viler, meaner and more hateful than ever. This is yet another part of the punishment for the glorious liberation of Switzerland from the talons of the two-headed eagle and the much boasting that went with it. And for the cup of punishment to be filled to the brim Austria itself has to be in such a pass that it could not give William Tell's sons any help whatever.

Written about November 10, 1847
First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 91, November 14, 1847
Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
When, during the last session of the Legislative Chambers, M. E. de Girardin had brought to light those numerous and scandalous facts of corruption which he thought would overthrow the government; when, after all, the government had maintained themselves against the storm; when the celebrated Two Hundred and Twenty-Five declared themselves "satisfied" as to the innocence of the ministry, all seemed to be over, and the Parliamentary Opposition, towards the close of the session, fell back into the same impotency and lethargy which they had manifested at the beginning. But all was not over. Though Messrs Rothschild, Fould, Foulchiron, and Co. were satisfied, the people were not, nor was a large portion of the middle classes. The majority of the French bourgeoisie, especially those of the second and third rank, could not but see that the present class of electors became more and more the obedient servants of a small number of bankers, stock-jobbers, railway-speculators, large manufacturers, landed and mining proprietors, whose interest was the only interest cared for by the government. They saw that there was no hope for them ever to regain the position in the Chambers which, since 1830, they had been losing more and more every day, unless they extended the suffrage. They knew that electoral and parliamentary Reform was a dangerous experiment for them to try; but what could they do? Seeing that the haute finance, the lords of Paris Exchange, bought up the government and both the Chambers; seeing their own interests openly trampled upon; they were obliged either to submit patiently, and await humbly and
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a The majority in the Chamber of Deputies supporting the Guizot government.—Ed.
quietly the day when the encroachments of the ruling money lords would make them bankrupts, or to risk parliamentary Reform. They preferred the latter.

The Opposition, of all shades, therefore, united, some four months ago, in getting up a demonstration in favour of Electoral Reform. A public dinner was arranged and took place in July, at the Château-Rouge ball-rooms, at Paris. All fractions of Reformers were represented, and the assembly was rather mixed; but the Democrats, having been the most active, evidently predominated. They had made it a condition of their assistance, that the king's health should not be drunk, but be replaced by a toast in favour of the sovereignty of the people; the committee knowing well that in the most democratic town of France they could not get up a decent demonstration without the Democrats, were obliged to comply. If I recollect rightly, you gave, at the time, a full account of the banquet,¹⁷⁹ which was in every respect more like a demonstration of the strength, both in number and intellect, of democracy at Paris, than anything else.

The Journal des Débats failed not to raise a terrible outcry about this banquet.

"What! no toast to the king? and this toast not omitted by negligence, by want of a sense of propriety—no, this omission put as a condition for their support by part of the getters-up! Why, what pretty company this calm and peaceful M. Duvergier de Hauranne—this moral-force, monarchical M. Odilon Barrot have got into! Why, this is not mere republicanism—this is revolutionism, physical-forcism, socialism, utopianism, anarchism and communism! Ah, but, gentlemen, we know you—we have had samples of your bloody deeds, we have proofs of what you are contending for! Fifty years ago, gentlemen, you called yourselves the club of the Jacobins!"¹⁸⁰

Next day's National replied to the fierce and furious vituperation of the furiously moderate paper by a host of quotations from Louis Philippe's private journal, written in 1790 and 1791, where every day's note of the then "Citizen Égalité" commenced with the words:

"To-day I was at the Jacobins"—"To-day I took the liberty of saying a few words at the Jacobins which were warmly applauded"—"To-day I was called to the office of door-keeper at the Jacobins", etc.⁵

The central committee of the Opposition had invited their friends in the country to imitate the example given by the metropolis, in
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¹ Louis Philippe.—*Ed.*

² The name which Duke of Orleans, Louis Philippe's father, took during the French Revolution.—*Ed.*

getting up everywhere similar banquets in favour of Reform. This was done accordingly, and a great number of Reform dinners were held in almost all parts of France. But not everywhere the same union of all fractions of Reformers could be made to prevail. In a great number of the smaller towns the middle-class Liberals were strong enough to carry the king's health being drunk, by which the Democrats were excluded. In other localities they tried to make it pass in the shape of a toast:—"The constitutional king, and the sovereignty of the people." This being not yet sufficient to the Democrats, they went on shuffling, and replaced the "constitutional king" by the "constitutional institutions", among which royalty, of course, was tacitly comprised. The great question now agitated among the provincial Liberals is, whether they are to give up even this, and to resign all attempts at carrying the king's health in whatever shape or disguise it be, or whether they are to separate openly from the Democrats, who, in that case, would get up separate and competing banquets. For the democratic party insist upon the original agreement, that the king be not mixed up at all with the affair, and if in one case the National has been wavering a little, the party of the Réforme stand firmly on the side of republicanism. In all the large towns the Liberals have been forced to give way, and if in the localities of lesser importance they have carried the king's health, it is because such banquets cost a great deal of money, and, therefore, the people are naturally excluded from them. On the occasion of the banquet of Bar-le-Duc, the Réforme says:

"Whoever would take such demonstration as a sