the economist were honest, he would employ this term for "value in exchange". But he has still to keep up some sort of pretence that price is somehow bound up with value, lest the immorality of trade become too obvious. It is, however, quite correct, and a fundamental law of private property, that price is determined by the reciprocal action of production costs and competition. This purely empirical law was the first to be discovered by the economist; and from this law he then abstracted his "real value", i.e., the price at the time when competition is in a state of equilibrium, when demand and supply cover each other. Then, of course, what remains over are the costs of production and it is these which the economist proceeds to call "real value", whereas it is merely a definite aspect of price. Thus everything in economics stands on its "head". Value, the primary factor, the source of price, is made dependent on price, its own product. As is well known, this inversion is the essence of abstraction; on which see Feuerbach.

According to the economists, the production costs of a commodity consist of three elements: the rent for the piece of land required to produce the raw material; the capital with its profit, and the wages for the labour required for production and manufacture. But it becomes immediately evident that capital and labour are identical, since the economists themselves confess that capital is "stored-up labour". We are therefore left with only two sides—the natural, objective side, land; and the human, subjective side, labour, which includes capital and, besides capital, a third factor which the economist does not think about—I mean the mental element of invention, of thought, alongside the physical element of sheer labour. What has the economist to do with inventiveness? Have not all inventions fallen into his lap without any effort on his part? Has one of them cost him anything? Why then should he bother about them in the calculation of production costs? Land, capital and labour are for him the conditions of wealth, and he requires nothing else. Science is no concern of his.
What does it matter to him that he has received its gifts through Berthollet, Davy, Liebig, Watt, Cartwright, etc.—gifts which have benefited him and his production immeasurably? He does not know how to calculate such things; the advances of science go beyond his figures. But in a rational order which has gone beyond the division of interests as it is found with the economist, the mental element certainly belongs among the elements of production and will find its place, too, in economics among the costs of production. And here it is certainly gratifying to know that the promotion of science also brings its material reward; to know that a single achievement of science like James Watt's steam-engine has brought in more for the world in the first fifty years of its existence than the world has spent on the promotion of science since the beginning of time.

We have, then, two elements of production in operation—nature and man, with man again active physically and mentally, and can now return to the economist and his production costs.

What cannot be monopolised has no value, says the economist—a proposition which we shall examine more closely later on. If we say "has no price", then the proposition is valid for the order which rests on private property. If land could be had as easily as air, no one would pay rent. Since this is not the case, but since, rather, the extent of a piece of land to be appropriated is limited in any particular case, one pays rent for the appropriated, i.e., the monopolised land, or one pays down a purchase price for it. After this enlightenment about the origin of the value of land it is, however, very strange to have to hear from the economist that the rent of land is the difference between the yield from the land for which rent is paid and from the worst land worth cultivating at all. As is well known, this is the definition of rent fully developed for the first time by Ricardo. This definition is indeed correct in practice if one presupposes that a fall in demand reacts instantaneously on rent, and at once puts a corresponding amount of the worst cultivated land out of cultivation. This, however, is not the case, and the definition is therefore inadequate. Moreover, it does not cover the causation of rent, and is therefore even for that reason untenable. In opposition to this definition, Col. T. P. Thompson, the champion of the Anti-Corn Law League,181 revived Adam Smith's definition, and substantiated it. According to him, rent is the relation between the competition of those striving for the use of the land and the limited quantity of available land.
Here at least is a return to the origin of rent; but this explanation does not take into account the varying fertility of the soil, just as the previous explanation leaves out competition.

Once more, therefore, we have two one-sided and hence only partial definitions of a single object. As in the case of the concept of value, we shall again have to combine these two definitions so as to find the correct definition which follows from the development of the thing itself and thus embraces all practice. Rent is the relation between the productivity of the land, the natural side (which in turn consists of natural fertility and human cultivation—labour applied to effect improvement), and the human side, competition. The economists may shake their heads over this "definition"; they will discover to their horror that it embraces everything relevant to this matter.

The landowner has nothing with which to reproach the merchant.

He practises robbery in monopolising the land. He practises robbery in exploiting for his own benefit the increase in population which increases competition and thus the value of his estate; in turning into a source of personal advantage that which has not been his own doing—that which is his by sheer accident. He practises robbery in leasing his land, when he eventually seizes for himself the improvements effected by his tenant. This is the secret of the ever-increasing wealth of the big landowners.

The axioms which qualify as robbery the landowner's method of deriving an income—namely, that each has a right to the product of his labour, or that no one shall reap where he has not sown—are not advanced by us. The first excludes the duty of feeding children; the second deprives each generation of the right to live, since each generation starts with what it inherits from the preceding generation. These axioms are, rather, consequences of private property. One should either put into effect the consequences or abandon private property as a premise.

Indeed, the original act of appropriation itself is justified by the assertion of the still earlier existence of common property rights. Thus, wherever we turn, private property leads us into contradictions.

To make land an object of huckstering—the land which is our one and all, the first condition of our existence—was the last step towards making oneself an object of huckstering. It was and is to this very day an immorality surpassed only by the immorality of self-alienation. And the original appropriation—the monopolisation of the land by a few, the exclusion of the rest from that which
is the condition of their life—yields nothing in immorality to the subsequent huckstering of the land.

If here again we abandon private property, rent is reduced to its truth, to the rational notion which essentially lies at its root. The value of the land divorced from it as rent then reverts to the land itself. This value, to be measured by the productivity of equal areas of land subjected to equal applications of labour, is indeed taken into account as part of the production costs when determining the value of products; and like rent, it is the relation of productivity to competition—but to true competition, such as will be developed when its time comes.

We have seen that capital and labour are initially identical; we see further from the explanations of the economist himself that, in the process of production, capital, the result of labour, is immediately transformed again into the substratum, into the material of labour; and that therefore the momentarily postulated separation of capital from labour is immediately superseded by the unity of both. And yet the economist separates capital from labour, and yet clings to the division without giving any other recognition to their unity than by his definition of capital as "stored-up labour". The split between capital and labour resulting from private property is nothing but the inner dichotomy of labour corresponding to this divided condition and arising out of it. And after this separation is accomplished, capital is divided once more into the original capital and profit—the increment of capital, which it receives in the process of production; although in practice profit is immediately lumped together with capital and set into motion with it. Indeed, even profit is in its turn split into interest and profit proper. In the case of interest, the absurdity of these splits is carried to the extreme. The immorality of lending at interest, of receiving without working, merely for making a loan, though already implied in private property, is only too obvious, and has long ago been recognised for what it is by unprejudiced popular consciousness, which in such matters is usually right. All these subtle splits and divisions stem from the original separation of capital from labour and from the culmination of this separation—the division of mankind into capitalists and workers—a division which daily becomes ever more acute, and which, as we shall see, is bound to deepen. This separation, however, like the separation already considered of land from capital and labour,
in the final analysis an impossible separation. What share land, capital and labour each have in any particular product cannot be determined. The three magnitudes are incommensurable. The land produces the raw material, but not without capital and labour. Capital presupposes land and labour. And labour presupposes at least land, and usually also capital. The functions of these three elements are completely different, and are not to be measured by a fourth common standard. Therefore, when it comes to dividing the proceeds among the three elements under existing conditions, there is no inherent standard; it is an entirely alien and with regard to them fortuitous standard that decides—competition, the cunning right of the stronger. Rent implies competition; profit on capital is solely determined by competition; and the position with regard to wages we shall see presently.

If we abandon private property, then all these unnatural divisions disappear. The difference between interest and profit disappears; capital is nothing without labour, without movement. The significance of profit is reduced to the weight which capital carries in the determination of the costs of production; and profit thus remains inherent in capital, in the same way as capital itself reverts to its original unity with labour.

Labour—the main factor in production, the “source of wealth”, free human activity—comes off badly with the economist. Just as capital has already been separated from labour, so labour is now in turn split for a second time: the product of labour confronts labour as wages, is separated from it, and is in its turn as usual determined by competition—there being, as we have seen, no firm standard determining labour's share in production. If we do away with private property, this unnatural separation also disappears. Labour becomes its own reward, and the true significance of the wages of labour, hitherto alienated, comes to light—namely, the significance of labour for the determination of the production costs of a thing.

We have seen that in the end everything comes down to competition, so long as private property exists. It is the economist's principal category—his most beloved daughter, whom he ceaselessly caresses—and look out for the Medusa's head which she will show you!
The immediate consequence of private property was the split of production into two opposing sides—the natural and the human sides, the soil which without fertilisation by man is dead and sterile, and human activity, the first condition of which is that very soil. Furthermore we have seen how human activity in its turn was dissolved into labour and capital, and how these two sides antagonistically confronted each other. Thus we already had the struggle of the three elements against one another, instead of their mutual support; now we have to add that private property brings in its wake the fragmentation of each of these elements. One piece of land stands confronted by another, one capital by another, one labourer by another. In other words, because private property isolates everyone in his own crude solitariness, and because, nevertheless, everyone has the same interest as his neighbour, one landowner stands antagonistically confronted by another, one capitalist by another, one worker by another. In this discord of identical interests resulting precisely from this identity is consummated the immorality of mankind's condition hitherto; and this consummation is competition.

The opposite of competition is monopoly. Monopoly was the war-cry of the Mercantilists; competition the battle-cry of the liberal economists. It is easy to see that this antithesis is again a quite hollow antithesis. Every competitor cannot but desire to have the monopoly, be he worker, capitalist or landowner. Each smaller group of competitors cannot but desire to have the monopoly for itself against all others. Competition is based on self-interest, and self-interest in turn breeds monopoly. In short, competition passes over into monopoly. On the other hand, monopoly cannot stem the tide of competition—indeed, it itself breeds competition; just as a prohibition of imports, for instance, or high tariffs positively breed the competition of smuggling. The contradiction of competition is exactly the same as that of private property. It is in the interest of each to possess everything, but in the interest of the whole that each possess an equal amount. Thus, the general and the individual interest are diametrically opposed to each other. The contradiction of competition is that each cannot but desire the monopoly, whilst the whole as such is bound to lose by monopoly and must therefore remove it. Moreover, competition already presupposes monopoly—namely, the monopoly of property (and here the hypocrisy of the liberals comes once more to light); and so long as the monopoly of property exists, for so long the
possession of monopoly is equally justified— for monopoly, once it exists, is also property. What a pitiful half-measure, therefore, to attack the small monopolies, and to leave untouched the basic monopoly! And if we add to this the economist’s proposition mentioned above, that nothing has value which cannot be monopolised—that nothing, therefore, which does not permit of such monopolisation can enter this arena of competition—then our assertion that competition presupposes monopoly is completely justified.

The law of competition is that demand and supply always strive to complement each other, and therefore never do so. The two sides are torn apart again and transformed into flat opposition. Supply always follows close on demand without ever quite covering it. It is either too big or too small, never corresponding to demand; because in this unconscious condition of mankind no one knows how big supply or demand is. If demand is greater than supply the price rises and, as a result, supply is to a certain degree stimulated. As soon as it comes on to the market, prices fall; and if it becomes greater than demand, then the fall in prices is so significant that demand is once again stimulated. So it goes on unendingly—a permanently unhealthy state of affairs—a constant alternation of over-stimulation and flagging which precludes all advance—a state of perpetual fluctuation without ever reaching its goal. This law with its constant adjustment, in which whatever is lost here is gained there, is regarded as something excellent by the economist. It is his chief glory—he cannot see enough of it, and considers it in all its possible and impossible applications. Yet it is obvious that this law is purely a law of nature and not a law of the mind. It is a law which produces revolution. The economist comes along with his lovely theory of demand and supply, proves to you that “one can never produce too much”, and practice replies with trade crises, which reappear as regularly as the comets, and of which we have now on the average one every five to seven years. For the last eighty years these trade crises have arrived just as regularly as the great plagues did in the past—and they have brought in their train more misery and more immorality than the latter. (Compare Wade: History of the Middle and Working Classes, London, 1835, p. 211.) Of course, these commercial upheavals confirm the law, confirm it exhaustively—but in a manner different from that which the economist would have us believe to be the case. What are we to think of a
law which can only assert itself through periodic upheavals? It is certainly a natural law based on the unconsciousness of the participants. If the producers as such knew how much the consumers required, if they were to organise production, if they were to share it out amongst themselves, then the fluctuations of competition and its tendency to crisis would be impossible. Carry on production consciously as human beings—not as dispersed atoms without consciousness of your species—and you have overcome all these artificial and untenable antitheses. But as long as you continue to produce in the present unconscious, thoughtless manner, at the mercy of chance—for just so long trade crises will remain; and each successive crisis is bound to become more universal and therefore worse than the preceding one; is bound to impoverish a larger body of small capitalists, and to augment in increasing proportion the numbers of the class who live by labour alone, thus considerably enlarging the mass of labour to be employed (the major problem of our economists) and finally causing a social revolution such as has never been dreamt of in the philosophy of the economists.

The perpetual fluctuation of prices such as is created by the condition of competition completely deprives trade of its last vestige of morality. It is no longer a question of value; the same system which appears to attach such importance to value, which confers on the abstraction of value in money form the honour of having an existence of its own—this very system destroys by means of competition the inherent value of all things, and daily and hourly changes the value-relationship of all things to one another. Where is there any possibility remaining in this whirlpool of an exchange based on a moral foundation? In this continuous up-and-down, everyone must seek to hit upon the most favourable moment for purchase and sale; everyone must become a speculator—that is to say, must reap where he has not sown; must enrich himself at the expense of others, must calculate on the misfortune of others, or let chance win for him. The speculator always counts on disasters, particularly on bad harvests. He utilises everything—for instance, the New York fire in its time—and immorality's culminating point is the speculation on the Stock Exchange, where history, and with it mankind, is demoted to a means of gratifying the avarice of the calculating or gambling speculator. And let not the honest "respectable" merchant rise above the gambling on the Stock Exchange with a Pharisaic "I
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thank thee, O Lord..." etc. He is as bad as the speculators in stocks and shares. He speculates just as much as they do. He has to: competition compels him to. And his trading activity therefore implies the same immorality as theirs. The truth of the relation of competition is the relation of consumption to productivity. In a world worthy of mankind there will be no other competition than this. The community will have to calculate what it can produce with the means at its disposal; and in accordance with the relationship of this productive power to the mass of consumers it will determine how far it has to raise or lower production, how far it has to give way to, or curtail, luxury. But so that they may be able to pass a correct judgment on this relationship and on the increase in productive power to be expected from a rational state of affairs within the community, I invite my readers to consult the writings of the English Socialists, and partly also those of Fourier.

Subjective competition—the contest of capital against capital, of labour against labour, etc.—will under these conditions be reduced to the spirit of emulation grounded in human nature (a concept tolerably set forth so far only by Fourier), which after the transcendence of opposing interests will be confined to its proper and rational sphere.

The struggle of capital against capital, of labour against labour, of land against land, drives production to a fever-pitch at which production turns all natural and rational relations upside-down. No capital can stand the competition of another if it is not brought to the highest pitch of activity. No piece of land can be profitably cultivated if it does not continuously increase its productivity. No worker can hold his own against his competitors if he does not devote all his energy to labour. No one at all who enters into the struggle of competition can weather it without the utmost exertion of his energy, without renouncing every truly human purpose. The consequence of this over-exertion on the one side is, inevitably, slackening on the other. When the fluctuation of competition is small, when demand and supply, consumption and production, are almost equal, a stage must be reached in the development of production where there is so much superfluous productive power that the great mass of the nation has nothing to live on, that the people starve from sheer abundance. For some considerable time England has found herself in this crazy position, in this living absurdity. When production is subject to greater fluctuations, as it
is bound to be in consequence of such a situation, then the alternation of boom and crisis, over-production and slump, sets in. The economist has never been able to find an explanation for this mad situation. In order to explain it, he invented the population theory, which is just as senseless—indeed even more senseless than the contradiction of coexisting wealth and poverty. The economist could not afford to see the truth; he could not afford to admit that this contradiction is a simple consequence of competition; for in that case his entire system would have fallen to bits.

For us the matter is easy to explain. The productive power at mankind's disposal is immeasurable. The productivity of the soil can be increased ad infinitum by the application of capital, labour and science. According to the most able economists and statisticians (cf. Alison's Principles of Population, Vol. I, Chs. 1 and 2), "over-populated" Great Britain can be brought within ten years to produce a corn yield sufficient for a population six times its present size. Capital increases daily; labour power grows with population; and day by day science increasingly makes the forces of nature subject to man. This immeasurable productive capacity, handled consciously and in the interest of all, would soon reduce to a minimum the labour falling to the share of mankind. Left to competition, it does the same, but within a context of antitheses. One part of the land is cultivated in the best possible manner, whilst another part—in Great Britain and Ireland thirty million acres of good land—lies barren. One part of capital circulates with colossal speed; another lies dead in the chest. One part of the workers works fourteen or sixteen hours a day, whilst another part stands idle and inactive, and starves. Or the partition leaves this realm of simultaneity: today trade is good; demand is very considerable; everyone works; capital is turned over with miraculous speed; farming flourishes; the workers work themselves sick. Tomorrow stagnation sets in. The cultivation of the land is not worth the effort; entire stretches of land remain untilled; the flow of capital suddenly freezes; the workers have no employment, and the whole country labours under surplus wealth and surplus population.

The economist cannot afford to accept this exposition of the subject as correct; otherwise, as has been said, he would have to give up his whole system of competition. He would have to recognise the hollowness of his antithesis of production and consumption, of surplus population and surplus wealth. To bring fact and theory into conformity with each other—since this fact simply could not be denied—the population theory was invented.
Malthus, the originator of this doctrine, maintains that population is always pressing on the means of subsistence; that as soon as production increases, population increases in the same proportion; and that the inherent tendency of the population to multiply in excess of the available means of subsistence is the root of all misery and all vice. For, when there are too many people, they have to be disposed of in one way or another: either they must be killed by violence or they must starve. But when this has happened, there is once more a gap which other multipliers of the population immediately start to fill up once more: and so the old misery begins all over again. What is more, this is the case in all circumstances—not only in civilised, but also in primitive conditions. In New Holland, with a population density of one per square mile, the savages suffer just as much from over-population as England. In short, if we want to be consistent, we must admit that the earth was already over-populated when only one man existed. The implications of this line of thought are that since it is precisely the poor who are the surplus, nothing should be done for them except to make their dying of starvation as easy as possible, and to convince them that it cannot be helped and that there is no other salvation for their whole class than keeping propagation down to the absolute minimum. Or if this proves impossible, then it is after all better to establish a state institution for the painless killing of the children of the poor, such as "Marcus" has suggested, whereby each working-class family would be allowed to have two and a half children, any excess being painlessly killed. Charity is to be considered a crime, since it supports the augmentation of the surplus population. Indeed, it will be very advantageous to declare poverty a crime and to turn poor-houses into prisons, as has already happened in England as a result of the new "liberal" Poor Law. Admittedly it is true that this theory ill conforms with the Bible's doctrine of the perfection of God and of His creation; but "it is a poor refutation to enlist the Bible against facts".

Am I to go on any longer elaborating this vile, infamous theory, this hideous blasphemy against nature and mankind? Am I to pursue its consequences any further? Here at last we have the immorality of the economist brought to its highest pitch. What are all the wars and horrors of the monopoly system compared with this theory! And it is just this theory which is the keystone of the liberal system of free trade, whose fall entails the downfall of the entire edifice. For if here competition is proved to be the cause of

---

a The old name for Australia.—Ed.
misery, poverty and crime, who then will still dare to speak up for it?

In his above-mentioned work, Alison has shaken the Malthusian theory by bringing in the productive power of the land, and by opposing to the Malthusian principle the fact that each adult can produce more than he himself needs—a fact without which mankind could not multiply, indeed could not even exist; if it were not so how could those still growing up live? But Alison does not go to the root of the matter, and therefore in the end reaches the same conclusion as Malthus. True enough, he proves that Malthus' principle is incorrect, but cannot gainsay the facts which have impelled Malthus to his principle.

If Malthus had not considered the matter so one-sidedly, he could not have failed to see that surplus population or labour-power is invariably tied up with surplus wealth, surplus capital and surplus landed property. The population is only too large where the productive power as a whole is too large. The condition of every over-populated country, particularly England, since the time when Malthus wrote, makes this abundantly clear. These were the facts which Malthus ought to have considered in their totality, and whose consideration was bound to have led to the correct conclusion. Instead, he selected one fact, gave no consideration to the others, and therefore arrived at his crazy conclusion. The second error he committed was to confuse means of subsistence with [means of] employment. That population is always pressing on the means of employment—that the number of people produced depends on the number of people who can be employed—in short, that the production of labour-power has been regulated so far by the law of competition and is therefore also exposed to periodic crises and fluctuations—this is a fact whose establishment constitutes Malthus' merit. But the means of employment are not the means of subsistence. Only in their end-result are the means of employment increased by the increase in machine-power and capital. The means of subsistence increase as soon as productive power increases even slightly. Here a new contradiction in economics comes to light. The economist's "demand" is not the real demand; his "consumption" is an artificial consumption. For the economist, only that person really demands, only that person is a real consumer, who has an equivalent to offer for what he receives. But if it is a fact that every adult produces more than he himself can consume, that children are like trees which give superabundant returns on the outlays invested in them—and these certainly are facts, are they not?—then it must be assumed that each worker ought to be able to produce far
more than he needs and that the community, therefore, ought to be very glad to provide him with everything he needs; one must consider a large family to be a very welcome gift for the community. But the economist, with his crude outlook, knows no other equivalent than that which is paid to him in tangible ready cash. He is so firmly set in his antitheses that the most striking facts are of as little concern to him as the most scientific principles.

We destroy the contradiction simply by transcending it. With the fusion of the interests now opposed to each other there disappears the contradiction between excess population here and excess wealth there; there disappears the miraculous fact (more miraculous than all the miracles of all the religions put together) that a nation has to starve from sheer wealth and plenty; and there disappears the crazy assertion that the earth lacks the power to feed men. This assertion is the pinnacle of Christian economics—and that our economics is essentially Christian I could have proved from every proposition, from every category, and shall in fact do so in due course. The Malthusian theory is but the economic expression of the religious dogma of the contradiction of spirit and nature and the resulting corruption of both. As regards religion, and together with religion, this contradiction was resolved long ago, and I hope that in the sphere of economics I have likewise demonstrated the utter emptiness of this contradiction. Moreover, I shall not accept as competent any defence of the Malthusian theory which does not explain to me on the basis of its own principles how a people can starve from sheer plenty and bring this into harmony with reason and fact.

At the same time, the Malthusian theory has certainly been a necessary point of transition which has taken us an immense step further. Thanks to this theory, as to economics as a whole, our attention has been drawn to the productive power of the earth and of mankind; and after overcoming this economic despair we have been made for ever secure against the fear of overpopulation. We derive from it the most powerful economic arguments for a social transformation. For even if Malthus were completely right, this transformation would have to be undertaken straight away; for only this transformation, only the education of the masses which it provides, makes possible that moral restraint of the propagative instinct which Malthus himself presents as the most effective and easiest remedy for over-population. Through this theory we have come to know the deepest degradation of mankind, their dependence on the conditions of competition. It has shown us how in the last instance private property has turned man
into a commodity whose production and destruction also depend solely on demand; how the system of competition has thus slaughtered, and daily continues to slaughter, millions of men. All this we have seen, and all this drives us to the abolition of this degradation of mankind through the abolition of private property, competition and the opposing interests.

Yet, so as to deprive the universal fear of over-population of any possible basis, let us once more return to the relationship of productive power to population. Malthus establishes a formula on which he bases his entire system: population is said to increase in a geometrical progression—\[1+2+4+8+16+32, \text{ etc.;}\] the productive power of the land in an arithmetical progression—\[1+2+3+4+5+6.\] The difference is obvious, is terrifying; but is it correct? Where has it been proved that the productivity of the land increases in an arithmetical progression? The extent of land is limited. All right! The labour-power to be employed on this land-surface increases with population. Even if we assume that the increase in yield due to increase in labour does not always rise in proportion to the labour, there still remains a third element which, admittedly, never means anything to the economist—science—whose progress is as unlimited and at least as rapid as that of population. What progress does the agriculture of this century owe to chemistry alone—indeed, to two men alone, Sir Humphry Davy and Justus Liebig! But science increases at least as much as population. The latter increases in proportion to the size of the previous generation, science advances in proportion to the knowledge bequeathed to it by the previous generation, and thus under the most ordinary conditions also in a geometrical progression. And what is impossible to science? But it is absurd to talk of over-population so long as “there is enough waste land in the valley of the Mississippi for the whole population of Europe to be transplanted there”\(^2\); so long as no more than one-third of the earth can be considered cultivated, and so long as the production of this third itself can be raised sixfold and more by the application of improvements already known.

Thus, competition sets capital against capital, labour against labour, landed property against landed property; and likewise each of these elements against the other two. In the struggle the stronger wins; and in order to predict the outcome of the struggle,
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\(^2\) A. Alison, loc. cit., p. 548.—Ed.
we shall have to investigate the strength of the contestants. First of all, labour is weaker than either landed property or capital, for the worker must work to live, whilst the landowner can live on his rent, and the capitalist on his interest, or, if the need arises, on his capital or on capitalised property in land. The result is that only the very barest necessities, the mere means of subsistence, fall to the lot of labour; whilst the largest part of the products is shared between capital and landed property. Moreover, the stronger worker drives the weaker out of the market, just as larger capital drives out smaller capital, and larger landed property drives out smaller landed property. Practice confirms this conclusion. The advantages which the larger manufacturer and merchant enjoy over the smaller, and the big landowner over the owner of a single acre, are well known. The result is that already under ordinary conditions, in accordance with the law of the stronger, large capital and large landed property swallow small capital and small landed property—i.e., centralisation of property. In crises of trade and agriculture, this centralisation proceeds much more rapidly.

In general large property increases much more rapidly than small property, since a much smaller portion is deducted from its proceeds as property-expenses. This law of the centralisation of private property is as immanent in private property as all the others. The middle classes must increasingly disappear until the world is divided into millionaires and paupers, into large landowners and poor farm labourers. All the laws, all the dividing of landed property, all the possible splitting-up of capital, are of no avail: this result must and will come, unless it is anticipated by a total transformation of social conditions, a fusion of opposed interests, an abolition of private property.

Free competition, the key-word of our present-day economists, is an impossibility. Monopoly at least intended to protect the consumer against fraud, even if it could not in fact do so. The abolition of monopoly, however, opens the door wide to fraud. You say that competition carries with it the remedy for fraud, since no one will buy bad articles. But that means that everyone has to be an expert in every article, which is impossible. Hence the necessity for monopoly, which many articles in fact reveal. Pharmacies, etc., must have a monopoly. And the most important article—money—requires a monopoly most of all. Whenever the circulating medium has ceased to be a state monopoly it has invariably produced a trade crisis; and the English economists, Dr. Wade among them, do concede in this case the necessity for monopoly. But monopoly is no protection against counterfeit
money. One can take one's stand on either side of the question: the one is as difficult as the other. Monopoly produces free competition, and the latter, in turn, produces monopoly. Therefore, both must fall, and these difficulties must be resolved through the transcendence of the principle which gives rise to them.

Competition has penetrated all the relationships of our life and completed the reciprocal bondage in which men now hold themselves. Competition is the great mainspring which again and again jerks into activity our aging and withering social order, or rather disorder; but with each new exertion it also saps a part of this order's waning strength. Competition governs the numerical advance of mankind; it likewise governs its moral advance. Anyone who has any knowledge of the statistics of crime must have been struck by the peculiar regularity with which crime advances year by year, and with which certain causes produce certain crimes. The extension of the factory system is followed everywhere by an increase in crime. The number of arrests, of criminal cases—indeed, the number of murders, burglaries, petty thefts, etc., for a large town or for a district—can be predicted year by year with unfailing precision, as has been done often enough in England. This regularity proves that crime, too, is governed by competition; that society creates a demand for crime which is met by a corresponding supply; that the gap created by the arrest, transportation or execution of a certain number is at once filled by others, just as every gap in population is at once filled by new arrivals; in other words, that crime presses on the means of punishment just as the people press on the means of employment. How just it is to punish criminals under these circumstances, quite apart from any other considerations, I leave to the judgment of my readers. Here I am merely concerned in demonstrating the extension of competition into the moral sphere, and in showing to what deep degradation private property has brought man.

In the struggle of capital and land against labour, the first two elements enjoy yet another special advantage over labour—the assistance of science; for in present conditions science, too, is directed against labour. Almost all mechanical inventions, for instance, have been occasioned by the lack of labour-power; in particular Hargreaves', Crompton's and Arkwright's cotton-spinning machines. There has never been an intense demand for labour which did not result in an invention that increased labour
productivity considerably, thus diverting demand away from human labour. The history of England from 1770 until now is a continuous demonstration of this. The last great invention in cotton-spinning, the self-acting mule, was occasioned solely by the demand for labour, and rising wages. It doubled machine-labour, and thereby cut down hand-labour by half; it threw half the workers out of employment, and thereby reduced the wages of the others by half; it crushed a plot of the workers against the factory owners, and destroyed the last vestige of strength with which labour had still held out in the unequal struggle against capital. (Cf. Dr. Ure, Philosophy of Manufactures, Vol. 2.) The economist now says, however, that in its final result machinery is favourable to the workers, since it makes production cheaper and thereby creates a new and larger market for its products, and thus ultimately re-employs the workers put out of work. Quite right. But is the economist forgetting, then, that the production of labour-power is regulated by competition; that labour-power is always pressing on the means of employment, and that, therefore, when these advantages are due to become operative, a surplus of competitors for work is already waiting for them, and will thus render these advantages illusory; whilst the disadvantages—the sudden withdrawal of the means of subsistence from one half of the workers and the fall in wages for the other half—are not illusory? Is the economist forgetting that the progress of invention never stands still, and that these disadvantages, therefore, perpetuate themselves? Is he forgetting that with the division of labour, developed to such a high degree by our civilisation, a worker can only live if he can be used at this particular machine for this particular detailed operation; that the change-over from one type of employment to another, newer type is almost invariably an absolute impossibility for the adult worker?

In turning my attention to the effects of machinery, I am brought to another subject less directly relevant—the factory system; and I have neither the inclination nor the time to treat this here. Besides, I hope to have an early opportunity to expound in detail the despicable immorality of this system, and to expose mercilessly the economist's hypocrisy which here appears in all its brazeness.\textsuperscript{186}

Written in October and November 1843
First published in the Deutsch-Françösische Jahrbücher, 1844
Signed: Frederick Engels in Manchester
Of all the fat books and thin pamphlets which have appeared in England in the past year for the entertainment or edification of "educated society", the above work is the only one which is worth reading. All the multi-volume novels with their sad and amusing intricacies, all the edifying and meditative, scholarly and unscholarly Bible commentaries—and novels and books of edification are the two staples of English literature—all these you may with an easy conscience leave unread. Perhaps you will find some books on geology, economics, history or mathematics which contain a small grain of novelty—however these are matters which one studies, but does not read, they represent dry, specialised branches of science, arid botanising, plants whose roots were long ago torn out of the general soil of humanity from which they derived their nourishment. Search as you will, Carlyle's book is the only one which strikes a human chord, presents human relations and shows traces of a human point of view.

It is remarkable how greatly the upper classes of society, such as the Englishman calls "respectable people", or "the better sort of people", etc., have intellectually declined and lost their vigour in England. All energy, all activity, all substance are gone; the landed aristocracy goes hunting, the moneyed aristocracy makes entries in the ledger and at best dabbles in literature which is equally empty and insipid. Political and religious prejudices are inherited from one generation to another; everything is now made easy and there is no longer any need to worry about principles as one had to formerly; they are now picked up already in the cradle, ready-

* The words in inverted commas are given by Engels in English.—Ed.
made, one has no notion where they come from. What more does one need? One has enjoyed a good education, that is, one has been tormented to no avail with the Romans and Greeks at school, for the rest one is "respectable", that is, one has so many thousand pounds to one's name and thus does not have to bother about anything except marrying, if one does not already have a wife.

And now, to cap it all, this bugbear which people call "intellect"! Where should intellect come from, in such a life, and if it did come, where might it find a home with them? Everything there is as fixed and formalised as in China—woe be to the man who oversteps the narrow bounds, woe, thrice woe to the man who offends against a time-honoured prejudice, nine times woe to him if it is a religious prejudice. For all questions they have just two answers, a Whig answer and a Tory answer; and these answers were long ago prescribed by the sage supreme masters of ceremony of both parties, you have no need of deliberation and circumstantiality, everything is cut and dried, Dicky Cobden or Lord John Russell has said this, and Bobby Peel or the Duke, that is, the Duke of Wellington, has said that, and that is an end of the matter.

You good Germans are told year in, year out by the liberal journalists and parliamentarians what wonderful people, what independent men the English are, and all on account of their free institutions, and from a distance it all looks quite impressive. The debates in the Houses of Parliament, the free press, the tumultuous popular meetings, the elections, the jury system—these cannot fail to impress the timid spirit of the average German, and in his astonishment he takes all these splendid appearances for true coin. But ultimately the position of the liberal journalist and parliamentarian is really far from being elevated enough to provide a comprehensive view, whether it be of the development of mankind or just that of a single nation. The English Constitution was quite good in its day and has achieved a fair number of good things, indeed since 1828 it has set to work on its greatest achievement—that is to say, on its own destruction—but it has not achieved what the liberal attributes to it. It has not made independent men of the English. The English, that is, the educated English, according to whom the national character is judged on the Continent, these English are the most despicable slaves under the sun. Only that part of the English nation which is unknown on the Continent, only the workers, the pariahs of England, the poor, are really respectable, for all their roughness
and for all their moral degradation. It is from them that England's salvation will come, they still comprise flexible material; they have no education, but no prejudices either, they still have the strength for a great national deed—they still have a future. The aristocracy—and nowadays that also includes the middle classes—has exhausted itself; such ideas as it had, have been worked out and utilised to their ultimate logical limit, and its rule is approaching its end with giant strides. The Constitution is its work, and the immediate consequence of this work was that it entangled its creators in a mesh of institutions in which any free intellectual movement has been made impossible. The rule of public prejudice is everywhere the first consequence of so-called free political institutions, and in England, the politically freest country in Europe, this rule is stronger than anywhere else—except for North America, where public prejudice is legally acknowledged as a power in the state by lynch law. The Englishman crawls before public prejudice, he immolates himself to it daily—and the more liberal he is, the more humbly does he grovel in the dust before his idol. Public prejudice in "educated society" is however either of Tory or of Whig persuasion, or at best radical—and even that no longer has quite the odour of propriety. If you should go amongst educated Englishmen and say that you are Chartists or democrats—the balance of your mind will be doubted and your company fled. Or declare you do not believe in the divinity of Christ, and you are done for; if moreover you confess that you are atheists, the next day people will pretend not to know you. And when the independent Englishman for once—and this happens rarely enough—really begins to think and shakes off the fetters of prejudice he has absorbed with his mother's milk, even then he has not the courage to speak out his convictions openly, even then he feigns an opinion before society that is at least tolerated, and is quite content if occasionally he can discuss his views with some like-minded person in private.

Thus the minds of the educated classes in England are closed to all progress and only kept to some degree in movement by the pressure of the working class. It cannot be expected that the literary diet of their decrepit culture should be different from these classes themselves. The whole of fashionable literature moves in a never-ending circle and is just as boring and sterile as this blasé and effete fashionable society.

When Strauss' Das Leben Jesu and its fame crossed the Channel, no respectable man dared to translate the book, nor any bookseller of repute to print it. Finally it was translated by a socialist
"lecturer" (there is no German word for this propagandist term)—a man, therefore, in one of the world’s least fashionable situations—a small socialist printer printed it in instalments at a penny each, and the workers of Manchester, Birmingham and London were the only readers Strauss had in England.

If, by the way, either of the two parties into which the educated section of the English people is split deserves any preference, it is the Tories. In the social circumstances of England the Whig is himself too much of an interested party to be able to judge; industry, that focal point of English society, is in his hands and makes him rich; he can find no fault in it and considers its expansion the only purpose of all legislation, for it has given him his wealth and his power. The Tory on the other hand, whose power and unchallenged dominance have been broken by industry and whose principles have been shaken by it, hates it and sees in it at best a necessary evil. This is the reason for the formation of that group of philanthropic Tories whose chief leaders are Lord Ashley, Ferrand, Walter, Oastler, etc., and who have made it their duty to take the part of the factory workers against the manufacturers. Thomas Carlyle too was originally a Tory and still stands closer to that party than to the Whigs. This much is certain: a Whig would never have been able to write a book that was half so humane as *Past and Present.*

Thomas Carlyle has become known in Germany through his efforts to make German literature accessible to the English. For several years he has been mainly occupied with the social conditions of England—the only educated man of his country to do so!—and as early as 1838 he wrote a brief work entitled *Chartism.* At that time the Whigs were in office and proclaimed with much trumpeting that the “spectre” of Chartism, which had arisen round 1835, was now destroyed. Chartism was the natural successor to the old radicalism which had been appeased for a few years by the Reform Bill and reappeared in 1835-36 with new strength and with its ranks more solid than ever before. The Whigs thought they had suppressed this Chartism, and Thomas Carlyle took this as his cue to expound the real causes of Chartism and the impossibility of eradicating it before these causes were eradicated. It is true that as a whole the position taken by that book is the same as in *Past and Present,* though with rather stronger Tory colouring, but this is perhaps merely a result of the fact that the Whigs as the ruling party were the most open to criticism. At all events, everything that is in the smaller book is to be found in *Past and Present,* with greater clarity, with the argument
further developed, and with an explicit description of the consequences, and therefore makes a critical analysis of Chartism on our part superfluous.

*Past and Present* is a parallel between England in the twelfth and in the nineteenth centuries and consists of four sections, entitled “Proem”, “The Ancient Monk”, “The Modern Worker” and “Horoscope”. Let us consider these sections in turn; I cannot resist the temptation to translate the finest of the book’s often marvellously fine passages.—Criticism will no doubt take care of itself.

The first chapter of the “Proem” is called “Midas”.

"The condition of England ... is justly regarded as one of the most ominous, and withal one of the strangest, ever seen in this world. England is full of wealth [...] in every kind; yet England is dying of inanition. With unabated bounty the land of England blooms and grows; waving with yellow harvests; thick-studded with workshops, industrial implements, with fifteen millions of workers, understood to be the strongest, the cunningest and the willingest our Earth ever had; these men are here; the work they have done, the fruit they have realised is here, abundant, exuberant on every hand of us: and behold, some baleful fiat as of Enchantment has gone forth, saying, "Touch it not, ye workers, ye master-workers, ye master-idlers; none of you can touch it, no man of you shall be the better for it; this is enchanted fruit!"

This fiat falls on the workers first. In 1842 England and Wales counted 1,430,000 paupers, of whom 222,000 were incarcerated in workhouses—Poor-law Bastilles the common people call them.—Thanks to the humanity of the Whigs! Scotland has no poor law, but poor people in plenty. Ireland, incidentally, can boast of the gigantic number of 2,300,000 paupers.

"At Stockport Assizes" (Cheshire) “a Mother and a Father are arraigned and found guilty of poisoning three of their children, to defraud a ‘burial-society’ of some £1 8s. due on the death of each child: [...] and the official authorities, it is whispered, hint that perhaps the case is not solitary, that perhaps you had better not probe farther into that department of things.... Such instances are like the highest mountain apex emerged into view; under which lies a whole mountain region and land, not yet emerged. A human Mother and Father had said to themselves, What shall we do to escape starvation? We are deep sunk here, in our dark cellar; and help is far.—Yes, in the Ugolino Hunger-tower stern things happen; best-loved little Gaddo fallen dead on his Father’s knees!—The Stockport Mother and Father think and hint: Our poor little starveling Tom, who cries all day for victuals, who will see only evil and not good in this world: if he were out of misery at once; ... and the rest of us perhaps kept alive? It is thought, and hinted; at last it is done. And now Tom being killed, and all spent and eaten, Is it poor little starveling Jack that must go, or poor little starveling Will?—What an inquiry of ways and means!

"In starved sieged cities, in the uttermost doomed ruin of old Jerusalem fallen under the wrath of God, it was prophesied and said, ‘The hands of the pitiful..."
women have sodden their own children.' The stern Hebrew imagination could conceive no blacker gulf of wretchedness; that was the ultimatum of degraded god-punished man. And we here, in modern England, exuberant with supply of all kinds, [...] are we reaching that?—How come these things? Wherefore are they, wherefore should they be?"  

This happened in 1841. I would add that five months ago Betty Eules of Bolton was hanged in Liverpool; she had poisoned three children of her own and two stepchildren for the same reason.

So much for the poor. How do things stand with the rich?

"This successful industry of England, with its plethoric wealth, has as yet made nobody rich; it is an enchanted wealth, and belongs yet to nobody. [...] We can spend thousands where we once spent hundreds; but can purchase nothing good with them. [...] Many men eat finer cookery, drink dearer liquors, [...] what increase of blessedness is there? Are they better, beautifuller, stronger, braver? Are they even what they call 'happier'?"  

The master-worker is not happier, the master-idler—that is, the aristocratic landowner—is not happier.

"To whom, then, is this wealth of England wealth? Who is it that it blesses; makes happier, wiser, beautifuller, [...] better? [...] As yet no one. [...] Our successful industry is hitherto unsuccessful; [...] In the midst of plethoric plenty, the people perish; with gold walls, and full barns, no man feels himself safe or satisfied. [...]"

"Midas longed for gold, and insulted the Olympians. He got gold, so that whatsoever he touched became gold,—and he, with his long ears, was little the better for it. Midas had misjudged the celestial music-tones; Midas had insulted Apollo and the gods: the gods gave him his wish, and a pair of long ears, which also were a good appendage to it. What a truth in these old Fables!"

"How true," he continues in the second chapter, "is that other old Fable of the Sphinx [...] Nature, like the Sphinx, [...] is a goddess, but one not yet disimprisoned", still half encased in brutishness, in the inarticulate—there is order and wisdom on the one hand, but also darkness, ferocity and fatality.

Sphinx-like nature—German mysticism, say the English, when they read this chapter—has a question to put to every man and every age—happy is the man who answers it aright; he who does not answer it or answers wrongly, falls a prey to that part of the Sphinx which is brutish and ferocious, instead of the beautiful bride he finds a devouring lioness. And so it is with nations too: can you solve the riddle of destiny? And all unfortunate peoples, like all unfortunate individuals, have answered the question wrongly, have taken the semblance for the truth, have abandoned the eternal inner facts of the universe in favour of transient outer appearances, and England too has done this. England, as Carlyle:
later puts it, has fallen a prey to atheism and its present condition is the necessary consequence of that. We shall have occasion to speak of this later, for the present let us simply observe that the parable of the Sphinx, if it is to be accepted in the above pantheistic sense reminiscent of the older Schelling, could well have been developed somewhat further by Carlyle—the answer to the riddle today is, as it was in the myth: man; indeed he is the answer in the widest possible sense. That too will be settled.

The next chapter gives us the following description of the Manchester insurrection of August 1842.

"A million of hungry operative men [...] rose all up, came all out into the streets, and—stood there. What other could they do? Their wrongs and griefs were bitter, insupportable, their rage against the same was just: but who are they that cause these wrongs, who that will [...] make effort to redress them? Our enemies are we know not who or what; our friends are we know not where! How shall we attack any one, shoot or be shot by any one? O, if the accursed invisible Nightmare, that is crushing out the life of us and ours, would take a shape; approach us like the Hyrcanian tiger, the Behemoth of Chaos, the Archfiend himself; in any shape that we could see, and fasten on!"

But the misfortune of the workers in the summer insurrection of 1842 was precisely that they did not know whom to fight against. The evil they suffered was social—and social evils cannot be abolished as the monarchy or privileges are abolished. Social evils cannot be cured by People's Charters, and the people sensed this—otherwise the People's Charter would be today the basic law of England. Social evils need to be studied and understood, and this the mass of the workers has not yet done up till now. The great achievement of the uprising was that England's most vital question, the question of the final destiny of the working class, was, as Carlyle says, raised in a manner audible to every thinking ear in England. The question can now no longer be evaded. England must answer it or perish.

Let us pass over the final chapters of this section, and for the moment too the whole of that which follows, and let us straightaway take the third section which treats of "The Modern Worker", so that we may have before us all of a piece the description of the condition of England which was begun in the "Proem".

We have abandoned, Carlyle continues, the piety of the Middle Ages and acquired nothing in its place: we have

"Forgotten God [...] We have quietly closed our eyes to the eternal Substance of things, and opened them only to the Shews and Shams of things. We quietly believe this Universe to be intrinsically a great unintelligible Perhaps; extrinsically,
clear enough, it is a great, most extensive Cattlefold and Workhouse, with most extensive Kitchen-ranges. Dining tables,—whereat he is wise who can find a place! All the Truth of this Universe is uncertain; only the profit and loss of it, the pudding and praise of it, are and remain very visible to the practical man.

"There is no longer any God for us! God's Laws are become a Greatest-Happiness Principle, a Parliamentary Expediency: the Heavens overarch us only as an Astronomical Time-keeper; a butt for Herschel-telescopes to shoot science at, to shoot sentimentalities at:—in our and old Jonson's dialect, man has lost the soul out of him; and now [...] begins to find the want of it! This is verily the plague-spot; centre of the universal Social Gangrene [...] There is no religion; there is no God; man has lost his soul, and vainly seeks antiseptic salt. Vainly: in killing Kings, in [passing] Reform Bills, in French Revolutions, Manchester Insurrections, is found no remedy. The foul [...] leprosy, alleviated for an hour, reappears in new force and desperateness next hour."

Since however the place of the old religion could not remain entirely vacant, we have acquired a new gospel in its stead, a gospel that accords with the hollowness and lack of substance of the age—the gospel of Mammon. The Christian heaven and the Christian hell have been abandoned, the former as doubtful, and the latter as absurd—and you have acquired a new hell; the hell of modern England is the consciousness of "not succeeding, of not making money".

"True [...] we [...] with our Mammon-Gospel, have come to strange conclusions. We call it a Society; and go about professing openly the totallest separation, isolation. Our life is not a mutual helpfulness; but rather, cloaked under due laws-of-war, named 'fair competition' and so forth, it is a mutual hostility. We have profoundly forgotten [...] that Cash-payment is not the sole relation of human beings; [...] 'My starving workers?' answers the rich Mill-owner: 'Did not I hire them fairly in the market? Did I not pay them, to the last sixpence, the sum covenanted for? What have I to do with them more?'—Verily Mammon-worship is a melancholy creed."

"A poor Irish Widow [...] of Edinburgh, went forth with her three children [...] to solicit help from the Charitable Establishments of that City." At every establishment "she was refused; [...] her strength and heart failed her: she sank down in typhus-fever; died, and infected her Lane with fever, so that seventeen other persons died of fever there in consequence. The humane Physician" who tells this story—Dr. W. P. Alison—"asks thereupon [...] Would it not have been economy to help this poor Widow? She took typhus-fever, and killed seventeen of you!—Verily curious. The forlorn Irish Widow applies to her fellow-creatures [...] 'Behold I am sinking, bare of help: ye must help me! I am your sister, bone of your bone; one God made us: ye must help me!' They answer, 'No; impossible: thou art no sister of ours.' But she proves her
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sisterhood; her typhus-fever kills them: they actually were her brothers, though denying it! Had man ever to go lower for a proof?"

Carlyle, incidentally, is in error here, as is Alison. The rich have no sympathy, no interest in the death of the “seventeen”. Is it not a public blessing that the “surplus population” should be reduced by seventeen? If only it were a few million instead of a miserly “seventeen”, it would be by so much the better. — This is the reasoning of wealthy English Malthusians.

And then there is the other, even worse gospel of dilettantism which has produced a government which does not govern; this gospel has deprived people of all seriousness and impels them to want to appear that which they are not — the striving for "happiness", that is, for good food and drink; this gospel has lifted crude matter on to the throne and destroyed all spiritual substance; what shall be the consequence of all this?

"But what will reflective readers say of a Governing Class\(^c\) such as ours, addressing its Workers with an indictment of 'Over-production'! Over-production: runs it not so? 'Ye miscellaneous [...] manufacturing individuals, ye have produced too much! We accuse you of making above two-hundred thousand shirts for the bare backs of mankind. Your trousers too, which you have made, of fustian, of cassimere, of Scotch-plaid, of [...] nankeen and woollen broadcloth, are they not manifold? Of hats [...], of shoes [...], of stools to sit on, spoons to eat with — Nay [...] You produce gold-watches, jeweleries, silver-forks [...] — Nay [...] You produce gold-watches, jeweleries, silver-forks [...], commodes, chifforbies, stuffed sofas — Heavens, the Commercial Bazaar and multitudinous Howel-and-Jameses cannot contain you. You have produced, produced; — he that seeks your indictment, let him look around. Millions of shirts, and empty pairs of breeches, hang there in judgment against you. We accuse you of over-producing: you are criminally guilty of producing shirts, breeches, hats, shoes and commodities, in a frightful over-abundance. And now there is a glut, and your operatives cannot be fed!"\(^c\)

My lords and gentlemen, of what do you accuse those poor workers? "My lords and gentlemen, — why, it was you that were appointed [...] to guard against 'gluts' [...]; you were appointed to preside over the Distribution and Apportionment of the Wages of Work done; and to see well that there went no labourer without his hire, were it of money-coins, were it of hemp gallows-ropes: that function was yours, and from immemorial time has been [...]. These poor shirt-spinners have forgotten much, which by the virtual unwritten law of their position they should have remembered: but by any written recognised law of their position, what have they forgotten? They were set to make shirts. The Community [...] commanded them, saying, 'Make shirts'; — and there the shirts are! Too many shirts? Well, that is a novelty, in this intemperate Earth, with its nine-hundred millions of bare backs! But the Community commanded you", my lords and gentlemen, saying. See that the shirts are well apportioned [...] — and where is the apportionment? Two million shirtless or ill-shirted workers sit [...] in Workhouse Bastiles, five million more [...] in Ugolino Hunger-cellar; and for remedy, you say [...] 'Raise our rents!' [...] You continue [...] in [...] a [...] triumphant

\(^a\) Carlyle, op. cit., pp. 201-02. — Ed.
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manner: 'Will you bandy accusations, will you accuse us of over-production? We take the Heavens and the Earth to witness that we have produced nothing at all. [...] In the wide domains of created Nature, circulates no shirt or thing of our producing. [...] We are innocent of producing—ye ungrateful, what mountains of things have we not, on the contrary, had to "consume", and make away with! [...] have they not disappeared before us; as if we had the talent of ostriches [...] and a kind of divine faculty to eat? Ye ungrateful!—and did you not grow under the shadow of our wings? Are not your filthy mills built on these fields of ours [...]? And we shall not offer you our own wheat at the price that pleases us [...]? What would become of you, if we "chose [...] to decide on growing no wheat more?"

This attitude of the aristocracy, this barbaric question, what would become of you if we did not deign to allow corn to grow, has produced the "mad and miserable Corn Laws" 198; the Corn Laws which are so insane that no arguments can be brought against them but such as "must needs make an Angel in Heaven and an Ass on Earth weep". The Corn Laws prove that the aristocracy has not yet learned to do no mischief, to sit still and do nothing, to say nothing of doing good, and yet this, according to Carlyle, is their duty:

"You are bound to furnish guidance and governance to England! That is the law of your position." And every worker in the workhouse has the right to ask them above all, "Why am I here?" His appeal is audible in Heaven; and will become audible enough on Earth too, if it remain unheeded here. His appeal is against you", my lords and gentlemen; "you stand in the front-rank of the accused; you, by the very place you hold, have first of all to answer him [...]"

"The fate of the Idle Aristocracy, as one reads its horoscope hitherto in Corn-Laws and such like, is an abyss that fills one with despair. Yes, my rosy fox-hunting brothers [...] through those fresh buxom countenances of yours, through your Corn-Law Majorities, Sliding-Scales, Protecting-Duties, Bribery-Elections and triumphant Kentish-fire, a thinking eye discerns ghastly images of ruin, too ghastly for words; a handwriting as of Mené, Mene. [...] Good God! did not a French Donothing Aristocracy, hardly above half a century ago, declare in like manner [...] 'We cannot exist, and continue to dress and parade ourselves, on the [...] rent of the soil [...] we must have farther payment than rent of the soil, we must be exempted from taxes too,'—we must have a Corn-Law to extend our rent? This was in 1789; in four years more"—have you heard of "the Tanneries of Meudon, and the long-naked making for themselves breeches of human skins! May the merciful Heavens avert the omen; may we be wiser, that so we be less wretched."

And the working aristocracy is caught in the partridge nets of the idle aristocracy and with its "Mammonism" eventually finds itself in dire straits too.

---
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"The Continental people it would seem, are exporting our machinery, beginning
to spin cotton and manufacture for themselves, to cut us out of this market and then
out of that! Sad news indeed; [...]—by no means the saddest news. The saddest news
is, that we should find our National Existance, as I sometimes hear it said, depend on
selling manufactured cotton at a farthing an ell cheaper than any other People. A most
narrow stand for a great Nation to base itself on! A stand which, with all the Corn-Law
Abrogations conceivable, I do not think will be capable of enduring."

"No great Nation can stand on the apex of such a pyramid; screwing itself higher
and higher; balancing itself on its great-toe!" b "In brief, all this Mammon-Gospel",
with its Hell of "failing to make money", "of Supply-and-demand, Competition",
free-trade, "Laissez-faire," c and Devil take the hindmost, begins to be [...] the
shabbiest Gospel ever preached on Earth".

"Yes, were the Corn-Laws ended tomorrow, there is nothing yet ended; there is
only room made for all manner of things beginning. The Corn-Laws gone, and Trade
made free, it is [...] certain this paralysis of industry will pass away. We shall have another
period of commercial enterprise, of victory and prosperity [...] . The strangling
band of Famine will be loosed from our necks; we shall have room again to breathe;
time to bethink ourselves, to repent and consider! A [...] thrice-precious space of
years; wherein to struggle as for life in reforming our foul ways; in alleviating, in­
structing, regulating our people [...] that something like spiritual food be imparted
them, some real governance and guidance be provided them! It will be a priceless
time. For our new period [...] of commercial prosperity will and can, d on the old
methods of 'Competition and Devil take the hindmost', prove but a paroxysm: [...] 
likely enough, [...] our last. [...] If our Trade in twenty years [...] double itself; yet then
also [...] our Population is doubled: we shall then be as we are, only twice as many of
us, twice and ten times as unmanageable!"

"Ah me, into what [...] latitudes, in this Time-Voyage, have we wandered;
[...]—where the men go about as if by galvanism, e with meaningless glaring eyes, and
have no soul, but only a beaver-faculty and stomach! The haggard despair of
Cotton-factory, Coal-mine [operatives], Chandos Farm-labourers, in these days, is
painful to behold; but not so painful [...] to the inner sense, as that brutish
godforgetting Profit-and-Loss Philosophy, and Life-theory, which we hear jangled on
all hands of us, in senate-houses, spouting-clubs, leading-articles, pulpits and
platforms, everywhere as the Ultimate Gospel and candid Plain-English of Man's
Life."

"And yet I will venture to believe that in no time, since the beginnings of Society,
was the lot of those same dumb millions of toilers so entirely unbearable as it is [...] 
now [...] . It is not to die, or even to die of hunger, that makes a man wretched [...] all
men must die,—the last exit of us all is in a Fire-Chariot of Pain. But it is to live miserable
we know not why; to work sore and yet gain nothing; to be heart-worn, weary, yet
isolated, girt in with a cold universal Laissez-faire: it is to die slowly all our
life long, imprisoned in a deaf, dead, Infinite Injustice, as in the accursed iron
belly of a Phalaris' Bull! This is and remains forever intolerable to all men whom God has
made. Do we wonder at French Revolutions, Chartisms, Revolts of Three Days?  

If in such unexampled times the aristocracy shows itself incapable of guiding public affairs, it is necessary to expel it. Hence democracy.

"To what extent Democracy has now reached, how it advances irresistible with ominous, ever-increasing speed, he that will open his eyes on any province of human affairs may discern. [...] From the thunder of Napoleon battles, to the jabbering of Open-vestry in St. Mary Axe, all things announce Democracy."  

But what, after all, is democracy?

Nothing but the absence of masters who could govern you, and the acceptance of this unavoidable absence, the attempt to manage without them. "No man oppresses thee, O free and independent Franchiser: but does not this stupid Porter-pot oppress thee? No Son of Adam can bid thee come or go; but this absurd Pot of Heavy-wet d can this and does! Thou art the thrall not of Cedric the Saxon, but of thy own brutal appetites [...] And thou pratest of thy 'liberty? Thou entire blockhead!"

"The notion that a man's liberty consists in giving his vote at election-hustings, and saying, 'Behold now I too have my twenty-thousandth part of a Talker in our National Palaver; will not all the gods be good to me?'—is one of the pleasantest! [...] The liberty especially which has to purchase itself by social isolation, and each man standing separate from the other, having 'no business with him' but a cash account. [...] This liberty turns out, before it have long continued in action, [...] to be, for the Working Millions a liberty to die by want of food; for the Idle Thousands and Units [...] a [...] liberty to live in want of work [...] Brethren, we know but imperfectly yet, after ages of Constitutional Government, what Liberty is and Slavery is. Democracy [...] shall go its full course [...] The Toiling Millions [...], in most vital need and passionate instinctive desire of Guidance, shall cast away False-Guidance; and hope, for an hour, that No-Guidance will suffice them: but it can be for an hour only. [...] The oppression of man by his Mock-Superiors [...] let him shake off [...] I blame him not, I pity and commend him. But oppression by your Mock-Superiors well shaken off, the grand problem yet remains to solve: That of finding government by your Real-Superiors!"

"The leadership, as it now exists, is, to be sure, wretched enough. "In the case of the late Bribery Committee" of Parliament "it seemed to be the conclusion of the soundest practical minds that Bribery could not be put down; that Pure Election was a thing we had seen the last of, and must now go on without, as we best could,"

"A Parliament, [...] which proclaims itself elected and eligible by bribery [...] What Legislating can you get out of" that? [...] "Bribery means not only length of purse, [...] but it means dishonesty, and even impudent dishonesty;—brazen insensibility to lying and to making others lie [...] What an improvement, were there once fairly.
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in Downing-street, an Election-Office opened,\(^a\) with a Tariff of Boroughs! Such and such a population, amount of property-tax, ground-rental [...] returns two Members, returns one Member, for so much money down: Ipswich so many thousands, Nottingham so many, [...] now at least you have it fairly by length of purse, and leave the dishonesty, the impudence, the unveracity all handsomely aside.\(^b\)

"Our [...] Parliament announces itself elected and eligible in this manner [...] What is to become of a Parliament elected or eligible in this manner? Unless Belial and Beelzebub have got possession of the throne of this Universe, such Parliament is preparing itself for new Reform-bills. We shall have to try it by Chartism, or any conceivable ism, rather than put up with this [...] A Parliament working with a lie in its mouth, will have to take itself away. [...] At all hours of the day and night, some Chartism\(^c\) is advancing, some armed Cromwell is advancing, to apprise such Parliament: 'Ye are no Parliament. In the name of God,—go!'\(^d\)

This is the condition of England, according to Carlyle. An idle landowning aristocracy which "have not yet learned even to sit still and do no mischief", a working aristocracy submerged in Mammonism, who, when they ought to be collectively the leaders of labour, "captains of industry", are just a gang of industrial buccaneers and pirates. A Parliament elected by bribery, a philosophy of simply looking on, of doing nothing, of laissez-faire, a worn-out, crumbling religion, a total disappearance of all general human interests, a universal despair of truth and humanity, and in consequence a universal isolation of men in their own "brute individuality", a chaotic, savage confusion of all aspects of life, a war of all against all, a general death of the spirit, a dearth of "soul", that is, of truly human consciousness: a disproportionately strong working class, in intolerable oppression and wretchedness, in furious discontent and rebellion against the old social order, and hence a threatening, irresistibly advancing democracy—everywhere chaos, disorder, anarchy, dissolution of the old ties of society, everywhere intellectual insipidity, frivolity, and debility.—That is the condition of England. Thus far, if we discount a few expressions that have derived from Carlyle’s particular standpoint, we must allow the truth of all he says. He, alone of the “respectable” class, has kept his eyes open at least towards the facts, he has at least correctly apprehended the immediate present, and that is indeed a very great deal for an “educated” Englishman.

How does the future appear? Matters will not and cannot remain as they are now. We have seen that Carlyle has, as he himself admits, no “Morison’s pill”,\(^1\) no panacea for curing the
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ills of society. In that too he is right. All social philosophy, as long as it still propounds a few principles as its final conclusion, as long as it continues to administer Morison's pills, remains very imperfect; it is not the bare conclusions of which we are in such need, but rather study; the conclusions are nothing without the reasoning that has led up to them; this we have known since Hegel; and the conclusions are worse than useless if they are final in themselves, if they are not turned into premises for further deductions. But the conclusions must also assume a distinct form for a time, they must in the course of development evolve from vague imprecision into clear ideas, and then of course, in the case of such an exclusively empirical nation as the English are, they cannot avoid becoming "Morison's pills". Carlyle himself, although he has absorbed much that is German and is quite far removed from crass empiricism, would probably have a few pills to hand if he were less vague and hazy about the future.

Meanwhile he declares everything to be useless and unprofitable as long as mankind persists in atheism, as long as it has not recovered its "soul". Not that traditional Catholicism can be restored in its vigour and vitality, nor that today's religion can be maintained—he knows very well that rituals, dogmas, litanies and Sinai thunder cannot help, that all the thunder of Sinai does not make the truth any truer, nor does it frighten any sensible person, that we are far beyond the religion of fear, but religion itself must be restored, we ourselves see where "two centuries of Atheist Government"—since the "blessed" restoration of Charles II—have brought us, and we shall gradually also be obliged to recognise that this atheism is beginning to show signs of wear and tear. But we have seen what Carlyle calls atheism: it is not so much disbelief in a personal God, as disbelief in the inner essence, in the infinity of the universe, disbelief in reason, despair of the intellect and the truth; his struggle is not against disbelief in the revelation of the Bible, but against the most frightful disbelief, the disbelief in the "Bible of Universal History". That is the eternal book of God in which every man, while his spirit and the light of his eyes are yet with him, may see God's finger write. To make mockery of this is disbelief like none other, a disbelief you would punish, not by burning at the stake, but nevertheless with the most imperative command to keep one's silence until one has something better to say. Why should blissful silence be broken by loud noise, just to proclaim such stuff? If there is no divine reason in the past, but merely diabolic unreason, it will pass away for ever, speak no more of it; we whose fathers were all hanged, should not talk of ropes!
"But modern England cannot believe in history." The eye sees of all things only so much as it can see by its own inherent capacity. A godless century cannot comprehend epochs filled with God. It sees in the past (the Middle Ages) only empty strife, the universal rule of brute force, it does not see that in the last analysis might and right coincide, it just sees stupidity, savage unreason, more fitting to Bedlam than to a human world. From this it naturally follows that the same qualities should continue to prevail in our own time. Millions held in Bastille workhouses; Irish widows who prove that they are human beings by typhus-fever: what would you have? It was ever so, or worse. Has history not always been the exploitation of obdurate stupidity by successful mountebanks? There was no God in the past; nothing but mechanisms and chaotic brute-gods:—how shall the poor "philosophic historian", to whom his own century is all godless, "see any God in other centuries"?

And yet our age is not so utterly forsaken.

"Nay, in our poor distracted Europe itself, in these newest times, have there not religious voices risen,—with a religion new and yet the oldest; entirely indisputable to all hearts of men? Some I do know, who did not call or think themselves 'Prophets' [...]; but who were, in very truth, melodious Voices from the eternal Heart of Nature once again; souls forever venerable to all that have a soul. A French Revolution is one phenomenon; as complement and spiritual exponent thereof, a Poet Goethe and German Literature is to me another. The old Secular or Practical World [...] having gone up in fire, is not here the prophecy and dawn of a new Spiritual World, parent of far nobler, wider, new Practical Worlds? A Life of Antique devoutness, Antique veracity and heroism, has again become possible, is again seen actual there, for the most modern man. A phenomenon, as quiet as it is, comparable for greatness to no other! [...] Touches there are [...] of new Sphere-melody; audible once more, in the infinite jargoning discords [...] of the thing called Literature."

Goethe is the prophet of the "religion of the future", and its cult is work.

"For there is a perennial nobleness, and even sacredness, in Work. Were he never so benighted, forgetful of his high calling, there is always hope in a man that actually and earnestly works: in Idleness alone is there perpetual despair. Work, never so Mammonish, mean, is in communication with Nature; the real desire to get Work done will itself lead one more and more to truth, to Nature's appointments and regulations....

"An endless significance lies in Work: a man perfects himself by working. Foul jungles are cleared away, fair seedfields rise instead, and stately cities; and withal the man himself first ceases to be a jungle and foul unwholesome desert thereby. Consider how, even in the meanest sorts of Labour, the whole soul of a man is composed into a kind of real harmony, the instant he sets himself to work! Doubt,
Desire, Sorrow, Remorse, Indignation, Despair itself, all these like helldogs lie beleaguer ing the soul of the poor dayworker, as of every man: but he bends himself with free valour against his task, and all these shrink murmuring far off into their caves. The man is now a man. The blessed glow of Labour in him, is it not as purifying fire, wherein all poison is burnt up, and of sour smoke itself there is made bright blessed flame? 

"Blessed is he who has found his work; let him ask no other blessedness. He has a work, a life-purpose; he has found it, and will follow it! How, as a free-flowing channel, dug through the sour mud-swamp of one's existence, runs and flows; draining off the sour festering water, gradually from the root of the remotest grass-blade; making, instead of pestilential swamp, a green fruitful meadow! Labour is Life. Properly thou hast no other knowledge but what thou hast got by working: the rest is yet all a hypothesis a thing to be argued of in schools, a thing floating in the clouds, in endless logic-vortices, till we try it and fix it. 'Doubt, of whatever kind, can be ended by Action alone.'

"Admirable was that saying of the old Monks, 'Laborare est Orare, Work is Worship.' Older than all preached Gospels was this unpreached, inarticulate, but ineradicable, forever-enduring Gospel: Work, and therein have wellbeing. Man lies there not, in the innermost heart of thee, a Spirit of active Method, a Force for Work, and burns like a painfully smouldering fire, giving thee no rest till thou unfold it, till thou write it down in beneficent Facts around thee! What is immethodic, waste, thou shalt make methodic, regulated, arable; obedient and productive to thee. Wheresover thou findest Disorder, there is thy eternal enemy; attack him swiftly, subdue him; make Order of him, the subject not of Chaos, but of Intelligence, Divinity and Thee! But above all, where thou findest Ignorance, Stupidity, Brute-mindedness attack it, I say; smite it wisely, unweariedly, and rest not while thou livest and it lives; but smite, smite, in the name of God! Thou shalt work while it is called Today. For the Night cometh, wherein no man can work.

"All true Work is sacred; Sweat of the brow; Sweat of the brain, sweat of the heart; which includes all Kepler calculations, Newton meditations, all Sciences, all spoken Epics, all acted Heroisms, Martyrdoms,—up to that 'Agony of bloody sweat', which all men have called divine! If this is not 'worship' the more pity for worship. Who art thou that complainest of thy life of toil? Complain not. Heaven is kind,—as a noble Mother; as that Spartan Mother, saying while she gave her son his shield, 'With it, my son, or upon it!' Complain not; the very Spartans did not complain."

"One monster there is in the world: the idle man. What is his 'Religion'? That Nature is a Phantasm. That God is a lie; and that Man and his Life are a lie."

But work too has been dragged into the furious vortex of disorder and chaos, the principle which was to cleanse, enlighten, evolve, has succumbed to involution, confusion and obscurity. This really leads to the main issue, the future of work.
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“What a business will this be, which our Continental friends, groping this long while somewhat absurdly about it and about it, call ‘Organisation of Labour’:—which must be taken out of the hands of absurd windy persons, and put into the hands of wise, laborious [...] and valiant men, to begin with it straightway; to proceed with it, and succeed in it more and more, if Europe, at any rate if England, is to continue habitable much longer. Looking at the kind of most noble Corn-Law Dukes [or Practical Duces] we have, and also of right reverend Soul-Overseers, Christian Spiritual Duces ‘on a minimum of four thousand five hundred’, one’s hopes are a little chilled. Courage, nevertheless; there are many brave men in England! My indomitable Plugson,—nay is there not even in thee some hope? Thou art hitherto a Bucanier [...] but in that grim brow, in that indomitable heart which can conquer Cotton, do there not perhaps lie other ten times nobler conquests?“

“Look around you. Your world-hosts are all in mutiny, in confusion, destitution; on the eve of fiery wreck and madness! They will not march farther for you, on the sixpence a day and supply-and-demand principle: they will not; nor ought they, nor can they. [...] Their souls are driven nigh mad; let yours be [...] saner. Not as a bewildered bewildering mob; but as a firm regimented mass, with real captains over them, will these men march any more. All human interests, combined human endeavours [...] have, at a certain stage of their development, required organising: and Work, the grandest of human interests, does now require it.”

In order to effect this organisation, in order to put true guidance and true government in the place of false guidance, Carlyle longs for a “true aristocracy”, a “hero-worship”, and puts forward the second great problem to discover the άποτομον, the best, whose task it is to combine “with inevitable Democracy indispensable Sovereignty”.

From these excerpts Carlyle’s position emerges fairly clearly. His whole outlook is essentially pantheistic, and, more specifically, pantheistic with German overtones. The English have no pantheism but merely scepticism; the conclusion of all English philosophising is the despair of reason, the confessed inability to solve the contradictions with which one is ultimately faced, and consequently on the one hand a relapse into faith and on the other devotion to pure practice, without a further thought for metaphysics, etc. Carlyle with his pantheism derived from German literature is therefore a “phenomenon” in England, and for the practical and sceptical English a pretty incomprehensible one. People gape at him, speak of “German mysticism” and distorted English; others claim there is at bottom something in it, his

---

Engels has: “valiant, wise, laborious men”.—Ed.
Engels has: “you indomitable factory-lord”.—Ed.
Carlyle, op. cit., pp. 262-63.—Ed.
Engels has: “they will not and that is their right”.—Ed.
Carlyle, op. cit., p. 368.—Ed.
English, though unusual, is very fine, he is a prophet, etc.—but nobody really knows what to make of it all.

For us Germans, who know the antecedents of Carlyle’s position, the matter is clear enough. On the one hand vestiges of Tory romanticism and humane attitudes originating with Goethe, and on the other sceptical-empirical England, these factors are sufficient for one to deduce the whole of Carlyle’s view of the world from them. Like all pantheists, Carlyle has not yet resolved the contradiction, and Carlyle’s dualism is aggravated by the fact that though he is acquainted with German literature, he is not acquainted with its necessary corollary, German philosophy, and all his views are in consequence ingenuous, intuitive, more like Schelling than Hegel. With Schelling—that is to say, with the old Schelling, not the Schelling of the philosophy of revelation 197—Carlyle really has a great deal in common; with Strauss, whose outlook is similarly pantheistic, he is on common ground in his “hero-worship” or “cult of genius”.

The critique of pantheism has recently been so exhaustively set forth in Germany that little more remains to be said. Feuerbach’s “Theses” in the Anekdota and Bruno Bauer’s works contain all the relevant material. We will therefore be able to confine ourselves simply to following up the implications of Carlyle’s position and showing that it is basically only a first step towards the position adopted by this journal.

Carlyle complains about the emptiness and hollowness of the age, about the inner rottenness of all social institutions. The complaint is fair; but by simply complaining one does not dispose of the matter; in order to redress the evil, its cause must be discovered; and if Carlyle had done this, he would have found that this desultoriness and hollowness, this “soullessness”, this irreligion and this “atheism” have their roots in religion itself. Religion by its very essence drains man and nature of substance, and transfers this substance to the phantom of an other-worldly God, who in turn then graciously permits man and nature to receive some of his superfluity. Now as long as faith in this other-worldly phantom is vigorous and alive, thus long man will acquire in this roundabout way at least some substance. The strong faith of the Middle Ages did indeed give the whole epoch considerable energy in this way, but it was energy that did not come from without but was already present within human nature.

---

\(^a\) Ludwig Feuerbach, “Vorläufige Thesen zur Reformation der Philosophie” in Anekdota zur neuesten deutschen Philosophie und Publicistik.—Ed.
though as yet unperceived and undeveloped. Faith gradually weakened, religion crumbled in the face of the rising level of civilisation, but still man did not perceive that he had worshipped and deified his own being in the guise of a being outside himself. Lacking awareness and at the same time faith, man can have no substance, he is bound to despair of truth, reason and nature, and this hollowness and lack of substance, the despair of the eternal facts of the universe will last until mankind perceives that the being it has worshipped as God was its own, as yet unknown being, until—but why should I copy Feuerbach.

The hollowness has long been there, for religion represents man's action of making himself hollow; and you are surprised that now, when the purple that concealed it has faded, when the fog that enveloped it has passed away, that now, to your consternation, it emerges in the full light of day?

Carlyle accuses the age furthermore—this is the immediate consequence of the foregoing—of hypocrisy and lying. Naturally the hollowness and enervation must be decently concealed and kept upright by accessories, padded clothes and whalebone stays! We too attack the hypocrisy of the present Christian state of the world; the struggle against it, our liberation from it and the liberation of the world from it are ultimately our sole occupation; but because through the development of philosophy we are able to discern this hypocrisy, and because we are waging the struggle scientifically, the nature of this hypocrisy is no longer so strange and incomprehensible to us as it admittedly still is to Carlyle. This hypocrisy is traced back by us to religion, the first word of which is a lie—or does religion not begin by showing us something human and claiming it is something superhuman, something divine? But because we know that all this lying and immorality follows from religion, that religious hypocrisy, theology, is the archetype of all other lies and hypocrisy, we are justified in extending the term “theology” to the whole untruth and hypocrisy of the present, as was originally done by Feuerbach and Bruno Bauer. Carlyle should read their works if he wishes to know the origin of the immorality that plagues our whole society.

A new religion, a pantheistic hero-worship, a cult of work, ought to be set up or is to be expected; but this is impossible; all the possibilities of religion are exhausted; after Christianity, after absolute, i.e., abstract, religion, after “religion as such”, no other form of religion can arise. Carlyle himself realises that Catholic, Protestant or any other kind of Christianity is irresistibly moving towards its downfall; if he knew the nature of Christianity, he
would realise that after it no other religion is possible. Not even pantheism! Pantheism itself is another consequence of Christianity and cannot be divorced from its antecedent, at least that is true of modern pantheism, of Spinoza's, Schelling's, Hegel's and also Carlyle's pantheism. Once more, Feuerbach relieves me of the trouble of providing proof of this.

As I have said, we too are concerned with combating the lack of principle, the inner emptiness, the spiritual deadness, the untruthfulness of the age; we are waging a war to the death against all these things, just as Carlyle is, and there is a much greater probability that we shall succeed than that he will, because we know what we want. We want to put an end to atheism, as Carlyle portrays it, by giving back to man the substance he has lost through religion; not as divine but as human substance, and this whole process of giving back is no more than simply the awakening of self-consciousness. We want to sweep away everything that claims to be supernatural and superhuman, and thereby get rid of untruthfulness, for the root of all untruth and lying is the pretension of the human and the natural to be superhuman and supernatural. For that reason we have once and for all declared war on religion and religious ideas and care little whether we are called atheists or anything else. If however Carlyle's pantheistic definition of atheism were correct, it is not we but our Christian opponents who would be the true atheists. We have no intention of attacking the "eternal inner Facts of the universe", on the contrary, we have for the first time truly substantiated them by proving their perpetuity and rescuing them from the omnipotent arbitrariness of an inherently self-contradictory God. We have no intention of pronouncing "the world, man and his life a lie"; on the contrary, our Christian opponents are guilty of this act of immorality when they make the world and man dependent on the grace of a God who in reality was only created from the reflected image of man in the crude hyle of his own undeveloped consciousness. We have no intention whatever of doubting or despising the "revelation of history", for history is all and everything to us and we hold it more highly than any other previous philosophical trend, more highly than Hegel even, who after all used it only as a case against which to test his logical problem.

It is the other side that scorns history and disregards the development of mankind; it is the Christians again who, by putting forward a separate "History of the Kingdom of God" deny that real history has any inner substantiality and claim that this substantiality belongs exclusively to their other-worldly, ab-
stract and, what is more, fictitious history; who, by asserting that
the culmination of the human species is their Christ, make history
attain an imaginary goal, interrupt it in mid-course and are now
obliged, if only for the sake of consistency, to declare the following
eighteen hundred years to be totally nonsensical and utterly
meaningless. We lay claim to the meaning of history; but we see in
history not the revelation of “God” but of man and only of man.
We have no need, in order to see the splendour of the human
character, in order to recognise the development of the human
species through history, its irresistible progress, its ever-certain
victory over the unreason of the individual, its overcoming of all
that is apparently supernatural, its hard but successful struggle
against nature until the final achievement of free, human self-
consciousness, the discernment of the unity of man and nature,
and the independent creation—voluntarily and by its own ef-
fort—of a new world based on purely human and moral social
relationships—in order to recognise all that in its greatness, we
have no need first to summon up the abstraction of a “God” and
to attribute to it everything beautiful, great, sublime and truly
human; we do not need to follow this roundabout path, we do not
need first to imprint the stamp of the “divine” on what is truly
human, in order to be sure of its greatness and splendour. On the
contrary, the “more divine”, in other words, the more inhuman,
something is, the less we shall be able to admire it. Only the human
origin of the content of all religions still preserves for them here
and there some claim to respect; only the consciousness that even
the wildest superstition nevertheless has within it at bottom the
eternal determinants of human nature, in however dislocated and
distorted a form, only this awareness saves the history of religion,
and particularly of the Middle Ages, from total rejection and
eternal oblivion, which would otherwise certainly be the fate of
these “godly” histories. The more “godly” they are, the more
inhuman, the more bestial, and the “godly” Middle Ages did
indeed produce the culmination of human bestiality, serfdom, jus
primae noctis, etc. The godlessness of our age, of which Carlyle so
much complains, is precisely its saturation with God. From this it
also becomes clear why, above, I gave man as the solution to the
riddle of the Sphinx. The question has previously always been:
what is God? and German philosophy has answered the question
in this sense: God is man. Man has only to understand himself, to
take himself as the measure of all aspects of life, to judge
according to his being, to organise the world in a truly human
manner according to the demands of his own nature, and he will
have solved the riddle of our time. Not in other-worldly, non-existent regions, not beyond time and space, not with a "God" immanent in or opposed to the world, is the truth to be found, but much nearer, in man's own breast. Man's own substance is far more splendid and sublime than the imaginary substance of any conceivable "God", who is after all only the more or less indistinct and distorted image of man himself. So when Carlyle follows Ben Jonson in saying, man has lost his soul and is only now beginning to notice the want of it, the right formulation would be: in religion man has lost his own substance, has alienated his humanity, and now that religion, through the progress of history, has begun to totter, he notices his emptiness and instability. But there is no other salvation for him, he cannot regain his humanity, his substance, other than by thoroughly overcoming all religious ideas and returning firmly and honestly, not to "God", but to himself.

All of this may also be found in Goethe, the "prophet", and anyone who has his eyes open can read this between the lines. Goethe did not like to be concerned with "God"; the word made him uncomfortable, he felt at home only in human matters, and this humanity, this emancipation of art from the fetters of religion is precisely what constitutes Goethe's greatness. Neither the ancients nor Shakespeare can measure up to him in this respect. But this consummate humanity, this overcoming of the religious dualism can only be apprehended in its full historical significance by those who are not strangers to that other aspect of German national development, philosophy. What Goethe could only express spontaneously, and therefore, it is true, in a certain sense "prophetically", has been developed and substantiated in contemporary German philosophy. Carlyle too embodies assumptions which, logically, must lead to the position set forth above. Pantheism itself is but the last, preliminary step towards a free and human point of view. History, which Carlyle presents as the real "revelation", contains only what is human, and only by an arbitrary act can its content be taken away from humanity and credited to the account of a "God". Work, free activity, in which Carlyle similarly sees a "cult", is again a purely human matter and can only be linked with "God" in an arbitrary manner. What is the point of continually pushing to the fore a word which at best only expresses the boundlessness of indetermination and, what is more, maintains the illusion of dualism, a word which in itself is the denial of nature and humanity?

So much for the inward, religious aspect of Carlyle's standpoint. It serves as a point of departure for the assessment of the
outward, politico-social aspect; Carlyle has still enough religion to remain in a state of unfreedom; pantheism still recognises something higher than man himself. Hence his longing for a "true aristocracy", for "heroes"; as if these heroes could at best be more than men. If he had understood man as man in all his infinite complexity, he would not have conceived the idea of once more dividing mankind into two lots, sheep and goats, rulers and ruled, aristocrats and the rabble, lords and dolts, he would have seen the proper social function of talent not in ruling by force but in acting as a stimulant and taking the lead. The role of talent is to convince the masses of the truth of its ideas, and it will then have no need further to worry about their application, which will follow entirely of its own accord. Mankind is surely not passing through democracy to arrive back eventually at the point of departure.—What Carlyle says about democracy, incidentally, leaves little to be desired, if we discount what we have just been referring to, his lack of clarity about the goal, the purpose of modern democracy. Democracy, true enough, is only a transitional stage, though not towards a new, improved aristocracy, but towards real human freedom; just as the irreligiousness of the age will eventually lead to complete emancipation from everything that is religious, superhuman and supernatural, and not to its restoration.

Carlyle recognises the inadequacy of "competition, demand" and "supply, Mammonism", etc., and is far removed from asserting the absolute justification of landownerships. So why has he not drawn the straightforward conclusion from all these assumptions and rejected the whole concept of property? How does he think he will destroy "competition", "supply and demand", Mammonism, etc., as long as the root of all these things, private property, exists? "Organisation of labour" cannot help in this respect, it cannot even be applied without a certain identity of interests. Why then does he not act consistently and decisively, proclaiming the identity of interests the only truly human state of affairs, and thereby putting an end to all difficulties, all imprecision and lack of clarity?

In all Carlyle's rhapsodies, there is not a syllable mentioning the English Socialists. As long as he adheres to his present point of view, which is admittedly infinitely far in advance of that of the mass of educated people in England but still abstract and theoretical, he will indeed not be able to view their efforts with particular sympathy. The English Socialists are purely practical and therefore also propose remedies, home-colonies, etc., rather in the manner of Morison's pills; their philosophy is truly English, sceptical, in
other words they despair of theory, and for all practical purposes they cling to the materialism upon which their whole social system is based; all this will have little appeal for Carlyle, but he is as one-sided as they. Both have only overcome the contradiction within the contradiction; the Socialists within the sphere of practice, Carlyle within the sphere of theory, and even there only spontaneously, whereas the Socialists, by means of reasoning, have definitely overcome the practical aspect of the contradiction. The Socialists are still Englishmen, when they ought to be simply men, of philosophical developments on the Continent they are only acquainted with materialism but not with German philosophy, that is their only shortcoming, and they are directly engaged on the rectification of this deficiency by working for the removal of national differences. We have no need to be very hasty in forcing German philosophy on them, they will come to it of their own accord and it could be of little use to them now. But in any case they are the only party in England which has a future, relatively weak though they may be. Democracy, Chartism must soon be victorious, and then the mass of the English workers will have the choice only between starvation and socialism.

For Carlyle and his standpoint, ignorance of German philosophy is not a matter of such indifference. He is himself a theoretician of the German type, and yet at the same time his nationality leads him to empiricism; he is beset by a flagrant contradiction which can only be resolved if he continues to develop his German-theoretical viewpoint to its final conclusion, until it is totally reconciled with empiricism. To surmount the contradiction in which he is working, Carlyle has only one more step to take, but as all experience in Germany has shown, it is a difficult one. Let us hope that he will take it, and although he is no longer young, he will still probably be capable of it, for the progress shown in his last book proves that his views are still developing.¹⁹⁹

All this shows that Carlyle's book is ten thousand times more worth translating into German than all the legions of English novels which every day and every hour are imported into Germany, and I can only advocate such a translation. But let our hack translators just keep their hands off it! Carlyle writes a very particular English, and a translator who does not thoroughly understand English and references to English conditions would make the most absurd howlers.

¹ Thomas Carlyle, Past and Present.—Ed.
Following this somewhat general introduction, I shall examine in greater detail in the following numbers of this journal the condition of England and the essential part of it, the condition of the working class. The condition of England is of immense importance for history and for all other countries; for as regards social matters England is of course far in advance of all other countries.
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THE CONDITION OF ENGLAND

I.
THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

[Voerwärts! No. 70, August 31, 1844]

The century of revolution has to all appearances passed England by, causing little change. While on the Continent an entire old world was shattered, while a twenty-five-year war cleared the air, in England everything remained calm, neither state nor church were in any way threatened. And yet since the middle of the last century England has experienced a greater upheaval than any other country—an upheaval which is all the more momentous the more quietly it is brought about, and it will therefore in all probability attain its goal more readily in practice than the political revolution in France or the philosophical revolution in Germany. The revolution in England is a social one and therefore more comprehensive and far-reaching than any other. There are no fields—however remote—of human knowledge and no conditions of life which have not contributed to it and which in turn have not been affected by it. The only true revolution is a social revolution, to which political and philosophical revolution must lead; and this social revolution has already been in progress in England for seventy or eighty years and is rapidly approaching its crisis at this very time.

The eighteenth century was the assembling, the gathering of mankind from the fragmentation and isolation into which it had been driven by Christianity; it was the penultimate step towards the self-understanding and self-liberation of mankind, but just because it was the penultimate step it was still partial and remained within the contradictions. The eighteenth century collated the results of the past, which had previously been scattered and appeared to be fortuitous, and laid bare their necessity
and inner connection. The jumble of countless scientific discoveries was put in order, classified and the causal connections shown; knowledge became science, and the sciences approached their perfection, that is to say, they took philosophy on the one hand and practice on the other as their point of departure. Before the eighteenth century science did not exist; the study of nature assumed its scientific form only in the eighteenth century or, in some fields, a few years earlier. Newton created scientific astronomy with the law of gravitation, scientific optics with the decomposition of light, scientific mathematics with the binomial theorem and the theory of infinity, and scientific mechanics with the analysis of the nature of forces. Physics likewise acquired its scientific character in the eighteenth century; chemistry was only brought into being by Black, Lavoisier and Priestley; geography became a science with the establishment of the form of the earth and the many voyages which only now were of benefit to science; with Buffon and Linné natural history too became a science; even geology gradually began to struggle free from the whirl of fantastic hypotheses which threatened to engulf it. The concept of the Encyclopaedia was typical of the eighteenth century; it was based on the awareness that all these sciences were interconnected but it was not yet able to show these connections, so that only a simple juxtaposition could be achieved. History was in a similar position; now for the first time we find voluminous compilations of world history, as yet without any critical comment, and entirely without a philosophical approach, but nevertheless universal history instead of the previous historical fragments limited both in time and place. Politics was given a human foundation, and political economy was reformed by Adam Smith. The culmination of science in the eighteenth century was materialism, the first system of natural philosophy and the consequence of this development of the natural sciences. The struggle against the abstract subjectivity of Christianity forced the philosophy of the eighteenth century to the other extreme; it opposed subjectivity with objectivity, the mind with nature, spiritualism with materialism, the abstract individual with the abstract universal or substance. The eighteenth century represents the revival of the spirit of antiquity as against that of Christianity. Materialism and the republic; the philosophy and politics of the ancient world, arose anew, and the French, the exponents of the ethos of antiquity within Christianity, assumed the historical initiative for a time.

The eighteenth century thus did not resolve the great antithesis which has been the concern of history from the beginning and
whose development constitutes history, the antithesis of substance and subject, nature and mind, necessity and freedom; but it set the two sides against each other, fully developed and in all their sharpness, and thereby made it necessary to overcome the antithesis. The consequence of this clear final evolution of the antithesis was general revolution which spread over various nations and whose imminent completion will at the same time resolve the antithesis of history up to the present. The Germans, the nation of Christian spiritualism, experienced a philosophical revolution; the French, the nation of classical materialism and hence of politics, had to go through a political revolution; the English, a nation that is a mixture of German and French elements, who therefore embody both sides of the antithesis and are for that reason more universal than either of the two factors taken separately, were for that reason drawn into a more universal, a social revolution.

This will need to be elaborated in greater detail, for the position of nations, at least with regard to recent times, has in our philosophy of history so far been dealt with very inadequately, or rather not at all.

That Germany, France and England are the three foremost countries at the present moment in history, I can doubtless take for granted; that the Germans represent the Christian spiritual principle, the French that of classical materialism, in other words, that the former represent religion and the church and the latter politics and the state, is equally obvious or will be made so in due course; the significance of the English in recent history is less conspicuous and yet for our present purpose it is the most important. The English nation was formed from Germanic and Romance people at a time when the two nations had only just separated from one another and their development towards the two sides of the antithesis had scarcely begun. The Germanic and Romance elements developed alongside one another and eventually formed one nation which contains the two unmediated sides. Germanic idealism retained abundant scope so that it was even able to turn into its opposite, abstract externalism; the fact that women and children may still be legally sold, and indeed the whole mercantile spirit of the English, must definitely be attributed to the Germanic element. In a similar fashion, Romance materialism turned into abstract idealism, inwardness and piety; hence the phenomenon of Romance Catholicism persisting within Germanic Protestantism, the Established Church, the papacy of the sovereign and the thoroughly Catholic manner of disposing of religion with mere formalities. The English nation is characterised
by this unresolved contradiction and the mingling of the sharpest contrasts. The English are the most religious nation on earth and at the same time the most irreligious; they worry more about the next world than any other nation, and at the same time they live as though this world were all that mattered to them; their expectation of heaven does not hinder them in the slightest from believing equally firmly in the “hell of making no money”. Hence the everlasting inner restlessness of the English, which is caused by the sense of being unable to resolve the contradiction and which drives them out of themselves and into activity. The sense of contradiction is the source of energy, but merely externalised energy, and this sense of contradiction was the source of colonisation, seafaring, industry and the immense practical activity of the English in general. The inability to resolve the contradiction runs like a thread through the whole of English philosophy and forces it into empiricism and scepticism. Because Bacon could not resolve the contradiction between idealism and realism with his intellect, the intellect as such had to be incapable of solving it, idealism was simply discarded and empiricism regarded as the only remedy. From the same source derives the critical analysis of cognition and the whole psychological tendency within whose bounds English philosophy has moved from the outset, and in the end, after many unsuccessful attempts at resolving the contradiction, philosophy declares it to be insoluble and the intellect to be inadequate, and seeks a way out either in religious faith or in empiricism. Humean scepticism is still the form all irreligious philosophising takes in England today. We cannot know, this viewpoint argues, whether a God exists; if one exists, he is incapable of any communication with us, and we have therefore so to arrange our practical affairs as if he did not exist. We cannot know whether the mind is distinct from the body and immortal; we therefore live as if this life were the only one we have and do not bother about things that go beyond our understanding. In short, this scepticism is in practice exactly the same as French materialism, but in metaphysical theory it never advances beyond the inability of arriving at any definitive conclusion.

However because the English embodied within them both the elements which were responsible for historical progress on the Continent, they were therefore able, even without having much contact with the Continent, to keep abreast of development there and at times even to be ahead of it. The English revolution of the seventeenth century provides the exact model for the French one of 1789. In the “Long Parliament” the three stages which in
France took the form of Constituent and Legislative Assembly and National Convention, are easy to distinguish; the transition from constitutional monarchy to democracy, military despotism, restoration and *juste-milieu* revolution is sharply delineated in the English revolution. Cromwell is Robespierre and Napoleon rolled into one; the Presbyterians, Independents and Levellers correspond to the Gironde, the Montagnards and the Hébertists and Babouvists; in both cases the political outcome is rather pitiable, and the whole parallel, which could be elaborated in much greater detail, incidentally also proves that a religious and an irreligious revolution, as long as they remain political, will in the final analysis amount to the same thing. Admittedly, this lead the English had over the Continent was only temporary and was gradually evened out again; the English revolution ended in *juste-milieu* and the creation of two national parties, whilst the French one is not yet complete and cannot be so until it achieves the result which the German philosophical and the English social revolutions have to achieve as well.

The English national character is thus substantially different both from the German and from the French character; the despair of overcoming the contradiction and the consequent total surrender to empiricism are its peculiar characteristics. The pure Germanic element converted its abstract inwardness into abstract outwardness, but this outwardness never lost the mark of its origin and always remained subordinate to inwardness and spiritualism. The French too are to be found on the side of materialism and empiricism; but because this empiricism is the primary national tendency and not a secondary consequence of a national consciousness divided within itself, it asserts itself nationally, generally and finds expression in political activity. The Germans asserted the absolute justification of spiritualism and hence sought to set forth the universal interests of mankind in religious and later in philosophic terms. The French opposed this spiritualism with materialism as something absolutely justified and consequently considered that the state was the eternal manifestation of these interests. The English however have no universal interests, they cannot mention them without touching that sore spot, the contradiction, they despair of them and have only individual interests. This absolute subjectivity, the fragmentation of the universal into the many individual parts, is admittedly of Germanic origin, but, as we have said, it is cut off from its roots and

---

*The French revolution of July 1830.—Ed.*
therefore only takes effect empirically, which is precisely what distinguishes English social empiricism from French political empiricism. France's actions were always national, conscious of their entireness and universality from the start; England's actions were the work of independent coexisting individuals—the movement of disconnected atoms—who rarely acted together as one whole, and even then only from individual motives, and whose lack of unity is at this very time exposed to the light of day in the universal misery and complete fragmentation of society.

In other words, only England has a social history. Only in England have individuals as such, without consciously standing for universal principles, furthered national development and brought it near to its conclusion. Only here have the masses acted as masses, for the sake of their interests as individuals; only here have principles been turned into interests before they were able to influence history. The French and the Germans are gradually attaining a social history too, but they have not got one yet. On the Continent too there have been poverty, misery and social oppression, this however has had no effect on national development; but the misery and poverty of the working class in present-day England has national and even world-historical importance. On the Continent the social aspect is still completely hidden by the political aspect and has not yet become detached from it, whilst in England the social aspect has gradually prevailed over the political one and has made it subservient. The whole of English politics is fundamentally social in nature, and social questions are expressed in a political way only because England has not yet advanced beyond the state, and because politics is a necessary expedient there.

As long as church and state are the only forms in which the universal characteristics of human nature are realised, there can be no question of social history. Antiquity and the Middle Ages were also therefore without social development; only the Reformation, the first, as yet biased and blundering attempt at a reaction against the Middle Ages, brought about a major social change, the transformation of serfs into "free" workers. But even this change remained without much enduring effect on the Continent, indeed it really took root there only after the revolution of the eighteenth century; whereas in England the category of serfs was transformed during the Reformation into villeins, bordars and cottars and thus into a class of workers enjoying personal freedom, and as
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[a] Engels gives the words "villeins", "bordars" and "cottars" in English.—Ed.
early as the eighteenth century the consequences of this revolution became evident there. Why this happened only in England is explained above.

[Vorwärts! No. 71, September 4, 1844]

Antiquity, which as yet knew nothing of the rights of the individual, whose whole outlook was essentially abstract, universal and material, could therefore not exist without slavery. The Christian-Germanic view of the world, by contrast with antiquity, set up abstract subjectivity, and hence arbitrariness, inwardness and spiritualism, as the basic principle. However this subjectivity, precisely because it was abstract and one-sided, was bound to turn at once into its opposite and to engender, not the freedom of the individual, but the enslavement of the individual. Abstract inwardness became abstract outwardness, the rejection and alienation of man, and the first consequence of the new principle was the restoration of slavery in another form, that of serfdom, which was less offensive but for that reason hypocritical and more inhuman. The dissolution of the feudal system, the political Reformation, in other words, the apparent acknowledgement of reason, and hence really the culmination of unreason, appeared to abolish this serfdom, but in reality only made it more inhuman and more universal. It was the first to declare that mankind should no longer be held together by force, that is, by political means, but by self-interest, that is, by social means, and through this new principle it laid the foundation for social advance. But although it thus negated the state, on the other hand it actually revived the state by restoring to it the content which had previously been usurped by the church, and thus gave the state, which in the Middle Ages had been an empty form of little consequence, the strength for further development. The Christian state, the culmination of the political aspect of the Christian world order, arose from the ruins of feudalism; another aspect of the Christian world order attained its culmination by elevating interestedness to a general principle. For interest is essentially subjective and egoistical, it is the interest of the individual, and as such the highest point of the Germanic and Christian principle of subjectivity and particularisation. The consequence of elevating interest to the nexus of man to man—that is as long as interest remains directly subjective and purely egoistical—is bound to be universal fragmentation, the concentration of each individual upon himself, isolation, the transformation of mankind into a collection of
mutually repelling atoms; and this particularisation is again the ultimate consequence of the Christian principle of subjectivity, the culmination of the Christian world order.

Moreover, as long as private property, the basic form of alienation, exists, interest must necessarily be the interest of the individual and its domination will be the domination of property. The abolition of feudal servitude has made "cash-payment the sole relation of human beings". Property, a natural, spiritless principle, as opposed to the human and spiritual principle, is thus enthroned, and ultimately, to complete this alienation, money—the alienated, empty abstraction of property—is made master of the world. Man has ceased to be the slave of men and has become the slave of things; the perversion of the human condition is complete; the servitude of the modern commercial world, this highly developed, total, universal venality, is more inhuman and more all-embracing than the servitude of the feudal era; prostitution is more immoral and more bestial than the *jus primae noctis*.

The Christian world order cannot be taken any further than this; it must collapse under its own weight and make way for a humane, rational order. The Christian state is merely the last possible manifestation of the state as such; its demise will necessarily mean the demise of the state as such. The disintegration of mankind into a mass of isolated, mutually repelling atoms in itself means the destruction of all corporate, national and indeed of any particular interests and is the last necessary step towards the free and spontaneous association of men. The supremacy of money as the culmination of the process of alienation is an inevitable stage which has to be passed through, if man is to return to himself, as he is now on the verge of doing.

These consequences of the abolition of the feudal system have been taken to such lengths by the social revolution in England that the crisis which will destroy the Christian world order can no longer be far away, and indeed that the time of this crisis can be predicted with certainty, even if not quantitatively, in years, at least qualitatively; for this crisis must begin when the Corn Laws are repealed and the People's Charter introduced, in other words, when the aristocracy of birth has been politically overcome by the money aristocracy and the latter in turn by working-class democracy.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had brought into being all the preconditions for social revolution, they had destroyed the

---

* Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present*, p. 198.—Ed.
Middle Ages, established social, political and religious Protestantism, created England's colonies, sea-power and trade, and set up alongside the aristocracy a growing and already quite powerful middle class. Social conditions gradually settled down after the disturbances of the seventeenth century and acquired a stable form which they retained until about 1780 or 1790.

There were at that time three classes of landowners, the aristocratical landlords, still the only, and unchallenged, nobility of the kingdom, who leased their estates in parcels and consumed the income in London or while travelling; the non-aristocratical landlords or country gentlemen (usually called squires*), who lived at their country-seats, put out their land on lease and enjoyed among their tenants and other local inhabitants the aristocratic esteem which was denied to them in the town on account of their humble origin, lack of education and unpolished country manners. This class has now totally disappeared. The old squires who ruled with patriarchal authority the countryfolk of the district and acted as advisers, arbiters and everything rolled into one, are quite extinct; their descendants call themselves the untitled aristocracy of England, as regards education and fine manners, luxury and aristocratic demeanour they vie with the aristocracy, which has little advantage left over them, and all they have in common with their rude and unpolished forefathers are their estates.

The third class of landowners was that of the yeomen, who owned small plots of land which they worked themselves, usually in the good old careless manner of their forebears; this class too has disappeared from the face of England, the social revolution has expropriated it and brought about the curious situation, that at the same time as in France the large landed estates were being forcibly parcelled out, in England the parcels were being attracted by the large landed estates and swallowed up by them. Alongside the yeomen there were small tenant farmers who were usually engaged in weaving as well as farming; they too are no longer to be found in modern England; almost all the land belongs now to a small number of large estates and is thus let on lease. The competition of the large tenant farmers drove the small tenant farmers and yeomen out of the market and impoverished them; they became agricultural day-labourers and weavers dependent on wages and supplied the masses whose influx caused the towns to grow with such amazing rapidity.

---

* Engels gives the words "country gentlemen" and "squires" in English.—*Ed.

* Engels gives this word in English.—*Ed.
The farmers of those days led a quiet and placid life of godliness and propriety, they lived with few cares, but also without any changes, without general interests, without culture and mental activity; they were still at the prehistoric stage. The position in the towns was not very different. Only London was an important centre of trade; Liverpool, Hull, Bristol, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds and Glasgow were still insignificant. The main industries, spinning and weaving, were carried on chiefly in the country or at least not within the towns, but in their vicinity; the production of metal and pottery wares was still at the handicraft stage of development; not much was therefore likely to happen in the towns. The extreme simplicity of the electoral system relieved the townsfolk of any political cares, they were nominally Whig or Tory, but knew very well that it really made no difference, for they did not have the vote; small merchants, shopkeepers and craftsmen made up the whole urban population and led that familiar life of the small provincial town which is so totally incomprehensible to the English today. Little use was as yet made of the mines; iron, copper and tin lay more or less undisturbed below ground, and coal was only used for domestic purposes. In short, the situation in England was then similar to that which, alas, still exists in most of France and particularly in Germany, that is, a state of antediluvian apathy towards all general and intellectual interests, a state of social infancy, in which society does not as yet exist, where there is as yet no life, no consciousness, no activity. This state is in fact a continuation of feudalism and of medieval thoughtlessness, and will only be overcome with the arrival of modern feudalism, with the division of society into owners of property and non-owners. We on the Continent, as we have said, are still deeply immersed in this state; the English fought against it for eighty years and overcame it forty years ago. If civilisation is a matter of practice, a social quality, then the English are indeed the most civilised people in the world.

I mentioned above that the sciences had assumed their scientific form in the eighteenth century and were consequently connected on the one hand with philosophy and on the other with practice. The result of taking philosophy as the point of departure was materialism (for which Newton was just as much a prerequisite as Locke), the Enlightenment and the French political revolution. The result of taking practice as the point of departure was the English social revolution.

In 1760 George III began his reign, drove out the Whigs—who had held office almost uninterruptedly since the reign of George I
but had of course governed in a thoroughly conservative manner—and laid the foundation of the Tory monopoly which lasted until 1830. The government thereby regained its inner truth; in a politically conservative period in England, it was quite appropriate that the conservative party should rule. From then on, social developments absorbed the energies of the nation and ousted political interests, indeed destroyed them, for all domestic politics is from then on just concealed socialism, the form that social issues take to succeed in asserting themselves generally and nationally.

In 1763 Dr. James Watt of Greenock began working on the design of the steam-engine, and completed it in 1768.

In 1763 Josiah Wedgwood laid the foundations of the English pottery industry by the introduction of scientific principles. By his efforts a desolate area of Staffordshire has been turned into an industrial region—the Potteries—which now employs 60,000 people and has played a very important part in the social and political movement of recent years.

In 1764 in Lancashire James Hargreaves invented the spinning-jenny, a machine operated by one worker, which enabled him to spin sixteen times as much yarn as on the old spinning-wheel.¹

In 1768 Richard Arkwright, a barber from Preston in Lancashire, invented the spinning-throstle, the first spinning-machine which was designed from the outset for mechanical power. It produced water-twist, that is, yarn used for warps in weaving.

In 1776 in Bolton, Lancashire, Samuel Crompton invented the spinning-mule by combining the mechanical principles applied in the jenny and the throstle. The mule, like the jenny, spins the mule-twist, that is, the weaver’s weft; all three machines are designed for the working-up of cotton.

In 1787 Dr. Cartwright invented the power-loom, which however still had to undergo a number of improvements and could not be used in practice until 1801.

These inventions stimulated social development. Their most immediate consequence was the rise of English industry, or more specifically of cotton manufacture in the first instance. The jenny had, it is true, made the production of yarn cheaper, and by the expansion of the market that followed from this, it had given the first impetus to industry; but it left the social aspect, the character of the industrial enterprise, more or less unaffected. It was Ark-

¹ Engels gives most of the technical terms in this and the following two paragraphs in English.—Ed.
wright's and Crompton's machines and Watt's steam engine that first set the movement going, by creating the factory system. Smaller factories, driven by horses or water-power, arose first, but were soon displaced by the larger factories driven by water or steam. The first steam spinning-mill was set up by Watt in Nottinghamshire in 1785; others followed it, and soon the new system became general. The spread of the steam spinning-mill, like all the other industrial improvements introduced simultaneously or later, proceeded with enormous speed. The import of raw cotton, which in 1770 was still less than five million pounds a year, rose to 54 million pounds (1800) and 360 million pounds (1836). Then the steam-loom was actually introduced and gave a new impetus to industrial progress; all the machines underwent countless small but, when taken together, very significant improvements, and each new improvement encouraged the spread of the industrial system as a whole. All branches of the cotton industry were revolutionised; printing was immensely improved by the introduction of mechanical aids and simultaneously by the advances made in chemistry, by which dyeing and bleaching profited as well. Hosiery manufacture too was carried along by this current; and since 1809 machines were used to manufacture fine cotton goods, tulle, lace, etc. I have not the space here to pursue the progress of cotton manufacture through all the details of its history; I can only indicate the outcome, and that, when compared with the antediluvian cotton industry with its four million pounds of imported cotton, with its spinning-wheel, hand-carding and hand-loom, cannot fail to impress.

In 1833, 10,264 million skeins of yarn were spun in Britain, their length amounting to over 5,000 million miles, and 350 million ells of cotton fabric were printed; 1,300 cotton mills were in operation, which employed 237,000 spinners and weavers; over 9 million spindles, 100,000 steam-looms and 240,000 hand-looms, 33,000 hosiery looms and 3,500 bobbinet machines were in operation; cotton-manufacturing machinery used 33,000 h.p. of steam-power and 11,000 h.p. of water-power, and one and a half million people lived directly or indirectly from this industry. Lancashire derives its subsistence solely and Lanarkshire largely from the spinning and weaving of cotton; the subsidiary branches of the cotton industry are chiefly located in Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire. The quantity of exported cotton goods has increased eightfold since 1801; the amount consumed in the country itself has increased a great deal more.
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The impetus given to cotton manufacturing was soon communicated to other branches of industry. The woollen industry had until then been the most important branch of industry; it was now displaced by cotton, but instead of declining, it also grew. In 1785 the whole wool crop of three preceding years lay unused; the spinners could not work it up as long as they had no alternative to their crude spinning-wheel. Then people began to apply the machines for spinning cotton to wool, and this, after a few modifications, was entirely successful; then the wool industry experienced the same rapid growth as we have already observed in the case of cotton manufacture. The import of raw wool rose from 7 million pounds (1801) to 42 million pounds (1835); in the latter year 1,300 woollen mills employing 71,300 workers were in operation, not counting a host of hand-weavers who worked at home, and printers, dyers, bleachers, etc., etc., who also live indirectly from the wool industry. This industry is chiefly located in the West Riding of Yorkshire and the west of England (especially Somerset, Wiltshire, etc.).

The linen industry was formerly located chiefly in Ireland. The first factories for the processing of flax were built towards the end of the last century in Scotland. The machinery was however still very far from perfect; the material gave rise to difficulties which necessitated significant modifications in the machines. They were first improved by the Frenchman Girard (1810); but these improvements acquired practical importance first of all in England. The introduction of steam-looms into the linen industry took place even later; and from this point on linen manufacture expanded at immense speed, although it suffered from the competition of cotton. In England Leeds became the centre of the linen industry, in Scotland Dundee and in Ireland Belfast. Dundee alone imported 3,000 tons of flax in 1814 and 19,000 tons in 1834. The export of linen from Ireland, where hand-weaving continued to exist alongside power-weaving, rose by 20 million yards from 1800 to 1825, almost all of which went to England, and from there some of it was re-exported. Exports from the whole of Britain to foreign countries rose by 27 million yards between 1820 and 1833; in 1835 there were 347 flax mills in operation, 170 of these in Scotland; 33,000 workers were employed in these mills, not counting the many Irish artisans.

The silk industry only became important after 1824 with the abolition of the heavy customs duties, since then the import of raw
silk has doubled and the number of factories increased to 266, employing 30,000 workers. This industry is chiefly located in Cheshire (Macclesfield, Congleton and district), then follow Manchester, and Paisley in Scotland. The centre of ribbon-making is Coventry in Warwickshire.

These four industries which produce yarn and fabrics were thus totally revolutionised. Domestic industry was replaced by collective labour in large buildings; manual labour was supplanted by steam-power and the use of machinery. With the aid of the machine a child of eight was now able to produce more than twenty grown men before. Six hundred thousand factory workers, of whom half are children and more than half female, are doing the work of one hundred and fifty million people.

But that is only the beginning of the industrial revolution. We have seen that dyeing, printing and bleaching expanded as a result of the advance in spinning and weaving and consequently sought the assistance of engineering and chemistry. Since the application of the steam-engine and of metal cylinders in printing, one man does the work of two hundred; the use of chlorine instead of oxygen in bleaching has reduced the time required for this operation from a few months to a few hours. While the industrial revolution thus affected the processes to which the product was subjected after spinning and weaving, its repercussions on the materials used by the new industry were even more significant. It was only through the steam-engine that the inexhaustible coal fields beneath the surface of England acquired their great importance; new coal mines were opened in large numbers and the old ones worked with redoubled energy. The manufacture of spinning-machines and looms also began to constitute a separate branch of industry and reached a degree of perfection unattained by any other nation. The machines were made by machines, and by a division of labour extending to the minutest detail, it was possible to achieve the precision and exactitude which distinguish English machines. The machine-building industry in its turn influenced iron and copper mining, which however received their chief impetus from another direction, but this too was caused by the original revolution effected by Watt and Arkwright.

The consequences of an industrial impetus, once given, are endless. The progress made in one industry is communicated to all the others. The newly-created forces demand nourishment, as we have just seen; the newly-created working population brings in its wake new conditions of life and new needs. The mechanical
advantages of factory production reduce the price of manufactured articles, and therefore make the necessities of life and in consequence wages in general cheaper; all other products can be sold more cheaply and thereby reach a wider market in proportion to their cheapness. Once the advantageous application of mechanical devices has been demonstrated, it is gradually imitated throughout industry; the advance in civilisation, which is the inevitable consequence of all industrial improvements, generates new needs, new industries and thus again new improvements. The consequence of the revolution in cotton-spinning was necessarily a revolution in the whole of industry; and if we cannot always trace how the motive forces are imparted to the more remote branches of the industrial system, only the absence of statistical and historical information is to blame. But we shall see everywhere that the introduction of mechanical devices and of scientific principles in general has been the mainspring of progress.

After spinning and weaving, metal-working is the most important industry in England. It is chiefly located in Warwickshire (Birmingham) and Staffordshire (Wolverhampton). Steam-power was very soon employed in this industry and this, together with division of labour, cut the production costs of metal goods by three-quarters. On the other hand, exports multiplied fourfold from 1800 to 1835. In the former year 86,000 cwt. of iron goods and the same quantity of copper goods were exported, in the latter year 320,000 cwt. of iron and 210,000 cwt. of copper and brass goods. The export of bar-iron and pig-iron became significant at the same time; in 1800, 4,600 tons of bar-iron were exported, in 1835, 92,000 tons of bar-iron and 14,000 tons of pig-iron.

English cutlery is made exclusively in Sheffield. The use of steam-power, especially for grinding and polishing blades, the conversion of iron into steel, which only then became important, and the newly-invented method of casting steel, brought about a complete revolution here too. Sheffield alone consumes annually 500,000 tons of coal and 12,000 tons of iron, of which 10,000 tons come from abroad (particularly from Sweden).

The use of cast-iron goods also dates from the second half of the last century and has attained its present importance only in the last few years. Gas-lighting (introduced, in effect, since 1804) created an enormous demand for cast-iron pipes; the railways, suspension bridges, etc., machinery, etc., increased this demand still more. In 1780 puddling was invented, that is, the conversion of cast into wrought iron by heating and removing the carbon, and this gave new importance to the English iron-ore mines. For
lack of charcoal the English had until then to obtain all their wrought iron from abroad. Since 1790 nails have been made by machine, and screws since 1810; in Sheffield Huntsman invented crucible steel-making in 1760; wire was drawn by machinery, and generally a host of new machines was introduced throughout the iron and brass industry, manual labour was ousted and, insofar as the nature of the business permitted, the factory system was established.

The increase in mining was only the necessary consequence of this. Until 1788 all iron-ore had been smelted with charcoal and iron extraction had therefore been limited by the small quantity of fuel available. After 1788 coke (coked coal) began to be used instead of charcoal and the amount produced annually was as a result multiplied by six in six years. In 1740, the annual output was 17,000 tons, in 1835, 558,000 tons. Extraction from the tin and copper mines has trebled since 1770. But along with the iron mines the coal mines are the most important in England. The growth of coal production since the middle of the last century cannot be assessed. The vast quantity of coal which is now consumed by the countless steam-engines working in the factories and mines, by the forges, by the smelting-furnaces and casting-works and by the domestic heating of a population that has doubled, bears no relation whatever to the amount consumed one hundred or eighty years ago. The smelting of pig-iron alone devours over three million tons a year (at twenty cwt. a ton).

The most immediate consequence of the creation of industry was the improvement of the means of communication. In the last century the roads in England were just as bad as elsewhere and remained so until the celebrated McAdam based road-building on scientific principles and thereby gave a new impetus to the advance of civilisation. From 1818 to 1829 new highways with a total length of 1,000 English miles were laid down in England and Wales, not counting smaller country lanes, and almost all the old roads were reconstructed according to McAdam's principles. In Scotland the public works authorities have built over 1,000 bridges since 1803. In Ireland, the wide, desolate bogs of the south, inhabited by half-wild robbers, were traversed by roads. By these means the remotest localities in the country, which had previously had no contact with the outside world, were now made accessible; in particular the Celtic-speaking areas of Wales, the Scottish Highlands and the south of Ireland were thereby compelled to make acquaintance with the outside world and accept the civilisation imposed upon them.
In 1755 the first canal of any note was constructed in Lancashire; in 1759 the Duke of Bridgewater started to build a canal from Worsley to Manchester. Since then canals have been constructed to a total length of 2,200 miles; in addition England has another 1,800 miles of navigable rivers, which for the most part have also been opened up only recently.

Since 1807, steam-power has been used for the propulsion of ships, and since the construction of the first British steamship (1811), 600 others have been built. In 1835 there were some 550 steamships sailing from British ports.

The first public railway was built in Surrey in 1801; but only with the opening of the Liverpool-Manchester railway (1830) did the new form of transport become important. Six years later, 680 miles of railway had been constructed and four major lines—from London to Birmingham, Bristol and Southampton, and from Birmingham to Manchester and Liverpool—were in operation. Since then the network has been extended over the whole of England; London is the junction of nine railways, and Manchester of five.*

This revolution through which British industry has passed is the foundation of every aspect of modern English life, the driving force behind all social development. Its first consequence was, as we have already indicated, the elevation of self-interest to a position of dominance over man. Self-interest seized the newly-created industrial powers and exploited them for its own purposes; these powers, which by right belong to mankind, became, owing to the influence of private property, the monopoly of a few rich capitalists and the means to the enslavement of the masses. Commerce absorbed industry into itself and thereby became omnipotent, it became the nexus of mankind; all personal and national intercourse was reduced to commercial intercourse, and—which amounts to the same thing—property, things, became master of the world.
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The domination of property was bound to turn first against the state and to destroy it, or, at least, as it cannot do without it, to undermine it. Adam Smith began this undermining at the very time of the industrial revolution by publishing in 1776 his Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations and thereby

* The above statistical data are mainly drawn from The Progress of the Nation by G. Porter, a Board of Trade official under the Whig Ministry, that is, from official sources.—Note by Engels.
created the science of finance. Up to now all finance had been entirely national; the economy had been regarded as a mere branch of affairs of the state as a whole and subordinated to the state as such; Adam Smith subordinated cosmopolitanism to national aims and raised the economy of the state to the very essence and purpose of the state. He reduced politics, parties, religion, indeed everything, to economic categories and thereby recognised property as the essence of the state and enrichment as its purpose. On the other hand, William Godwin (Political Justice, 1793\(^a\)) supported the republican political system, propounded, at the same time as J. Bentham, the principle of utility, whereby the republican salus publica suprema lex\(^b\) was taken to its legitimate conclusions, and attacked the very essence of the state itself with his aphorism that the state is an evil. Godwin still defines the principle of utility quite generally as the duty of the citizen to live only for the general good without regard to his individual interest; Bentham, on the contrary, takes the essentially social nature of this principle further and in accordance with the national trend of that time makes the individual interest the basis of the general interest: he recognises that the two are identical in the proposition, which his pupil Mill in particular developed, that charity is nothing but enlightened egoism, and he substitutes the greatest happiness of the greatest number for the “general good”. Bentham here makes the same error in his empiricism as Hegel made in his theory; he does not seriously try to overcome the contradictions, he turns the subject into the predicate, subordinates the whole to the part and in so doing stands everything on its head. First he says that the general and individual interests are inseparable and then he stays unilaterally at the crudest individual interest. His proposition is only the empirical expression of another one, namely, that man is mankind, but because it is expressed empirically it grants the rights of the species not to the free, self-conscious, creative man, but to the crude and blind man who remains within the confines of the contradictions. Bentham makes free competition the essence of morality, regulates human relations according to the laws of property, of things, according to the laws of nature, and thus represents the culmination of the old, naturally evolved Christian world order, the highest point of alienation, and not the beginning of a new order to be created by self-conscious man in full freedom. He does not advance beyond the state, but strips it of all

\(^a\) An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice.—Ed.

\(^b\) The public good is the supreme law.—Ed.
meaning, substitutes social principles for political ones, turns the political organisation into the form of the social content and thus carries the contradiction to its extreme limit.

The democratic party originated at the same time as the industrial revolution. In 1769 J. Horne Tooke founded the Society of the Bill of Rights, in which, for the first time since the republic, democratic principles were discussed again. As in France, the democrats were exclusively men with a philosophical education, but they soon found that the upper and middle classes were opposed to them and only the working class lent a ready ear to their principles. Amongst the latter class they soon founded a party, which by 1794 was already fairly strong and yet still only strong enough to act by fits and starts. From 1797 to 1816 it disappeared from view; in the turbulent years from 1816 to 1823 it was again very active but then subsided once more into inactivity until the July revolution. From then on it has maintained its importance alongside the old parties and is making steady progress, as we shall later see.

The most important effect of the eighteenth century for England was the creation of the proletariat by the industrial revolution. The new industry demanded a constantly available mass of workers for the countless new branches of production, and moreover workers such as had previously not existed. Up to 1780 England had few proletarians, a fact which emerges inevitably from the social condition of the nation as described above. Industry concentrated work in factories and towns; it became impossible to combine manufacturing and agricultural activity, and the new working class was reduced to complete dependence on its labour. What had hitherto been the exception became the rule and spread gradually outside the towns too. Small-scale farming was ousted by the large tenant farmers and thus a new class of agricultural labourers was created. The population of the towns trebled and quadrupled and almost the whole of this increase consisted solely of workers. The expansion of mining likewise required a large number of new workers, and these too lived solely from their daily wage.

On the other hand, the middle class rose to become definitely aristocratic. During the industrial advance manufacturers multiplied their capital in an amazingly rapid fashion; the merchants likewise received their share, and the capital created by this rev-
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a Of 1649-60.—Ed.
olution was the means by which the English aristocracy fought the French Revolution.

The result of this whole development was that England is now split into three parties, the landed aristocracy, the monied aristocracy, and working-class democracy. These are the only parties in England, they alone act as driving forces, and how they act we will perhaps try to describe in a later article.

Written in February 1844
First published in Vorwärts!
(Paris) Nos. 70, 71, 72 and 73, August 31 and September 4, 7 and 11, 1844
In the previous article we elaborated the criteria for assessing the present position of the British Empire in the history of civilisation, and gave the relevant facts concerning the development of the English nation insofar as they are indispensable to this purpose but are little known on the Continent; having thus justified our initial assumptions, we can now proceed without more ado to the object of our investigation.

The position of England has hitherto seemed enviable to all other nations of Europe, and indeed so it is to anyone who dwells on the surface and observes simply with the eyes of a politician. Britain is an empire of such a kind as is possible today, and such as all other empires in essence were as well; for the empires of Alexander and Caesar too represented, like the British, the rule of civilised nations over barbarians and colonies. No other country in the world can measure up to England in terms of power and wealth, and this power and wealth do not lie in the hands of a single despot, as was the case in Rome, but belong to the educated part of the nation. The fear of despotism and the struggle against the power of the Crown came to an end a hundred years ago; England is undeniably the freest, in other words, the least unfree, country in the world, not excepting North America, and the educated Englishman consequently has about him a degree of innate independence such as no Frenchman, to say nothing of German, can boast of. The political activity, the free press, the maritime supremacy and the colossal industry of England have so fully developed the energy inherent in the national character, the combination of the most resolute force and the calmest delibera-
tion, in almost every individual that in this respect too the continental nations trail infinitely far behind the English. The history of the British Army and Navy is a series of brilliant victories, whilst England has scarcely seen an enemy on its shores for the past eight hundred years; the stature of its literature can only be rivalled by the literature of ancient Greece and Germany; England has produced at least two great names—Bacon and Locke—in philosophy, and innumerable ones in the empirical sciences, and if it is a question of which nation has done most, no one can deny that the English are that nation.

These are the things of which England can be proud, in which she surpasses the Germans and the French, and which I have listed here at the outset, so that the good Germans may convince themselves of my "impartiality" at the very start; for I know full well that in Germany it is much more acceptable to make inconsiderate statements about the Germans than about any other nation. And, broadly speaking, the things I have just listed form the subject-matter of that whole literature, so voluminous and yet so very unproductive and unnecessary, which has been churned out about England on the Continent. It has not occurred to anyone to investigate the nature of English history and of the English national character, and just how paltry all the literature about England is, is revealed by the simple fact that Herr von Raumer's paltry work about England is still, as far as I know, held to be the best on the subject in Germany.

Since England has hitherto only been considered from the political angle, let us begin with that. Let us examine the English Constitution, which, as the Tories put it, is "the most perfect product of English reason", and let us, as another favour to the politician, for the present proceed quite empirically.

The juste-milieu esteem it a particular beauty of the English Constitution that it has developed "historically"; that means, in plain German, that the old basis created by the revolution of 1688 has been preserved, and this foundation, as they call it, further built on. We shall soon see what characteristics the English Constitution has acquired in consequence; for the moment a simple comparison of the Englishman of 1688 with the Englishman of 1844 will suffice to prove that an identical constitutional foundation for both of them is an absurdity and an impossibility. Even disregarding the general progress of civilisation, the political character of the nation alone is quite different from what it was

---

*England im Jahre 1835.—Ed.*
then. The Test Act, the Habeas Corpus Act and the Bill of Rights were Whig measures which arose from the weakness and defeat of the Tories at that time and were directed against these Tories, in other words, against absolute monarchy and open or concealed Catholicism. But within the next fifty years the old Tories disappeared and their descendants adopted the principles which were hitherto the property of the Whigs; since George I ascended the throne, the monarchical, Catholic Tories have become an aristocratic, High-Church party, and since the French Revolution, which first woke them up, the positive precepts of Toryism have evaporated increasingly into abstract "conservatism", the undisguised, unthinking defence of the status quo—indeed even this stage has already been left behind. Through Sir Robert Peel Toryism has decided to acknowledge change, it has realised that the English Constitution cannot be defended, and is making concessions simply to maintain that tottering structure as long as possible.

The Whigs have undergone an equally important development, a new democratic party has arisen, and yet the foundation of 1688 is still supposed to be adequate for 1844! Now the inevitable consequence of this "historical development" is that the inner contradictions which are characteristic features of constitutional monarchy and which were sufficiently exposed even at the time when modern German philosophy still upheld a republican viewpoint—that these contradictions attain their most extreme form in the modern English monarchy. In fact the English constitutional monarchy is the culmination of constitutional monarchy as such, it is the only state where, insofar as this is still possible at the present time, a real aristocracy of birth has held its position alongside a comparatively highly developed public consciousness, and consequently where that trinity of legislative power really exists which on the Continent has been artificially restored and is maintained only with difficulty.

If the essence of the state, as of religion, is mankind's fear of itself, this fear reaches its highest pitch in constitutional, and particularly in the English, monarchy. The experience of three millennia has not made men wiser but on the contrary more confused and more prejudiced, it has made them mad, and the result of this madness is the political condition of present-day Europe. The pure monarchy arouses terror—people think of
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Oriental and Roman despotism. Pure aristocracy is no less frightening—the patricians of Rome and the feudalism of the Middle Ages, the nobili of Venice and Genoa have not been in vain. Democracy is more dreadful than either; Marius and Sulla, Cromwell and Robespierre, the bloody heads of two kings, proscription lists and dictatorship speak loudly enough of the "horrors" of democracy. What is more, it is generally known that none of these forms has ever been able to survive for long. What then was to be done? Instead of proceeding on a straight course, instead of concluding from the imperfection or rather inhumanity of all forms of the state that the state itself is the cause of all these inhumanities and is itself inhuman, instead of that people took comfort in the view that immorality only adheres to particular forms of the state, they deduced from the above premises that the result of three immoral factors can be a moral product, and created the constitutional monarchy.

The first axiom of constitutional monarchy is that of the balance of powers, and this axiom is the most perfect expression of mankind’s fear of itself. It is not my intention to comment on the absurd irrationality and total impracticability of this axiom, I will merely examine whether it is applied in the English Constitution; as I promised, I shall stick exclusively to empirical facts, so much so indeed that it will perhaps be too much even for our political empiricists. I shall therefore not take the English Constitution as it figures in Blackstone’s Commentaries, in de Lolme’s fantasies or in the long series of constituent statutes from “Magna Carta” to the Reform Bill, but as it is in reality.

First, the monarchic element. Everyone knows the real significance of the sovereign king of England, whether male or female. The power of the Crown is reduced in practice to nil, and if this situation, notorious the world over, needed any further proof, the fact that the whole struggle against the Crown ceased over a hundred years ago and that even the radical democratic Chartists know their time is better spent on other things than on this struggle, should be sufficient proof. What then becomes of that third part of the legislative power which in theory is assigned to the Crown? Nevertheless—and in this, fear reaches its climax—the English Constitution cannot exist without the monarchy. Remove the Crown, the "subjective apex", and the whole artificial structure comes tumbling down. The English Constitution
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is an inverted pyramid; the apex is at the same time the base. And the less important the monarchic element became in reality, the more important did it become for the Englishman. Nowhere, as we all know, is a non-ruling personage more revered than in England. The English press surpasses the German by far in slavish servility. But this loathsome cult of the king as such, the veneration of an empty idea—or rather not an idea but the word "king"—stripped of all content, is the culmination of monarchy, just as the veneration of the mere word "God" is the culmination of religion. The word "king" is the essence of the state, just as the word "God" is the essence of religion, even though neither word has any meaning at all. The essential thing about both of them is to make sure that the essential thing, that is, man, who is behind these words, is not discussed.

Then, the aristocratic element. At least in the sphere assigned to it by the Constitution, it fares little better than the Crown. If the mockery which has continuously been heaped on the House of Lords for more than a hundred years has gradually become so much a part of public opinion that this branch of the legislature is generally regarded as a home for superannuated statesmen and the offer of a peerage as an insult by any not yet totally worn-out member of the House of Commons, it may easily be imagined in what esteem the second of the political powers established by the Constitution is held. In fact the activity of the Lords in the Upper House has been reduced to a mere empty formality, rising only rarely to a kind of force of inertia such as was displayed during the Whig Ministry of 1830 to 1840—and even then the Lords are not strong in themselves but through the Tories, the party whose most genuine representatives they are; and the House of Lords, whose main advantage in constitutional theory is supposed to be the fact that it is equally independent of the Crown and of the people, is in reality dependent on a party, that is, on the state of public opinion, and also on the Crown, because of its right to create peers. But the weaker the Upper House was, the firmer was its position in public opinion. The constitutional parties, the Tories, Whigs and Radicals, shrink with equal horror from the idea of abolishing this empty formality, and the Radicals go no further than to observe that the Lords, as the only power in the Constitution that is answerable to no one, are an anomaly and that therefore the hereditary peerage should be replaced by an elected peerage. Once more it is the fear of humanity which maintains this empty form, and the Radicals, who are demanding a purely democratic basis for the House of Commons, take this fear even
further than the other two parties by attempting to breathe new life into the worn-out, antiquated House of Lords by an infusion of popular blood, so as to avoid abandoning it altogether. The Chartists have a better idea of what they must do; they know that before the assault of a democratic House of Commons, the whole rotten structure, Crown, Lords and so forth, must collapse of its own accord, and unlike the Radicals they therefore do not worry about the reform of the peerage.

And just as the veneration for the Crown has grown in proportion as the power of the Crown diminished, so the aristocracy has risen all the higher in popular esteem the more the political influence of the House of Lords declined. It is not just that the most humiliating formalities of the feudal era have been retained, that the members of the House of Commons, when they appear in an official capacity before the Lords, have to stand cap in hand before the seated and behatted Lords and that the official mode of addressing a nobleman is “may it please your lordship”, etc.; the worst of it is that all these formalities really are the expression of public opinion, which regards a Lord as a being of a superior kind and harbours a respect for pedigrees, sonorous titles, old family mementoes, etc., which is as repugnant and nauseating to us continental as the cult of the Crown. In this aspect of the English character too we have again the same veneration for an empty, meaningless word, the utterly insane, fixed idea that a great nation, that the human race and the universe, could not exist without the word “aristocracy”.

For all that, the aristocracy nevertheless has an important influence in reality; but just as the power of the Crown is the power of the Ministers, in other words, of the representatives of the majority of the House of Commons, and has thus taken quite a different turn from that intended by the Constitution, so the power of the aristocracy consists in something quite other than its right to an hereditary seat in the legislature. The aristocracy is strong because of its vast estates, its wealth in general, and it therefore shares this strength with all other, non-aristocratic men of wealth; the power of the Lords is effective not in the House of Lords but in the House of Commons, and this brings us to that component of the legislature which according to the Constitution is supposed to represent the democratic element.

* Engels gives this phrase both in German and in English.— *Ed.*
If the Crown and the House of Lords are powerless, it follows that all power must necessarily be concentrated in the House of Commons, and this is the case. In reality the House of Commons makes the laws and administers them through the Ministers, who are but a committee of the House. The House of Commons being thus omnipotent, England ought to be a pure democracy, even if nominally the other two branches of the legislature continue to exist, provided the democratic element itself were truly democratic. But there is no question of this. The local organisations were quite unaffected by the constitutional settlement after the revolution of 1688; the cities, boroughs and constituencies which had previously had the right to send a member retained it; and this right was by no means one of the democratic "universal human rights", but an entirely feudal privilege, which as late as Elizabeth's reign was conferred quite arbitrarily by the grace and favour of the Crown on many towns which had not previously been represented. Even the representative character which the elections to the House of Commons at least originally had, was soon lost through "historical development". The composition of the old House of Commons is well known. In the towns the return of a member was either in the hands of an individual or of an exclusive corporation co-opting its own members; only a few boroughs were open, in other words, had a fairly large electorate, and here the most brazen bribery put paid to the last vestiges of true representation. The closed boroughs were mostly in the pocket of one individual, usually a lord; and in the rural constituencies the all-powerful big landowners suppressed any free, spontaneous stirring there might be among the people, who were moreover politically inert. The old House of Commons was no more than an exclusive medieval corporation independent of the people, the culmination of the "historical" right, incapable of adducing even a single genuinely or apparently rational argument for its existence, existing in defiance of all reason and hence denying in 1794 through its committee that it was an assembly of representatives and that England was a representative state.* In comparison with such a Constitution, the theory of representative government, even of an ordinary constitutional monarchy with a chamber of deputies, must have appeared thoroughly revolutionary and reprehensible.

and the Tories were therefore quite right when they described the Reform Bill as a measure diametrically opposed to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution and which undermined the Constitution. The Reform Bill, however, went through, and it is now our task to see what it has made of the English Constitution and particularly of the House of Commons. In the first place, the conditions for the election of members in the countryside have remained exactly the same. The electors are here almost exclusively tenant farmers, and they are utterly dependent on their landlord since the latter, who has no contractual relationship with them, may at any time terminate the lease. The members for the counties (as opposed to the towns) remain, as they were before, deputies of the landowners, since it is only at times of the greatest unrest, as in 1831, that the tenant farmers dare to vote against the landowners. Indeed, the Reform Bill only aggravated the evil, since it increased the number of county members. Of the 252 county members, the Tories can consequently always count on at least 200, except when there is general unrest among the tenant farmers which would make any intervention by the landowners unwise. In the towns representation was introduced, at least formally, and every man occupying a house of at least ten pounds sterling annual rental value and paying direct taxes (poor-rate, etc.) received the vote. By this means the enormous majority of the working classes is excluded; for in the first place it is naturally only the married who live in separate houses, and even if a significant number of these houses have an annual rent of ten pounds, almost all the occupiers avoid the payment of direct taxes and are therefore not electors. Universal suffrage as advocated by the Chartists would at least treble the number of persons entitled to vote. The towns are thus in the hands of the middle class, and this in its turn is in the smaller towns very frequently—directly or indirectly—dependent on the landlords, via the tenant farmers, who are the main customers of the tradesmen and craftsmen. Only in the large towns does the middle class really achieve supremacy, and in the smaller factory towns, especially in Lancashire, where the middle class lacks significant numbers and the country people significant influence, where therefore even a minority of the working class has a decisive effect on the outcome, the illusory representation approaches true representation in some measure. These towns, e.g., Ashton, Oldham, Rochdale, Bolton, etc., consequently send almost exclusively Radicals to Parliament. In these places, as in all factory towns generally, an extension of the franchise on Chartist principles would enable this party to gain a

majority of votes. Apart from these various and in practice very complex influences, various local interests also make themselves felt, and finally, a very significant influence—bribery. In the first article of the present series, we already mentioned that the House of Commons, through its Bribery Committee, declared that it was elected by bribery, and Thomas Duncombe, the only thoroughgoing Chartist member, long ago told the House of Commons plainly that not a single member of the whole assembly, not even he himself, could say that he had secured his seat by the free vote of his constituents without bribery. Last summer, Richard Cobden, member for Stockport and leader of the Anti-Corn Law League, declared at a public meeting in Manchester that bribery had reached greater proportions than ever, that in the Tory Carlton Club and the Liberal Reform Club in London the representation of towns was positively auctioned to the highest bidder, and that these clubs acted as contractors—for so many pounds we guarantee you a certain position, etc.—And on top of all this we must not forget the fine manner in which the elections are held, the general drunkenness amid which the votes are cast, the public houses where the electors become intoxicated at the candidates' expense, the disorder, the brawling, the howling of the crowds at the voting-booths; thus putting the finishing touches to the hollowness of representation which is valid for seven years.

[Vorwärts! No. 77, September 25, 1844]

We have seen that the Crown and the House of Lords have lost their importance; we have seen how the all-powerful House of Commons is recruited; the question is now: who then actually rules in England? Property rules. Property enables the aristocracy to control the election of deputies for rural areas and small towns; property enables the merchants and manufacturers to choose the members for the large and to some extent also for the small towns; property enables both to increase their influence by bribery. The rule of property is explicitly recognised in the Reform Bill by the property qualification incorporated in it. And to the extent that property and the influence conferred by property constitute the essence of the middle class, to the extent therefore that the aristocracy brings its property to bear in the elections and thus does not act as an aristocracy but puts itself on
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a level with the middle class, to the extent that the influence of the actual middle class is on the whole much greater than that of the aristocracy, to that extent the middle class does indeed rule. But how and why does it rule? Because the people do not as yet really understand the nature of property, because they are in general—at least in the countryside—still intellectually dead and therefore tolerate the tyranny of property. England is admittedly a democracy, but in the same way as Russia is a democracy; as the people unwittingly rules everywhere, and the government in every state is but another expression for the level of education of the people.

It will be difficult to retrace our steps from the practice of the English Constitution to the theory of it. There is the most flagrant contradiction between the theory and the practice; the two are so estranged from one another that they no longer have any similarity. On the one hand the trinity of the legislature—on the other the tyranny of the middle class; on the one hand a two-chamber system—on the other the all-powerful House of Commons; on the one hand the royal prerogative—on the other a government chosen by the Commons; on the one hand an independent House of Lords with hereditary legislators—on the other a home for antiquated members of the Commons. Each of the three components of the legislature has had to surrender its power to another element: the Crown to the Ministers, in other words to the majority of the House of Commons, the Lords to the Tory party, that is, to a popular element, and to the Ministers who create the peers, in other words, basically to a popular element too, and the Commons to the middle class, or, which amounts to the same thing, to the people that has not yet come of age politically. In reality the English Constitution has ceased to exist at all, the whole wearisome process of legislation is a mere farce; the contradiction between theory and practice has become so glaring that it cannot possibly persist for long, and even if the vitality of this ailing Constitution appears to have been somewhat increased by the emancipation of the Catholics, of which we shall have cause to speak further, and by the parliamentary and municipal reform, these measures—which in themselves are an admission that hope of preserving the Constitution has been given up—introduce into it elements which unquestionably contradict the fundamental principles of the Constitution and thus further intensify the conflict by making the theory contradict itself.
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We have seen that the organisation of powers in the English Constitution depends entirely on fear. This fear is even more evident in the rules by which legislation proceeds, the so-called Standing Orders. Every Bill must pass three readings in each of the two Houses, at stated intervals; after the second reading it is referred to a Committee which discusses it in detail; in cases of some importance, the House becomes a Committee of the whole House to discuss the Bill and appoints a reporter, who afterwards with great solemnity presents a report on the discussion to the very House that discussed the Bill. Incidentally, is this not the most splendid example of "the transcendent within the immanent and the immanent within the transcendent" that a Hegelian could possibly wish for? "The knowledge the House of Commons has of the committee is the knowledge the committee has of itself", and the reporter is "the absolute personification of the intermediary, in whom the two are identical". Every Bill is thus discussed eight times before it can receive the royal assent. Once more it is of course fear of humanity that underlies this absurd procedure. They realise that progress is the essence of humanity but have not the courage to proclaim progress openly; they pass laws which are supposed to have absolute validity and which therefore put barriers in the way of progress; and by reserving the right to amend laws, the progress which they have just denied is allowed in again through the backdoor. But care must be taken not to proceed too fast, not to be over-hasty! Progress is revolutionary, it is dangerous, and there must therefore be a powerful brake on it; before they decide to acknowledge it, they must ponder the matter eight times. But this fear, which is futile in itself, and only proves that those who are filled with it are themselves not yet real, free men, is bound to lead to the introduction of inappropriate measures. Instead of ensuring a comprehensive examination of the Bills, the repeated reading of them becomes quite superfluous in practice and a mere formality. The main argument is usually concentrated in the first or second reading, sometimes also in the debates in committee, according to what suits the opposition best. The whole futility of this multiplication of debates becomes evident when one considers that the fate of each Bill is already decided at the outset, and where it is not decided, the debate concerns not the particular Bill but the existence of a Cabinet. The outcome of all these antics, which are repeated eight times, is thus not a calmer discussion in the House itself, but something quite
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different which was by no means the intention of those who intro-
duced these antics. The protracted nature of the deliberations
gives public opinion time to form an opinion about the pro-
posed measure and if need be to oppose it by means of meetings
and petitions, and often—as last year in the case of Sir James
Graham’s Education Bill—a—successfully. But this, as we have said,
was not the original purpose and could be achieved far more
simply.

While we are now on the subject of the Standing Orders, we
may mention a few more points which betray the fear that is part
of the English Constitution and the original corporate character of
the House of Commons. The debates in the House of Commons
are not public; admission is a privilege and is usually secured only
by written order of a member. During divisions the galleries are
cleared; despite this absurd secretiveness, the abolition of which
the House has always vigorously opposed, the names of the
members who have voted for and against are in all the newspapers
on the following day. The Radical members have never been able
to get approval for an authentic publication of the minutes—a
fortnight ago a motion to this end failed—and as a consequence
the printer of the parliamentary reports that appear in the papers
is solely responsible for their content and can be sued, according
to the law even by the government, for the publication of
defamatory statements by anyone who feels insulted by a remark
by a Member of Parliament, while the author of the defamation is
protected from any prosecution by his parliamentary privilege.
These and a host of other points in the Standing Orders show the
exclusive, anti-popular character of the reformed Parliament; and
the tenacity with which the House of Commons holds to these
customs shows clearly enough that it has no desire to transform
itself from a privileged, corporative body into an assembly of
representatives of the people.

[Vorwärts! No. 78, September 28, 1844]

Another proof of this is the privilege enjoyed by Parliament, the
exceptional position of its members vis-à-vis the courts and the
right of the House of Commons to have anyone it wishes arrested.
Originally aimed against infringements by the Crown, which has
since that time been deprived of all its power, this privilege has in
recent times only been used against the people. In 1771 the House
was angered by the insolence of the newspapers which had

* See this volume, p. 381.—Ed.
published its debates, a thing which after all only the House itself was entitled to do, and tried to put a stop to this insolence by arresting the printers and then the officials who had released these printers. Of course this was unsuccessful; but the attempt shows the nature of the privileges Parliament enjoys, and its failure shows that even the House of Commons, despite its being exalted over the people, is nevertheless dependent on the latter, in other words, that the House of Commons does not rule either.

In a country where "Christianity is part and parcel of the laws of the land" the *Established Church* is necessarily part of the Constitution. According to her Constitution, England is essentially a Christian state, indeed a fully developed and powerful Christian state; state and church merge entirely with one another and are inseparable. This unity of church and state can however only exist in *one* Christian denomination, to the exclusion of all others, and these excluded sects are of course thereby branded as heretical and are victims of religious and political persecution. So it is in England. These sects were thus all along thrown together as one class, excluded, as nonconformists or dissenters, from all participation in the state, harassed and hampered in their worship and prosecuted by penal laws. The more fervently they declared themselves against the unity of church and state, the more violently was this unity defended by the ruling party and exalted to a vital concern of the state. When the Christian state in England was still in its heyday, the persecution of the dissenters and more especially of the Catholics was therefore a daily occurrence, a persecution which was admittedly less violent but more universal and persistent than that of the Middle Ages. The disease ceased to be acute and became chronic, the sudden, blood-thirsty outbursts of anti-Catholic fury were transformed into cold political calculation which sought to exterminate heterodoxy by gentler but sustained pressure. Persecution was transferred to the secular sphere and thereby made harder to bear. Disbelief in the Thirty-Nine Articles ceased to be blasphemy, instead it was made a crime against the state.

But the progress of history was not to be halted; the discrepancy between the legislation of 1688 and public opinion as it existed in 1828 was so great that in the latter year even the House of Commons found itself obliged to revoke the most oppressive laws against the dissenters. The Test Act and the religious clauses of the Corporation Act were abolished; the emancipation of the
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Catholics followed in the next year, despite the furious opposition of the Tories. The Tories, the exponents of the Constitution, were perfectly correct in their opposition, as not one of the liberal parties, not even the Radicals, attacked the Constitution itself. The Constitution was to remain the foundation for them too, and on the basis of the Constitution only the Tories were consistent. They realised, and said so, that the above measures would inevitably bring about the downfall of the Anglican Church and necessarily that of the Constitution too; that to give the dissenters the civil rights would mean the de facto destruction of the Anglican Church and the sanctioning of the attacks on the Anglican Church; that it is a dangerous inconsistency towards the state itself to allow a Catholic a share in administration and legislation since he recognises the authority of the Pope over the power of the state. Their arguments could not be answered by the Liberals; nevertheless, the emancipation went through and the prophecies of the Tories are already beginning to be fulfilled.

So in this way the Anglican Church has become an empty name and now only differs from the other denominations by virtue of the three million pounds it draws annually, and a few small privileges which are just sufficient to sustain the struggle against it. Amongst these are the ecclesiastical courts in which the Anglican bishop exercises sole but quite unimportant jurisdiction and whose oppressiveness consists particularly in the law costs; and then there are also the local church rates which are used for the maintenance of the buildings available for the use of the Established Church; the dissenters come under the jurisdiction of these courts and are equally liable for payment of these rates.

But it is not just the legislation against the church but also the legislation for it which has contributed towards making the Established Church an empty name. The Church of Ireland has always been a mere name, a perfect established or government church, a complete hierarchy from the archbishop down to the vicar, lacking nothing except a congregation, and whose occupation consists in preaching, praying and singing off litanies to the empty pews. The Church of England has an audience, it is true, although it too, especially in Wales and the factory districts, has been to a considerable degree dislodged by the dissenters, but then the well-paid pastors trouble themselves little about their sheep. If you wish to bring a caste of priests into disrepute and cause its downfall, then pay it well, says Bentham, and the English and Irish churches testify to the truth of this statement. In the
countryside and in the towns of England nothing is more hateful and more contemptible to the people than a Church of England parson. And in the case of as pious a people as the English, that is really saying something.

It is self-evident that the emptier and more meaningless the name of the Anglican Church becomes, the more firmly does the conservative party and indeed the confirmed constitutional party become attached to it; the separation of church and state might draw tears even from Lord John Russell; it is equally self-evident that the emptier the name becomes, the harsher and the more strongly felt does its oppressiveness become. The Irish Church particularly, because it is the most insignificant, is the most hated; it has no other purpose than to embitter the people, than to remind them that they are a subjugated people upon whom the conqueror forces his religion and his institutions.

Hence England is now at a stage of transition from a determinate to an indeterminate Christian state, to a state which bases itself not on one determinate denomination but on an indeterminate Christianity, a mean of all existing denominations. Naturally the old, determinate, Christian state defended itself against unbelief, and the Apostasy Act of 1699 punishes it with the loss even of the passive civil rights and with imprisonment; this Act has never been annulled, but is no longer ever applied. Another law, originating in Elizabeth's times, lays down that anyone who fails to attend church on Sunday without a proper excuse (if I am not mistaken, even the episcopal church is laid down, because Elizabeth acknowledged no dissenting chapels) is to be made to attend it by a fine or imprisonment. In the countryside this law is still frequently applied; even here, in civilised Lancashire, a few hours travel from Manchester, there are some bigoted Justices of the Peace who—as Mr. Gibson, member for Manchester, alleged a fortnight ago in the House of Commons—have sentenced a large number of people, sometimes to six weeks imprisonment, for failing to attend church. However the main laws against unbelief are those which disqualify from taking an oath anyone who does not believe in a God or in any reward or punishment in the afterlife, and make blasphemy a punishable offence. Blasphemy is everything which aims to bring the Bible or the Christian religion into contempt, and equally the direct denial of the existence of God; the penalty for this is imprisonment—usually one year, and a fine.
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But the indeterminate Christian state too is moving towards its downfall, even before it has been officially recognised by legislation. The Apostasy Act is, as we have said, entirely obsolete; the requirement of church attendance is likewise rather antiquated and it is only enforced in exceptional cases; the blasphemy law is likewise beginning—thanks to the fearlessness of the English Socialists and particularly of Richard Carlile—to become antiquated and is only applied here and there in particularly bigoted localities such as Edinburgh, and even a refusal of the oath is avoided where possible. The Christian party has become so weak that it realises itself that a strict operation of these laws would bring about their repeal before long, and it therefore prefers to remain passive so that the Damocles sword of Christian legislation may at least remain suspended over the heads of the unbelievers and perhaps continue to be effective as a threat and deterrent.

Apart from the political institutions proper which we have so far considered, there are several other matters which may be included in the sphere of the Constitution. There has so far been scarcely any mention of the rights of the citizen; within the Constitution strictly speaking, the individual has no rights in England. These rights exist either through custom or by virtue of individual statutes which are quite unconnected with the Constitution. We shall see how this strange separation has arisen; for the moment we move on to a critique of these rights.

The first is the right that any man may publish his opinion without hindrance and without the previous permission of the government—the freedom of the press. Taken as a whole it is true that nowhere is the freedom of the press more extensive than in England; and yet this freedom is still very limited here. The law of libel, the law of high treason and the law of blasphemy weigh heavily on the press, and if the press is rarely prosecuted, that is not due to the law but to the government's fear of the inevitable unpopularity which would follow measures taken against the press. English newspapers of all parties commit press offences every day, both against the government and against individuals, but they are allowed to pass with impunity, until it is possible to launch a political trial, and then the occasion is used to deal with the press as well. That is how it turned out with the Chartists in 1842 and just recently with the Irish Repealers. The freedom of the press in England has been living just as much on grace and favour for the past hundred years as it did in Prussia from 1842.
The second "birthright" of the Englishman is the right of popular assembly, a right which no other nation in Europe has enjoyed to date. This right, although very ancient, was subsequently made explicit in a statute as the right of the people to assemble for the purpose of discussing grievances and petitioning the legislature for their remedy. This wording contains a limitation. If no petition results from a meeting, the latter thereby acquires if not precisely an illegal character, then at least a very ambiguous one. In O'Connell's trial the Crown particularly emphasised that the meetings which were described as illegal were not convened for the deliberation of petitions. The main limitation however is imposed by the police; the central or local government can prohibit any meeting in advance, or interrupt and dissolve it, and it has done this often enough, not just at Clontarf but actually in England in the case of Chartist and Socialist meetings. This however is not considered an attack on the Englishman's birthrights because the Chartists and Socialists are poor devils and thus have no rights; no one cares two hoots about it except the Northern Star and the New Moral World, and therefore one hears nothing about it on the Continent.

Then the right of association. All associations which pursue lawful aims by lawful means are permitted; but in any given case, only one big society is allowed, and this may not include branch associations. The formation of societies divided into local branches, each with its own organisation, is only permitted for charitable, or pecuniary purposes in general, and may only be embarked upon in England on the issue of a certificate by an official appointed for this purpose. The Socialists obtained such a certificate for their organisation by declaring their purpose was of this nature; it was denied to the Chartists, although they copied the statutes of the socialist society word for word in their own. They are now forced to circumvent the law and are thus put in a position where a single slip of the pen by a single member of the Chartist association may entangle the whole society in the snares of the law. But even apart from that, the right of association, in its full extent, is a privilege of the rich; an association needs money first of all, and it is easier for the rich Anti-Corn Law League to raise hundreds of thousands than for the poor Chartist society or the Union of British Miners to meet the bare expenses of association. And an association which has no funds at its disposal is not likely to have much effect and cannot conduct any agitation.

* Engels gives this term both in German and in English.— Ed.
The right of Habeas Corpus, that is, the right of any accused person (high treason constitutes an exception) to be released on bail pending the start of the trial, this much-praised right is once more a privilege of the rich. The poor man cannot offer surety and therefore must go to prison.

The last of these rights of the individual is the right of each man to be tried only by his peers, and that too is a privilege of the rich man. The poor man is not tried by his peers, he is without exception tried by his born enemies, for in England the rich and the poor are openly at war with one another. The jury must have certain qualifications, and their nature is evident from the fact that the jury list in Dublin, a city of 250,000 inhabitants, contains only 800 qualified persons. At the most recent Chartist trials at Lancaster, Warwick and Stafford, the workers were tried by landlords and tenant farmers, who are mostly Tories, and by manufacturers or merchants, who are mostly Whigs, but in any case they are the enemies of the Chartists and the workers. But that is not all. A so-called impartial jury does not exist. When O'Connell was tried four weeks ago in Dublin, every member of the jury, being a Protestant and Tory, was his enemy. “His peers” would have been Catholics and Repealers—and not even they, for they were his friends. A Catholic in the jury would have prevented the verdict, he would have made any verdict impossible, except an acquittal. This case is a particularly blatant example; but fundamentally it is the same in any case. Trial by jury is in essence a political and not a legal institution; but because all law is essentially political in origin, the reality of legal practice is revealed in it, and the English trial by jury, because it is the most highly developed, is the consummation of juridical mendacity and immorality. The starting point is the fiction of the “impartial jurymen”; it is impressed upon the jury that they must forget everything relating to the current case that they may have heard before the trial, and judge only by the evidence brought before the Court—as though such a thing were possible. The second fiction is that of the “impartial judge”, whose task is to expound the law and bring together the arguments presented by both sides, without partiality, quite “objectively”—as though that were possible! It is moreover required of the judge that he should especially and in spite of everything exert no influence on the verdict of the jury and should not put the verdict into their mouths—in other words, he must present the premises as they need to be presented for the
conclusion to be drawn; but he should not draw the conclusion himself, he may not even draw it for himself, for that would have an effect on his presentation of the premises—all these and a hundred other impossibilities, inhumanities and stupidities are demanded, simply so as decently to conceal the original stupidity and inhumanity. But there is no deceiving actual practice, in practice all this rubbish is ignored, the judge gives the jury clearly enough to understand what sort of verdict it is to pronounce, and that verdict is then regularly brought in by the obedient jury.

But next! The defendant must be protected in every way, the defendant, like the king, is sacred and inviolable and can do no wrong, in other words, he can do nothing at all, and if he does do anything, it has no validity. The defendant may confess his crime, it will avail him not at all. The law decides that he is not trustworthy; I believe it was in 1819 that a man arraigned his wife for adultery after she had confessed to her husband, during an illness she thought would prove fatal, that she had committed adultery—but the defence counsel for the wife objected that the defendant's confession was no evidence, and the charge was dismissed.* The sanctity of the defendant is furthermore sustained in the legal formalities which surround the English jury, and which offer such a very fertile field to the cavilling wiles of the barristers. That a trivial technical blunder can upset a whole trial verges on the incredible. In 1800 a man was found guilty of forgery but released because his defence counsel discovered before the sentence was pronounced that on the forged banknote the name was written in the abbreviated form Bartw, while in the bill of indictment Bartholomew was written in full. The judge, as I have said, accepted the objection as adequate and released the convicted man.** In 1827 a woman was charged with infanticide in Winchester but acquitted because in the verdict of the coroner's jury the latter declared "upon their oath" (The jurors of our Lord the King upon their oath present that, etc.*) that such and such had happened, whereas this jury of thirteen men had sworn not one oath but thirteen oaths and the verdict therefore ought to have read "upon their oaths".*** A year ago in Liverpool a boy who stole a handkerchief out of someone's pocket one Sunday evening was caught in the act and arrested. His father objected that the
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** Ibid.— Note by Engels.
*** Ibid.— Note by Engels.

* Given by Engels in English.— Ed.
police officer had arrested him unlawfully because there is a law which says no one may perform on Sunday the work by which he earns his living; the police, therefore, may not arrest anyone on Sunday. The judge agreed with this, but continued to examine the boy, and when the latter confessed he was a thief by profession, he was fined five shillings because he had followed his profession on a Sunday. For each of these examples I could give a hundred more, but they speak for themselves well enough. English law sanctifies the defendant and is applied against the society for whose protection it really exists. As in Sparta, it is not the crime but the stupidity with which it is committed that is punished. Any form of protection is turned against the person whom it is intended to protect; the law is intended to protect society and attacks it; it is intended to protect the defendant and injures him—for it is obvious that any man who is too poor to oppose the official pettifogging with a counsel equally skilled in pettifogging has against him all the forms which were created for his protection. Any man who is too poor to provide a defence counsel or an appropriate number of witnesses has no hope in any suit that is in the least degree doubtful. Before the trial he can read only the indictment and the statements originally made to the magistrate and therefore does not know the details of what is to be brought against him (and this is most dangerous precisely for the man who is innocent); he must answer at once when the prosecutor has concluded his case and may only speak once; if he does not deal with everything, or if a witness whom he had not regarded as necessary is absent, then he is lost.

But the culmination of the whole system is the rule that the twelve jurors must be unanimous in their verdict.

They are locked in a room and are not let out until they are agreed or the judge realises that they cannot be brought to unanimity. It is however thoroughly inhuman and to such an extent contrary to human nature that it is quite ridiculous to demand that twelve people should be of exactly the same opinion on a particular issue. But it is consistent. The procedure of the Inquisition is to torture the accused physically or mentally; the jury system declares the accused sacred and tortures the witnesses with a cross-examination in no way less formidable than that of the Inquisition; it even tortures the jury; it must have a verdict, though the heavens should fall in the process; the jury is punished.
by imprisonment until it produces a verdict; and if it should be so capricious as to wish to adhere to its oath, a new jury is appointed, there is a retrial, and so on until either the prosecution or the jury becomes weary of the struggle and surrenders unconditionally. Proof enough that the whole legal system cannot exist without torture and is in any case barbaric. But there is no other possibility; if one wants to have mathematical certainty in matters which do not admit of such certainty, one cannot but end up in absurdity and barbarism. Practice once again brings to light what lies behind all these things; in practice the jury takes the easy way out and, there being no alternative, breaks its oath with perfect composure. In 1824, a jury in Oxford could not agree. One man said: guilty; eleven: not guilty. Finally they reached a settlement; the one dissenter wrote "guilty" on the bill of indictment and withdrew; then came the foreman with the other jurors, picked up the paper and wrote "not" in front of the word "guilty" (Wade, British History).

Another case is recounted by Fonblanque, editor of the Examiner, in his work England under Seven Administrations. In this instance too a jury could not reach a decision, and eventually the jurors had recourse to the drawing of lots; they took two straws and drew; the opinion of the party which drew the longer straw was adopted.

While we are concerned with the legal institutions, we may examine the matter a little more closely in order to complete our survey of the legal situation in England. It is well known that the English Penal Code is the most severe in Europe. As recently as 1810 it was in no way inferior in barbarity to that of the Carolina; burning, breaking on the wheel, quartering, disembowelment while the person was still alive, etc., were widely used types of punishment. Since then, it is true, the most outrageous atrocities have been abolished, but there still remain numerous instances of brutality and infamy unamended on the statute-book. The death penalty applies to seven crimes (murder, high treason, rape, sodomy, breaking and entering, robbery with violence and arson with intent to kill); only in 1837 was the formerly much more widely applicable death penalty limited to this number; and in addition, English penal law knows two forms of punishment of particularly choice barbarity—transportation, or debasement through association, and solitary confinement, or debasement through isolation. Neither could be more cruelly or more vilely chosen to ruin systematically and consistently the victims of the law physically, intellectually and morally and to reduce them to below
the level of beasts. The criminal who is transported finds himself in such an abyss of degradation and loathsome bestiality that the best of men cannot but succumb there in six months; anyone who wishes to read the reports of eyewitnesses about New South Wales and Norfolk Island will agree when I maintain that everything I have said earlier falls far short of the actual truth. The prisoner in solitary confinement is driven insane; the model gaol in London, after only three months of existence, had already three lunatics to transfer to Bedlam, to say nothing of the religious mania which is still usually regarded as sanity.

The penal laws against political crimes are drawn up in almost exactly the same terms as in Prussia; particularly “exciting discontent” and “seditious language” are phrased in the same vague way which gives so much latitude to the judge and jury. In this field too the penalties are harsher than elsewhere; transportation is the main form.

If these severe penalties and these ill-defined political crimes are less significant in practice than it might seem according to the law, this is, on the one hand, a failing in the law itself, which is so confused and unclear that a clever barrister can raise objections in the defendant’s favour at every turn. English law is either common law, in other words, unwritten law such as existed at the time when statutes were first gathered and later collated by legal authorities; on the most important points this law is naturally uncertain and ambiguous; or else it is statute law, which consists of an infinite number of individual acts of Parliament gathered over five hundred years, which contradict each other and represent not a “state of law”, but a state of complete lawlessness. The barrister is everything here; anyone who has wasted a lot of his time on this legal jungle, on this chaos of contradictions is all-powerful in an English law-court. The uncertainty of the law naturally led to belief in the authority of decisions taken by past judges in similar cases, and this only aggravates the uncertainty, since these decisions also contradict one another, and the outcome of the proceedings depends again on the learning and presence of mind of the barrister. On the other hand, lack of importance of English penal law is however just a matter of clemency, etc., and regard for public opinion, which the law by no means obliges the government to have; and the vigorous opposition to all law-reforms shows that the legislature is by no means inclined to
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a Engels gives some of the legal terms in this and the following paragraph both in German and in English.— Ed.
change this state of affairs. But it should never be forgotten that property rules and that in consequence this clemency is only practised towards “respectable” criminals; it is on the poor man, on the pariah, on the proletarian that the full force of the law’s barbarity descends, and no one cares a brass farthing about it.

This favouritism towards the rich is moreover explicitly stated in the law. While all serious crimes are liable to the severest penalties, fines are stipulated for almost all minor* offences, fines which are of course the same for the poor and the rich but which affect the rich man little or not at all, while in nine cases out of ten the poor man cannot pay them and is then committed without more ado to the treadmill for a few months “in default of payment”\footnote{Given by Engels in English.—Ed.}. One only needs to read the police reports in the first English newspaper that comes to hand to be convinced of the truth of this statement. The maltreatment of the poor and the preferential treatment of the rich in all the courts of law is so universal, is practised so openly and brazenly, and is reported so shamelessly by the newspapers that one can rarely read a paper without being filled with indignation. Such a rich man is always treated with uncommon courtesy, and however brutal his offence may have been, “the judges are always very sorry” that they have to sentence him to what is usually a quite paltry fine. The administration of the law is in this respect still more inhuman than the law itself; “law grinds the poor and rich men rule the law”\footnote{Given by Engels in English.—Ed.} and “there is one law for the poor and another for the rich”\footnote{Given by Engels in English.—Ed.} are completely true sayings that have long since become proverbial. But how can it be otherwise? The magistrates and the jury alike are themselves rich, are chosen from the middle class and are thus biased towards their own kind and are born enemies of the poor. And if the social effect of property, which we cannot go into now, is taken into account, then indeed nobody can be surprised at such a barbaric state of affairs.

The question of direct social legislation in which this infamy culminates, will be dealt with later.\footnote{Vorwärts! has: “more oppressive”.—Ed.} In any case it could not be described in its full significance at this point.

Let us summarise the conclusions of this critique of the law in England. Whatever objections may be raised to it from the viewpoint of the “constitutional state” are a matter of supreme indifference. The fact that England is not officially a democracy
cannot prejudice us against her institutions. For us there is only one matter of importance: that we have found everywhere theory and practice in flagrant contradiction with each other. All the powers of the Constitution, the Crown, the House of Lords and the House of Commons, have dissolved before our eyes; we have seen that the Established Church and all the so-called birthrights of the British are empty names, that even trial by jury is in reality only an outward show, that even the law has no existence, in short, that a state, which has given itself a clearly defined legal foundation, denies and abuses this foundation. The Englishman is not free on account of the law but despite the law, if one can say at all that he is free.

We have seen furthermore what a jungle of lies and immorality follows from this state of affairs; people prostrate themselves before empty names and deny reality, they do not want to know anything about it and are reluctant to acknowledge what really exists, what they have themselves created; they deceive themselves and invent a language of conventions with artificial concepts, each of which is a parody of reality, and cling fearfully to these hollow abstractions, so as to avoid having to own to themselves that what matters in real life, in practice, are quite different things. The whole English Constitution and the whole of constitutional public opinion is nothing but a big lie which is constantly supported and concealed by a number of small lies whenever at one point or another its true nature appears a little too openly in the light of day. And even if a person comes to the realisation that the whole of this construction is but untruth and fiction, even then he still adheres to it, indeed more tenaciously than ever, so that the empty words, the few meaninglessly assembled letters, should not fall apart, for these words are after all the pivot on which the world turns, and with them the world and mankind would of necessity plunge into the darkness of chaos! One cannot but turn away in deep disgust from this tissue of blatant and concealed lies, of hypocrisy and self-deception.

Can such a state of affairs last long? There is no chance of that. The struggle of practice against theory, of reality against abstraction, of life against hollow words devoid of meaning, in short, of man against inhumanity, must be decided, and there is no question as to which side will be victorious.

The struggle is already on. The Constitution is shaken to its foundations. What form the immediate future will take emerges from what has just been said. The new, alien elements in the Constitution are democratic in nature; it will become evident that
public opinion too is developing in a democratic direction; the immediate future of England will be democracy.

But what a democracy! Not that of the French Revolution, whose antithesis was the monarchy and feudalism, but the democracy whose antithesis is the middle class and property. The whole of the preceding development shows this. The middle class and property are dominant; the poor man has no rights, is oppressed and fleeced, the Constitution repudiates him and the law mistreats him; the struggle of democracy against the aristocracy in England is the struggle of the poor against the rich. The democracy towards which England is moving is a social democracy.

But democracy by itself is not capable of curing social ills. Democratic equality is a chimera, the fight of the poor against the rich cannot be fought out on a basis of democracy or indeed of politics as a whole. This stage too is thus only a transition, the last purely political remedy which has still to be tried and from which a new element is bound to develop at once, a principle transcending everything of a political nature.

This principle is the principle of socialism.
I propose furnishing you with reports concerning the progress of the movement party on the Continent for the Star, extracts from the German papers, and of my correspondence with well-informed men in Paris and Germany. I see with pleasure, that your paper contains more and better information about the state of public opinion in France than all other English papers together; and I should like to place you in the same position as far as regards Germany. The political state of Germany is becoming more important every day. We shall have a revolution there very shortly, which cannot but end in establishment of a Federal Republic. At the same time, I shall not confine myself to Germany, but report to you everything about Switzerland, Austria, Italy, Russia, &c., which will be likely to prove interesting to your readers; and I shall leave it entirely to yourself to make what use you think proper of the materials furnished by me.

Written late in April 1844
First published in The Northern Star
No. 338, May 4, 1844

Printed according to the newspaper
When Frederick William IV ascended the throne there was not a more popular monarch in all Europe. Now, there is none more unpopular; not one, not even Nicholas of Russia, who is at least worshipped by the dumb beastly stupidity of his degraded serfs. The Prussian King, who calls himself emphatically "the Christian King", and has made his court a most ludicrous assemblage of whining saints and piety-feigning courtiers, has done everything in his power to open the eyes of the nation, and not in vain. He commenced with a show of liberality, then passed over to feudality; and ended in establishing the government of the police-spy. The press is laid down by a rigorous censorship, and by prosecutions in courts of law, before judges, paid by the king, and removable by the king, who conduct trials without juries, and with closed doors. Oppression is very rife. The students at Berlin commenced holding meetings and discussing political subjects; these meetings were stopped by the police, the speakers arrested, prosecuted, and several of them expelled the University. Dr. Nauwerck, lecturer at the University, who lectured on modern politics, and hesitated not to proclaim his Republican opinions, had his lectures visited by the minister's spies, and at last stopped by the illegal interference of the minister, about a month ago. The University protested against such an obstruction, and some of their members published the protest; for this heinous crime they are now under prosecution. At some public demonstrations of the students, which happened in February, cheers were given for Professor Hoffman, who had been dismissed for his having published some satirical poetry. The consequence of this was, that again half-a-dozen students were expelled, and by this disabled to
take any Government office, or to exercise the medical profession. At Düsseldorf, on the Rhine, the annual public masquerade during the Carnival was stopped by the police, on account of some political allusions, and the poor Dusseldorfians were even hindered from going to Cologne, and partaking in the procession there. These are only a few of the oppressive measures by which the Government has shown its mind; and they have had a miraculous effect on the development of public opinion. They have awakened the nation from a state of political lethargy, and thrown them into such an excitement that even the oldest and most loyal supporters of the "Christian King" begin to entertain fears for the stability of the present order of things. Dissatisfaction is increasing everywhere, and has become almost universal in the Rhenish provinces, in Eastern Prussia, Posen, Berlin, and all the large towns. The people are resolved to have a free press and constitution to begin with. But there is so much combustible matter heaped up in all Germany, and the shades of opinion are so various, that it is impossible to predict where the movement, if once fairly commenced, may stop. However, it will be in the direction towards democracy; thus much is evident.

Written late in April 1844
First published in The Northern Star
No. 338, May 4, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
In the Chamber of Deputies of the Grand Duchy of Baden, Mr. Welcker, a liberal member and the Lord John Russell of that country, implored the government to do something in order to satisfy the discontented feelings of the people:

"for", said he, "I have been travelling much in all parts of Germany, and have been visited there by a great number of men of all ranks and from all parts of the country; and I should be, I should fail in my duty as a representative of the people, if I did not state that everywhere the principle of monarchical government is daily losing its ground more and more in the minds of all classes of the German nation. I therefore implore the ministers to oppose no longer the current of public opinion; for if something is not done soon; if the breach between the governments of our fatherland and the people is allowed to become wider, then nobody can doubt for a moment what the consequence will be."

And Mr. Welcker's evidence, as to the spread of Republicanism in Germany, may be admitted as the most unquestionable that can be given, because this progress frightens him even more than it does the government; and because it is quite contrary to his own expectations.

M. Frederic Steinmann who has for some time been under prosecution for a book he published, in which he assailed the Austrian government, has been condemned to eight months imprisonment in a fortress, though he lives in Prussia, and published his book there. He was not prosecuted by the Austrian, but by the Prussian government, and in a Prussian court of law.

Dr. Strauss, the author of the *Life of Jesus*, is occupied with a similar work, on the *Acts of the Apostles*, which book he, of
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a F. A. Steinmann, *Caricaturen und Silhouetten des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*.—*Ed.*
b D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*.—*Ed.*
course, will treat in the same manner as he did the gospels in his former work.

The Russian Diplomacy is very active at present at the different courts of Germany, in order to effect some measures against the violence with which the German press treats the policy of the Czar. The anti-Russian feeling, which is now quite universal in Germany, has vented itself for some time past in all newspapers, and in a great many pamphlets, which makes the autocrat uneasy. But, fortunately, he will not be able to stop these publications.

Serious riots at Munich.—There were riots at Munich on the 3rd inst., on account of a rise in the price of beer. The tumult was serious, and was not quelled without a somewhat sanguinary use of the soldiery, who by express orders of the King,\(^b\) fired on the unarmed people, killing several, and wounding others. The following later particulars show the people have triumphed, and the King succumbed; the cause being that the royal man-slayer feared that his own tools, the troops, would turn against him!

"Munich, May 5.—Tranquillity has been re-established in our town, but it cannot be denied that the royal authority has suffered a good deal in the transaction. The King, after having shown himself greatly opposed to any sort of conciliation or compromise, after having himself ordered the soldiery to charge the people, and that in his own presence, ended by requiring of the brewers that they should yield to the popular demands. This morning notice was stuck up at the corners of all the streets, that the increase in the price of beer would not take place, and the people appeared satisfied, but they at the same time retain a secret animosity against the King for having ordered them to be fired upon—an order which cost the lives of several of the people of this town. It appears that the King yielded principally on account of the small degree of devotion shown towards him by the troops, who did not appear at all willing to fire upon the people."

Written in the first half of May 1844

First published in *The Northern Star*
No. 340, May 18, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"

\(^b\) Ludwig I of Bavaria.----Ed.
Count Adam Gurowski, who took an active part in the revolution of 1830, afterwards deserted his party, was allowed to return to his country, and became notorious in a very unenviable manner by some publications, in which he advised his countrymen to consider the annihilation of their independence as a judgment of God, to which they must humbly submit, and seek shelter at the throne of the mighty Czar, in whose hands God had laid their fates. He told them that Poland could not have met with a better luck than it had done by being subdued under the Russian yoke; that it was their duty to abandon all hopes of independence; and that, in fine, the Czar's government was the very best that could be found on the face of the earth. He expected, of course, to be rewarded by Nicholas, but the autocrat was too prudent to trust a traitor. He used him and abandoned him; he gave him a subordinate office, which Gurowski resigned, when he saw that he had no hope of being promoted; he could not even get the rights of a nation which, by his participation in the insurrection, were forfeited; and at last he has chosen to leave Poland again to take shelter in Prussia, and to go to Breslau, where he has requested the authorities to be treated as a military deserter. Despised by his countrymen, whose cause he deserted, scorned by all parties in Europe, abandoned by the Czar, he intends going to America, hoping, perhaps, that his reputation will not follow him across the ocean.

The iron sway with which Russian despotism rules Poland, is at present as unrelenting as ever. Every thing is done to remind the unfortunate Pole at every step that he is a slave. Even the fingerposts on the road sides must have inscriptions in Russian
language and characters; not a word of Polish is allowed. The Polish language is banished from all courts of law. A German song, "the gipsy-boy in the North", containing not the slightest allusion to either Russia or Poland, but expressing only a strong desire to return to their native country, was translated into Polish, but suppressed by the Russian censor, as a patriotic, and therefore, of course, criminal song. No wonder, then, that Nicholas should wish to have the German press silenced, the only channel through which the world becomes acquainted with such facts as those. I must, however, not forget one fact: six Poles, soldiers of a Russian regiment at the frontier, deserted, but were caught before they reached Prussia. They were condemned to fifteen hundred lashes each; the punishment was inflicted; their relations were forced to assist at it; three only of the six survived the flogging.

Written in the first half of May 1844
First published in The Northern Star No. 340, May 18, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
BEER RIOTS IN BAVARIA

The Bavarian Beer is the most celebrated of all kinds of this drink brewed in Germany, and, of course, the Bavarians are much addicted to its consumption in rather large quantities. The government laid a new duty of about 100s. *ad valorem* on beer, and in consequence of this an outbreak occurred, which lasted more than four days. The working men assembled in large masses, paraded through the streets, assailed the public houses, smashing the windows, breaking the furniture, and destroying everything in their reach, in order to take revenge for the enhanced price of their favourite drink. The military was called in, but a regiment of horse-guards, when commanded to mount on horseback, *refused to do so*. The police, being, as everywhere, obnoxious to the people, were severely beaten and ill-treated by the rioters, and every station formerly occupied by police-officers had to be occupied by soldiers, who, being upon good terms with the people, were considered less hostile and showed *an evident reluctance to interfere*. They only did interfere when the palace of the King was attacked, and then they merely took up such a position as was sufficient to keep the rioters back. On the second evening (the 2nd of May) the King, in whose family a marriage had just been celebrated, and who for this reason had many illustrious visitors at his court, visited the theatre; but when, after the first act, a crowd assembled before the theatre and threatened to attack it, every one left the house to see what the matter was, and His Majesty, with his illustrious visitors, was obliged to follow them, or else he would have been left alone in his place. The French papers assert that the King on this occasion ordered the military stationed before the theatre to fire upon the people, *and that the soldiers refused*. The
German papers do not mention this, as may be expected from their being published under censorship; but as the French papers are sometimes rather ill-informed about foreign matters, we cannot vouch for the truth of their assertion. From all this, however, it appears, that the Poet King (Ludwig, King of Bavaria, is the author of three volumes of unreadable Poems, of a Traveller's Guide to one of his public buildings, &c. &c.) has been in a very awkward position during these outbreaks. In Munich, a town full of soldiers and police, the seat of a royal court, a riot lasts four days, notwithstanding all the array of the military, and at last the rioters force their object. The King restored tranquillity by an ordinance, reducing the price of the quart of beer from ten kreutzers (3½d) to nine kreutzers (3d). If the people once know that they can frighten the government out of their taxing system, they will soon learn that it will be as easy to frighten them as far as regards more serious affairs.

Written in mid-May 1844

First published in The Northern Star No. 341, May 25, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
The parsonocracy of this country, enjoying the peculiar protection and favour of the present government, assume every day a more haughty position. It has, for instance, lately occurred in Berlin, that one parson after the other refused to perform marriage ceremonies on a Saturday, alleging as his reason for this refusal, that the parties would in all probability not rise on Sunday morning in a fit state of mind for the celebration of the Lord's day, if they were married on the previous day! Of course the Berliners, who care very little about a due celebration of the Sunday, and on the contrary make it the merriest day of the week, are crying out that the governing party was going to introduce among them "the English Sunday", than which they know nothing more formidable. Indeed, the English Sunday is most repugnant to the feelings and habits of all continental nations.

Written in mid-May 1844
First published in The Northern Star
No. 341, May 25, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
Considerable ministerial changes have occurred in St. Petersburg. The Minister of Finance, M. Cancrin, has fallen into disgrace, and the same is reported concerning the Police Minister, the well-known Count Benkendorff. Nicholas is evidently struggling to keep up a system which is rapidly ruining itself. The anti-Russian feeling in Germany and the other continental states is upon the increase, notwithstanding all the efforts of Nicholas's paid literary army. The financial state of the government is one great difficulty; the pomp of the court, the innumerable army of policemen and spies, the expenses of diplomats, spies, reporters, of secret intrigues, and bribery all over Europe, the army and navy, and the endless wars against the Circassians, have eaten up everything that taxes and loans could bring together. The restrictive commercial policy of M. Cancrin has made foreign trade in some parts of the empire almost impossible, and has failed to establish a system of national industry at home. Among the nobility, three parties are to be traced distinctly—the court, the old country nobility, and the officers of the army. They are intriguing constantly against each other, their object of course being nothing else but exclusive dominion over the person of the Emperor, who, as all despots, is, after all, only the tool of his favourites.

Written in mid-May 1844
First published in The Northern Star
No. 341, May 25, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
THE CIVIL WAR IN THE VALAIS

The valley of the River Rhone, from its source at the foot of the glacier du Rhone to the Lake Leman, is one of the finest countries in the world. On its sides are the highest mountains of Europe, two uninterrupted chains of a mean height of 12,000 feet, covered with eternal snow, from which spring the numberless rivulets which feed the Rhone and fertilise the meadows and fields of the valley. Here, within a few hours' walk from eternal winter, the chestnut and the vine are found thriving under a sun as powerful almost in its warmth as that of the evergreen plains of Lombardy. This valley is called the Valais, and inhabited partly by Germans, partly by Frenchmen. The Germans, entering the country from the north-east, occupy the higher and more mountainous part of the valley, where the country is unfavourable to agriculture, but excellent for the breeding of cattle; consequently this part of the population remains up to this time in almost the same state of nature in which their forefathers occupied the Upper Valais. Political and religious education is left entirely in the hands of a few aristocratic families and of the priesthood, who, of course, keep the people as stupid and superstitious as possible. On the contrary, the French settled in the Lower Valais, where the widening of the valley admits of introducing agriculture and other pursuits of industry. The French have founded the more considerable towns of the Valais, are educated and civilised, and by their bordering on the lake and the Radical canton of Vaud, are brought into connection with the outer world, and enabled to keep

---

a Lake of Geneva.—Ed.

b The German name for it is Wallis.—Ed.
up with the progress of their neighbour's ideas. Nevertheless, the rough mountaineers of the Upper Valais had, I know not how, many hundred years ago, subdued the French Lower Valais, and continued to consider this part of the country as a conquered province, and to exclude its inhabitants from any participation in government. In 1798, when the French overthrew the old aristocratic system of Swiss patrician despotism, the Lower Valais got its share of government, but not to the full extent it was entitled to. In 1830, when the democratic party in all Switzerland was in the ascendant, the constitution was re-modelled upon fair and democratic principles; but the priest-ridden cow-herds of Upper Valais, and the sovereign rulers of their minds, the parsons, have ever since tried to bring about a change in favour of the old system of injustice. The Radical party, in order to guard against this, formed an association called Young Switzerland—la jeune Suisse—among themselves and the Radicals of Vaud. They were most violently assailed and calumniated by the priesthood, and usually attacked upon the ground of being infidels, which, however, on the continent is a charge more laughed at than shuddered at. In 1840 the first outbreak against Young Switzerland took place, but, finding the democrats well prepared, the dupes of superstition and ignorance retreated to their unassailable mountain passes, in order to break forth again in March, 1844. They have now succeeded in taking the Radicals by surprise, in profiting by the general reaction in favour of Conservative principles; and of the leading canton (the seat of the federal Government for the time being) Luzern, being a Conservative Canton. The democratic party in Valais is for the moment overwhelmed. The interference of the federal Government will be required; it remains to be seen what profit the priests, who accompanied the Conservative army and headed it, will make of their victory; but at any rate there is no chance, even now, to re-establish anything like the old system, or to keep the Lower Valais and its spirited inhabitants in a state of subjection. A few years, nay, months, may bring back the ascendancy of the democratic party.

Written in the first half of June 1844
First published in The Northern Star No. 344, June 15, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
There has been a serious turn-out of colliers at Rive de Jier, near Lyons, for wages and other grievances. This affair offered upon the whole the same features as the English strikes: processions with banners, meetings, molesting of knobsticks, &c. The strike lasted about six weeks; several of the men were imprisoned for conspiracy, though no serious disturbance appears to have occurred. At last the men are reported to have returned to their pits, though it is not stated whether the object of the strike was accomplished.

Republican Demonstration.—The following account of the gathering of the Republican forces upon the occasion of the funeral of the deceased M. Laffitte from the pen of the correspondent of the Weekly Dispatch will be found interesting, as showing the great strength of the Republicans in Paris, and the certainty of a speedy revolution in that country.

"Although no disturbance occurred at the funeral of the celebrated Jacques Laffitte, on the 30th ult.," the Republican party nevertheless made a powerful demonstration of its strength. Five thousand students belonging to the schools of law and medicine, assembled to do honour to a man whose whole life (with one fatal exception) had been devoted to the cause of political liberty. For that one error—viz., conferring the Crown upon Louis Philippe—he partially atoned in the Chamber of Deputies, by imploring pardon of God and of man for the grievous injury he had been instrumental in inflicting upon France and the civilised world. The five thousand students who followed him to his last home, are all staunch Republican spirits—all glowing for political liberty. These noble-minded young men, together with the military students of the Polytechnic Schools, are the hope of young France. Let them eradicate from their breasts that absurd animosity towards England, which would lead them to plunge into war, for the mere purpose of settling the question of national rivalry over again—let them

---

a May 30, 1844.—Ed.
learn to respect their island-ally as a power advancing with them hand-in-hand in the road of civilisation—and those young men—the rising generation whom the Conservative press of both nations affect to despise—will one day be called upon to decide the destinies of France. In the Revolution of 1830, military students of sixteen and eighteen years of age became the generals of the people in that dreadful struggle with the royal troops. At the death of Louis Philippe the Republicans will no doubt proclaim their principles to be those alone adapted to France and French interests; and the young students of Paris must co-operate with, and advise the people in the political arena, as readily and faithfully as they led them on to victory fourteen years ago. But the demonstration of Republican strength on the occasion of the funeral of M. Laffitte, was not confined to the law and medical students. The Secret Societies were not idle. The members of those formidable political combinations assembled in immense numbers. They are for the most part respectable tradesmen, mechanics, and artisans, and are by no means the despicable rabble and low character which The Times and Journal des Débats have on various occasions represented them to be. They formed a column four deep, and marched immediately in front of the students. A third section of the Republican party also followed Laffitte to the cemetery of Père La Chaise. This was composed of operatives, all neatly attired, respectable in appearance, and exemplary in behaviour. The friends of liberty, therefore, mustered strong upon this occasion. Indeed, it is absurd for the Conservative press to deny the fact that the numerical strength, and the moral influences of the French Republican party are immense. Ranking amongst its numbers some of the most exalted names in France—names respectively famous in the spheres of war, literature, art, science, and policy—gaining strength daily by the acquisition of those whom the tyranny of the King alienates from the Orleans cause, and professing principles which accord with the new interests and new wants of civilisation, the Republican party is the one to which all eyes will be turned the moment any unforeseen accident or natural occurrence disturbs the reign of the Orleans dynasty.”

The “Holy War”.—The Emperor of Morocco has declared a “holy war” against France and Frenchmen, and is rousing the various peoples and tribes within and contiguous to his dominions to arms [in] defence of the one faith, and for the extermination of the “Infidels”. Abd-el-Kader, the African Wallace, is the leader of this national enterprise for the overthrow and expulsion of the French conquerors. The latest accounts represent the advanced section of the Moorish army as being within sight of the French forces.

From accounts received from Constantine, it appears that the Duke d’Aumale has met with some reverses, which seem to have been the result of his own imprudence and want of experience. It will be seen from the subjoined extracts, that a small body of troops, left in charge of Biskra, has been surprised, the French garrison killed, and the whole of the baggage, ammunition, and stores, carried away by the natives.

A Toulon letter of the 3rd says:—

---

a Abd ur-Rahman II.—Ed.
"We have received most afflicting news from the province of Constantine, dated the 20th ult. The Duke d'Aumale had left at Biskra a very small garrison, composed only of Lieutenant Petitgand, commandant, Sub-Lieutenant Crochard, and Aide-Surgeon Major Arcelin, with about forty men, from the battalion of the Constantine Fusileers. This small corps was intended to form the nucleus of a new battalion, to be raised from among the tribes in the environs of Biskra. Of all these, only a serjeant-major, named Pelisse, escaped. The new recruits opened the gates of the Casbah during the night to Mahommed Seghir, the Calif of Abd-el-Kader, and his followers, who surprised our men in their sleep, and killed them all. Plunder became general, and 70,000 fr. left with the commandant to pay his men, and all the cannon, muskets, ammunition, and other stores, were carried off. This unfortunate affair is said to have encouraged the surrounding tribes to take up arms. The fatal news having reached the Prince while in the mountains of the Ouled Sultau, he instantly marched to Biskra with a column of 3,000 men. He arrived on the 18th, but the Calif had left on the preceding day. The third battalion of the African Light Infantry marched from Constantine on the 24th for Biskra, to form its garrison."

On Friday, the Chamber of Deputies voted by a majority of 190 to 53 a sum of 7,500,000 f. to defray the expense of increasing the present military force of France in Algeria (96,000, by 15,000 more; thus raising the number of bayonets in Algeria to 111,000).

Written in the first half of June 1844
First published in The Northern Star
No. 344, June 15, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
The people have achieved a great triumph; they have by their steady and protracted opposition forced the King\textsuperscript{a} to abandon his pet measure, the proposed new law of divorce.\textsuperscript{237} The present law in this respect is very liberal, and, of course, never pleased the Christian King. Ever since his accession to the throne, he was big with an amended law, by which a divorce was to be granted in very few cases only. The holiness of the marriage bond was to be enforced as strictly as possible, and another door to be opened to the parsons to meddle with the family affairs of other people. The spirit of the nation, however, arose against such a law; the press opposed it, and when a democratic paper\textsuperscript{b} succeeded in getting and publishing an authentic abstract of the proposed law, a general outcry was raised against it from one end of the country to the other.\textsuperscript{238} Nevertheless, the King persisted in his intention. The bill was laid before the Privy Council, in order to be prepared for the provincial Parliaments,\textsuperscript{239} the advice of which is necessary, according to the Prussian constitution. Whether there was already a strong opposition in the Privy Council, or whether the King saw that this measure would never pass the provincial Parliaments, may be difficult to decide; it is enough, that an ordinance dated the 11th instant has been directed to the Council, withdrawing the bill, abandoning entirely its principle, and declaring that the King will be satisfied with the alteration of a few formalities of the present law. This most important triumph of the opposition must strengthen permanently the popular party, and will be received

\textsuperscript{a} Frederick William IV.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} Rheinische Zeitung.—Ed.
with cheers in every hamlet of the realm. It will show the people that they are strong, and that if united, they may defeat any measure they do not like; nay that by merely using their strength, they may frighten the government into any thing they please. In the manufacturing district of Silesia very serious riots have occurred; the workpeople of the neighbourhood, depending almost entirely upon the linen-manufacture and suffering great distress, not being able to stand the competition against the English machine-made article, have for some time been in a condition similar to that of the English hand-loom weavers. Oppressed by competition, machinery, and greedy manufacturers, they at last arose in Peterswalden (Silesia), demolished the house of a manufacturer, and were only dispersed by the appearance of the military. In Langenbielau, outrages of a similar nature were committed; the military were repelled by the people, and could only restore the peace after having received reinforcements and fired on the rioters, of whom several were killed. In other districts tumultuous assemblages took place, and even in the capital of the province (Breslau), the peace was disturbed. Thus it is evident that the consequences of the factory system, of the progress of machinery, &c., for the working classes are quite the same on the continent as they are in England: oppression and toil for the many, riches and wealth for the few; insecurity of fortune, discontent, and riot exist among the hills of Silesia, as well as in the crowded cities of Lancashire and Yorkshire.\footnote{See this volume, p. 201.—Ed.}
The riots commenced, as stated in my last, at Peterswalden, in the District of Reichenbach, the centre of the manufacturing part of Silesia. The weavers assembled before the house of one of the most respectable manufacturers, of the name of Zwanziger, singing a song, in which the behaviour of this individual towards his workmen was animadverted upon, and which seems to have been manufactured for the occasion. Mr. Zwanziger sent for the police, and got several of the ringleaders arrested; the people assembled in growing numbers before his door, threatened to rescue them, and, the prisoners not being liberated, they immediately commenced the work of destruction. The doors were forced, the windows smashed, the crowd entered the house, and destroyed every thing within their reach. Zwanziger's family had hardly time to save themselves, and the throwing of stones at them was so incessant that it was found necessary to wrap up in bedding the female part of the family, and have them carried in a coach to Schweidnitz. To this place messengers also were sent to call in the aid of the military, but the commanding officer replied he could do nothing without orders from the provincial authorities at Breslau. The people, in the meantime, entirely demolished the dwelling house of Mr. Zwanziger, and proceeded then to the warehouse, where they destroyed all books, bills of exchange and other documents, and threw the cash they found, amounting to upwards of £1,000, upon the street, where it was picked up by a lot of Bohemian smugglers, who had passed the frontier to see whether they could not profit by the riots. The bales of cotton and

* See previous article.— Ed.
Further Particulars of the Silesian Riots

bags, as well as all the manufactured yarn and goods, were, as far as possible, destroyed or made useless, and the machinery in the adjoining factory, entirely broke. Having finished up here, they left the ruins of the demolished buildings and proceeded to Langenbielau, the men of which town joined them immediately, and where Mr. Dierig's factory and warehouse was attacked. Mr. Dierig first tried to buy them off, but after having paid part of his bargain, he was informed that the military were on the road, and he immediately refused to pay the remainder. The crowd immediately forced their way to the premises, and demolished them in the same way as they had done at Peterswalden; while they were engaged in this, a detachment of about 160 foot soldiers arrived, with the civil authorities; the Riot Act was read, the people replied by throwing stones at the military, then the word to fire was given, and twelve of the rioters were killed and many wounded. But the enraged crowd rushed on against the soldiers, and wounded such a number of them by stones, that the commanding officer, who had been dragged from his horse and severely beaten, retreated with them, to await reinforcements, while the destruction of property continued going on. At last two battalions of infantry, a company of rifles, some cavalry and artillery appeared, and dispersed the rioters. Further attempts at similar proceedings were stifled by the military keeping the town and surrounding places occupied, and, as usual, when everything was over, the proper authorities came forward with proclamations and such like, declaring the district in a state of siege, and threatened the most horrible punishments for every breach of the peace. The riots were not confined to these two towns; in Alt-Friedland and Leutmansdorf similar scenes took place, though not characterised by such a violent manifestation of feeling towards the manufacturers; some arms were broke and some windows were smashed before the military could restore tranquility. The people throughout the district profited on this occasion by giving to the manufacturers such a display of their feelings as could not be mistaken. The causes of these affrays were the incredible sufferings of these poor weavers, produced by low wages, machinery, and the avarice and greediness of the manufacturers. It will scarcely be believed that the wages of this oppressed class, in a family where father, mother, and children worked, all of them at the loom, amounted to a sum which would buy no more than six shillings would in England. Besides, they were all in debt, which is not at all a matter of surprise, when wages are so low; and the manufacturers gladly advanced them small sums, which
the men could never pay, but which were sufficient to give the masters an absolute sovereignty over them, and to make them the slaves of the manufacturers. Then there was, besides that, the competition of the English article, which had an advantage over them from the superior machinery of the English factories and the low wages there, and which tended to bring down their wages too. In short, it was the factory system with all its consequences that pressed upon the Silesian weavers in the same manner as it has done, and now does, upon the English factory workers and hand-loom weavers and which has occasioned more dissatisfaction and riotous outbreaks within this country than anything else. It is to be noticed, that during all these disturbances, according to the statements of all German papers, not one single robbery has been committed by the starving weavers. They threw the money on the street; they did not convert it to their own use. They left the stealing and plunder to the Bohemian smugglers and poachers.

Written in the latter half of June 1844
First published in The Northern Star
No. 546, June 29, 1844, with an editorial note: "From our own Correspondent"
SUPPLEMENT
ACT ONE

Scene One

The Forum in Rome, with the Capitol in the background. Enter Colonna with other Patricians, and, soon after, the people, led by Battista.

PATRICIANS
Away, Colonna, the people crowd us.
Come, flee from the wrath of the howling mob!

COLONNA
Flee? A Colonna flee the dregs
Of the people whose necks he so often trod
And trampled on?
Flee, cowardlings, flee! I'll brave their fury!

PATRICIANS
See you them surging along the street?
Can you not hear them raging? Come!

The people, with Battista at their head, crowd onto the stage.

BATTISTA
How are you, fine sirs, today?
Must you make such haste to go?
Surely you'd be glad to stay?
COLONNA (to the Patricians)
Can you let them mock you so?

BATTISTA
See their faces, how they plead!
Stay with us, we humbly pray!

COLONNA AND PATRICIANS
Hence, you insolent ones, away!

BATTISTA
Just to serve you is our need!

COLONNA (to the Patricians)
Draw, Patricians!

BATTISTA
We would treat you as our parents,
We would never mutiny,
We would never speak too free,
Leave our families in your care.
All our goods you need not spare;
You may torture, thrash or flail us,
Crush, bait, shackle us and gaol us,
For our sins you may impale us,
All we ask you is, please stay!

COLONNA (to the Patricians)
Well, my lords, what do you say?

PATRICIANS
Hence, you insolent ones, away!

COLONNA
Hence, you insolent, filthy rabble!
Know you not this voice's thunder
That has rent you oft asunder?
Know you not how this foot treads
When it walks upon your heads?
Know you not your lord and master?
Scene One revised

Colonna, Orsini, Orlando Orsini. The people in the background. Enter Patricians; they remain standing on one side.

ORSINI

Come, Colonna, let us hurry,
For the mob approaches, see!

COLONNA

I shall stand and face their fury.
Never was I known to flee!

ORSINI

Yield, just once, or we'll pay dear.
We were mad to tarry longer.

ORLANDO

We must go, or else I fear
We shall not escape their anger.

COLONNA

No! I'll walk, though I die here,
Through their midst, defying danger!

BATTISTA

(He comes out from among the people. The people draw nearer.)

How are you, fine sirs, today?
Must you make such haste to go?
Surely you'd be glad to stay?

ORSINI

Can you let them mock you so?

BATTISTA

See their faces, how they plead.
Stay with us, we humbly pray!
COLONNA, ORSINI, ORLANDO
Hence, you insolent ones, away!

BATTISTA
Just to serve you is our need!

COLONNA (to the Patricians)
Draw, Patricians!

BATTISTA
We would treat you as our parents,
We would never mutiny,
Never speak too evilly,
Leave our families in your care.
All our goods you need not spare;
You may torture, thrash or flail us,
Crush, bait, shackle us and gaol us,
For our sins you may impale us,
All we ask you is, please stay!

COLONNA (to the Patricians)
Well, my lords, what do you say?

COLONNA, ORSINI, ORLANDO
Hence, you insolent ones, away!

COLONNA
Hence, you insolent, filthy rabble!
Know you not this voice's thunder
That has rent you oft asunder?
Know you not how this foot treads
When it walks upon your heads?
Know you not your lord and master?

PEOPLE
Down with you!

COLONNA (to the Patricians)
Draw your swords! Our lives are at stake!
PEOPLE
Down with you! We are free!

BATTISTA
Do stay with us, we beg you!

PATRICIANS
Away! Just let us flee their rage
Until revenge’s hour shall strike!

COLOUNNA
Let us give in for now.
Rave, you rabble, rave on!
One day we shall return,
Then tremble before our wrath!

PEOPLE
Down with you!

(Exeunt Colonna and Patricians. The people gradually
divide into two choruses, the first of which
is bigger than the second.)

BATTISTA
See, they quail, those noble lords,
Cowering back with unsheathed swords,
Count and Baron, Marquis and Prince,
Needs must hastily hie them hence!
But what use, if ten small devils
Leave us, and the worst of evils—
Yes, the Prince of Hell, none other—
Comes and takes the whole place over?
Granted those ones are a curse,
Still the Tribune plagues us worse!

FIRST CHORUS
Hail to the Tribune, the people’s liberator!
Who dares to revile him?

SECOND CHORUS
Down with him!
BATTISTA

He is as evil and as good
As yonder lords of noble blood.
He ever speaks words passing fair,
Yet to the people shuts his ear.
Tyrants out, a despot in—
'Twill end as it did first begin.

FIRST CHORUS

Silence, slanderer!

SECOND CHORUS

No, say on!

BATTISTA

He is as evil and as good
As yonder lords of noble blood.

FIRST CHORUS

Traitor! Defame not the liberator! Hail to the Tribune!
Hail to Rienzi! Traitor! Away with you!
Beat him, beat him!

SECOND CHORUS

Down with him, the tyrant! Curse Rienzi!
Death to the Tribune! We will protect you!

BATTISTA

To you he speaks, etc.
Tyrants out, etc.

(Confusion. The music of a triumphal procession is heard in the distance. Cannon-fire. All are startled.)

BOTH CHORUSES

He comes! Let us meet him!

FIRST CHORUS

Hail to the liberator.
SECOND CHORUS
He'll fall to our revenge
Soon, as did those others,
However firm he stands.

BOTH CHORUSES
To meet him!

(Exeunt omnes.)

Scene Two
Colonna’s palace, Camilla’s chamber.

CAMILLA
Why that turmoil? What’s the meaning
Of that roaring mob out there;
All that raving, running, screaming,
Bloody flags waved in the air?
And I hear a wild throng gathered
At the palace steps: they’re crying
Out the name of my own father,
Threatening and vilifying.

Will you escape, father, safe and sound
From the crazed people that riot and swarm?
Will Holy Mary, Protectress, look down
Like a good star and preserve you from harm?
Fear is upon me, black and ineffable,
Father, all for your sake!
Spare me this suffering, dreadful, unbearable,
Father, oh please come back!

All the servants, in their terror,
Leaving me, have run away,
And I stand here white with horror
In the palace on my own.
But—Oh God! for here comes Walter—
Heart, O heart, be still, I pray!—
Now he sees me quail and falter,
Through the gates he runs alone!
Enter Montreal.

CAMILLA
By all the Saints in Heaven, Montreal, you dare—

MONTREAL (going down on his knees)
O Camilla! My Camilla!

CAMILLA
You dare set foot inside this house
Denied to you forever by my father?
Let him but meet you here, and from his sword
Your life's in danger!

MONTREAL
Sweet lady, do you mind no more
The love that bound us lastingly,
The vows that by the stars we swore,
The tears you used to shed for me?

CAMILLA
Leave me! O Saints, my poor heart
Is bursting in my breast!

MONTREAL
Beloved, see the hectic fever
That drives the blood into my face.
Am I now strange to you forever
Who on your breast once found my peace?

CAMILLA
I must not look you in the eye,
Being beholden to forswear you.
My wretched heart will break, but I,
Alas, I must not dare come near you.

MONTREAL
O see me begging at your feet,
My only dearest love are you!
But lock your heart against me, sweet,
And Heaven locks its portals too!
CAMILLA
My breast is heaving up and down,
From him I cannot stay apart.
Once more in true love's toils I'm bound.
Walter—forever yours my heart!

BOTH
O true love's blessed victory!
No matter what else may conspire
Against us, what can mar our sky
When each belongs to each entire?
Though we be shunned the whole world over,
Our bond disparaged as a bane,
If we do not desert each other,
Indeed our star can never wane!

CAMILLA
But tell me, Walter, what arouses
The mob on the streets to such violent rage?
And, above all, my father, my father—
Where is he?

MONTREAL
Fear not! Your father is in safety,
Debating flight with the city nobles
In the Orsini's palace.
The Tribune approached; rejoicing, the people
All went to meet him. Like lightning he moved,
And, ere the nobles could guess what was happening,
He stood at the gates of the city.
Your father will soon be here with his trusted friends,
To lead you from here to a place of safety.
But look! his suite comes over there,
With trumpets sounding, banners waving!
Yes, I can see his silver hair!
He comes, and so I must be leaving.

CAMILLA
My Walter, go away from me,
But for my love you need not fear.
I shall yearn for you constantly,
My heart shall ever hold you dear!
WALTER
My joy—until we meet again!
The Saints be with you—I will come
Back to you, love, a nobler man,
To carry you, my Princess, home!

Great things to do some day I mean.
My life on it: the time will come,
I'll raise you to the throne as queen
And you shall reign with me in Rome.

CAMILLA
My loving heart content would be
If I were simply your poor wife.
It were the height of bliss for me
To serve you, body and soul, for life!

BOTH
O true love's blessed victory!

Scene Three
The people swarm onto the stage and range themselves
in the background, while Battista [stands] in front with
the chorus of malcontents. Triumphal procession.

CHORUS OF PEOPLE
Hail to the Tribune, the people's liberator!
Hail to Rienzi, Father of the Fatherland!

The procession grows.

BATTISTA
With mercenaries he moves in,
The people's freedom claims to win!
He's scared of his own countrymen.
This joke will soon come to an end!

Chorus as above. BATTISTA
They fill the air with joyful cries.
Suffering soon will make them wise!
CHORUS OF MALCONTENTS
Down with the foreign mercenaries!
Down with the Tribune!
Curse you, the people's oppressor,
Curse you, desecrator of holy places!
Away with the foreigners, away!

CHORUS OF PEOPLE
Hail to the Tribune on high!
Long live the Father of the Fatherland!

BATTISTA
See, he looks arrogant enough,
Now that his clever trick's come off.
See how defiant he goes there,
Now that he's caught us in his snare.
He will not long remain so proud
When common sense dawns on the crowd.

Chorus of people as above.

RIENZI (on the rostrum)
So stand I once again amongst you,
O noble Romans! Again I see
All Rome's holy places—the Capitol,
The eternal Forum! You are welcoming me,
And so my gratitude shall not be wanting.
I swear before God's countenance
To consecrate my whole life to your freedom,
That Ancient Rome shall rise again
As great and free as ever from her ruins!
I shall not rest, nor tarry,
Till Rome in all her ancient splendour,
And in her ancient majesty,
Shines before all the peoples of this Earth!
Even as the phoenix, prouder, more magnificent,
Soars up aloft from its own funeral pyre,
So may the bygone age of world conquest
Return once more, new and imperishable!

CHORUS OF PEOPLE (as above)
Curtain
ACT TWO

Scene One

Palestrina. A chamber in Colonna's house. At the beginning, shots are heard from time to time.

Colonna, Camilla.

CAMILLA

Father, for Jesus' sake, what is afoot?
With anxious faces your friends are leaving,
Deserting you; the besiegers' cannon
Are thundering closer and fiercer than ever—
Are we then lost, my father, oh tell me!

COLONNA

Camilla, be calm and listen.
The ambitious Orsini wanted
No more to obey me, the chosen leader,
But stand beside me, give orders like me!
I stuck to my rights;
The rift between us was irremediably wide.
His son stepped forward. Fathers, said he,
Be not divided in danger's hour,
When unity is our foremost need.
I want to reunite you!

GIVE me, Colonna, your daughter in marriage.
Long have I loved her, the fair Camilla.
If, through your children, you are united
By holy bonds,
Strife no longer shall split you asunder
Over the power in the land.
Then his father spoke up as follows:
So be it! But if you refuse, Colonna,
Tomorrow I shall withdraw my troops
And come to terms with the Tribune.
Then try and hold the fortress alone!
Those were his words. And so, my daughter,
Even before the sun goes down
You'll go—as I told him—to young Orsini
And join him in wedlock. So make you ready.
CAMILLA

Oh God, what shall I do?

COLONNA

You seem unwilling to give in.
I'd long intended that you should win
A better thing on your brow to set
Than Count Orsini's coronet.
Whoever might your hand in marriage merit
At least a princedom should inherit—
Or so I thought. Things worked out differently.
What choice have we?

CAMILLA

So it is settled, then:
I'll be the sacrifice.
For peace between you men,
My own peace I must lose.
Am I so much alone
That he I most despise
Must be my husband—one
I would not freely choose?
Father, I beg you, spare me your fury!
Just for you, I
Would gladly die,
But Count Orsini I never shall marry!

COLONNA

What evil spirit has made you so wild?
You even choose
My wish to refuse?
I, I command you, iniquitous child!

CAMILLA

Command of me whatever you will,
But the vow that I swore
To the man I adore,
I honour it still!

COLONNA

To Montreal I'm to give you away?
I thought the hope of his winning your hand
Had long, long since been gone from your mind.  
A fine son-in-law for me, I must say!  
Since when have plunderers,  
Robbers and murderers  
Won the Colonnas' womenfolk, pray?

CAMILLA
Ere I should prove  
False to my vow,  
Let the Earth now  
Swallow me up, or the blackness of night.  
Walter, our love  
Nothing can blight,  
True ones in woe  
Live to the day when their darkness turns bright!

COLONNA
Can you not see the threat that surrounds us?  
Iron balls  
Pound down the walls,  
The enemy stranglehold tightens around us.  
Think of what's going to happen to you  
At the dread hour  
When turret and tower  
Fall, and foeman comes swarming through.  
Who will protect you and save you from force  
When the wild soldiers clutch you with their claws?

CAMILLA
My Walter will shield me, he surely will come!  
If he comes not, a dagger will save me  
From shame!

COLONNA
Did not this Montreal of yours  
First put us in this sorry plight,  
Sending the Tribune his own force  
To harass us by day and night?  
Yet this same Montreal  
You'd choose before them all?

CAMILLA
I shall stay true to him forever!
COLONNA
Will you not think and have some sense?

CAMILLA
What I've said I won't gainsay.

COLONNA
Intractable one, then get you hence,
I'll tame this obduracy!

CAMILLA
What I've sworn I should forswear?

COLONNA
Yes. Before this day is through—

CAMILLA
Empty then my promise were!

COLONNA
I will see you change your view.

CAMILLA
These my passions—

COLONNA
I'll suppress!

CAMILLA
This my love—

COLONNA
cannot survive.

CAMILLA
Such devotion to repress—

COLONNA
that will be child's play to me!

CAMILLA
I shall not betray him, never!
COLONNA, CAMILLA

Ha, it may cost you your life.
Yes, me my life.

CAMILLA

I'll be true to him forever.
His I am and e'er shall be!

CAMILLA, COLONNA

All upon it I would stake,
Though it may cost you your life.

This your vow you must forsake
This my vow I'll not forsake
And obey me constantly!

A SERVANT (entering)

My Lord, a stranger waits outside.
He has important news to bring you,
But only to you he'll give his name.

COLONNA

Let him come in!

(EXIT servant. Enter Montreal in cloak and hat. He doffs his hat and flings back his cloak.)

CAMILLA

Oh Heavens! Walter!

COLONNA

Montreal! You dare to enter my house,
You, whose soldiers besiege us now,
You, that have taken the enemy's side,
You, that have stolen my daughter's heart
From me? What is your purpose here?

MONTREAL

Softly, dear sir, and listen to me!
Do you remember, you turned me away
When I was seeking Camilla's hand?
Now I revenge myself, as befits a knight.
My soldiers have you completely surrounded,
Their guns rock Palestrina's towers.
A sign from me, and the whole wild horde streams in,
And then you are lost. For who will save you?
Well, I will save you, if you so wish!
Palestrina need not fall, and I shall lead you
In pomp and ceremony back to Rome!

COLONNA

So you would treacherously leave the Tribune?
That is hardly a knightly deed—
I'll have no part in it at all.

MONTREAL

What treachery's here? My brothers, not I,
Sent the troops to join the Tribune.
I never sanctioned the deed at all.
Who's to prevent me withdrawing my soldiers?
That I'll do. This only I ask:
Give me what I could anyway win for myself!

COLONNA

What do you want of me?

MONTREAL

In Romagna, in the March of Ancona
Are thousands obedient to my word.
I have no land, and yet I am
The most powerful man in Italy.
I come to you, and I demand:
Agree to let me assume the title
Of Roman Podestà and take your daughter
As wife beside me on the Throne!

(Colonna paces up and down in thought.)

CAMILLA

Did I not say he'd rescue us,
Hearing that I was in distress?
Did I not know he'd think of me
In times of danger or of stress?
MONTREAL

How could I ever desert my beloved
Or my beloved's father in need?

COLONNA

So be it! I'll sacrifice Orsini.
He always envied me, being vain.
He and his house may fall, but I shall rise!
My son, here is my daughter! She's yours!
Be Podestà of Rome with her beside you!

Camilla, past returning
Are hate and enmity.
I have appeased your yearning,
Look up, look up at me!

CAMILLA

Flowers of love's joy so tender
From harsh adversity
Have blossomed in their splendour—
O wondrous Destiny!

MONTREAL

And now what do we care
That once we burned so long,
Wrestling with despair,
And grief, and pain, and wrong!

CAMILLA

O day of joy for lovers!

MONTREAL

O gift of love so true!

CAMILLA

O bliss when suffering's over!

COLOUNNA

Now take you each the other,
May life be good to you!
ALL THREE

We'll go unhesitating
To meet our destiny,
The Future contemplating
Serene, and gay, and free,
Through harsh pain sanctified,
After long strife together—
Love's flames thus purified
Shall burn and burn forever!

Scene Two

A room in Rienzi's home.

RIENZI (paper in hand)

Curse the traitors! For turning the people
Away from me, for reviling me.
As if I'd fatten myself on the poor!
Curse them! If only the people stay loyal,
The future shall see me gloriously vindicated.
My people all, for whom I've gladly
Been cursed, reviled, imprisoned, banned,
For whom I've braved the Tyrants, loudly
Crying amongst them: Hold your hand!
My people, you will not go under
Shamed and abused, like cowards base;
You shall arise in all your grandeur,
A proud and a victorious race!

You know not the many trials,
Cares and anguish I went through;
You know not the many perils
That I faced because of you!
Long years, hesitating never,
Through the thorns I struggled on,
Yet you may not thank me ever
For the good that I have done!

But no! I wanted Rome to free
That fell, a victim to dissension.
Restore her ancient dignity—
Is that no fine and great intention?
O Ancient Rome, do but once show
Yourself to me in your past might,
And I have lived enough, can go
Happy into the grave’s dark night!

NINA (entering)
Oh Cola, tell me, is it true
That foes are plotting against you?
Is danger hanging over
The head so dear to me?

RIENZI
Calm yourself, my dearest wife.
A few power-seeking, envious ones,
And Walter von Montreal, that traitor,
Are stirring up the people against me,
Hoping to bring about my downfall.
Helped by God and a loyal people,
I shall outwit the treacherous ones.
Before they even sense the danger,
Their heads will roll for their own crimes.
How could these schemes of theirs unnerve me?
Are they as strong as I am here,
With my true-loving wife to serve me,
And with my senses calm and clear?

NINA
Cola, why can’t I put to flight
The fears with which I am consumed?
In dreams I’ve seen your face all white
Since you the purple robe assumed.

RIENZI
My dearest wife, come, fear no more!
We are not in the slightest danger;
Untroubled can the eagle soar
Clear of the snakes that hiss with anger.

NINA
I cannot think what I would do,
If I should lose you, love, one day.
Cola di Rienzi

Whoever left me without you,
Would steal my very life away.

COLA
Oh, put aside all fear and care,
For what inspires me is sublime.
I can't go under—do not dare—
Until I have achieved my aim,

Until Rome's might triumphantly
Is born again, and Freedom shakes
The dust off, and the world can see
In trembling how the lion wakes.

If, in the heat of battle, I stood
Alone, in peril of my life,
Deserted and abandoned, would
You not stay by me, dearest wife?

NINA
Dearest, as some God may decree,
So let it be, then, for us two.
I cannot, and I will not, flee,
In need and death I'll stand by you!

BOTH
Firmly together, on our own,
We shall face treachery and lies.
Though in this world we stood alone,
Our true love ever would suffice!

Scene Three

A hall in the Colonnas' palace, festively arrayed for
a banquet.

Montreal, Battista, Chorus of guests.

MONTREAL
Your health, good sirs! Let gaiety
And the wine goblet reign this night!
Think not how late the hour may be,
While the wine laughs in beaker bright.
Frederick Engels

Let song resound
These halls around
Till the dawn breaks with radiant light!

**CHORUS**

Drink all the brimming cup may hold,
Quaff merrily the flowing wine;
The goblet filled with liquid gold
Revives man's heart at any time.
Let song resound
These halls around
Until the light of dawn doth shine!

**BATTISTA**

Ho, there! A song, who'll sing a song?

**MONTREAL**

Hey, boy, hand me that lute of yours.
Let me sing you a song of Provence
After the fashion of my native land—
The song of a high-born troubadour.

*Here follows a love-song, to be inserted later.*

**BATTISTA**

Long life to all the ladies!

**CHORUS**

Long life to the ladies! In sparkling wine
We think about them all the time!
Long life to all the ladies!

**MONTREAL**

Ho, butler, fill the glasses!
Lachrymae Christi, Monte Falerno,
Bring us the best Falernian wine!
Now let us drink and let us sing!

**CHORUS**

Drink all the brimming cup, etc.

*(The Capitol bell sounds.)*
BATTISTA
What is happening? Hear you the Capitol bell?

MONTREAL
What could it be? Nothing to trouble us!
Let us be merry! It's nothing to alarm us!

BATTISTA
I drink this, noble sir, to you,
And to your gallant following too!
That the Tribune by you may be
Relieved of his authority!
Loudly I cry to one and all:
Long live Walter von Montreal!

CHORUS
Loud ring our voices one and all:
Long live our gracious host!
Long live Walter von Montreal!

CHOIR OF MONKS (off)
Requiem aeternam dona eis,
Domine! Et lux perpetua
luceat eis!

MONTREAL
What has come over you, friends?
Let the priests whine of graves and of death,
Life is red-blooded while we draw breath!

(CHOIR OF MONKS in the background: Dies irae, dies illa.)
I thank you all, my friends!
Let us drown out those wailing monks
With joyous cries!
Long live Rome, the eternal city!

CHORUS
Long live Rome, the eternal city!
Drink all the brimming cup, etc.

(CHOIR, off: Ne me perdas illa die! quia pius es!)
MONTREAL

And here’s a toast to the Tribune’s downfall,
The traitor who, on the people’s sweat,
Carouses there in the Capitol!
Revenge will be on him before he knows it.
Down with him!

CHORUS

Down with the Tribune, be our word—
Let him reap his treason’s reward!

(Three bangs on the door. Confusion.)

MONTREAL

Enter, you uninvited guests!

(Enter the Tribune in purple and ermine, followed by men-at-arms.)

Pause.

RIENZI

Are you so gay, then, Montreal,
When the Capitol bell outside
And the chanting priests tell you the tidings
That your brothers are being led to execution?
Let you and the rest all know this!

CHORI

Judex ergo nunc tedebit
etc.

[RIENZI]

At last your hour has struck,
And your traitor’s reward is settled!

(Montreal and Battista are led off.)

Curtain
ACT THREE

Scene One

A room in Rienzi's home.

NINA (hastening in, breathless)

Help, Holy Mary!
Help, Father in Heaven!
Oh, what a rabble
Comes down the streets tearing,
Roaring, rampaging,
Many-voiced, raging;
They're bursting through breaches
And soon they will reach us.
Our palace they're nearing!
In wild agitation
They threaten destruction
And grim devastation;
In savage eruption
The rabble draws nigh!

Our deliverance please send,
Ye most blessed ones on high;
Let the angels' wings extend
Over us protectingly.
Hear, oh hear my anguished plea,
Come to us, shield us from danger.
Please, oh please let us not be
Victims of the mob's blind anger!

Nearer and nearer
The rabble is teeming,
Higher and higher
The flood is streaming.
Swords are glittering,
Spear-points flickering.
Flashing bright!

Ever nearer and more mighty,
Death enfoldus with his arm.
Help, O Mary! Help, Almighty!
Do not let us come to harm!
RIENZI (entering)
It's happened—something I never feared!
The maddened people have risen against me,
Howling vengeance for Montreal's death
And for Battista's too.

NINA
O dearest Cola!
Danger is pressing nearer and nearer,
O save us both!

RIENZI
-Keep calm, beloved wife!
Danger is not so very near.
Still in the flush of youth am I,
And with a face unyielding, proud,
I shall go out there to defy
The fury of the crowd!

My eye is swift as lightning blast,
My brow unmarred by life's abuse,
Like swords, my words are keen and fast—
So let all Hell break loose!

Let Hell break loose—still I shall brave it.
I raised myself up to the throne,
Now I must stand my ground and save it.
I'll calm their anger down!

NINA
Oh, let us yield, I humbly pray,
Let us seek refuge from their fury.
Cola, just once, hear what I say,
O Cola, let us hurry!

RIENZI
In cowardice? Not while I draw breath!

NINA
Cola, while still there's time—decide!
RIENZI
I’ll stand and face it out with death,
Though he press in from every side!

NINA
Oh, come! The mob does not deserve
So great a sacrifice—oh, no!

RIENZI
If ruin strikes, my death shall serve
Before the whole wide world to show
I did not shrink to dedicate
My life that Rome once more be great.

NINA
So, husband, you’ll not run away?
Then from your side I shall not go,
As in good times, likewise in woe
And wretched fortune, I shall stay.

RIENZI
Come to my breast, O marvellous wife!
The reward of striving constantly
Blooms in your love, God’s joy, for me,
Though reached I not my goal in life!

NINA
So big, so strong you are, my mate!
Held in your warm embrace, to fall
With you, most wonderful of all—
Oh what a high and blissful fate!

COLA, NINA
And so we go forth joyously,
Embracing one another tight,
Bathed in the glow of true love’s light,
To meet whate’er our fate may be!
Though death outside await us twain,
Through fire and sword, both unaffrighted
We go, together and united,
To face what Fortune may ordain!
Scene Two

Before the Capitol.

CAMILLA (hair unbound, sword in hand)

So it has come, then,
For what I so languish,
The hour of revenge
For my sorrow and anguish.
The hour of revenge!
His blood shall be shed
In atonement for yours,
My murdered, my dear one,
Though I strike him dead
With this, my own hand.
True love has been murdered,
Burn hatred, burn more,
And stain, blood of tyrants,
My thirsting sword-blade
With purple-red gore.
Not woman, but Fury
Henceforth be my name;
With steel I shall sever
The veins of that same
Vile traitor who sent
My love to his grave!
Away with compassion
And womanly weakness!
Vengeance, ay, vengeance
For that shameful crime
Is all that I crave!
The crowds are all swarming
And gathering together,
More frenzied than ever
I'm going to make them.
Fall, then, Rienzi,
From the throne to your doom—
Your victim, my lover,
Awaits you in the tomb!

(To the people, who have gathered round her.)

Vengeance I cry! Vengeance I cry!
For the tyrant's execution,
For the grimmest retribution,
Storm into the Capitol!
From his rooms in all their glory
Drag him hither bodily,
To his end so grim and gory;
Dying, he'll atone for all!

CHORUS
Vengeance! Vengeance!—To the Capitol.

CAMILLA
On his guilty head let roll
Curses, death, calamity.
Liberty from us he stole,
Now it is his reckoning time.
At our feet in terror, he
Shall like any traitor die.
Red his blood shall flow and free
For his most perfidious crime.

CHORUS
At our feet in terror, etc.

Enter Rienzi, Nina following him.

RIENZI
Citizens of Rome! Why do you gather here
In milling crowds, with spear and sword
Before the Capitol?
Do you not trust me now, whom you elected
And on whose shoulders you it was that laid
This purple? What have I done to harm you?
Let me finish my task.
Let me restore our ancient glory
And you'll be lords of the Earth
And free, with laws of your own making.
Listen not to the voice of slander,
Judge me by deeds alone!

CAMILLA
Do not listen to him speaking,
Let yourselves be not misled.
Be intent alone on wreaking
Vengeance for lost liberty!

CHORUS
By your flattery, by your speaking,
We'll no longer be misled.
Now we only think of wreaking
Vengeance for lost liberty!

They press towards him.

NINA
God!

RIENZI
Hence, insolent ones, away!

NINA
See you not the tears I shed?

CAMILLA
Ha, Triumph! Now the vengeance-seeking
Flames I've kindled, as I see.

CHORUS
Now we only think of wreaking
Vengeance for lost liberty!

NINA
Would you spill the blood of him
Whom you owe your fortune to?
If it's blood you want, take mine:
I'll atone for every sin.

CAMILLA
Only vengeance for his crime,
Push compassion far from you!

NINA
Hear my weeping and lamenting,
He did good—give that a thought!
CAMILLA

Think, you Romans, unrelenting,
Of the suffering he brought!

CHORUS

Yes, we’re mindful, unrelenting,
Of the suffering he brought.

NINA

Please have mercy!

CAMILLA

Think of vengeance!

NINA

Spare this noble man, I say.

CAMILLA

On the tyrant wreak your vengeance
For your freedom snatched away.

CHORUS

Vengeance on the tyrant, vengeance,
For our freedom snatched away!

NINA

Do not let yourselves be blinded
By your fury’s raging fire!

CAMILLA

Ha! Now shall his life be ended
By the people’s burning ire!

NINA

Show us mercy!

CAMILLA

Think of vengeance.
NINA
Please have mercy.

CAMILLA
Hear her not.

CHORUS
Ha, you traitor, this our vengeance
And our wrath escape you not!
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MARRIAGE CONTRACT
between
Herr Carl Marx, Doctor of Philosophy,
resident in Cologne,
and Fräulein Johanna Bertha Julie Jenny von Westphalen,
without occupation, resident in Kreuznach,
June 12, 1843

No. 715

We, Frederick William,
by the Grace of God
King of Prussia,
Grand Duke of Lower Rhine, etc., etc.,

herewith give notice and let it be known that:

Before the Undersigned Wilhelm Christian Heinrich Burger,
royal Prussian notary in the residence of the town of Kreuznach, in the provincial-court district of Coblenz, and in the presence of the two witnesses named below, there appeared Herr Karl Marx, Doctor of Philosophy, resident in Cologne, on the one hand, and Fräulein Johanna Bertha Julie Jenny von Westphalen, without occupation, resident in Kreuznach, on the other hand.

The declarants stated that they intended to marry and in view of their future marriage, the celebration of which is to take place as soon as possible, they have mutually agreed and laid down the clauses and conditions and the consequences in civil law as follows:

Firstly. Legal common ownership of property shall be established between the future marriage partners insofar as this is not specially amended by the following articles.

Secondly. This common ownership shall also apply to all future fixed assets of the spouses by the future spouses hereby declaring all fixed assets which they will inherit in the future, or which will later fall to the lot of one or other of them, to be movable property, and putting these future fixed assets, which they give wholly into common ownership, on a par with movable property,
whereby in accordance with Article fifteen hundred and five of the Civil Code their transformation into movable assets (ameublement) takes place.

Thirdly. Each spouse shall for his or her own part pay the debts he or she has made or contracted, inherited or otherwise incurred before marriage; in consequence whereof these debts shall be excluded from the common ownership of property.

Thus everything has been agreed and settled between the future spouses. Concerning which the present marriage contract was adopted, which has been clearly read out to the interested parties.

Done at Kreuznach in the dwelling of the widow Frau von Westphalen, June twelfth of the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, in the presence of the attendant witnesses, personally known to the notary, Johann Anton Rickes, private gentleman, and Peter Beltz, tailor, both resident in Kreuznach. And in witness thereof the present document has been signed first by the above-mentioned declarants, the name, position and residence of whom is known to the notary, and after them by the above-mentioned witnesses and the notary.

The original, which has remained in the possession of the notary, and on which a stamp of two talers has been affixed, has been signed by:

"Dr. Karl Marx, Jenny von Westphalen, J. A. Riches, Peter Beltz, and Burger, notary."

At the same time We order and instruct all executors of courts of justice on request to put into operation the present act; Our Procurators-General and Our Procurators at provincial courts of justice to administer the same; all officers and commandants of the armed forces or their representatives to lend a powerful helping hand if legally requested to do so.

In confirmation thereof the present main copy has been signed by the notary and furnished with his seal of office.

Vouching for the correctness of this main copy

Burger, notary

Printed according to a copy of the document Published in English for the first time

* The notary's round seal is attached to the document and also a receipt for 6 talers and 15 groschen.— Ed.
In the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, on the nineteenth of the month of June, at 10 a.m., there appeared before me, Franz Buss, Chief Burgomaster of Kreuznach, Registrar for Births, Deaths and Marriages, Karl Marx, aged twenty-five, born in Trier, administrative district of Trier, Doctor of Philosophy, resident in Cologne, administrative district of Cologne, major son of Heinrich Marx, deceased, in his lifetime King's Counsel, resident in Trier, administrative district of Trier, and of Henriette Pressburg, of no profession, resident in Trier, administrative district of Trier.

And Johanna Bertha Julie Jenny von Westphalen, aged twenty-nine, born at Salzwedel, administrative district of Magdeburg, of no particular occupation, resident in Kreuznach, administrative district of Coblenz, major daughter of Johann Ludwig von Westphalen, deceased, in his lifetime Privy Councillor, resident in Trier, administrative district of Trier, and of Carolina Heubel, of no profession, resident in Kreuznach, administrative district of Coblenz.

The bridegroom's mother consents to the intended marriage by the deed of consent quoted below and the bride's mother by her personal presence. In the deed of consent of the bridegroom's mother the Christian name of the bride's father is given as Ferdinand, but it is Johann Ludwig, as follows from the sworn declaration made before us by the bride and the four witnesses present, after they had previously declared that they knew him closely and well.

The same requested me to perform legally the marriage agreed upon between them. As the prescribed public announcements of this marriage were actually read twice before the main door of the Kreuznach Town Hall, namely, the first on Sunday, the twenty-first of May, and the second on the following Sunday, the twenty-eighth of May, one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, and as the documents of the announcement were duly posted up
publicly and no objection to the marriage was lodged, I, in order to comply with the said request, read out the following documents:

a) the birth certificate of the bridegroom, and

b) the death certificate of his father, both certificates drawn up by Chief Burgomaster Görtz and Assistant Thanisch in Trier under the date of the thirtieth and twenty-eighth of January this year;

c) the deed of consent of his mother, recorded by Notary Funck in Trier under the date of the twenty-eighth of January this year;

d) the birth certificate of the bride, furnished by the Royal Consistorial Councillor and Pastor of the Church of Saint Mary at Salzwedel under the date of the eleventh of February this year;

e) the death certificate of her father, furnished by Assistant Thanisch in Trier under the date of the twenty-third of February this year;

f) the attestation of the announcement in Cologne, furnished by the Registrar for Births, Deaths and Marriages Schenk in that city under the date of the fourteenth of June this year;

g) the attestation of the announcement in Bonn, furnished by the Registrar for Births, Deaths and Marriages Gerhard in that city under the date of the sixteenth of the current month and year, and read out aloud Chapter Six of the part dealing with marriage in the Civil Code of Law and thereupon asked the above-named bridegroom and bride whether they wished to be joined in wedlock.

As each of them separately answered this question affirmatively, I declared in the name of the law that Karl Marx and Johanna Bertha Julie Jenny von Westphalen were legally married.

Of this I drew up the present document in the presence of Dr. Karl Engelmann, aged thirty-five, a physician, resident in Kreuznach, a friend of the newly married couple; of Heinrich Balthasar Christian Clevens, aged thirty, a probationer notary, resident in Kreuznach, a friend of the newly married couple; of Elias Mayer, aged sixty-four, man of private means, resident in Kreuznach, a friend of the newly married couple; and of Valentin Keller, aged fifty-six, innkeeper, resident in Kreuznach, a friend of the newly married couple. Then the persons present signed the document with me after it had been read out to them.

Dr. Karl Marx. Jenny von Westphalen. ———
Valentin Keller. ——— E. Mayer. ——— Buss. ———

Published for the first time Printed according to a copy of the document
JENNY MARX TO KARL MARX
IN PARIS

[Trier, about June 21, 1844]

You see, dear heart, that I don't deal with you according to the law and demand an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and a letter for a letter; I am generous and magnanimous, but I hope that my twofold appearance before you will soon yield me golden fruit, a few lines in return, for which my heart is yearning, a few words to tell me that you are well and are longing for me a little. I should so like to know that you miss me and to hear you say you want me. But now quickly, before the holding of the daily court begins again, a bulletin about our little one, for after all she is now the chief person in our alliance and, being at once yours and mine, is the most intimate bond of our love. The poor little doll was quite miserable and ill after the journey, and turned out to be suffering not only from constipation but downright overfeeding. We had to call in the fat pig, and his decision was that it was essential to have a wet-nurse since with artificial feeding she would not easily recover. You can imagine my anxiety. But that is all over now, the dear little Clever Eyes is being fed magnificently by a healthy young wet-nurse, a girl from Barbeln, the daughter of the boatman with whom dear Papa so often sailed. In better times, Mother once provided a complete outfit of clothes for this girl, when she was still a child, and what a coincidence—this poor child, to whom Papa used to give a kreutzer every day, is now giving life and health to our baby. It was not easy to save her life, but she is now almost out of any danger. In spite of all her

---

a Their daughter Jenny — Ed.
b Schleicher — Ed.
c Gretchen — Ed.
d Ludwig von Westphalen — Ed.
e Caroline von Westphalen — Ed.
sufferings, she looks remarkably pretty and is as flower-white, delicate and transparent as a little princess. In Paris we would never have got her through the illness, so this trip has already been well worth while. Besides, I am now again with my good, poor mother, who only with the greatest struggle can put up with our being separated.

She has had a very bad time at the Wettendorfs'. They are rather coarse people. Ah, if I had only known how things were with poor Mother on many occasions during the winter! But I often wept and was miserable when thinking of her, and you were always so considerate and patient. Another good thing about this wet-nurse is that she is also very useful as a maid, is willing to accompany us and, as it happens, served three years in Metz and therefore also speaks French. Hence my return journey is fully assured. What a stroke of luck it is, is it not? Only at present poor Mother has to bear too many expenses and is after all very poor. Edgar robs her of all she has and then writes one nonsensical letter after another, rejoices over the approaching revolutions and the overthrow of all existing conditions, instead of beginning by revolutionising his own conditions, which then always evokes unpleasant discussions and indirect attacks on the mad revolutionary youth. In general, nowhere does a longing for a transformation of the existing state of things arise more strongly than when one sees the surface looking so drearily flat and even, and yet knows what a commotion and ferment is taking place in the depths of mankind.

But let us leave the revolution and come back to our wet-nurse. I shall pay the monthly sum of four talers from the remainder of the journey money, from which I will pay also for the medicine and doctor. True, Mother does not want me to do so, but for food alone she has to bear more than she can. In spite of poverty, she keeps everything about her in decent condition. People in Trier are really behaving excellently towards her and that placates me a little. Moreover, I do not need to visit anyone, for they all come to me and I hold court from morning to night. I cannot give you the names of all of them. Today I also disposed of the patriot Lehmann, who is very well disposed by the way, and is only afraid that your thorough scientific studies might suffer over there. Incidentally, I behave towards everyone in a lordly fashion and my external appearance fully justifies this. For once I am more elegant than any of them and never in my life have I looked better and more blooming than I do now. Everyone is unanimous.

---
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about that. And people constantly repeat Herwegh's compliment asking me "when my confirmation has taken place". I think to myself, too, what would be the good of behaving humbly; it does not help anyone out of a difficulty, and people are so happy if they can express their regret. Despite the fact that my whole being expresses satisfaction and affluence, everyone still hopes that you will decide after all to obtain a permanent post. O, you asses, as if all of you were standing on firm ground. I know that we are not exactly standing on rock, but where is there any firm foundation now? Can one not see everywhere signs of earthquake and the undermining of the foundations on which society has erected its temples and shops? I think that time, the old mole, will soon stop burrowing underground—indeed in Breslau there have been thunderstorms again. If we can only hold out for a time, until our little one has grown big. As to that, you'll put my mind at ease, won't you, my dear sweet angel, my one and only heart's beloved? How my heart went out to you on June 19! How strongly and intimately it beat out of love for you.

But to return to the account of events. It was not until our wedding-day that our dear little baby was well again and sucked healthily and lustily. Then I set out on my difficult journey—you know where to. I wore my nice Paris frock and my face glowed with anxiety and excitement. When I rang, my heart was beating almost audibly. Everything went through my mind. The door opened and Jettchen appeared. She embraced and kissed me and led me into the drawing-room where your mother and Sophie were sitting. Both immediately embraced me, your mother called me “thou”, and Sophie sat me on the sofa beside her. She has been terribly ravaged by illness, looks like CxG, and is hardly likely to get well again. And yet Jettchen is in an almost worse state. Only your mother looks well and flourishing, and is cheerfulness itself, almost gay and frolicsome. Alas, this gaiety seems somehow sinister. All the girls were equally affectionate, especially little Caroline. Next morning your mother came already at 9 o'clock to see the baby. In the afternoon Sophie came, and this morning little Caroline also paid a visit to our little angel. Can you imagine such a change? I am very glad about it and Mother as well, but how has it come about so suddenly? What a difference
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success makes, or in our case rather the appearance of success, which by the subtlest tactics I know how to maintain.

That's strange news, isn't it? Just think, how the time runs and even the fattest pigs as well; Schleicher, too, is no longer a politician, and a Socialist, that is to say, like Schmiriaks from the organism of labour, etc. It is enough to make one sick, as the Frankenthaler says. He partly considers that your clique is mad, but he thinks it is high time you attacked Bauer. Ah, Karl, what you are going to do, do it soon. And also do give me soon some sign of your life. I am being treated with great tenderness by the most gentle loving mother, my little one is being properly looked after and cared for, the whole of Trier gapes, stares, admires, and pays court, and yet my heart and soul are turned towards you. Ah, if only I could see you now and again, and ask you: what is that for? Or sing for you: "Do you know also when it will be the day after tomorrow?" Dear heart of mine, how I should like to kiss you, for such cold collations are no good, isn't that true, my dearest one? However, you should read the Trier'sche Zeitung, it is quite good now. How do things look with you? It is now already eight days I have been away from you. Even here, with better-quality milk, it would not have been possible to get our baby over her illness without a wet-nurse. Her whole stomach was upset. Today Schleicher has assured me that she is now saved. O, if only poor Mother did not have so many worries, and particularly because of Edgar, who makes use of all the great signs of the times, and all the sufferings of society, in order to cover up and whitewash his own worthlessness. Now the vacation is coming again and then once again nothing will come of the examination. All his essays are ready. It is unpardonable. Mother must deny herself everything, while he has a good time in Cologne going to all the operas, as he himself writes. He speaks with the utmost tenderness of his little sister, his little Jenny, but I find it impossible to be tender towards the scatterbrain.

Dearest heart, I am often greatly worried about our future, both that near at hand and later on, and I think I am going to be punished for my exuberance and cockiness here. If you can, do set my mind at rest about this. There is too much talk on all sides about a steady income. I reply then merely by means of my rosy cheeks, my clear skin, my velvet cloak, feather hat and smart coiffure. That has the best and deepest effect, and if as a result I become depressed, nobody sees it. Our baby has such a beautiful

* Bruno Bauer.— Ed.
white colour that everyone wonders at it, and she is so fine and
delicate. Schleicher is very solicitous and very nice to the child.
Today he did not want to go away at all, then there came God's
Wrath, and then Reverchon, then Lehmann, and then Poppey,
and so it goes on all the time. Yesterday the Tree-frog, a too, was
here with his parchment better half. I did not see them. The
members of your family have just paid a call in passing, including
Sophie in full fig. But how ill she looks!!! — Give greetings from
me to Siebenkäs and the Heines, if you see them. I shall have
news of you soon, isn't that so? And are you bravely singing the
postillion of Longjumeau?

Only don't write with too much rancour and irritation. You
know how much more effect your other articles have had. Write
either in a matter-of-fact and subtle way or humorously and
lightly. Please, dear heart of mine, let your pen run over the
paper, even if it should on occasion stumble and fall, and the
sentence with it. Your thoughts all the same stand erect like the
grenadiers of the old guard, so honourably firm and courageous,
and they could say like the old guard: elle meurt mais elle ne se rend
pas. b What does it matter if occasionally the uniform hangs a bit
loosely and is not so tightly buttoned up? What is so very nice
about the French soldiers is their free and easy appearance. When
you think of our stilted Prussians, doesn't it make you shudder? —
Just slacken the strappings and remove the cravat and
helmet — let the participles take their course and set down the
words just as they come of themselves. Such an army does not
have to march in such strict order. And your troops are taking the
field, are they not? Good luck to the general, my dusky master!

Good-bye, dearest heart, my beloved, my entire life. For the
present I am in my little Germany, with everything around me,
including my little one and my mother, and yet my heart is sad
because you are absent; it yearns for you, and it hopes for you
and your black messengers.

Good-bye,

Your Schipp and Schribb

---


** Published in English for the first time

---
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b It dies, but does not surrender.— Ed.
My dearest,

I received your letter at the very moment when all the bells were ringing, the guns firing, and the pious crowd flocking into the temples to convey their hallelujahs to the heavenly Lord for having so miraculously saved their earthly Lord. You can imagine with what peculiar feeling I read Heine’s poems during the celebration and also chimed in with my hosannas. Did not your Prussian heart also quiver with horror at the news of that crime, that shocking, unthinkable crime? Alas, for the lost virginity, the lost honour! Such are the Prussian catchwords. When I heard the little green grasshopper, cavalry captain X., declaiming about the lost virginity, I could only believe that he meant the holy immaculate virginity of Mother Mary, for that after all is the only one officially confirmed. But as for the virginity of the Prussian state! No, I lost any belief in that long ago. As regards the terrible event, one consolation remains for the pure Prussian people, viz., that the motive for the deed was not any political fanaticism, but a purely personal desire for revenge. They console themselves with that—lucky for them—but it is precisely a new proof that a political revolution is impossible in Germany, whereas all the seeds of a social revolution are present. While there has never been a political fanatic there who dared to go to the extreme, the first one to risk an attempt at assassination was driven to it by want, dire want. For three days the man had been begging in vain in Berlin in constant danger of death from starvation—hence it was a social attempt at assassination. If something does break out, it will start from this direction—that is the most sensitive spot, and in this respect a German heart also is vulnerable!
JENNY MARX TO KARL MARX

IN PARIS

[Trier, between August 11 and 18, 1844]

My dearest, unique Karl,

You cannot believe, darling of my heart, how very happy you make me by your letters, and how your last pastoral letter, you high priest and bishop of my heart, has once again restored soothing calm and peace to your poor lamb. It is certainly wrong and silly to torture oneself with all sorts of cares and glimpses of dark distant perspectives. I am very well aware of that myself in those self-tormenting moments—but although the spirit is willing, the flesh is weak, and so it is always only with your help that I am able to exorcise those demons. Your latest news truly brought me such real and tangible solace that it would be quite wrong to start brooding again. I expect now that it is going to happen as in a game of cards, and I hope that some external circumstance will determine the time of my return home. Perhaps Edgar's arrival or some similar occasion. I touch on this painful point very unwillingly, and it is only in Edgar's presence that I shall return to this matter for a decision. In any case I shall be coming before the winter, how could I indeed resist such dear, heart-warming friendliness as that which shines on me from your lines. And then in the background are dark feelings of anxiety and fear, the real menace of unfaithfulness, the seductions and attractions of a capital city—all those are powers and forces whose effect on me is more powerful than anything else. How I am looking forward after such a long time to rest comfortably and happily once more close to your heart, in your arms. What a lot I shall have to chatter with you about, and what trouble you will have to bring me again à la hauteur des principes for in partitioned Germany it is not easy to remain au courant.

How glad you will be to see the little creature. I am convinced that you will not be able to recognise our child, unless her little eyes and black crest of hair reveal the secret to you. Everything else is really quite different now, only the resemblance to you becomes ever more obvious. During the last few days she has begun to eat a little broth made from the herbs which I have
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brought with me, and she relishes it greatly. In the bath she splashes with her little hands so much that the whole room is flooded, and then she dips her tiny finger in the water and afterwards licks it hastily. Her little thumb, which she has always kept bent and then made to peep out between her fingers, has become so unusually supple and flexible owing to this habit that one cannot help being astonished by it. She can become a little piano player—I believe she can do magic tricks with her little thumb. When she cries, we quickly draw her attention to the flowers in the wall-paper, and then she becomes quiet as a mouse and gazes so long that tears come into her eyes. We must not talk to her for too long because it makes her over-exert herself. She wants to imitate every sound and answer it, and the fact that her forehead swells and reddens is a sign of excessive strain. Incidentally, she is the acme of cheerfulness. Every kind of look you give her makes her laugh. You ought to see what a darling little creature I shall bring with me. When she hears anyone speaking she at once looks in that direction and goes on looking until something fresh happens. You can't have any idea of the liveliness of the child. For whole nights through her little eyes refuse to close in sleep, and if one looks at her she laughs out loud. She is happiest when she sees a light or the fire. By that means one can allay her heaviest storm. Karl dear, how long will our little doll play a solo part? I fear, I fear, that when her papa and mama are together once again, and live in common ownership, the performance will soon become a duet. Or should we set about it in the good Parisian style? Usually one finds the greatest number of children where the means are smallest. Recently a poor man with ten children asked for relief from Chief Burgomaster Görtz. When he was reproached for having produced so many children, his only reply was to say: there is a parish fête once a year even in the tiniest and most insignificant village. Then he was given assistance, and no doubt he will be celebrating the eleventh parish fête.

We have not seen your relatives for a long time. First the great illustrious visit and now the important arrangements for the marriage, so that one’s presence is inopportune, one does not receive any calls and is oneself modest enough not to visit them again. The marriage is on August 28. On Sunday the banns were called for the first time. In spite of all the magnificence, Jetchen's health becomes worse every day, her cough and hoarseness are increasing. She can hardly walk any longer. She goes about like a
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ghost, but married she must be. It is generally regarded as terrible and unscrupulous. Rocholl, however, is said to be in favour of it in order to secure something for his nephew. I don’t know whether that can turn out well. If at least they were going to live in a town—but in a miserable village, and in winter at that. I can’t imagine how your relatives can be cheerful and happy about it. If fate did not somewhat dampen their spirits, there could be no escape from their haughtiness. And the boasting about grand parties and brooches, ear-rings and shawls! I cannot understand your mother. She herself has told us that she thinks Jettchen is consumptive, and yet she lets her marry. But Jettchen is said to want it very strongly. I am curious to know how it will all turn out.

In Trier there is already such a stir and bustle as I have never seen. There is activity everywhere. All the shops have been newly smartened up, everyone is arranging rooms for lodging. We, too, have got a room ready. The whole of Coblenz is coming here and the cream of society is joining in the procession. All the hotels are already full up. 210 new pubs have been established, as well as circuses, theatres, menageries, dioramas, international theatres, in short, everything one could think of is already announcing its presence. The entire palace square is covered with tents. Entire wooden houses have been erected outside the gates. Trier marches on Sunday. Everyone has to join a procession and then come the villages. Every day some 16,000 people. Frau Stein has already sold 400 talers’ worth of tiny copies of the sacred linen cloth, made out of old strips of ribbon. Rosaries, worth from six pfennigs to one hundred talers, are displayed at every house. I, too, have bought a little medallion for my little one, and yesterday she herself obtained a small rosary. You cannot imagine the bustling activity that is going on here. Next week half Luxemburg is coming; cousin Michel has also announced his arrival. All the people seem to be mad. What is one to think about it? Is it a good sign of the times that everything has to go to extremes, or are we still a long way from our goal?

Where you are, too, all hell is being let loose. Will things be patched up once more? And tell me, what did the blockhead say about your article? Has he given tit for tat, replied or kept silent? Jung really is an exceptionally noble character.
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What a good thing it is that you are now a little bit in funds again. Only always bear in mind, when the purse is full, how quickly it becomes empty again, and how difficult it is to fill it. You dear good Karl, darling of my heart. How I love you, how my heart yearns for you. I should like so very much that Edgar could still see his charming niece. If only he became an uncle barrister—then I could earlier talk to Mother about my departure. Our little doll is just eating her soup. Just think, she does not want to lie down at all any more, she wants to sit upright all the time. She is then better able to look around her. Tell me, dear heart, for some time past I have noticed that you no longer mention Guerrier. Has anything happened in connection with the worthy cousin? And is there no news of the divine Georg? 8?

I am very eager to know what the Pomeranian is going to do now. Will he keep silent or will he make a row? It is peculiar that from Cologne there never comes anything unpleasant, but always the best. After all, how loyal our friends are, how solicitous, tactful and considerate. Even if it is painful to have to ask for money, in relation to these people it surely ceases to be at all unpleasant and onerous. I can hardly go on writing, the baby keeps distracting my attention with her delicious chuckles and attempts at speech. You cannot have any idea of the beauty of her forehead, the transparency of her skin and the wonderful delicacy of her tiny hands.

Dear good heart of my heart. Do write to me again quite soon. I am so very happy when I see your handwriting. You dear, good, sweet, little wild boar. You dear father of my little doll.

Adieu, heart of my heart.

---

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

---

a Georg Herwegh.— Ed.
b Arnold Ruge.— Ed.
NOTES AND INDEXES
NOTES

Marx mentions his intention of critically analysing Hegel's views on the state and law as far back as in the spring of 1842. In a letter to Arnold Ruge of March 5 he writes that he is preparing an article on Hegel's legal and political views in which he intends first of all to criticise Hegel's apology on behalf of the constitutional monarchy (see this edition, Vol. 1). The above-mentioned article is not extant and it is unknown whether he actually wrote it, but the subject-matter continued to attract his attention. As Marx's theoretical views developed and he gradually adopted a materialist standpoint, largely due to Feuerbach's influence, his plans of writing a critique of Hegel's philosophy became more extensive and profound and finally he conceived the idea of counterposing the materialist conception of social phenomena to their idealist interpretation. For Marx the basic problem was the interdependence of material social relations, property relations and so on—which Hegel called "civil society"—and the political system of society, the state.

Marx began to work on his plan during his stay from May to October 1843 in Kreuznach (where his bride Jenny von Westphalen, whom he married in June 1843, lived with her mother). Here, apparently, he wrote the original version of the work. In the process of writing it he felt the need for greater concrete historical material, and with this aim in view he began to study problems related not only to the theory and history of the state as a whole but to the history of individual countries (England, France, Germany, the United States, Italy, Sweden) and major world-historical events, in particular the Great French Revolution, as can be seen from his five notebooks containing excerpts (the Kreuznach Notebooks). Later on, he wrote an introduction to that work which was published in February 1844 in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher. But Marx did not manage to prepare the main sections of his work for publication because he turned to other studies and conceived other literary plans (economic studies, preparation of a book against the Young Hegelians, work on the history of the Convention and so on). However, his work on the manuscript dealing with the criticism of the Hegelian philosophy of law played a major role in his spiritual development and was an important stage in the formation of his materialist views. Marx himself pointed to this in 1859 in the Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Engels, for his part, in his article "Karl Marx" (1869) described the conclusions arrived at by his friend as a result of the critical analysis of
Hegel's views in the following way: "Proceeding from the Hegelian philosophy of law, Marx came to the conclusion that it was not the state which Hegel had described as the 'top of the edifice' but 'the civil society' which Hegel had regarded with disdain that was the sphere in which a key to the understanding of the process of historical development of mankind should be looked for."

The extant manuscript consists of 39 big sheets numbered in Roman figures by the author (II-XL), apparently after the work had been finished. The first sheet is missing. Each sheet is folded in two to form four pages, which are numbered in Arabic figures from sheet I-XXII. The manuscript contains a critical analysis of paragraphs 261-313 of G. W. F. Hegel's Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts. These paragraphs comprise the subsection "Internal State Law" in the third part of Hegel's work. The missing first sheet apparently dealt with §§257-260 as can be seen from the extant text. The manuscript bears the imprint of an unfinished work. Some problems which the author promises to deal with below have not been treated by him in the extant part. The title of the work given by the author, which is missing in the manuscript, is reproduced from the above-mentioned introduction published in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher. In one of the notebooks written by Marx in Bonn in 1842 there are some notes connected with this manuscript. The date of writing the notes is not established. The notes contain some subheadings, the first of which refers to the non-extant part of the manuscript and contains references to the sheets and pages of the manuscript of the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. The content of the notes is as follows:

"Duplication of the Development System. I. 3, 4. Logical Mysticism. II, 8. III, 9 [see this volume, pp. 7, 8].

"Mystical way of presentation."

Ibid. Example, §267. IV, pp. 13, 14 [see this volume, pp. 10, 11].


Marx's manuscript was first published in Moscow by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

This work was first published in English in part in the book Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society, New York, 1967, and in full as a separate edition entitled Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right by Karl Marx. Translated from the German by Annette Jolin and Joseph O'Malley, Cambridge, 1970.

In translating the term "Hegelsche Rechtsphilosophie", the translators and editors, being aware of the difficulty of its rendering into English, proceeded from the interpretation of this and similar concepts in the works of Marx and Engels written in English. Thus, in the English authorized edition of Engels' work Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Hegel's expression "Begriff des Rechts" is translated in one of the notes as "concept of law" (see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 115).

In this manuscript as in the other works published in this volume Marx frequently uses two similar German terms, "Entäusserung" and "Entfremdung", to express the notion of "alienation". In the present edition the former is generally translated as "alienation", the latter as "estrangement", because in the later economic works (Theories of Surplus-Value) Marx himself used the word "alienation" as the English equivalent of the term "Entäusserung". p. 3

Here and below Marx quotes Hegel, Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts oder Naturrecht und Staatswissenschaft im Grundrisse, according to the edition Georg
Sometimes Marx quotes with omissions which he does not always indicate with dots. Similarly, he does not always reproduce italics, frequently italicising instead other words and passages in the quotations. In the present edition emphasis in the quotations from Hegel's work reproduced by Marx is rendered by italics, whereas passages emphasised by Marx are printed in bold italics. In individual cases where there are no indications in the manuscript, the editors give in square brackets references to the corresponding paragraphs of Hegel's work.

Marx did not return to this question anywhere else in the extant manuscript.

Apparently this refers to G. W. F. Hegel, Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundriss, Erster Theil, Die Wissenschaft der Logik.

This possibly refers to Saint-Simon and his followers, who considered that in the future society the state would turn from an instrument for administering people into an instrument for administering things, i.e., would lose its political character.

In the extant manuscript an analysis of the Addition to § 290 of Hegel's work is missing.

The Prussian Common Law (Preußische Landrecht)—the laws of the provinces in the kingdom of Prussia codified in 1794. It reflected the backwardness of feudal Prussia in the sphere of law and court procedure.

The extant manuscript does not deal with this question.

This section is from the third, concluding part of Hegel's Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, comprising §§ 182-256. It precedes the section "Der Staat", the paragraphs of which (§§ 261-313) are analysed in this manuscript. There is no special analysis of this section in the extant part of the manuscript though Marx repeatedly touches on Hegel's views on civil society when examining § 308 (see, in particular, pp. 111-15 of this volume).

This refers to la Charte bâclée (the Constitutional Charter) introduced after the July 1830 revolution in France.

This problem is not dealt with in the extant part of the manuscript.

This apparently refers to the same problem which Marx mentioned above, on page 121, as a problem to be analysed later on (see Note 11).

This note was written by Marx in connection with his reading and summarising of the journal Historisch-politische Zeitschrift, edited by Leopold Ranke. Hamburg, 1832, Bd. 1, Heft 1. Marx was interested, in particular, in Ranke's article, "Über die Restauration in Frankreich". This note is to be found in the fourth Kreuznach Notebook which contains Marx's historical excerpts relating to July-August 1843 (see Note 1). The thoughts expressed in it on the inconsistency of the Hegelian idealist conception of the relation between the abstract idea of the state and its concrete historical forms, etc., are directly connected with Marx's work Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law (see pp. 75-80 and 82-83 of this volume).

This refers to the Constitutional Charter of 1814, the basic law of the Bourbons returned to power, and the Charter published on August 14, 1830, after the bourgeois revolution in France. The Constitutional Charter of 1830 was the basic law of the July monarchy. It repeated the main principles of the 1814
Charter but the preamble of the 1814 Charter, speaking of the constitution being granted (*octroyée*) by the king, was omitted from the 1830 Constitution and the rights of the Upper and Lower Chambers were extended at the expense of some of the monarch's prerogatives. Under the new constitution the monarch was regarded only as the head of the executive and was deprived of the right to repeal or suspend laws.

p. 130

Early in the spring of 1843 Marx conceived the idea of launching a new journal as the organ of the German and French democrats. He intended to publish it in collaboration with the Young Hegelian Arnold Ruge, editor of the journal *Deutsche Jahrbücher*, which had been suppressed by the government (see Marx's letter to Ruge of March 13, 1843, this edition, Vol. 1). At the end of May 1843 Marx went to Dresden to see Ruge on this question. In the course of the preliminary talks, two tendencies became apparent in respect of the line of the future journal. Ruge pursued chiefly educational goals and planned to turn the journal into a means for an exchange of ideas in the sphere of philosophy (primarily German philosophy) and social and political sciences (above all, French), whereas Marx sought to link the theoretical tasks of the journal as closely as possible with the actual revolutionary struggle against the feudal-absolutist order in Germany, to use the journal as an ideological weapon in the struggle for restructuring society. The different approaches to the journal's programme were reflected in the materials prepared for it and in the correspondence between its prospective editors. Marx's intention to turn the journal into a more radical and militant organ is felt also in the given draft programme of the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, which Marx wrote after he had received Ruge's programmes in German and French in August 1843. Marx used these programmes but changed some formulations, especially those of the second and partly of the third point which in Ruge's programmes read as follows:

**French Text of Ruge's Programme**

"2) Reviews of the newspapers, which will give a calm but just and strict appraisal of the periodicals of our day, the spirit inspiring them, their actions and tendencies and also their impact on public opinion."

"3) Critical reviews of books published on both sides of the Rhine."

**German Text of Ruge's Programme**

"2) Reviews of the newspapers and journals which express their attitude to the problems of the day."

"3) Reviews of old-time writings and *belles-lettres* in Germany as well as reviews of books published in the two countries which open or continue the new epoch."

In elaborating the final text of the programme, Ruge was to take into account the draft written by Marx and reproduce, wholly or in part, some of his formulations. For the sake of comparison we quote below the text printed in issue No. 1-2 of the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, Paris, 1844:

"This journal is a critical publication, but it is not a German literary newspaper. We shall publish excerpts from French and German sources:"

"1. On men and systems which are of significance and enjoy influence, on topical questions, on the constitution, legislation, political economy, morals and institutions. Instead of the divine policy of the heavenly kingdom it will reflect the true science of human affairs."

"2. Reviews of newspapers and journals which express their attitude to the problems of our day."
"3. Reviews of old-time writings and belles-lettres in Germany which of necessity will subject to criticism the old German spirit in its transcendent, now moribund existence; as well as reviews of books of the two countries which open or continue the new epoch which we are entering." p. 131

The journal *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* was to contribute to rallying various representatives of progressive democratic and socialist thought in France and Germany, and to become the organ of "a Franco-German scientific alliance" as Marx wrote in a letter to Ludwig Feuerbach on October 3, 1843 (see p. 349 of this volume). Invitations to contribute to the journal were extended to Frederick Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach, Heinrich Heine, Moses Hess, Karl Bernays, Julius Fröbel, Pierre Joseph Proudhon, Félicité de Lamennais, Alphonse de Lamartine, Louis Blanc, Pierre Leroux, Étienne Cabet and others. This letter of the editorial board of the future journal, which was signed by Marx and Ruge, was published in the Fourierist newspaper *Démocratie pacifique* in reply to an unsigned item, written by Lamartine, which appeared on December 10, 1843, in the newspaper *Bien Public.*

This refers to a letter of November 16, from Leipzig, which was published in the *Könische Zeitung* on November 20, 1843.

These letters written by Marx form part of his correspondence with Ruge at the time of their preparations for publishing the journal *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, they were published in the journal in the section "From the Correspondence of 1843", where letters by Ruge, Bakunin and Feuerbach were also printed. In these letters Marx in fact formulated his revolutionary views on the programme of the journal which went further than the tasks of disseminating abstract philosophical ideas and bourgeois-democratic political views, set by its other editor, Ruge.

Marx's letters to Ruge from the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* were first published in English in the book *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*, New York, 1967.

Despite considerable organisational and material difficulties (the journal was edited in Paris and printed in Zurich) the editorial board managed to put out the first double issue (No. 1-2) of the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* at the end of February 1844. The main trend of the journal was determined by Marx's letters and articles ("On the Jewish Question", "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. Introduction") and Engels' articles ("Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy", "The Condition of England. Past and Present by Thomas Carlyle"), which were published in it and were imbued with revolutionary-communist spirit. However, the publication of the journal was discontinued (for the reason see this volume, p. 188, and Note 36).

By its sharp political presentation of material the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* attracted the attention of the progressive sections of society in Germany, France and other countries but at the same time evoked indignation of the conservative press. On March 10, 1844, the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote: "The criticism to which the new Paris journal resorts knows no mercy, in its polemics it disregards all aesthetic standards, and its satirical tone, though it does not stab like a dagger, punches like a huge fist." The Prussian Government considered the political line of the journal extremely "dangerous", banned its import to Germany and issued warrants for the arrest of Marx, Ruge, Heine and the other contributors in the event of their coming to Prussia. About two-thirds out of the total of three thousand copies fell into the hands of the police.
This figure of speech was used by analogy with the satirical poem of the German humanist Sebastian Brant, *Das Narrenschiff* (The Ship of Fools), published in 1494. In a letter to Ruge in May 1843 Marx repeated this metaphor (see p. 139 of this volume).  

In a letter to Marx written from Berlin in March 1843, Ruge complained about the absence of any signs of revolutionary ferment in Germany, about the spirit of servility, submission to despotism and allegiance that had been prevalent in the country for many years. This letter was published in the section "From the Correspondence of 1843" in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*.  

Marx alludes to the patronage and support which Frederick William IV, while still Crown Prince, extended to the journal *Berliner politisches Wochenblatt* (1831-41) which was the mouthpiece for the ideas of feudal reaction and conservative romanticism.

The coronation of Frederick William IV, which took place on June 7, 1840, in Königsberg, was surrounded with the pageantry of medieval knighthood.

In a letter to Marx in August 1843 (published in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*) Ruge informed him of the final decision to have the journal published in Paris. Earlier there had been no unanimity on this point, besides Paris other places had been suggested, in particular Switzerland and Strasbourg.

Marx's departure for Paris was delayed. He arrived there with Jenny at the end of October 1843.

This article was written in reply to the Young Hegelian Bruno Bauer, who in his works on this subject reduced the problem of the emancipation of the Jews to their emancipation from Judaism. Being an idealist, Bauer considered the overcoming of religious prejudices as the decisive means for eliminating national contradictions. Polemics with him over this question provided Marx with an occasion for considering from the materialist point of view the broader problem of emancipating not only the Jews but the whole of mankind from economic, political and religious fetters.

When quoting from the works of Bruno Bauer and others Marx sometimes slightly departs from the text of the source; the emphasis, as a rule, is Marx's, but in quoting from Hegel's book *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* he reproduces also the author's emphasis. Quotations from books and documents in French are given by Marx in the French language. In the present work these are given in French in the text, and the corresponding English texts are given in the footnotes.

The first English translation of this article was published in the book: Karl Marx, *Selected Essays*; London, Parsons, 1926.

The quotation from the Constitution of 1795 is taken from Vol. 36 of the *Histoire parlementaire de la Révolution française* by P. J. B. Bûchez and P. C. Roux. p. 163

The first quotation is taken from the book: W. Wachsmuth, *Geschichte Frankreichs im Revolutionszeitalter*, the second from Vol. 31 of the *Histoire parlementaire de la Révolution française* by P. J. B. Bûchez and P. C. Roux. p. 164

Quoted from Thomas Münzer's pamphlet directed against Martin Luther: *Hoch verursachte Schutirede und Antwort wider das geistlose, sanflebende Fleisch zu Wittenberg, welches mit verkehrter Weise durch den Diebstahl der heiligen Schrift die erbärmliche Christenheit also ganz jämmerlich besudelt hat.* The pamphlet was published in 1524. Marx quotes it from Leopold Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation*, Berlin, 1839. p. 172

According to Marx's intention, this article was to serve as an introductory section to a detailed work in which he planned to make a critical analysis of Hegel's idealist philosophy and political views (see Note 1). While working on the "Introduction" Marx did not confine himself to the criticism of Hegel's philosophy; he set himself the task of defining his attitude not only to the existing ideological trends but also to the actual revolutionary processes.

The first English translation of this work was published in the book: Karl Marx, *Selected Essays*, London, Parsons, 1926. p. 175

This remark testifies to Marx's intention to complete his criticism of the Hegelian philosophy of law which he had begun earlier, to finish and prepare for publication the rough draft of the manuscript of 1843 on this subject. However, after the publication of the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* had been discontinued, Marx gradually abandoned his plan because he was busy with other work, primarily, the study of economic relations. Marx also had other reasons, which he mentioned in the Preface to the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, namely, his dissatisfaction with the chosen form of combining a criticism of Hegel's views on different subjects with a critical analysis of these subjects as such, his growing conviction that in this form his work would give "the impression of arbitrary systematism" (see p. 231 of this volume).

Proceeding from these considerations, Marx arrived at the conclusion that it would be better to give a critical analysis of law, ethics, politics, etc., in separate booklets and to crown it all with a critical work summing up his views on the idealist, speculative philosophy. Soon, however, the need arose of first coming out against the Young Hegelians and Marx's plans again underwent a change. He began to connect his elaboration of the principles of a new, revolutionary-materialist world outlook primarily with a criticism of the idealist world outlook of the Young Hegelians and other representatives of German bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. This task was fulfilled by Marx and Engels in their joint works: *The Holy Family* and *The German Ideology*. p. 176

The historical school of law—a trend in the historical and legal science which arose in Germany at the end of the 18th century. The representatives of this school (Gustav Hugo, Friedrich Karl von Savigny and others) attempted to justify the privileges of the nobility and feudal institutions on the grounds of stability of historical traditions. For a description of this school see Marx's article "The Philosophical Manifesto of the Historical School of Law" (this edition, Vol. 1). p. 177

This refers to the liberal circles of Germany, representatives of the liberal opposition in the Landtags, liberal publicists of various descriptions, and others, who demanded constitutional reforms. p. 180
This refers to the Young Hegelians. They drew radical atheistic conclusions from Hegel’s philosophy but at the same time detached philosophy from reality and turned it into a self-contained and determining force. In fact the Young Hegelians were withdrawing more and more from the practical revolutionary struggle.

The September laws promulgated by the French Government in September 1835 restricted the rights of the jury and introduced severe measures against the press. They provided for increased money deposits for periodical publications and introduced imprisonment and large fines for publishing statements against private property and the existing state system. The enactment of these laws in conditions of the July constitutional monarchy, which formally proclaimed freedom of the press, emphasised the anti-democratic nature and hypocrisy of the bourgeois system.

The Holy Roman Empire of the German nation (962-1806) comprised at different times German, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian and Czech lands, Switzerland and the Netherlands and was a loose confederation of feudal kingdoms and principalities, church domains and free cities with different political systems, laws and traditions.

The printing of the journal was carried out in Zurich by the publishing house Das literarische Comptoir founded by Julius Fröbel in 1842. Besides the reason mentioned in the letter, disagreements between Marx and Arnold Ruge were largely responsible for the journal ceasing to be published. These disagreements boiled down to the fact that the bourgeois radical Ruge opposed Marx’s revolutionary-communist world outlook. The final break between Marx and Ruge took place in March 1844. Ruge’s hostile attitude towards the revolutionary struggle of the masses, which became evident at the time of the Silesian uprising of June 1844, induced Marx to come out in the press against his former co-editor.

This article was written in reply to Ruge’s article signed “Ein Preusse”, which was published in the newspaper Vorwärts on July 27, 1844, under the title “Der König von Preussen und die Sozialreform”. In his article Ruge represented the Silesian weavers’ uprising (June 4-6, 1844) as a futile revolt of the helpless poor people driven to despair. Unlike Ruge, Marx saw it as the first big battle of the German proletariat against the bourgeoisie, as the manifestation of the growth of class-consciousness of the German workers.

With the publication of this article, Marx began to contribute to the newspaper Vorwärts, which prior to that, during the initial period of its publication—from early 1844 to the summer of the same year—was of a moderate liberal trend due to the influence of its publisher, the German businessman Heinrich Börnstein, and its editor Adalbert von Bornstedt. However, when a friend of Marx, Karl Bernays, a revolutionary-minded radical, became its editor in the summer of 1844, the newspaper began to assume a democratic character. Having become a contributor to the newspaper, Marx began to influence its editorial policy and in September became one of its editors. On his proposal Engels, who had published in it two articles in the series “The Condition of England”, was also included on the editorial board. Among its other contributors were Heine, Herwegh, Ewerbeck and Bakunin. Under Marx’s influence the newspaper began to express communist views. It sharply criticised Prussian absolutism and moderate German liberalism. To comply with the demand of the Prussian Government, the Guizot ministry took repressive measures against its editors and contributors in January 1845 and its publication ceased.
In the quotations from the article by Ruge the emphasis is Marx's. Works of other authors—French and English (in their publications in French)—were quoted by Marx in German, apparently in his own translation.

This article was first published in English in the book: Karl Marx, Selected Essays, London, Parsons, 1926.

p. 189

The editorial of the French democratic newspaper La Réforme of July 20, 1844, dealt with the Cabinet order of the Prussian King Frederick William IV to display concern for the poor. This Cabinet order was prompted by the fear caused by the Silesian weavers' uprising. The author of the article was inclined to take the Prussian King's demagogy for a serious intention to carry out social reforms.

p. 189

Marx refers to the Cabinet order of the Prussian King Frederick William IV of July 18, 1843, issued in connection with the participation of government officials in a banquet arranged in Düsseldorf by the liberals to mark the seventh Rhenish Landtag; the order prohibited the government officials to take part in manifestations of this kind.

p. 190

This refers to the Corn Laws—a series of laws in England (the first of which dated back to the 15th century) which imposed high duties on imported corn with the aim of maintaining high prices on it on the home market. In the first third of the 19th century several laws were passed (in 1815, 1822 and later) changing the conditions of corn imports, and in 1828 a sliding-scale was introduced, which raised import duties on corn when prices fell on the home market and, vice versa, lowered import duties when prices rose.

In 1838 the Manchester factory owners Cobden and Bright founded the Anti-Corn Law League, which widely exploited the popular discontent at rising corn prices. While agitating for the abolition of the corn duties and demanding complete freedom of trade, the League strove to weaken the economic and political positions of the landed aristocracy and to lower workers' wages.

The struggle between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy over the Corn Laws ended in their repeal in 1846.

p. 192


p. 193

This quotation from Dr. Kay's pamphlet published anonymously in 1839 is cited by Marx in his own free translation with omissions from the two-volume edition of Eugène Buret, De la misère des classes laborieuses en Angleterre et en France... T. 1, pp. 396, 398, 401.

p. 193

The decree of the National Convention of May 11 (22 Floréal), 1794, ordered the compilation of a Livre de la bienfaisance nationale (Book of National Charity) in which were to be entered invalids, orphans, the incapacitated and so forth, who were entitled to certain grants. It was one of the palliative measures for fighting the misery of the popular masses, introduced by the Jacobin government before its fall on July 27 (9 Thermidor), 1794.

The irruption of a crowd of hungry women into the building of the National Convention on May 20 (1 Prairial), 1795, marked the beginning of an uprising by the plebeian and proletarian masses of Paris against the Thermidor reaction; they put forward the slogan, "Bread and the Constitution of 1793!" Like the
preceding uprising in Germinal (April) of the same year, the Prairial uprising was suppressed by military force.

44 Marx refers to the revolutionary song Das Blutgericht which was popular among the Silesian weavers on the eve of the revolt.

45 This refers to the revolts of the Lyons weavers in November 1831 and April 1834.

46 The Cabinet order of Frederick William IV quoted here and below was published on August 9, 1844, in the Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung. It was caused by an abortive attempt on the life of the king on July 26, 1844, in Berlin, by the former burgomaster of the town of Storkow, H. L. Tschech, acting on personal grounds.

47 This refers to the proposals submitted by the Prussian diplomat Bunsen to Frederick William IV in the spring and summer of 1844 concerning the proposed reform of the Prussian political system. According to Bunsen, his project was drawn up in "the monarchical and conservative spirit" and provided for the institution of an English-type bicameral Prussian parliament (Landtag) with an aristocratic upper chamber and a lower chamber elected on the estates principle.

48 These comments are made by Marx in his conspectus of James Mill's book Elements of Political Economy (Marx used the French translation published in 1823 under the title Elémens d'Économie politique), which forms part of the fourth and fifth of the nine notebooks of excerpts made by Marx during his stay in Paris from the end of 1843 till January 1845. The Paris Notebooks reflect Marx's intense work on political economy. The books summarised by Marx include works by J. B. Say, Adam Smith, David Ricardo, McCulloch, James Mill, Destutt de Tracy, Sismondi, Jeremy Bentham, Boisguillebert, Lauderdale, Schütz, List, Skarbek and Buret. At the time Marx used mainly French translations of the English authors. In a number of his conspectuses Marx added his own comments to the excerpts or to his summaries of passages from the books he was studying. However, most of these comments are of a fragmentary nature. Many ideas set forth in them are reproduced in one form or another, and frequently in a more developed form, in the extant sections of the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. The most detailed and systematised comments are those from his conspectus of Mill's book, which form two lengthy digressions from the text he was summarising. In their ideas they are close to the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and it is possible that they anticipated the thoughts expounded in the missing pages of the second manuscript of this work.

The first author's digression in the conspectus follows a considerable number of excerpts from Mill's book, which, like the other excerpts or summaries of passages in the concluding part of the conspectus, are not given in this edition. The full text of the conspectus was published in: Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, Erste Abteilung, Band 3, Berlin, 1932. However, the excerpts from Mill's book made by Marx in between these two digressions, which by their content constitute a link between these comments, are published in full. Marx quotes excerpts from Mill's book and from other French publications partly in French, but mainly in his own translation into German, alternating German text with French. In the present edition the texts quoted or paraphrased by Marx are given in English, exact quotations are reproduced from the original edition.

The first English translation of this article was published, in part, in the book: *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*, New York, 1967.

The text of this comment in the conspectus is immediately preceded by the following excerpts from James Mill's book:

"...A medium of exchange ... is some one commodity, which, in order to effect an exchange between two other commodities, is first received in exchange for the one, and is then given in exchange for the other." (P. 93.) Gold, silver, money.

"By value of money, is here to be understood the proportion in which it exchanges for other commodities, or the quantity of it which exchanges for a certain quantity of other things."

"This proportion is determined by the total amount of money existing in a given country." (P. 95.)

"What regulates the quantity of money?"

"Money is made under two sets of circumstances: Government either leaves the increase or diminution of it free; or it controls the quantity, making it greater or smaller as it pleases.

"When the increase or diminution of money is left free, government opens the mint to the public, making bullion into money for as many as require it. Individuals possessed of bullion will desire to convert it into money only when it is their interest to do so; that is, when their bullion, converted into money, will be more valuable than in its original form. This can only happen when money is peculiarly valuable, and when the same quantity of metal, in the state of coin, will exchange for a greater quantity of other articles than in the state of bullion. As the value of money depends upon the quantity of it, it has a greater value when it is in short supply. It is then that bullion is made into coin. But precisely because of this conversion, the old ratio is restored. Therefore, if the value of money rises above that of the metal of which it is made, the interest of individuals operates immediately, in a state of freedom, to restore the balance by augmenting the quantity of money." (Pp. 99-101.)

"Whenever the coining of money, therefore, is free, its quantity is regulated by the value of the metal, it being the interest of individuals to increase or diminish the quantity, in proportion as the value of the metal in coins is greater or less than its value in bullion.

"But if the quantity of money is determined by the value of the metal, it is still necessary to inquire what it is which determines the value of the metal.... Gold and silver are in reality commodities. They are commodities for the attaining of which labour and capital must be employed. It is cost of production, therefore, which determines the value of these, as of other ordinary productions." (P. 101.)

The monetary system—an early type of mercantilism. Its adherents believed that wealth consisted in money, in amassing bullion reserves, hence the prohibition of gold and silver exports, the policy of securing an active trade balance.

This passage (which in the original reads as follows: "Durch die wechselseitige Entäusserung oder Entfremdung des Privateigentums ist das Privateigentum selbst in die Bestimmung des entäusserten Privateigentums geraten") shows that when using the terms "Entäusserung" and "Entfremdung" to denote alienation
Marx imparted to them an identical or nearly identical meaning. On the translation of these terms in this edition see Note 1.

52 This refers primarily to James Mill, who divided his system of political economy into four independent sections: Production, Distribution, Exchange and Consumption.

53 The rest of the conspectus contains further excerpts from Mill’s book. Concerning his excerpts from pages 261-66, on which Mill examines the question of the rent of land, profit on capital and wages as sources of taxation and the state revenue, Marx made the following brief comment:

"Es versteht sich, dass Mill wie Ricardo dagegen protestiert, irgend einem Gouvernement den Gedanken einflössen zu wollen, die Grundrente zur einzigen Quelle der Steuern zu machen, da sie parteisch ungerechte Belastung einer besonder Klasse von Individuen. Aber—and dies ist ein gewichtiges heimlich­isches Aber—aber die Steuer auf die Grundrente ist die einzige, vom nationalekonomischen Standpunkt aus nicht schädliche, also die einzig nationalekonomisch gerechte Steuer. Ja, das einzige Bedenken, was die Nationalökonomie aufstellt, ist mehr anlockend als abschreckend, nämlich: dass in einem selbst nur gewöhnlich bevölkerten und ausgedehnten Lande, die Höhe der Grundrente das Bedürfnis der Regierung übersteigen würde.” ("Needless to say, Mill, like Ricardo, denies that he wishes to impress on any government the idea that land rent should be made the sole source of taxes, since this would be a partisan measure placing an unfair burden on a particular class of individuals. But—and this is a momentous, insidious but—but the tax on land rent is the only tax that is not harmful from the standpoint of political economy, hence the only just tax from the point of view of political economy. Indeed, the one doubt raised by political economy is rather an attraction than a cause for apprehension, namely, that even in a country with an ordinary number of population and of ordinary size the amount yielded by land rent would exceed the needs of the government.")

p. 228

54 The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 is the first work in which Marx tried to systematically elaborate problems of political economy from the standpoint of his maturing dialectical-materialist and communist views and also to synthesise the results of his critical review of prevailing philosophic and economic theories. Apparently, Marx began to write it in order to clarify the problems for himself. But in the process of working on it he conceived the idea of publishing a work analysing the economic system of bourgeois society in its time and its ideological trends. Towards the end of his stay in Paris, on February 1, 1845, Marx signed a contract with Carl Leske, a Darmstadt publisher, concerning the publication of his work entitled A Critique of Politics and of Political Economy. It was to be based on his Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and perhaps also on his earlier manuscript Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Law. This plan did not materialise in the 1840s because Marx was busy writing other works and, to some extent, because the contract with the publisher was cancelled in September 1846, the latter being afraid to have transactions with such a revolutionary-minded author. However, in the early 1850s Marx returned to the idea of writing a book on economics. Thus, the manuscripts of 1844 are connected with the conception of a plan which led many years later to the writing of Capital.

The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts is an unfinished work and in part a rough draft. A considerable part of the text has not been preserved. What
remains comprises three manuscripts, each of which has its own pagination (in Roman figures). The first manuscript contains 27 pages, of which pages I-XII and XVII-XXVII are divided by two vertical lines into three columns supplied with headings written in beforehand: “Wages of Labour”, “Profit of Capital” (this section has also subheadings supplied by the author) and “Rent of Land”. It is difficult to tell the order in which Marx filled these columns. All the three columns on p. VII contain the text relating to the section “Wages of Labour”. Pages XIII to XVI are divided into two columns and contain texts of the sections “Wages of Labour” (pp. XIII-XV), “Profit of Capital” (pp. XIII-XVI) and “Rent of Land” (p. XVI). On pages XVII to XXI, only the column headed “Rent of Land” is filled in. From page XXII to page XXVII, on which the first manuscript breaks off, Marx wrote across the three columns disregarding the headings. The text of these pages is published as a separate section entitled by the editors according to its content “Estranged Labour”.

Of the second manuscript only the last four pages have survived (pp. XL-XLIII). The third manuscript contains 41 pages (not counting blank ones) divided into two columns and numbered by Marx himself from I to XLIII (in doing so he omitted two numbers, XXII and XXV). Like the extant part of the second manuscript, the third manuscript has no author’s headings; the text has been arranged and supplied with the headings by the editors.

Sometimes Marx departed from the subject-matter and interrupted his elucidation of one question to analyse another. Pages XXXIX-XL contain the Preface to the whole work which is given in the present volume before the text of the first manuscript. The text of the section dealing with the critical analysis of Hegel’s dialectic, to which Marx referred in the Preface as the concluding chapter and which was scattered on various pages, is arranged in one section and put at the end in accordance with Marx’s indications.

In order to give the reader a better visual idea of the structure of the work, the text reproduces in vertical lines the Roman numbers of the sheets of the manuscripts, and the Arabic numbers of the columns in the first manuscript. The notes indicate where the text has been rearranged. Passages crossed out by Marx with a vertical line are enclosed in pointed brackets; separate words or phrases crossed out by the author are given in footnotes only when they supplement the text. The general title and the headings of the various parts of the manuscripts enclosed in square brackets are supplied by the editors on the basis of the author’s formulations. In some places the text has been broken up into paragraphs by the editors. Quotations from the French sources cited by Marx in French or in his own translation into German, are given in English in both cases and the French texts as quoted by Marx are given in the footnotes. Here and elsewhere Marx’s rendering of the quotations or free translation is given in small type but without quotation marks. Emphasis in quotations, belonging, as a rule, to Marx, as well as that of the quoted authors, is indicated everywhere by italics.

The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 was first published by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow in the language of the original: Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, Abt. 1, Bd. 3, 1932.

In English this work was first published in 1959 by the Foreign Languages Publishing House (now Progress Publishers), Moscow, translated by Martin Milligan.

This refers to Bruno Bauer’s reviews of books, articles and pamphlets on the Jewish question, including Marx’s article on the subject in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher, which were published in the monthly Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung.
(issue No. I, December 1843, and issue No. IV, March 1844) under the title “Von den neuesten Schriften über die Judenfrage”. Most of the expressions quoted are taken from these reviews. The expressions “utopian phrase” and “compact mass” can be found in Bruno Bauer’s unsigned article, “Was ist jetzt der Gegenstand der Kritik?”, published in the Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung, issue No. VIII, July 1844. A detailed critical appraisal of this monthly was later on given by Marx and Engels in the book Die heilige Familie, oder Kritik der kritischen Kritik (see this edition, Vol. 4, The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism).

Marx apparently refers to Weitling’s works: Die Menschheit, wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte, 1838, and Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit, Vivis, 1842.

Moses Hess published three articles in the collection Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz (Twenty-One Sheets from Switzerland), Erster Teil (Zürich und Winterthur, 1843), issued by Georg Herwegh. These articles, entitled “Sozialismus und Kommunismus”, “Philosophie der Tat” and “Die Eine und die ganze Freiheit”, were published anonymously. The first two of them had a note—“Written by the author of Europäische Triarchie”.

The term “element” in the Hegelian philosophy means a vital element of thought. It is used to stress that thought is a process, and that therefore elements in a system of thought are also phases in a movement. The term “feeling” (Empfindung) denotes relatively low forms of mental life in which no distinction is made between the subjective and objective.

Shortly after writing this Preface Marx fulfilled his intention in The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism, written in collaboration with Engels (see this edition, Vol. 4).

The expression “common humanity” (in the manuscript in French, “simple humanité”) was borrowed by Marx from the first volume (Chapter VIII) of Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations, which he used in Garnier’s French translation (Recherches sur la nature et les causes de la richesse des nations, Paris, 1802, t. I, p. 138). All the subsequent references were given by Marx to this publication, the synopsis of which is contained in his Paris Notebooks with excerpts on political economy. In the present volume wherever there are references to or quotations from this work by Adam Smith the corresponding pages of the English edition are given and references to Garnier’s edition are reproduced in square brackets, e.g., Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, Everyman’s Library edition, Vol. I, pp. 58-60 [Garnier, t. I, pp. 132-36].

Marx uses the German term “Nationalökonomie” to denote both the economic system in the sense of science or theory, and the economic system itself.

Loudon’s work was a translation into French of an English manuscript apparently never published in the original. The author did publish in English a short pamphlet—The Equilibrium of Population and Sustenance Demonstrated, Leamington, 1836.

Unlike the quotations from a number of other French writers such as Constantin Pecqueur and Eugène Buret, which Marx gives in French in this work, the excerpts from J. B. Say’s book are given in his German translation.

From this page of the manuscript quotations from Adam Smith’s book (in the French translation), which Marx cited so far sometimes in French and sometimes
in German, are, as a rule, given in German. In this volume the corresponding
text published in small type here and below is not an exact quotation from
Smith but a summary of the corresponding passages from his work. Such
preceding page (VII) of the first manuscript does not contain any text
relating to the sections “Profit of Capital” and “Rent of Land” (see Note 54).

The whole paragraph, including the quotation from Ricardo’s book in the
French translation by Francisco Solano Constancio: *Des principes de l’économie politi-
que, et de l’impôt, 2-e éd.*, Paris, 1835, T. II, pp. 194-95 (see the corresponding
and from Sismondi’s *Nouveaux principes d’économie politique*, Paris, 1819, T. II,
p. 331, is an excerpt from Eugène Buret’s book *De la misère des classes laborieuses en

The allusion is to the following passage: “In a perfectly fair lottery, those who
draw the prizes ought to gain all that is lost by those who draw the blanks. In
a profession where twenty fail for one that succeeds, that one ought to gain all
that should have been gained by the unsuccessful twenty.” (Smith, *Wealth

The term “species-being” (Gattungswesen) is derived from
Ludwig Feuerbach’s philosophy where it is applied to man and mankind as a whole.

Apparently Marx refers to Proudhon’s book *Qu’est-ce que la propriété?*, Paris,
1841.

This passage shows that Marx here uses the category of wages in a broad sense,
as an expression of antagonistic relations between the classes of capitalists and
of wage-workers. Under “the wages” he understands “the wage-labour”, the
capitalist system as such. This idea was apparently elaborated in detail in that
part of the manuscript which is not extant.

This apparently refers to the conversion of individuals into members of
civil society which is considered as the sphere of property, of material relations
that determine all other relations. In this case Marx refers to the material rela-

tions of society based on private property and the antagonism of different classes.

The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 deprived poor people considered able to work (including children) of any public relief except a place in the workhouse, where they were compelled to work.

In the manuscript "sein für sich selbst" which is an expression of Hegel's term "für sich" (for itself) as opposed to "an sich" (in itself). In the Hegelian philosophy the former means roughly explicit, conscious or defined in contrast to "an sich", a synonym for immature, implicit or unconscious.


This refers to Georg Ludwig Wilhelm Funke, Die aus der unbeschränkten Theilbarkeit des Grundeigenthums hervorgehenden Nachtheile, Hamburg und Gotha, 1839, p. 56, in which there is a reference to Heinrich Leo, Studien und Skizzen zu einer Naturlehre des Staates, Halle, 1833, p. 102.

The third manuscript is a thick notebook the last few pages of which are blank. The pages are divided into two columns by a vertical line, not for the purpose of dividing the text according to the headings but for purely technical reasons. The text of the first three sections comprises pp. I-XI, XIV-XXI, XXXIV-XXXVIII and was written as a supplement to the missing pages of the second manuscript. Pages XI-XIII, XVII, XVIII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVI-XXXIV contain the text of the concluding chapter dealing with the criticism of Hegel's dialectic (on some pages it is written alongside the text of other sections). In some places the manuscript contains the author's remarks testifying to his intention to unite into a single whole various passages of this section separated from each other by the text of other sections. Pages XXIX-XL comprise the draft Preface. Finally, the text on the last pages (XL1-XLIII), is a self-contained essay on the power of money in bourgeois society.

The manuscript has "als für sich seienende Tätigkeit". For the meaning of the terms "für sich" and "an sich" in Hegel's philosophy see Note 78.

Marx refers to the rise of the primitive, crude equalitarian tendencies among the representatives of utopian communism at the early stages of its development. Among the medieval religious communist communities, in particular, there was current a notion of the common possession of women as a feature of the future society depicted in the spirit of consumer communism ideals. In 1534-35 the German Anabaptists, who seized power in Münster, tried to introduce polygamy in accordance with this view. Tommaso Campanella, the author of Civitas Solis (early 17th century), rejected monogamy in his ideal society. The primitive communist communities were also characterised by asceticism and a hostile attitude to science and works of art. Some of these primitive egalitarian features, the negative attitude to the arts in particular, were inherited by the communist trends of the first half of the 19th century, for example, by the members of the French secret societies of the 1830s and 1840s ("worker-egalitarians", "humanitarians", and so on) comprising the followers of Babeuf (for a characterisation of these see Engels, "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent", pp. 396-97 of this volume).

This note is given by Marx on page V of the manuscript where it is separated by a horizontal line from the main text, but according to its meaning it refers to this sentence.
This part of the manuscript shows clearly the peculiarity of the terminology used by Marx in his works. At the time he had not worked out terms adequately expressing the conceptions of scientific communism he was then evolving and was still under the influence of Feuerbach in that respect. Hence the difference in the use of words in his early and subsequent, mature writings. In the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 the word "socialism" is used to denote the stage of society at which it has carried out a revolutionary transformation, abolished private property, class antagonisms, alienation and so on. In the same sense Marx used the expression "communism equals humanism". At that time he understood the term "communism as such" not as the final goal of revolutionary transformation but as the process of this transformation, development leading up to that goal, a lower stage of the process. 

This expression apparently refers to the theory of the English geologist Sir Charles Lyell who, in his three-volume work The Principles of Geology (1830-33), proved the evolution of the earth's crust and refuted the popular theory of cataclysms. Lyell used the term "historical geology" for his theory. The term "geognosy" was introduced by the 18th-century German scientist Abraham Werner, a specialist in mineralogy, and it was used also by Alexander Humboldt.

This statement is interpreted differently by researchers. Many of them maintain that Marx here meant crude equalitarian communism, such as that propounded by Babeuf and his followers. While recognising the historic role of that communism, he thought it impossible to ignore its weak points. It seems more justifiable, however, to interpret this passage proceeding from the peculiarity of terms used in the manuscript (see Note 85). Marx here used the term "communism" to mean not the higher phase of classless society (which he at the time denoted as "socialism" or "communism equaling humanism") but movement (in various forms, including primitive forms of equalitarian communism at the early stage) directed at its achievement, a revolutionary transformation process of transition to it. Marx emphasised that this process should not be considered as an end in itself, but that it is a necessary, though a transitional, stage in attaining the future social system, which will be characterised by new features distinct from those proper to this stage.

Page XI (in part) and pages XII and XIII are taken up by a text relating to the concluding chapter (see Note 81).

The greater part of this page as well as part of the preceding page (XVII) comprises a text relating to the concluding chapter (see Note 81).

Apparently Marx refers to a formula of the German philosopher Fichte, an adherent of subjective idealism.

The preceding pages starting from p. XXI, which is partly taken up by a text relating to this section, contain the text of the concluding chapter.

In some of his early writings Marx already uses the term "bürgerliche Gesellschaft" to mean two things: (1) in a broader sense, the economic system of society regardless of the historical stage of its development, the sum total of material relations which determine political institutions and ideology, and (2) in the narrow sense, the material relations of bourgeois society (later on, that society as a whole), of capitalism. Hence, the term has been translated according
to its concrete meaning in the context as "civil society" in the first case and "bourgeois society" in the second.

The two previous pages of the manuscript contain the draft Preface to the whole work, which is published on pages 231-34.

Ontology— in some philosophical systems a theory about being, about the nature of things.

Originally the section on the Hegelian dialectic was apparently conceived by Marx as a philosophical digression in the section of the third manuscript which is published under the heading "Private Property and Communism" and was written together with other sections as an addition to separate pages of the second manuscript (see pp. 293-306 of this volume). Therefore Marx marked the beginning of this section (p. XI in the manuscript) as point 6, considering it to be the continuation of the five points of the preceding section. He marked as point 7 the beginning of the following section, headed "Human Requirements and Division of Labour Under the Rule of Private Property", on page XIV of the manuscript. However, when dealing with this subject on subsequent pages of his manuscript, Marx decided to collect the whole material into a separate, concluding chapter and mentioned this in his draft Preface. The chapter, like a number of other sections of the manuscript, was not finished. While writing it, Marx made special excerpts from the last chapter ("Absolute Knowledge") of Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, which are in the same notebook as the third manuscript (these excerpts are not reproduced in this edition).

The reference is not quite accurate. On page 193 of the work mentioned, Bruno Bauer polemises not against the anti-Hegelian Herr Gruppe but against the Right Hegelian Marheineke.

Marx here refers to Feuerbach's critical observations on Hegel in §§ 29-30 of his *Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft*.

This note is given at the bottom of page XIII of the third manuscript without any indication what it refers to. The asterisk after the sentence to which it seems to refer is given by the editors.

Here on page XVII of the third manuscript (part of which comprises a text relating to the section "Human Requirements and Division of Labour Under the Rule of Private Property") Marx gave the note: "see p. XIII", which proves that this text is the continuation of the section dealing with the critical analysis of the Hegelian dialectic begun on pp. XI-XIII.

At the end of page XVIII of the third manuscript there is a note by Marx: "continued on p. XXII". However number XXII was omitted by Marx in paging (see Note 54). The text of the given chapter is continued on the page marked by the author as XXIII, which is also confirmed by his remark on it: "see p. XVIII".

Marx apparently refers here not only to the identity of Hegel's views on labour and some other categories of political economy with those of the English classical economists but also to his profound knowledge of economic writings.
In lectures he delivered at Jena University in 1803-04 Hegel cited Adam Smith's work. In his *Philosophie des Rechts* (§ 189) he mentions Smith, Say and Ricardo and notes the rapid development of economic thought. p. 333

Hegel uses the term "thinghood" (Dingheit) in his work *Phänomenologie des Geistes* to denote an abstract, universal, mediating link in the process of cognition; "thinghood" reveals the generality of the specific properties of individual things. The synonym for it is "pure essence" (das reine Wesen). p. 334

These eight points of the "surmounting of the object of consciousness", expressed "in all its aspects", are copied nearly word for word from §§ 1 and 3 of the last chapter ("Absolute Knowledge") of Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. p. 335

Number XXV was omitted by Marx in paging the third manuscript. p. 335

Marx refers to § 30 of Feuerbach's *Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft*, which says: "Hegel is a thinker who surpasses himself in thinking". p. 339

This enumeration gives the major categories of Hegel's *Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften* in the order in which they are examined by Hegel. Similarly, the categories reproduced by Marx above (on p. 340) from "civil law" to "world history", are given in the order in which they appear in Hegel's *Philosophie des Rechts*. p. 341

This letter was written soon after the termination of the talks which Marx had with Arnold Ruge from March to September 1843, on the question of publishing the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* (see Note 15). The letter was connected with Marx's intention to enlist advanced German and French intellectuals to contribute to the journal. At the end of October 1843 Marx went from Kreuznach to Paris, where the journal was to be published.


As follows from Feuerbach's reply to Marx on October 25, 1843, Feuerbach when mentioning a book against Schelling, which was soon to appear, referred not to his own work, but to that of his friend and follower Kapp: *Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling*, Leipzig, 1843. p. 349

Marx ironically calls Schelling the 38th member of the German Confederation. The Confederation uniting 33 German states and 4 free cities was established at the 1815 Congress of Vienna with a view to ending feudal disunity in Germany. p. 349

According to the Prussian censorship instructions all publications of 21 signatures and more were not subject to preliminary censorship. p. 350

The reference is to German public opinion on the controversy over the book of the German theologian Paulus about Schelling's philosophy of revelation. After this book was published in 1843 Schelling brought in several law-suits against the author demanding that dues should be paid to him for quotations from his lectures. The proceedings were widely commented in the press. This incident prompted Heinrich Heine to write his satirical poem *Kirchenrat Prometheus*. p. 350
Although in his letter of October 25, 1843, Feuerbach fully agreed with the appraisal of the political tendencies of Schelling's philosophy given by Marx in his letter, he nevertheless refused to send an article on Schelling for the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher on the plea that he was occupied with other plans.

This letter concerns the circumstances of publication of the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher which was printed in the printshop of the publisher Fröbel. Apparently some of the manuscripts were forwarded directly to Fröbel.

See Note 111.


The English translation of Feuerbach's Wesen des Christentums was apparently never published. The French translation was published in the book: A. H. Ewerbeck, Qu'est-ce que la religion d'après la nouvelle philosophie allemande, Paris, 1850.

The statements quoted here and some lines below were taken by Marx from articles published in the Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung, issues V and VI, 1844. Marx criticised them in chapters seven and nine of The Holy Family (see this edition, Vol. 4).

The summary of the first volume of the Jacobin Levasseur's Memoirs was compiled by Marx in connection with his plans to write a work on the history of the French Revolution. Marx began to be interested in the revolutionary events in France at the end of the eighteenth century as early as the summer of 1843, as can be seen from his excerpts from special works on this subject by the German historians Wachsmuth and Ludwig contained in the Kreuznach Notebooks. As evidenced by A. Ruge (Ruge's letters to Feuerbach of May 15, 1844, to Fleischer of May 20 and July 9, 1844—see A. Ruge's Briefwechsel und Tagebuchblätter, Bd. 1, Berlin, 1886), after he had moved to Paris in the autumn of 1843, Marx planned to write a work on the history of the French Convention. He worked on it during several months of 1844, reading a lot of material, including the press of the time, memoirs of contemporaries, etc. In 1845 the radical Trierische Zeitung also wrote about these plans of Marx, which were never realised, in connection with Marx's banishment from France. Excerpts from Levasseur's Memoirs were published in the newspaper Vorwärts in 1844, evidently on Marx's advice.

The time when this conspectus was compiled apparently coincided with the beginning of Marx's economic research: it is contained in the third notebook of the series with excerpts from the works of economists which Marx made since his arrival in Paris to August 1844. Besides the summary of Levasseur's Memoirs, the notebook contains the end of the excerpts from the French translation of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations begun in the second notebook.

The pages of the notebook are divided into two columns by a vertical line. On the left-hand side Marx wrote direct quotations from the book in French (only one quotation is in German) or gave brief rendering in German of separate passages. Marx's own text consists of laconic comments and references which are typed in long primer in this edition. On the right-hand side there is more coherent rendering of the book's contents to which Marx gave the title: "The Struggle Between the Montagnards and the Girondists". The whole text is in
German with the exception of some French terms and expressions which are given in the original in this edition. In some cases, especially when assessing events and public figures, Marx also quotes from Levasseur's text word for word or almost word for word in German. These passages are typed in small type (the quotation marks being the editors').

In this edition we publish first the text of the left columns under the subheading "Excerpts", and then the text of the summary proper, written in the right columns. The italics are Marx's.

On June 20, 1792, a mass manifestation took place in Paris in front of the Legislative Assembly and the royal palace of the Tuileries. The participants demanded cancellation of the royal veto on the decree of the establishment of a camp of Marseilles volunteers (fédérés) near Paris and restoration to their ministerial posts of the Girondist leaders dismissed by the king. The actual refusal to meet these demands made the atmosphere still more tense. The Mayor of Paris, the Girondist Pétion, dismissed from his post for supporting the manifestation, was recalled under the pressure of the Parisian sections in mid-July 1792. During the month of July 1792, despite the royal veto, detachments of fédérés continued to arrive in Paris from Marseilles and other towns. This strengthened the movement for the abolition of the monarchy and made for an energetic rebuff to the external enemies of the revolution.

On April 20, 1792, the Legislative Assembly voted the decree on the declaration of war on Austria, which marked the beginning of revolutionary France's prolonged armed struggle against the coalition of counter-revolutionary states. This act was preceded by intense war propaganda on the part of the Jacobin Club (Appeals of February 15 and 17, 1792) conducted under the influence of Girondists. Representatives of the Left wing of the Club (Robespierre and others), on the contrary, considered it necessary to put off as long as possible the inevitable military conflict with the aim of gaining time for strengthening revolutionary order.

The Jacobin Club ("Société des amis de la constitution") founded in October 1789, initially united the representatives of different political trends in the anti-absolutist camp. In July 1791, following the internal struggle, the moderate constitutionalists left the Club, and after the uprising of August 10, 1792, the Girondists followed suit. The influence of the revolutionary-democratic circles (Jacobins) then prevailed entirely. Having become their party centre, the Club, with its branches in the provinces, played an outstanding part in making revolutionary transformations.

On the page mentioned Levasseur writes about the ambiguous position of General Lafayette, one of the leaders of the moderate liberal constitutionalists, on the eve of the uprising of August 10, 1792. He enjoyed the confidence neither of the royal court nor of the revolutionary-patriotic camp.

August 10, 1792—the day of the overthrow of the monarchy in France as a result of a popular uprising. Interregnum—the period between the uprising of August 10, 1792, and the convocation of the Convention on September 20, 1792, lasting 42 days (the first open session was held on the 21st of September). It was marked by acute struggle between the Legislative Assembly and the revolutionary Paris Commune, which was formed instead of the former municipal council during the uprising of August 10 and directed the actions of the insurgents.
The Convention Committee consisted of a President to be re-elected every fortnight and six secretaries. p. 362

Feuillants—moderate liberal constitutionalists whose representatives (the Lameth brothers and others) left the Jacobin Club on July 16, 1791, after it adopted a petition for the dethroning of the king (see Note 119), and formed their own political club (they met in a house formerly occupied by the religious order bearing the name of the Feuillants, which was abolished in 1789). Having a considerable influence among the members of the Legislative Assembly, they strove in the interests of the big bourgeoisie and the liberal nobility to prevent the development of the revolution. p. 363

On these pages Levasseur refutes the Girondists' accusations against the leaders of the Montagnards that they had been bribed by the émigrés and foreign agents. He characterises Danton, Robespierre and Marat (the latter with the reservation that he does not agree with his "wild" theories) as unselfish leaders devoted to the revolution. p. 363

On these pages Levasseur cites Marat's speech in his self-defence in the Convention on September 25, 1792. In this speech Marat succeeded in proving the groundlessness of the Girondist accusation of incitement to revolt against the Convention and in defeating the proposal that his activity should be censured. Although Levasseur disliked Marat, he was compelled to admit the courage and composure with which he fought this campaign of slander and hatred launched by his opponents. p. 364

In Levasseur's book: "It was difficult for the long-winded and garrulous eloquence of the latter to compete with the empty trumpery of Louvet." Further Levasseur speaks about the unsubstantiated accusations that Robespierre aimed at dictatorship and instigated reprisals against royalist prisoners in September 1792. In his speech in the Convention on November 5, 1792, Robespierre fully disproved these Girondist insinuations. p. 365

The discussion of Buzot's proposal which envisaged that the decree on the expatriation of the dethroned Bourbons should apply to the secondary branch of the dynasty as well—the family of the Duke of Orléans—was postponed by a majority vote. Levasseur states that many members of the Convention feared that expatriation of the former Duke of Orléans, Philippe Égalité, would be a dangerous precedent of violating a deputy's immunity. p. 365

On these pages Levasseur characterises the Girondists as a party whose activity objectively played into the hands of counter-revolutionary forces. "Though they were ardent republicans, they, unfortunately, fought on the side of the royalists, and, what is worse, concealed some of the royalists amidst themselves." p. 365

On September 2-5, 1792, when the enemy armies were launching an offensive, in an atmosphere of disturbing rumours of counter-revolutionary conspiracies and preparations of reprisals against the families of patriots who fought the foreign enemies, the popular masses of Paris stormed the prisons, organised improvised courts and executed about a thousand prisoners who were supporters of the monarchy. These spontaneous terroristic actions of the people were used by the Girondists to accuse the Jacobins of organising the September massacres. p. 366
The question of performance of religious rites arose in the Convention in connection with the discussion of the report on the primary education on December 12 and 14, 1792. The proposal to introduce religious education in the primary schools was rejected during the debate, but at the same time prominent Montagnard leaders (Robespierre, Danton) came out against some deputies who proposed the general prohibition of religious rites.

Under the Decree on Means of Subsistence is meant the repeal of the corn trade restrictions and the decision on the armed suppression of the movement for fixed prices adopted by the Convention under pressure of the Girondists in December 1792. These measures strongly infringed the interests of the masses who were suffering from shortage of food and the soaring prices. During this period the Montagnards did not support the popular demands for fixed prices on bread and other products but at the same time they rejected the principle of unrestricted freedom of trade upheld by the Girondists. Thus, speaking on the food question on December 2, 1792, Levasseur advocated the necessity of compulsory measures against sabotage by the farmers and grain merchants.

On March 10, 1793, representatives of the most radical plebeian trend in the revolutionary camp, called “les enragés”, who wanted fixed prices, social measures against poverty, punishment of profiteers, etc., attempted to stir up a rebellion. Participants in the rebellion, during which two Girondist printshops were smashed up, wrote a petition in which they demanded the expulsion of the Girondists from the Convention. However, not being supported by the Jacobins, who were afraid to oppose the Girondists openly, “les enragés” did not attain their goal.

The Cordelier Club (“Société des amis droits de l’homme et du citoyen”)—one of the most radical democratic organisations during the French Revolution, founded in 1790. The Left-wing Jacobins had a majority in the Club. Despite the fact that “les enragés” took part in its activities, it did not support their action of March 10, 1793.

On May 31 and June 2, 1793, a popular uprising took place in Paris resulting in the expulsion of the Girondists from the Convention. A revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the Jacobins supported by the masses was established. The success of the uprising was achieved through the unity of the revolutionary forces (Jacobins, “les enragés”) in their struggle against the political supremacy of the Girondist Party which became an exponent of the counter-revolutionary tendencies of the big bourgeoisie.

According to Levasseur’s statement Danton described Dumouriez as an extremely talented general, but having political convictions which were doubtful from the point of view of the republicans. Danton pointed to Dumouriez’ extreme ambition, his obvious reluctance to submit to the Convention’s control and his tendency to surround himself with flatterers and plotters.

The aggravation of the food crisis, the growing discontent of the masses and the agitation of “les enragés” for fixed prices compelled the Convention to discuss the food question again in the spring of 1793. Taking into consideration the sentiments of the people, the Jacobins this time spoke in favour of fixing the maximum prices on corn. Despite the Girondists’ resistance the decree on maximum corn prices was adopted on May 4, 1793.
The summary of Engels' article "Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy" is in the fifth notebook of excerpts from the works of economists made by Marx when he was in Paris (concerning the Paris Notes see Note 48). The conspectuses and excerpts in the fifth notebook were probably made in the first half of 1844.

Letters from London—a series of articles written by Engels and printed in May-June 1843 in the progressive journal Schweizerischer Republikaner published by German emigrants (Fröbel and others) in Zurich. They were actually the continuation of Engels' reports on the social and political conflicts in England which he published in the Rheinische Zeitung at the end of 1842, soon after his arrival in that country (see this edition, Vol. 2). In early 1843 Engels temporarily interrupted his activity as a journalist owing, on the one hand, to his intensive study of social conditions in England, the English labour movement and English socialist literature and, on the other, to the closure of the Rheinische Zeitung in the spring of 1843. Later, especially from the autumn of 1843, Engels began to contribute to the labour and socialist newspapers in England and on the Continent.

Only the fourth article from the series Letters from London was published in English, in the collection: Marx and Engels, Ireland and the Irish Question, Moscow, 1971.

The Anti-Corn Law League—see Note 40.

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 over 21), annual parliaments, vote by ballot, equal electoral districts, abolition of the property qualifications for M. P.s, and remuneration of M.P.s.

The English edition of Strauss' book Das Leben Jesu was put out by Hetherington Publishers in 1842 in weekly instalments.

Graham's Bill "For Regulating the Employment of Children and Young Persons in Factories, and for the Better Education of Children in Factory Districts" was submitted to the House of Commons on March 7, 1843 (see Hansard's Parliamentary Debates: Third series, Vol. LXVII, Second Volume of the Session, London, 1843, p. 422 sqq.).

Engels quotes from an article in the Allgemeine Zeitung No. 110, April 20, 1843, datelined: "London, 13 April".

The National Charter Association, founded in July 1840, was the first mass workers' party in the history of the labour movement, numbering up to 50 thousand members in the years of the rise of the Chartist movement. The lack of ideological and tactical unity among its members and the petty-bourgeois ideology of the majority of the Chartist leaders affected the activities of the Association. After the defeat of Chartistism in 1848, the Association declined and it ceased its activity in the 1850s.

The editorial board of the Schweizerische Republikaner gave the following note to this passage: "This comprises 1,767,500 Rhenish Fl., a sum which, according to our continental notions of 'the poor' is scarcely probable."

The reference is apparently to the project to establish a special fund for buying plots of land and distributing them among workers. This plan was proposed by
the Chartist leader Feargus O'Connor as early as 1838; he tried more than once to put it into effect; in 1845, with this aim in view, he founded the Chartist Land Co-operative Society, which was also a failure.  

p. 384

146 No article by Engels on this subject was published in the Schweizerische Republikaner. Later Engels wrote about the Chartists' attitude towards the Anti-Corn Law League in his book The Condition of the Working-Class in England (Chapter "Labour Movements", see this edition, Vol. 4).  

p. 384

147 The reference is to the following passage from Robert Owen's work The Marriage System of the New Moral World, Leeds, 1838: "I resume the subject of marriage because it is the source of more demoralisation, crime, and misery than any other single cause, with the exception of religion and private property; and these three together form the great trinity of causes of crime and immorality among mankind." (P. 54.)  

p. 387


p. 387

149 The Act of 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 an autonomous Irish Parliament and made Ireland still more dependent on England. The demand for the repeal of the Union became a most popular watchword in Ireland after the 1820s. However, the Irish liberals who were at the head of the national liberation movement (O'Connell and others) considered the agitation for the repeal of the Union only as a means of obtaining concessions for the Irish bourgeoisie and landowners from the English Government. In 1835 O'Connell came to an agreement with the English Whigs and stopped agitation altogether. Under the impact of the mass movement, however, the Irish liberals were compelled in 1840 to found an Association of Repealers, which they tried to direct onto the path of compromise with the English ruling classes.  

p. 389

150 The principal tenant—a middleman who leased land directly from the landlord and then let it in small plots to subtenants, who in their turn often parcelled out these plots and let them too.  

p. 390

151 The second Chartist petition demanding the adoption of the People's Charter was written by the Executive Committee of the National Charter Association and submitted to Parliament in May 1842. It also demanded for Ireland the right to annul the forced Act of Union of 1801. Despite this, the Irish liberals, far from supporting the Chartists' agitation, took a hostile attitude towards the Chartists.  

p. 391

152 With the article "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent" Engels started contributing to the London socialist weekly The New Moral World: and Gazette of the Rational Society founded by Robert Owen. The article was supplied with notes (reproduced at the end of this volume). Almost at the same time the article was published in an abridged form in the Chartist newspaper The Northern Star Nos. 313 and 315, November 11 and 25, 1843. The article was welcomed in English proletarian and socialist circles. The editor of the weekly, Fleming, noted in 1844 that the English readers had got
to know some representatives of continental socialism, in particular Wilhelm Weitling, thanks to the appearance at the end of the previous year of a series of articles ably written by a German living in England (The New Moral World, 1844, No. 14, p. 110). The editorial board of The Northern Star assessed Engels' article as "an interesting ... exposition of 'Continental Communism' from the pen of one who was master of his subject, because he knew the facts with which he made the public acquainted" (The Northern Star No. 586, May 4, 1844).

Engels continued to contribute to the organ of the English Owenists after he left England in August 1844 up to May 1845.

153 The English translation of Buonarroti's book was published in London in 1836 under the title Buonarroti's History of Babeuf's Conspiracy for Equality, with the Author's Reflections on the Causes and Character of the French Revolution, and His Estimate of the Leading Men and Events of that Epoch. The translation was made by Bronterre O'Brien, one of the leaders and theoreticians of Chartism.

154 The reference is to the group of English Utopian Socialists who in 1842 founded the colony-commune Concordium in Ham Common near London; followers of the English mystic J. P. Greaves, the Ham Common Socialists preached moral self-perfection and an ascetic way of life. The colony did not survive long.

155 The editors of The New Moral World supplied the following note to this passage: "A few years since we gave a complete exposition of the system in a series of articles in this Journal." The author of the note meant two large series of articles: "Socialism in France. Charles Fourier" and "Fourierism"; the first was published in The New Moral World in 1839 (Nos. 45-46, 48, 49), the second in 1839-40 (Nos. 53, 55, 57, 61-63, 71, 73-75).

156 The editors of The New Moral World gave the following note to this passage: "Now entitled Démocratie Pacifique." Besides the daily newspaper La Démocratie Pacifique, published since August 1843, the Fourierists continued to publish La Phalange as a theoretical journal.

157 Engels refers here to a series of armed actions by the French proletariat directed against the regime of the bourgeois July monarchy and also to the workers' active participation in the uprisings led by the republican secret societies. The major events in the 1830s were: the uprisings of Lyons workers at the end of November 1831 and in April 1834, and also republican revolts in Paris on June 5, 1832, April 13-14, 1834, and May 12, 1839, the main participants in which were workers.

158 "Travaailleurs Égalitaires"—a secret society of the French Communists-Babouvists, which sprang up in 1840 and consisted mainly of workers. Humanitarians—a secret society of Communists-Babouvists, who in 1841 rallied around the newspaper L'Humanitaire. These two societies were under the ideological influence of Théodore Dézamy and belonged to the revolutionary and materialist trend in French utopian communism.

159 The editors of The New Moral World gave the following note to this sentence: "It is proper to reiterate that the Icarian Communists, in their organ, the Populaire, have, in the strongest manner, disowned all participation in secret societies, and affixed the names of their leaders to public documents, expositions of their principles and objects."
Harmony—the name of a communistic colony founded by the followers of Robert Owen in Hampshire in 1841; the colony survived till the beginning of 1846. p. 398

The public debate between J. Watts, who was at that time an active proponent of Owenism, and the Chartist speaker J. Bairstow took place in Manchester on October 11, 12 and 13, 1843. Engels apparently attended it. p. 398

Münzer's communist revolutionary ideas, which are mentioned below, were expounded in a series of pamphlets issued by him on the eve and during the Peasant War in Germany (1524-25), in particular in the proclamation: "Ausgedrückte Entblössung des falschen Glaubens der ungetreuen Welt durchs Zeugnis des Evangelions Lucae, vorgetragen der elenden erbärmlichen Christenheit zur Erinnerung ihres Irrsais", published in the autumn of 1524 in Mühlhausen. Later Engels called this pamphlet "a highly inciting paper" (see F. Engels, The Peasant War in Germany, Ch. II; this edition, Vol. 16). p. 400

Engels' statement is based on the prospectus of Wilhelm Weitling's book Das Evangelium der armen Sünder which was published at that time. The book itself was published only in 1845 in Berne under the title Das Evangelium eines armen Sünder. p. 402

The Federal Diet—the supreme body of the German Confederation (1815-66) consisting of representatives of the German states; it defended the conservative monarchical regime in Germany. p. 406

The reference is to a letter written by the democratic poet Georg Herwegh to Frederick William IV in which he accused the king of breaking his promise to introduce the freedom of the press and, in particular, of banning the radical monthly Der deutsche Bote aus der Schweiz, which was being prepared for printing at the time. Herwegh's letter appeared in the Leipziger Allgemeine Zeitung on December 24, 1842; this led to the banning of the newspaper and Herwegh's banishment from Paris. In England the letter was published in The Times on January 16, 1843, in The Morning Herald on January 17, 1843, and in other newspapers. p. 406

Engels' article on this subject did not appear in The New Moral World. p. 407

Edgar Bauer was sentenced to four years' imprisonment for his book Der Streit der Kritik mit Kirche und Staat, Charlottenburg, 1843, confiscated by the Prussian Government. p. 407

During his stay in England Engels attended meetings organised by members of the Chartist movement and tried to establish personal contacts with its leaders. In the autumn of 1843 he visited Leeds, where the central Chartist organ, The Northern Star, was published at the time, and got acquainted with its editor George Julian Harney, a prominent figure in the revolutionary wing of the Chartist Party. Engels introduced himself, Harney recalled, as a permanent reader of The Northern Star, who was very much interested in the Chartist movement. As a result of this meeting Engels started contributing to the Chartist press, but at first only incidentally. On November 11 and 25, 1843, The Northern Star reprinted with some abridgements Engels' article "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent" immediately after its first publication in the weekly The New Moral World. Two weeks later these notes connected with the above-mentioned article appeared in the Chartist paper. They also appeared in
The New Moral World. In this volume they are published as one article. Closely connected with these is the short report "The Press and the German Despots" published in The Northern Star on February 3, 1844 (see this volume, p. 417). Later Engels proposed to the editors that he would systematically contribute to the paper reports about events on the Continent (see his letter to the editor of The Northern Star, p. 514 of this volume). From that time on Engels' articles and reports were regularly published in the newspaper. After his departure from England in August 1844 his reports ceased to appear in the paper but were resumed in the autumn of 1845. (In the summer of that year Engels visited England once more and again met Harney.) He contributed to The Northern Star till 1850.

The reference is to the League of the Just, a secret revolutionary organisation founded in 1836 by German proletarianised emigrant craftsmen in Paris. Besides France, League branches existed in Germany, England and Switzerland. A great role in their organisation was played by Weitling. Various theories of utopian communism and socialism, in particular Weitlingism, formed the ideological foundation of the League. The emigrant workers of other nationalities also participated in the League's activities. The internationalisation of the League and the evolution of its members' views under the influence of the ideas of Marx and Engels led to its reorganisation into the Communist League in 1847.

By the time of the publication of this article the final verdict of the Weitling case was not yet pronounced. At the end of December 1843, the Supreme Court of Appeal of the Swiss Bund sentenced Weitling to 10 months of imprisonment and 5-year exile from Switzerland on the basis of the appeal of the prosecutor who protested the decision of the court of the Zurich canton.

169 The reference is to the anonymous article The Communists in Germany published in The Times on December 29, 1843, and reprinted in The New Moral World No. 28 on January 6, 1844. Engels cites from this article below. p. 409

170 The reference is to the Paris uprising of May 12, 1839, prepared by the secret republican socialist Société des Saisons headed by Louis Auguste Blanqui and Armand Barbès; the uprising was suppressed by troops and the National Guard. p. 410

172 Repealers—see Note 149. p. 411

173 Engels alludes to prominent members of the League of the Just: the type-setter Karl Schapper, the watchmaker Joseph Moll and others, connected with the Blanquist secret Société des Saisons which organised the Paris uprising of May 12, 1839. Schapper and Moll took part in the uprising, were prosecuted by the French authorities and compelled to leave for England, where they headed local branches of the League. Engels made their acquaintance in the spring of 1843 in London, as he wrote later in his article "On the History of the Communist League". p. 411

174 On May 27, 1832, a political manifestation took place near the castle of Hambach in Bavarian Pfalz, which was organised by representatives of the German liberal and radical bourgeoisie. Participants of the "Hambach festival" launched an appeal to fight for the unification of Germany, for the bourgeois freedoms and constitutional reforms.
On July 27, 1834, on the occasion of the anniversary of the July revolution in France a large meeting in defence of the idea of German unification was held in Steinhölzli near Berne (Switzerland) on the initiative of the German emigrants.

Rebeccaites—members of the peasant movement in South Wales in 1843-44 demanding the removal of tollgates. The leader of the movement acted under the assumed name of Rebecca, a personage from the Bible. The Rebeccaites acted at night dressed in women's clothes.

Voigland—the name given to one of the working-class districts in Berlin. Saint Giles—a district of London populated by poor people.

The double issue of the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher (No. 1-2) was put out at the end of February 1844.

The Final Protocol of the 1834 Vienna Conference of the ministers of the states of the German Confederation envisaged measures for suppressing the liberal and democratic movement in Germany, stricter censorship and mutual support of the states in the struggle against the liberal and radical opposition. This Protocol as well as the decisions of the Federal Diet (the supreme body of the German Confederation) issued in June-July 1832 on the prohibition of popular societies and meetings and also on rendering military aid to those German states which were in danger of an uprising of their subjects was the answer of the ruling circles of Germany to the unrest in the country caused by the July revolution of 1830 in France. The chief inspirer of these police measures was the Austrian Chancellor Metternich.

The Protocol of the Vienna Conference and the reactionary decision of the 1819 Karlsbad Conference of the representatives of the German states, which had been kept secret, were published by the German liberal publicist and historian K. G. Welcker in his book Wichtige Urkunden für den Rechtszustand der deutschen Nation, Mannheim, 1844. Even before the book was put out the contents of the Protocol had been known to democratic circles and published in the German emigrant press, in particular in the Paris Vorwärts! in January 1844. The text was also reprinted in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher at the end of February 1844.

The reference is to the trial of O'Connell and eight other leaders of the Repeal movement which started in January 1844. Taking advantage of the waverings among the Irish liberal leaders fearing the scope of the movement, the Tory government wanted to deal a smashing blow at the movement by staging this trial. In February 1844 O'Connell and his followers were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment up to twelve months. However, under the impact of mass protest the House of Lords soon quashed the sentence.

The Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy is the first economic work written by Engels. It was one of the principal works published in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher, and together with the programme articles written by Marx it determined the journal's communist trend. Marx was very much interested in this work of Engels and wrote a summary of it (see pp. 375-76 of this volume). Later on he mentioned this work more than once in his writings. In the Preface to the first edition of A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (1859) Marx called it a “brilliant essay on the critique of economic categories”. Despite the fact that the work contained some traits of immaturity which are inevitable at the earlier stage of the formation of ideas: the influence
of Feuerbach's abstract humanism which had not yet been completely overcome, a one-sided appraisal of the labour theory of value, etc.—shortcomings about which Engels wrote in a general way in his letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht on April 15, 1876—the work contained profound anticipation of some propositions in the new, materialist economic teaching.

The work also produced a strong impression on other representatives of progressive circles. For example, the Berlin physician Julius Waldeck, stressing in his letter to Johann Jacoby the maturity and boldness of the ideas expounded in this work, exclaimed: "Engels has worked a real miracle!" (C. Mayer, Friedrich Engels. Eine Biographie, Bd. 1, S. 171.)

In English the Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy was first published as an appendix to the book: Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1959.

---

181 The Anti-Corn Law League—see Note 40.

182 The reference is to the New York fire of December 16, 1835.

183 Several pamphlets signed "Marcus" appeared in England, in particular: On the Possibility of Limiting Populousness, printed by John Hill, Black Horse Court, Fleet Street, 1838, and The Theory of Painless Extinction, the publication of which was announced in The New Moral World on August 29, 1840. They expounded the Malthusian misanthropic theory of population. The principal ideas of "Marcus" were also summed up in the anonymous pamphlet: An Essay on Populousness, printed for private circulation; printed for the author, 1838.

184 The reference is to the Poor Law Amendment act of 1834, under which the poor were placed in workhouses named by the people "Poor Law Bastilles". The repeal of this law was one of the main demands of the Chartists.

A characterisation of this law is given in Marx's work "Critical Marginal Notes on the Article 'The King of Prussia and Social Reform. By a Prussian'" (see pp. 194-95 of this volume).

185 It is difficult to judge by the available material to which literary plan this statement refers. Possibly Engels had in mind a work on English social history which he intended to write and which he mentions at the end of this work (see p. 443 of this volume). In his series of articles, The Condition of England, which is a brief preliminary outline of this work, Engels characterises the economic teaching of Adam Smith and the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and James Mill as a theoretical expression of the domination of private property, egoism, alienation of man, which represent the consummation of the principles following from the Christian world outlook and world order (see pp. 485-87 of this volume). It is probable, however, that he had in mind a plan of some special work on economics. A year later, in particular, Engels worked on a pamphlet about the German economist List (see his letter to Marx of November 19, 1844).

186 Engels has in mind a work on English social history which he planned to write and for which he collected material during his stay in England (November 1842-August 1844). He intended to devote a whole chapter of this work to the condition of the working class in England. Later he changed his plans and decided to write a special work on the English proletariat, which he did upon his return to Germany. His book The Condition of the Working-Class in England was published in Leipzig in 1845 (see this edition, Vol. 4).
Engels intended to write *The Condition of England* as a series of articles for the 
*Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*. The critical analysis of Carlyle’s book *Past and 
Present* was the beginning of it, a sort of introduction, which was to be followed, 
according to the author’s plans, by the main sections under the same general 
title (see p. 468 of this volume). However, two other articles written by Engels 
on the same subject for the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* were never printed 
in the journal as its publication ceased. These articles were published in two 
parts in the *Paris Vorwärts!* some months later, after Engels met Marx in Paris 
at the end of August 1844 and with the help of his friend became an editor of 
and a contributor to the newspaper.

The part of the work published in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* 
aroused considerable interest, as Engels himself stated, among the readers in 
Germany (see Engels’ letter to Marx of early October 1844).

Engels cites from Thomas Carlyle’s book in his own translation into 
German. In so doing he often abridges the text and does not always mark the 
omissions by leaders. In some cases he merely renders the contents of some 
passage or another; the italics in quotations as a rule belong to Engels. Engels 
gives no references to page numbers; for the readers’ convenience page 
numbers are given in footnotes in this edition.

The reference is to the repeal in 1828 of the *Test Act* of 1673 and some other 
acts under which only members of the Church of England could occupy 
governmental or elective posts, and also to the subsequent abolition of some 
religious restrictions and of the privileges of the top aristocracy (the *Act of 
Emancipation* of 1829, which granted Catholics the right to be elected to 
Parliament; the *Reform Act* of 1832). Engels wrote about this in greater detail 
in the last of the series of his articles *The Condition of England* (see pp. 490-91 
of this volume).

Concerning the English translation of David Strauss’ book see Note 140.

The *Reform Act* passed by the British Parliament in June 1832 was directed 
against the political monopoly of the landed and financial aristocracy and 
made membership of Parliament open to representatives of the industrial 
bourgeoisie. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, which formed the main 
force in the struggle for the reform, did not get any electoral rights.

In August 1842 Manchester was the centre of Chartist agitation and of a powerful 
strike movement.

The *People’s Charter*—see Note 139.

The *Corn Laws*—see Note 40.

*Laissez-faire, laissez-aller*—the formula of the economists who advocated free 
trade and non-intervention by the state in the sphere of economic relations.

By the “great week” is meant the bourgeois July revolution of 1830 in France. 
The major events took place between July 27 and August 2.

*Morison’s pills*—pills invented by the English quack James Morison and widely 
advertised by him in the mid-twenties of the nineteenth century as a remedy 
for all ailments. They were prepared from the juice of certain tropical plants.
Engels has in mind the last period of Schelling's life and activity when, having renounced many of his progressive ideas, he started preaching a mystical philosophy of open irrationalism. At that time Schelling was invited to Berlin University to oppose the influence of the Hegelian school (end of 1841-42). For more detail see Engels' *Schelling and Revelation* (this edition, Vol. 2).

Home-colonies—the name Robert Owen gave to his communist societies.

Engels expressed the same hope for subsequent evolution of Carlyle's views in the radical direction in his note to the concluding chapter of his book: *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* (1845) (see this edition, Vol. 4). However, his hopes were not justified and he decided to make the following addition to this note in the second German edition (1892): “But the February Revolution made him [Carlyle] an out-and-out reactionary. His righteous wrath against the Philistines turned into sullen Philistine grumbling at the tide of history that cast him ashore.”

This and the following article are the continuation of *The Condition of England* published in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* (see Note 187). Both articles were evidently written not later than February-March 1844, as can be judged by their contents and, in particular, the references to some facts (rejection of the motion to publish parliamentary minutes, O'Connell's trial) as events that had taken place several weeks before (see pp. 500 and 506 of this volume). It is possible that Engels ceased writing this series because of the closure of the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*. From the last lines of the preceding article we see that the central theme of this series was to be the condition of the working class in England.

In English the article was first published in the book: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Articles on Britain*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.

The reference is to the coalition wars of European states against revolutionary and Napoleonic France lasting from 1792 till 1815. England was an active member of these coalitions.

According to later historical investigations, in the 15th-17th centuries copyholders (a category of peasants holding land by copy, life and hereditary tenants who paid feudal rent) comprised the majority of the English peasants who had freed themselves from serf bondage. Modern science uses the terms villeins, bordars and cottars to denote the various categories of serf peasants in medieval England.

The *People's Charter*—see Note 139.

In the Introduction to the second German edition (1892) of his book *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* (see this edition, Vol. 4), Engels made the following addition to the analogous note: “The historical outline of the industrial revolution given above is not exact in certain details; but in 1843-44 no better sources were available.” The more precise information gained from later investigations includes, in particular, the fact that Arkwright was not the inventor of the spinning-jenny but used a number of inventions made by others. Judging by the corresponding passages in *The Condition of the Working-Class in England*, Engels here made use of other books besides Porter's work: E. Baines, *History of the Cotton Manufacture of Great Britain*, London. 1835; A. Ure,

205 The reference is to the democratic correspondence societies organised in various English towns in the 90s of the eighteenth century under the influence of the French Revolution. The first—the London Correspondence Society—was founded in 1792. In the autumn of 1793 an attempt was made to unite these organisations by convening a congress in Edinburgh which assumed the name of the Convention. The government answered with reprisals; some members of the Convention were condemned to penal servitude. In 1794 the leaders of the London Correspondence Society (Thomas Hardy, Horne Tooke and others) were arrested. By the end of the 90s the activity of the correspondence societies ceased; however, their ideas and traditions had a great influence on the further development of the radical movement in England, especially in the period of intensive agitation for the democratic reorganisation of its political system in 1816-23. p. 487

206 In English this article was published in the book: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Articles on Britain, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971. p. 489

207 The Test Act of 1673 demanded recognition of the dogmas of the Church of England by persons occupying governmental posts. At first directed against attempts to re-establish Catholicism, this Act was subsequently applied against various religious sects and trends which deviated from the dogmas of the Established Church.

The Habeas Corpus Act was passed by the English Parliament in 1679. Concerning this Act see p. 506 of this volume.

The Bill of Rights, passed by the English Parliament in 1689, restricted the rights of the King in Parliament and confirmed the compromise between the landed aristocracy and the top financial and commercial bourgeoisie which had been achieved as a result of the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688. p. 491

208 The Magna Carta Libertatum—a document signed by the English King John Lackland on June 15, 1215, under pressure from the rebellious barons. It restricted the rights of the King, mainly in the interests of the big feudal lords, and contained some concessions to the knights and to the towns.

The Reform Act—see Note 190. p. 492

209 The reference is to the mass campaign for the electoral reform, the peak year being 1831. The Reform Act was passed as a result of this campaign. (Concerning the Reform Act see Note 190.) p. 496

210 The reference is to Thomas Duncombe’s speech in the House of Commons on August 9, 1832 (see Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates, 1832, Vol. XIV, pp. 1159-1161). p. 497

211 The Act of Emancipation—see Note 188. p. 498

212 The reference is to the rejection by the House of Commons on February 12, 1844, of the motion by the radical M.P.s, Christy, Duncombe and others, concerning publication of minutes of the parliamentary debates (see Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates, 1844, Vol. LXXII, pp. 580-600). p. 500

213 The Thirty-Nine Articles—the symbol of faith of the Church of England passed by the English Parliament in 1571. p. 501
The Corporation Act, passed in 1661, demanded recognition of the dogmas of the Church of England by persons holding elective posts (mostly in municipal administration). It was repealed in 1828.

Concerning the repeal of the Test Act see Note 188. p. 501

The reference is to Thomas Gibson's speech in the House of Commons on February 14, 1844 (see Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1844, Vol. LXXII, p. 798). p. 503

The reference is to the banning by the English authorities of the mass meeting in Clontarf fixed by the Irish Repealers for October 5, 1843. The government concentrated troops in the region to prevent the protest demonstration. In these circumstances O'Connell and his followers decided to cancel the meeting; this encouraged the English authorities, who regarded it as a sign of weakness, and they decided to bring the Irish leaders to trial. The trial took place in January-February 1844 (concerning the trial see Note 179). p. 505

The reference is to the National Charter Association, concerning which see Note 143. p. 505

The reference is to the trials of the leaders of the National Charter Association and the participants in the strike movement of August 1842, ordered by the authorities in various towns of England after the suppression of the movement. There were mass reprisals. Out of more than 1,500 persons (mostly workers) arrested more than a half were put on trial. Sentences as a rule were very severe. Thus in Stafford (October 1842) fifty accused were sentenced to transportation (many of them for life) and 180 to various terms of imprisonment. A large group of Chartist leaders headed by Feargus O'Connor were also sentenced, their trial being held in March 1843 in Lancaster (later the sentence was quashed owing to mass pressure). Besides the towns mentioned by Engels trials were held in Chester, Liverpool and some other places in the autumn of 1842. p. 506

Carolina—the criminal code of the Emperor Charles V (Constitutio criminalis Carolina) passed by the Reichstag in Regensburg in 1532; it was marked by the extreme severity of the penalties which it prescribed. p. 509

This passage proves that Engels intended to continue the series The Condition of England (see Note 200). He evidently planned to describe the condition of the English working class and examine the social, including labour, legislation that existed in England. p. 511

This letter written by Engels to the editor of The Northern Star is incomplete: only the part of it which was published in the newspaper's editorial article on May 4, 1844, "The 'Movement', at Home and Abroad", has survived. Without mentioning the author's name, the editor of The Northern Star introduced him to the readers as the author of an essay on "Continental Communism" (they had in mind Engels' article: "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent" which had been reprinted in the newspaper). Engels' offer to contribute to the newspaper met the intentions of its editor Harney, who wanted to impart an international character to the newspaper by extending information on foreign
affairs, as the editorial article mentioned above stated. From that moment Engels worked as an official reporter of the Chartist newspaper. The same issue carried Engels' note on the situation in Prussia marked: "From our own Correspondent", which (sometimes with slight alterations) was used in respect of all the material he sent to The Northern Star. Articles written by Engels were printed in the section: "Movements Abroad" under the editorial headings denoting the country the information referred to ("Germany", "Prussia", "Bavaria", "Poland", "Russia", "Switzerland", "France", etc.). Sometimes several articles by Engels were printed in the same issue under different headings (e. g., on May 18 and 25, 1844). It is possible that in such cases the editors themselves divided the material of a single report into several parts.

In the course of his further study of the position in Germany Engels came to the conclusion that in the historical conditions obtaining the establishment of a centralised and not of a federal republic would meet the aims of the consistent struggle against political disunion and the remnants of medieval particularism in all spheres of social life. During the revolution of 1848-49 Marx and Engels, in contraposition to the petty-bourgeois republicans, who adhered to the principle of federalism, upheld the demand of transforming Germany into a single democratic republic.

The work under this title was not published by David Strauss.

The reference is apparently to the following pamphlets by Adam Gurowski: La vérité sur la Russie, 1834 and La civilisation et la Russie, 1840.

One of the public buildings of Ludwig of Bavaria, built in 1841 near Regensburg, was named by him "Walhalla" after the legendary posthumous abode of the German mythological heroes. The palace contained a collection of sculptures of famous men in Germany. The King himself wrote a guide book for it: Walhalla's Genossen, geschildert durch König Ludwig den Ersten von Bayern, dem Gründer Walhalla's, München, 1842. Poems written by Ludwig of Bavaria provide a sample of meaningless and pretentious poetry; they were published in 1842.

The reference is to the wars waged by the tsarist government against the peoples of the North Caucasus (Adyghei, Chechens, Avars, Lezghins, etc.) fighting for their independence. In the 1820s the liberation struggle of these peoples against the tsarist colonisers and the arbitrary rule of the local feudal lords was headed by Shamil, who was proclaimed Imam of Daghestan in 1834. The movement reached its peak in the 40s of the nineteenth century and was suppressed in 1859.

The canton of Vaud (German: Waadt) was known for its democratic traditions.

Prior to 1798 Switzerland was a union of small autonomous cantons in which political sway was exercised by the mountain patriarchal cantons headed by an aristocratic oligarchy. In 1798 a Helvetic Republic dependent on France was set up in Switzerland which was at the time occupied by the troops of the French Directory. Political privileges of the old cantons were abolished. However, the Treaty of Alliance of 1814 was approved by the Congress of Vienna, 1814-15, which restored the former sovereignty of the cantons; in the majority of them the clerical aristocratic elements again came to the fore.

In 1830 the movement for democratic reforms in Switzerland became more widespread under the influence of the July revolution in France. In the twelve
north-western cantons, which were more advanced, the power went to the bourgeoisie, but its aspirations for the unification of the country encountered resistance from the backward mountain cantons.

This prevision of Engels came true in three years. In November 1847 a civil war broke out in Switzerland between the aristocratic cantons united into a separate confederation known as the Sonderbund (the treaty was concluded at the end of 1845) and the north-western bourgeois cantons, in the course of which the Sonderbund was defeated. Bourgeois reforms were carried out in the Swiss cantons. Under the Constitution of 1848 Switzerland became a confederation.

In 1844, under the influence of the ruling clerical aristocratic circles the canton of Valais entered the Sonderbund. Radicals in Valais again came to power after the Sonderbund broke up.

Engels' article "The Civil War in Switzerland" was a response to the events of 1847 (see this edition, Vol. 6).

During the July revolution of 1830, which led to the downfall of the Bourbon dynasty, Jacques Laffitte, a representative of moderate liberal circles of the financial bourgeoisie and a member of the Chamber, which assumed power in Paris, helped to secure the accession to the throne of Louis Philippe, the Duke of Orléans.

The liberation struggle of the Algerians led by Emir Abd-el-Kader against the French colonisers lasted with interruptions from 1832 to 1847. Taking advantage of their military superiority, the French conquered Abd-el-Kader's state in Western Algeria in the period between 1839 and 1844. However, Abd-el-Kader continued the struggle, resorting to guerrilla warfare and relying on the help of the Sultan of Morocco. When the latter was defeated in the Franco-Moroccan war in 1844, Abd-el-Kader hid in the oases of the Sahara. An uprising in Western Algeria in 1845-47, which was suppressed by the French colonisers, was the last stage of this struggle.

Caliphs—local rulers in Abd-el-Kader's state, subject to the central government.

The reference is to the Divorce Bill drafted in 1842 by Friedrich Savigny, one of the founders of the reactionary historical school of law, who from 1842 to 1848 was High Chancellor of Prussia.

Although the Divorce Bill was kept secret, the Rheinische Zeitung edited by Marx published the Bill on October 20, 1842, thus initiating a broad discussion on the subject. On December 19, Marx's article "The Divorce Bill" (see this edition, Vol. 1), in which he criticised the Bill, was published. The publication of the Bill in the Rheinische Zeitung was one of the reasons for the persecution of the paper, which finally led to its banning in March 1843.

Landtags—provincial and local assemblies of estates established in Prussia in 1823; they consisted in the main of representatives of the nobility; urban and village communities had very small representation. Landtags were convened by the King and their functions were restricted to discussion of bills and to questions of local economy and administration.

This report had the following paragraph added to it by the editors: "In addition to the above, we give the following paragraph from the Sun:

"We learn from Breslau on the 9th inst. that the weavers have returned to their work after having obtained an increase of wages. They burst in, during
On the song of Silesian weavers, sung by the participants of the uprising of June 4-6, 1844, see Note 44. p. 552

This draft of the young Engels' verse drama Cola di Rienzi only became known after Volume 2, containing his early works, letters and literary experiments, had already gone to press. This draft is therefore being published in the present volume as a supplement, although chronologically it belongs to Volume 2.

The draft manuscript was discovered among the posthumous papers of the German poet Adolf Schults, a native of Elberfeld, by Michael Knieriem, director of Frederick Engels House in Wuppertal. Schults belonged to a group of Wuppertal writers and art-lovers which included many of Engels' fellow pupils from the Elberfeld high school who kept in touch with him during his residence (from July 1838 to March 1841) in Bremen, where he was gaining practical experience with a commercial firm and was also engaged in literary activities. Knieriem arranged the first publication of this drama in co-operation with Hans Pelger, director of Karl Marx House in Trier (see Michael Knieriem, Friedrich Engels: Cola di Rienzi. Ein unbekannter dramatischer Entwurf. Herausgegeben vom Friedrich-Engels-Haus, Wuppertal, und Karl-Marx-Haus, Trier, Trier, 1974). The draft was evidently intended for an opera libretto, as may be gathered from a letter of September 30, 1840, sent by Engels' schoolfriend Carl de Haas to Schults and other Elberfeld writers in which there is a reference to Engels' intention of writing the text of an opera at the request of one of his Elberfeld friends. This is also borne out by the style of the work, parts of which are specially adapted for performance (duets, trios, and settings for chorus), and in which provision is made for the insertion of musical episodes. The draft was in all probability written between the end of 1840 and the beginning of 1841, since one page of the manuscript bears a short passage in Hebrew from the Old Testament which was also quoted in a letter of February 22, 1841, from Engels to Friedrich Graeber (see present edition, Vol. 2, p. 526).

Engels took the plot for his drama from events in Rome in the middle of the 14th century—the struggle which developed between the feudal aristocracy on the one hand and the merchant and artisan population on the other. In May 1347, as a result of a popular uprising, a republic was proclaimed in Rome with "people's tribune" Cola di Rienzi at its head. With Rienzi, firm measures against the nobility and a desire to affirm the principle of popular sovereignty and achieve the unification of Italy were combined with fantastic notions about the restoration of ancient Rome's grandeur and world domination. Banished from Rome at the end of 1347 as a result of intrigues by the feudal magnates, Rienzi was reinstated in August 1354 with the aid of mercenary troops commanded by foreign condottieri. The people rose against Rienzi, however, resenting his despotic behaviour, his ambitiousness, and the increased tax burden, a measure which was forced on him by the costs of paying the mercenaries and conducting the war with the aristocrats. On October 8, 1354, an insurrection flared up against him and he was killed. The action in Engels' drama deals with the second period of Rienzi's rule.

The manuscript is a rough draft. In several places, there are author's corrections, erasures and additions in the margin. On one page, the initials "F.E." and Engels' signature are to be seen in the margin. Some drawings made by the author on several pages refer to the plot of the drama, while others are unconnected with it (there are also some cartoons). The last pages
contain a variant of the beginning of Act One, Scene One (in the present edition, this has been printed after the corresponding first version and has been separated from it, as from the continuation, by a horizontal line).  

243 In mid-June 1844 Jenny Marx with her baby girl Jenny born on May 1 left Paris, where she had lived with her husband since October 1843, for Trier to visit her mother Caroline von Westphalen. Jenny with her daughter and a wet-nurse returned to Paris in September 1844.  

244 At the end of 1843 Caroline von Westphalen left Kreuznach, where she had lived after the death of her husband, Ludwig von Westphalen, for Trier. Apparently, she lived in Trier for a time in the house of the tax-collector Wettendorf.  

245 An allusion to the reverberations of the Silesian uprising of weavers of June 4-6, 1844. In Breslau, the capital of Silesia (Polish: Wroclaw), new popular disturbances took place on June 6 and 7.  

246 Jenny had in mind the strained relations between Marx and his mother caused by Marx’s refusal to enter the civil service and his choice, after graduating from the University, of a type of activity which from his mother’s point of view could bring neither material welfare nor a stable social position. The fame brought to Marx by the publication of the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher and a certain improvement in his material condition made Henriette Marx slightly change her attitude towards Marx and his family.  

247 An apparent reference to the work Marx was planning to write on Bruno Bauer and other Young Hegelians (see Note 30). This plan was realised later, when together with Engels he wrote The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism (see this edition, Vol. 4).  

248 Only that part of this letter has survived which Marx decided to publish in the Paris newspaper Vorwärts!, without mentioning the author’s name, under the title “From the Letter of a German Lady”. In his letter to Ludwig Feuerbach of August 11, 1844, he wrote that the excerpt had been taken from his wife’s letter (see this volume, p. 557). The publication of this letter was prompted by an attempt made on King Frederick William IV on July 26, 1844, by H. L. Tschech (see Note 46).  

249 Marx’s letters to his wife mentioned here have not been found.  

250 The reference is to the traditional religious rites connected with the cult of the so-called Holy Coat of Trier (supposedly stripped off Christ before his crucifixion) kept in Trier Catholic Cathedral. This cult attracted many pilgrims from other German towns.  

251 The German radical publicist Georg Jung and other friends of Marx in Cologne took upon themselves to sell a certain number of copies of the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher which Marx had received instead of author’s emoluments and instead of wages for his work as an editor. Some of the copies sent from Switzerland by boat were confiscated by the Baden authorities. On July 31, 1844, Jung wrote to Marx that he had posted Marx 800 francs in compensation of the confiscated copies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abd-el-Kader (c. 1808-1888)</td>
<td>Emir of Algeria, one of the Arab leaders in the national liberation wars of 1832-47 in Morocco and Algeria against the French conquerors.— 528, 529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abd ur-Rahman II (c. 1790-1859)</td>
<td>Emperor of Morocco (1822-59).— 528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.)</td>
<td>Greek dramatist.— 179, 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great) (356-323 B.C.)</td>
<td>Soldier and statesman of the ancient world.— 489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison, Sir Archibald (1792-1867)</td>
<td>Scottish historian and economist, Tory.— 436, 438, 440, 452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison, William Pulteney (1790-1859)</td>
<td>Professor of medicine at Edinburgh University, Tory.— 451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacharsis (c. 600 B.C.)</td>
<td>Greek philosopher, Scythian by birth.— 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arago, DominiqueFrançois (1786-1853)</td>
<td>French astronomer, physicist and mathematician; politician, Republican.— 353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcofin</td>
<td>Military surgeon, served in the French army in Algeria (1841-48).— 529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle (384-322 B.C.)</td>
<td>Greek philosopher.— 137, 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkwright, Sir Richard (1792-1792)</td>
<td>English industrialist, introduced spinning-loom in production that were later named after him.— 442, 479, 480, 482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley (Cooper, Anthony Ashley, 7th Earl of Shaftesbury) (1801-1855)</td>
<td>English politician, Tory philanthropist.— 447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aumale, Henri Eugène Philippe Louis d’Orléans, Duc d’ (1822-1897)</td>
<td>Son of King of the French Louis Philippe; took part in the conquest of Algeria in the forties, one of the commanders in the French army.— 528, 529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babeuf, François Noel (Gracchus) (1760-1797)</td>
<td>French revolutionary, advocate of utopian equalitarian communism, organiser of the conspiracy of “equals” — 393, 396, 397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon, Francis, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Albans (1561-1625)</td>
<td>English philosopher, naturalist and historian.— 193, 472, 490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bairstow, Jonathan (born c. 1819)</td>
<td>Participant in the Chartist movement, delegate to the Chartist Convention (1842).— 398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbaroux, Charles Jean Marie (1767-1794)</td>
<td>Leading figure in the French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barère de Vieuzac, Bertrand (1755-1841)—French lawyer, leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, supported the Jacobins; subsequently took part in the Thermidorian coup.—197, 362, 369

Barmby, John Goodwyn (1820-1881)—English publicist, Christian Socialist, founder of the Communist Propaganda Society.—414

Bauer, Bruno (1809-1882)—German philosopher, one of the Young Hegelians.—146-50, 152, 154, 157, 160, 168-72, 251, 252, 327, 356, 406, 462, 578

Bauer, Edgar (1820-1886)—German philosopher and publicist, Young Hegelian, brother and supporter of Bruno Bauer.—407

Bazire, Claude (1764-1794)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Danton's supporter.—372

Beaumont de la Bonninière, Gustave Auguste de (1802-1866)—French liberal publicist and politician, author of a number of works on slavery in the United States of America.—150, 151, 159, 161, 171

Belf, Peter—Kreuznach tailor, witness to the signing of the marriage contract between Karl Marx and Jenny von Westphalen.—572

Bennendorff, Alexander Christofforovich (1783-1844)—Count, closest assistant of Emperor Nicholas I, organiser of the secret police in Russia.—524

Benjamin, Jeremy (1748-1892)—English sociologist, theoretician of utilitarianism.—486, 502

Bergasse, Nicolas (1750-1832)—French lawyer and politician, monarchist.—287

Berthollet, Claude Louis, Comte de (1748-1822)—French chemist.—428

Biron, Armand Louis de Contout, Duc de (1747-1793)—leading figure in the French Revolution, general, La Fayette's follower.—370

Black, Joseph (1728-1799)—Scottish physicist and chemist.—470

Blackstone, Sir William (1723-1780)—English lawyer, advocate of constitutional monarchy.—492

Blanc, Jean Joseph Louis (1811-1882)—French petty-bourgeois Socialist, historian.—352

Bluntschli, Johann Caspar (1808-1881)—Swiss lawyer and conservative politician.—352, 410

Boileau, Jacques (1752-1799)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.—369

Boisy d'Anglas, François Antoine, Comte de (1756-1826)—leading figure in the French Revolution, lawyer and writer, deputy to the Convention, representative of the Marsh.—362

Börne, Ludwig (1786-1837)—German critic and publicist.—394

Bourbons—French royal dynasty (1589-1792, 1814-1830).—134, 371

Bo—see Dickens, Charles

Bridgewater, Francis Egerton, Duke of (1736-1803)—powerful English landowner, builder of canals.—485

Brougham and Vaux, Henry Peter, 1st Baron (1778-1868)—British statesman, lawyer and writer, Whig.—243

Buchez, Philippe Joseph Benjamin (1796-1865)—French politician, historian, Christian Socialist.—165

Buffon, Georges Louis Leclerc, Comte de (1707-1788)—French naturalist.—470

Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias, Baron von (1791-1860)—Prussian diplomat, publicist and theologian.—210

Buonarroti, Filippo Michele (1761-1837)—Italian revolutionary, Utopian Communist; a leader of the revolutionary movement in France in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Babeuf's comrade-in-arms.—393

Buret, Eugène (1811-1842)—French economist, petty-bourgeois Socialist.—194, 196, 244, 245, 257
Burger, Wilhelm Christian Heinrich—Kreuznach notary.—571, 572
Buss, Franz—Oberbürgermeister of Kreuznach in 1843.—573, 574
Buzot, François Léonard Nicolas (1760-1793)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.—362, 364, 365, 369, 370, 371
Byron, George Gordon Noel, Lord (1788-1824)—English romantic poet.—380

C

Cabot, Etienne (1788-1856)—French publicist, advocate of utopian communism, author of Voyage en Icarie.—143, 297, 397, 398, 400, 402, 411-13
Cæsar, Gaius Julius (c. 100-44 B.C.)—Roman soldier and statesman.—208, 489
Cambacérès, Jean Jacques Régis de (1753-1824)—took part in the French Revolution, lawyer, deputy to the Convention, Girondist; subsequently a statesman under Napoleon’s rule.—364, 369
Cambon, Pierre Joseph (1756-1829)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Montagnard.—364, 365, 369
Cancrin, Yegor Frantsevich (1774-1845)—Russian statesman, Minister of Finance under Nicholas I.—524
Cardite, Richard (1790-1843)—English radical publicist.—504
Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881)—British writer, historian and philosopher, supported the Tories; preached views bordering on feudal socialism up to 1848, later a relentless opponent of the working-class movement.—379, 444, 447, 449, 450, 452, 453, 455, 456, 457, 460-67, 476
Canro, Lazare Nicolas Marguerite (1753-1823)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, an organiser of the revolutionary army.—365

Cartwright, Edmund (1743-1823)—English inventor.—428, 479
Chabot, François (1759-1794)—clergyman, took part in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Jacobin.—372
Charles II (1629-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).—457
Chevalier, Michel (1806-1879)—French engineer, economist and publicist, Saint-Simonist in the thirties, later a free trader.—203, 288, 310-11
Cléves, Heinrich Bolshasar Christian— petty official from Kreuznach, witness at the marriage of Karl Marx and Jenny von Westphalen.—574
Codden, Richard (1804-1865)—English manufacturer and politician, a leader of the free traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League.—445, 497
Colonna, Stefano (Stephen) (d. 1379)—member of the princely Roman family, senator, leader of the Ghibelline party; was in constant rivalry with the Orsini family; one of the opposition leaders against Cola di Rienzi; friend of Petrarch.—537-41, 543, 548-55, 557
Columbus, Christopher (1451-1506)—Italian navigator, discoverer of America.—595
Considérant, Victor Prosper (1808-1893)—French publicist, Utopian Socialist, disciple and follower of Fourier.—396, 413
Constant, Alphonse Louis (1816-1875)—French writer, abbot, Christian Socialist.—414
Constant de Rebecque, Henri Benjamin (1767-1830)—French liberal politician, publicist and writer.—412, 414
Cooper, Thomas (1805-1892)—English poet and journalist; at the beginning of the forties was active in the Chartist movement; later propagated Christianity.—389
Courier, Paul Louis (1773-1825)—French philologist and publicist, democrat.—288
Cousin, Victor (1792-1867)—French philosopher.—350
Couthon, Georges (1755-1794) — leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Jacobin, supporter of Robespierre. — 374

Cretet, Emmanuel (1747-1809) — French politician, Minister of Internal Affairs under Napoleon. — 196

Crochard — sub-lieutenant of the French army in Algeria (1841-43). — 529

Crompton, Samuel (1753-1827) — English inventor. — 442, 479, 480

Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658) — one of the leaders of the English revolution; became Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland in 1653. — 456, 473, 492

Danton, Georges Jacques (1759-1794) — leading figure in the French Revolution, leader of the Jacobin Right wing. — 363, 364, 366-70, 373, 374

Davy, Sir Humphry (1778-1829) — English chemist and physicist. — 428, 440

Delamare d'Angers, Joseph (1746-1794) — leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist. — 370

Delolme, Jean Louis (1741-1806) — Swiss statesman, lawyer, advocate of constitutional monarchy. — 492

Desmoulins, Lucie Simplice Camille Bénét (1760-1794) — French publicist, leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, belonged to the Jacobin Right wing. — 287, 374

Dussault de Tracy, Antoine Louis Claude, Comte de (1754-1836) — French economist, philosopher, advocate of constitutional monarchy. — 217, 288, 319

Désamy, Théodore (1803-1850) — French publicist, advocate of utopian communism. — 143

Dickens, Charles John Hufham (1812-1870) — English writer. — 415

Dievig — manufacturer in Langenbielau (Silesia). — 533

Doherty, Hugh — Irish philologist and philosopher, follower of Fourier. — 396

Dubois-Crancé, Edmond Louis Alexis (1747-1814) — leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Montagnard. — 372

Ducos, Roger (1747-1816) — leading figure in the French Revolution, chairman of the Jacobin Club (1794); subsequently took part in the Bonapartist coup (1799). — 374

Dulau, Jacques Antoine (1755-1895) — leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, representative of the Marsh. — 362

Dumouriez, Charles François du Périer (1739-1823) — leading figure in the French Revolution, general, closely associated with the Girondists, betrayed revolutionary France in 1793. — 371, 372, 373

Duncombe, Thomas Stigingby (1796-1861) — English politician, radical, active in the Chartist movement in the forties. — 381, 383, 497

Edward III (1312-1377) — King of England (1327-77). — 194

Elizabeth I (1533-1603) — Queen of England (1558-1603). — 194, 495, 503

Elizabeth (1801-1873) — wife of Frederick William IV. — 207

Engelmann, Karl — Kreuznach doctor, witness at the marriage of Karl Marx and Jenny von Westphalen. — 574


Eules, Betty — sentenced to death for murdering her children to save them from dire poverty and starvation. — 449

Ewerbeck, August Hermann (1816-1850) — German doctor and man of letters, leader of the Paris communities of the League of the Just, later member of the Communist League. — 354
Ferrand, William Bushfield — English landowner, Tory supporter, member of the Young England group.— 447

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas von (1804-1872) — German philosopher.— 144, 232-34, 303, 327-29, 359, 349-52, 354-57, 406, 427, 461, 462, 463

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb (1762-1814) — German philosopher.— 404

Fleming, George Alexander — editor of the Owenist journal The New Moral World (1837-44); in 1845 founded the journal The Moral World which appeared for a few months.— 407

Fonblanque, Albany William (1793-1872) — English liberal journalist.— 509

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837) — French Utopian Socialist.— 143, 294, 355, 392, 394-96, 398, 412, 413, 435

Fournier-Lhéritier, Claude (called Fournier l'Américain) (1745-1825) — leading figure in the French Revolution, Cordelier.— 372

Frankenthaler — friend of Marx's family in Trier.— 578

Frederick William III (1770-1840) — King of Prussia (1797-1840).— 139-40

Frederick William IV (1795-1861) — King of Prussia (1840-61).— 134, 138-40, 184, 189-91, 193, 195-97, 199, 207-10, 406, 515, 516, 530, 571, 580

Frobel, Julius (1805-1893) — German educationalist and publisher of progressive literature.— 351-53

Funck — Trier notary.— 574

Funke, Georg Ludwig Wilhelm — German theologian, Right-wing Hegelian.— 287
deputy to the Convention, a Girondist leader.— 365

George I (1660-1727) — King of Great Britain and Ireland (1714-27).— 478, 491

George III (1738-1820) — King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820).— 478

Gerhard — Bonn official.— 574

Gibson, Thomas Milner (1806-1884) — English politician and statesman, free trader.— 505

Girard, Philippe Henri de (1775-1845) — French engineer, inventor.— 481

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898) — British politician and statesman, Tory and later Peelite, leader of the Liberal Party and head of a number of Liberal cabinets in the latter half of the 19th century.— 382

Godwin, William (1756-1836) — English writer and publicist, one of the founders of anarchism.— 486

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832) — German poet.— 154, 323, 324, 458, 461, 466

Gorsas, Antoine Joseph (1751-1793) — leading figure in the French Revolution, publicist, publisher of the newspaper Courrier de Versailles à Paris et de Paris à Versailles, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.— 372

Görts — Oberbürgermeister of Trier in 1844.— 574, 582

Graham, Sir James Robert George (1792-1861) — English statesman, Home Secretary in Peel's Cabinet (1841-46).— 381, 382, 500

Grégoire, Henri (1750-1831) — priest, took part in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Jacobin.— 253, 306

Gruppe, Otto Friedrich (1804-1876) — German publicist and philosopher, opponent of the Young Hegelians, attacked Bruno Bauer in 1842.— 327

Guadet, Marguerite Elie (1758-1794) — leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.— 365, 367, 370, 373, 374
Guerrier—French Socialist, close associate of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the 1840s.—354, 584

Gurowski, Adam (1805-1866)—Polish publicist, took part in the Polish uprising (1830-31); subsequently betrayed the national liberation movement and emigrated to the United States in 1849.—519

Hagen, Karl (1810-1866)—German historian and politician, Privatdocent at Heidelberg University.—352

Hallier, Karl Ludwig von (1768-1854)—Swiss lawyer and historian, supporter of absolutism.—287

Hamilton, Thomas (1789-1842)—English writer, author of *Men and Manners in North America*.—151, 153, 170

Hargreaves, James (d. 1778)—English inventor.—442, 479

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—4-16, 44-57, 58-74, 75-80, 82-104, 107, 108, 111-17, 121-25, 128-29, 130, 135, 136, 163, 175, 181, 241-58, 319, 326-34, 338-45, 404-06, 457, 461, 463, 486

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)—German revolutionary poet.—579, 580

Heine, Mathilde (1815-1883)—Heinrich Heine’s wife.—579

Herwegh, Georg (1817-1875)—German democratic poet.—146, 406, 577, 584

Hess, Moses (1812-1875)—German radical publicist, one of the chief representatives of “true socialism” in the mid-forties.—232, 300, 352, 406

Hespel, Carolina—see Westphalen, Caroline von

Hoffmann von Fallersleben, August Heinrich (1798-1874)—German poet and philologist.—515

Holbach, Paul Henri Dietrich, Baron d’ (1723-1789)—French philosopher, Enlightener.—380

Hume, David (1711-1776)—British philosopher, historian and economist.—472

Huntman, Benjamin (1704-1776)—English inventor.—484

J

Jettehan—see Simons, Henriette

Jonson, Benjamin (c. 1573-1637)—English dramatist.—451, 465

Joseph Égalité—see d’Orléans, Louis Philippe Joseph

Jung, Georg Gottlieb (1814-1886)—German publicist, Young Hegelian, one of the managers of the *Rheinische Zeitung*.—583

K

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804)—German philosopher.—404, 406

Kapp, Christian (1790-1874)—German philosopher. Young Hegelian, friend of Ludwig Feuerbach.—350, 352

Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir James Phillips (1804-1877)—English physician, public figure.—193

Keiler, Valentin—witness at the marriage of Karl Marx and Jenny von Westphalen.—574

Kepler, Johann (1571-1630)—German mathematician and astronomer.—459

Kernant, Armand Gui Simon de Coetrempré, Comte de (1742-1793)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.—363, 368

Kosegarten, Wilhelm (1792-1868)—German publicist.—287

L

Lacroix, Jean François (1754-1794)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention.
one of Danton’s supporters.—369, 374

La Fayette, Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de (1757-1834)—leading figure in the French Revolution, one of the leaders of the moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants); fled to Holland in 1793. —362

Lafitte, Jacques (1767-1844)—French banker and liberal politician, headed the government in the early period of the July monarchy (1830-31). —527, 528

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician, one of the leaders of the moderate Republicans in the forties. —132, 358

Lamennais, Hugues Felicite Robert de (1782-1854)—French abbot, publicist, Christian Socialist. —132, 399

Lameth, Alexander, Comte de (1760-1829)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Constituent Assembly, one of the leaders of the moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants); fled to Austria in 1793. —363, 367

Lameth, Charles, Comte de (1757-1832)—leading figure in the French Revolution, brother of Alexander Lameth, deputy to the Constituent Assembly, Feuillant; fled to Germany after August 10, 1792. —363, 367

Lancizolle, Karl Wilhelm von Deluze de (1796-1871)—German lawyer, author of works on the history of the German states. —287

Lanoisais, Jean Denis, Comte (1758-1827)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist. —365, 370

Lariviére, Pierre François Joachim Henri de (1761-1838)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist, after 9 Thermidor supporter of the restoration of monarchy. —370

La Source, Marie David Albin (1762-1793)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist. —372, 373

Lauderdale, James Maitland, 8th Earl of (1759-1839)—British politician and economist, criticised Adam Smith’s theories. —309

Lavoisier, Antoine Laurent (1743-1794)—French chemist. —470

Lehmann—friend of Heinrich Marx’s and Ludwig von Westphalen’s families in Trier. —576, 579

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, Baron von (1646-1716)—German philosopher and mathematician. —404

Leo, Heinrich (1789-1878)—German historian and publicist, ideologist of Junkerdom. —287

Le Peletier (or Lapelleter), de Saint-Fargeau, Louis Michel (1760-1793)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Jacobin. —366, 371

Leroux, Pierre (1797-1871)—French publicist, Utopian Socialist. —350, 399, 400

Levasseur de la Sarthe, Rene (1747-1834)—physician, leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Jacobin, author of the memoirs on the French Revolution. —361, 371, 374

Liebig, Justus von, Baron (1803-1873)—German chemist. —428, 440

Linné, Carl von (1707-1778)—Swedish naturalist, first devised the classification systems for plants and animals. —470

List, Friedrich (1789-1848)—German vulgar economist, advocated protectionism. —179, 421

Locke, John (1632-1704)—English dualist philosopher and economist. —478, 490

Lolme, de—see Delolme, Jean Louis

Loudon, Charles (1801-1844)—English doctor, member of the Commission for Investigating Factory Labour. —244

Louis XVI (1754-1793)—King of France (1774-92). —361, 371

Louis XVIII (Louis le Désiré) (1755-1824)—King of France (1814-15, 1815-24). —130
Louis Philippe I (1773-1850) — Duke of Orleans, King of the French (1830-48).—130, 255, 391, 527, 528

Louvet de Couvrai, Jean Baptiste (1760-1797) — French writer, political figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist. — 365, 369, 370, 371

Lucian (c. 120-c. 180) — Greek satirist. — 179

Ludwig I Karl August (1786-1868) — King of Bavaria (1825-48).—518, 521, 522

Luther, Martin (1483-1546) — outstanding figure of the Reformation, founder of Protestantism (Lutheranism) in Germany, German burghers' ideologist.—182, 290, 291, 400, 401, 422
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Macleod, John Loudon (1756-1836) — Scottish inventor, who revolutionised road-building. — 484

McCulloch, John Ramsay (1789-1864) — British economist who vulgarised David Ricardo's theories.—192, 288, 375, 420, 424

Malhuer, Thomas Robert (1766-1884) — English clergyman and economist, founder of the misanthropic theory of population.—194, 309, 380, 420, 437-40, 452

Marat, Jean Paul (1743-1793) — leading figure in the French Revolution, prominent Jacobin.—363-65, 368-70, 372-74

Marcus — pseudonym used by an author of pamphlets propagating Malthus' theory, published in England in the 1830s.—437

Markus, Gaius (c. 156-86 B. C.) — Roman soldier and statesman, consul (107, 104-100, 86).—492

Marshall, John (1783-1841) — British economist and statistician. — 254

Martin du Nord, Nicolas Ferdinand Marie Louis Joseph (1790-1847) — French lawyer and politician, Minister of Justice and Cults during the July monarchy (since 1840).—149

Marx, Caroline (1824-1847) — sister of Karl Marx.—577

Marx, Heinrich (1777-1888) — father of Karl Marx.—573

Marx, Henriette (née Pressburg) (1787-1863) — mother of Karl Marx.—578, 577, 583

Marx, Henriette — see Simons, Henriette

Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen) (1814-1881) — wife of Karl Marx.—351, 357, 571-84

Marx, Jenny (1844-1883) — daughter of Karl Marx.—576, 577, 579, 581, 582, 584

Marx, Karl (1818-1883).—132, 133, 134, 139, 141-43, 188, 189, 202, 231, 292, 349-57, 406, 416, 571-84

Marx, Sophie — see Schmalkauen, Sophie

Maurer, Friedrich Wilhelm (1813-c. 1882) — German writer, democrat, member of the League of Outlaws, later of the League of the Just.—351-53

Mayer, Elias — witness at the marriage of Karl Marx and Jenny von Westphalen.—574

Metternich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Fürst von (1773-1859) — Austrian statesman and diplomat, Minister for Foreign Affairs (1809-21), Chancellor (1821-48), one of the organisers of the Holy Alliance.—209

Michel — cousin of Jenny Marx.—583

Michelot, Jules (1788-1874) — French historian.—411

Mill, James (1773-1836) — British economist, and philosopher.—211, 224, 284, 288, 291, 311, 312, 319, 321, 375, 420, 486

Mohammed Seghir — Caliph of Algeria, who headed Abd-el-Kader's troops in the 1840s.—529

Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat, Barón de la Brede et de (1699-1755) — French philosopher and sociologist, Enlightener.—5, 138

Morison, James (1770-1840) — English entrepreneur who amassed his wealth through the sale of so-called Morison's pills.—456, 457, 466
Moser, Justus (1720-1794) — German historian and politician, one of the founders of the conservative-romanticist trend in historiography. — 287

Mundt, Theodor (1808-1861) — German writer, belonging to the Young Germany literary group, professor of literature in Breslau and Berlin. — 413

Münzer, Thomas (c. 1490-1525) — leader of the urban mob and the poor peasants during the Reformation and the Peasant War in Germany, preached utopian equalitarian communism. — 172, 400

d‘Orléans, Louis Philippe Joseph, Duc (called Philippe Égalité) (1747-1793) — cousin of the King of France Louis XVI, sided with the Revolution in 1789, deputy to the Convention. — 364, 365, 368, 370, 371

Ottini — member of the princely Roman family which was in constant rivalry with the Colonna family; leader of the Guelph party. — 359-40, 543, 548, 549, 554

Owen, Robert (1771-1858) — British Utopian Socialist. — 297, 386, 387, 398
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Pachet, Jean Nicolas (1746-1823) — leading figure in the French Revolution, Jacobin, Minister of War and Mayor of Paris (October 1792-May 1794). — 365, 371, 372

Paine, Thomas (1737-1809) — English publicist, Republican, took part in the American War of Independence and in the French Revolution. — 387

Parisot, Jacques Théodore — translator of James Mill’s Elements of Political Economy into French. — 211

Paulus, Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob (1761-1851) — German Protestant theologian, supporter of the rationalist trend in Lutheranism. — 350

Pecqueur, Constantin (1801-1887) — French economist, Utopian Socialist. — 243, 254

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850) — English statesman, Tory, Prime Minister (1841-46), repealed the Corn Laws in 1846. — 382, 390-91, 445, 491

Pelisse — sergeant of the French army in Algeria during the campaign in the 1840s. — 529

Pélissier de Villeneuve, Jérôme (1753-1794) — leading figure in the French Revolution, Mayor of Paris in 1792, deputy to the Convention, Girondist. — 362, 363, 365, 367, 368, 370

Petigand — lieutenant of the French Army in Algeria, Commandant of Biskra in 1844. — 529
Phalaris (c. 571-555 B.C.)—tyrant of Agrigentum in ancient Sicily; according to legend, burned his opponents in a brazen bull.—454

Philippeaux, Pierre Nicolas (1754-1794)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Right Jacobin, one of Danton’s supporters.—354, 369, 374

Plato (c. 427-c. 347 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—59
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Poppey—friend of Heinrich Marx’s and Ludwig von Westphalen’s families in Trier.—579

Porter, George Richardson (1792-1852)—English economist and statistician.—485

Pressburg, Henriette—see Marx, Henriette

Priestley, Joseph (1733-1804)—English chemist and materialist philosopher, public figure.—470

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French publicist, economist and sociologist, one of the founders of anarchism.—143, 201, 241, 280, 294, 313, 316, 317, 356, 399, 412
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Rebecqui, François Trophime (1760-1794)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.—564, 569

Reverchon—friend of Heinrich Marx’s and Ludwig von Westphalen’s families in Trier.—579

Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—English economist.—192, 211, 256, 284, 288, 291, 309-11, 321, 375, 420, 424, 428

Ricke, Johann Anton—witness to the signing of the marriage contract between Karl Marx and Jenny von Westphalen in Kreuznach.—572

Rienzi, Cola di (more correctly, Rienzo) (1319-1354)—Italian statesman and leader (people’s tribune) of the Roman Republic (1347) and ruler (senator) of Rome (1354); looked for support from the masses in the struggle with the feudal aristocracy.—537, 541, 542, 546-48, 550, 553, 555-57, 559-65
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Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-1794)—leading figure in the French Revolution, leader of the Jacobins, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94).—199, 363-65, 367, 369, 370, 371, 373, 473, 492

Ruholl—uncle of Theodor Simons.—583

Roland de la Platière, Jean Marien (1754-1795)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Minister of the Interior, a leader of the Girondists.—364, 365, 369, 370, 371

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—French philosopher and writer of the Enlightenment.—167, 380, 387
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Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de (1760-1825)—French Utopian Socialist.—214, 288, 294, 394, 396, 398

Salles, Jean Baptiste (1760-1794)—leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.—370

Sand, George (pseudonym of Aurore Dupin, Baronne Dudevant) (1804-1876)—French writer, representative of the democratic trend in romanticism.—399, 415

Santerre, Antoine Joseph (1752-1809)—leading figure in the French Revolution, Commander of the Paris National Guard (1792-93), Girondist supporter.—372

Say, Jean Baptiste (1767-1832)—French economist, one of the founders of the “three production factors” theory.—247, 250, 259-61, 284, 291, 310, 319-21, 375, 424-26

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von (1775-1854)—German philosopher.—349-51, 404, 450, 461, 463

Schenck.—Cologne official.—574

Schleicher, Rofcert—Trier doctor, friend of Karl Marx’s family.—571, 578, 579

Schmalhausen, Sophie (1816-1888)—sister of Karl Marx.—577, 579

Schmuthausen.—Düsseldorf publisher.—352

Schulte-Bodmer, Wilhelm (1797-1860)—German publicist, democrat.—242, 254, 258

Servan de Gerber, Joseph (1741-1808)—leading figure in the French Revolution, general, Minister of War in 1792, Girondist.—365, 371

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616)—English poet and dramatist.—87, 180, 323, 324, 465

Shelley, Percy Bysshe (1792-1822)—English poet, revolutionary romantic.—380, 387

Siebenkäs.—Friend of Karl Marx’s family in Paris.—579

Sieges, Emmanuel Joseph (1748-1836)—leading figure in the French Revolution, abbot, deputy to the Convention, moderate constitutionalist (Feuillant).—362

Silery, Charles Alexis Pierre Brulart, Comte de Genlis, Marquis de (1737-1793)—leading figure in the French Revolution, general, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.—371

Simons, Henriette (1820-c. 1856)—sister of Karl Marx.—577, 582, 583

Simons, Theodor (b. 1813)—architect, husband of Henriette Marx.—582

Sismondi, Jean Charles Léonard Simonde de (1773-1842)—Swiss economist, representative of economic romanticism.—257, 287

Skarbek, Frédéric Florian (1792-1866)—Polish economist and writer, follower of Adam Smith.—319-21


Southweil, Charles (1814-1850)—English Utopian Socialist, follower of Robert Owen.—380, 388

Spinoza, Baruch (or Benedict) (1632-1677)—Dutch philosopher.—463

Staël, Madame de (Anne Louise Germaine, Baronne de Staël-Holstein, née Necker) (1766-1817)—French romantic writer.—412

Stein, Lorenz von (1815-1890)—German lawyer and historian, author of works on the socialist movement, supporter of “social monarchy”—388

Steinmann, Friedrich (1801-1875)—German publicist and man of letters.—517
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leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, representative of the Marsh, one of the chief participants in the Thermidorian coup.— 372
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Thompson, Thomas Perronet (1783-1869) —
English politician and economist, free trader.— 428

Thuriot de La Rosière, Jacques Alexandre (1753-1829) —
leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, for a time supported the Jacobins.— 369

Toquet de La Rozière, Jacques Alexandre (1753-1829) —
leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, for a time supported the Jacobins.— 369

Tocqueville, Alexis Charles Henri Maurice Céré (1805-1859) —
French liberal historian and politician.— 151

Tooke, John Horne (1736-1812) —
English radical politician.— 487

Tschech, Heinrich Ludwig (1789-1844) —
Prussian official, democrat, burgomaster of Storkow in 1832-41; executed for an attempt on the life of Frederick William IV.— 580
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Ure, Andrew (1773-1857) —
English chemist and economist, free trader.— 443
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Valazé, Éléonor Bernard Anne Christophe de Friche, Baron de (1751-1793) —
leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.— 369

Valence, Cyrus Marie Alexandre de Timbourn-Timbronne, Comte de (1757-1822) —
leading figure in the French Revolution, general, Dumouriez's comrade-in-arms.— 370

Vergniaud, Pierre Victoire (1758-1793) —
leading figure in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, one of the Girondist leaders.— 362, 364, 369, 371

Villehardouin, François (1610-1656) —
French publicist, follower of Fourier.— 297

Vincke, Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig, Baron von (1774-1844) —
Prussian statesman.— 287

Voltaire, François Marie Arnaud de (1694-1778) —
French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment.— 380, 387
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Wade, John (1788-1875) —
English publicist, economist and historian.— 433, 441, 507, 509

Wallace, Sir William (c. 1270-1305) —
leader of the Scottish uprising against British domination.— 528

Walter, John (1776-1847) —
English politician, associated with the Tories.— 447

Watt, James (1736-1819) —
Scottish engineer, inventor of the steam-engine.— 428, 479, 480, 482

Watts, John (1815-1887) —
English Utopian Socialist, follower of Robert Owen.— 385-88, 398

Wedgwood, Josiah (1730-1795) —
English pottery manufacturer, who devised improved pottery techniques.— 479

Weill, Alexandre (Abraham) (1811-1899) —
German journalist, democrat, lived as an émigré in France in the forties.— 352

Weitling, Wilhelm Christian (1808-1871) —
one of the early leaders of the working-class movement in Germany, tailor by trade, one of the theoreticians of utopian equalitarian commu-
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— in bourgeois society—198, 263-64, 263-70, 307, 322
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— contradictions between legislative power and constitution—54, 55, 57-58
See also Executive, Hegel’s teaching on the state, Parliament, State
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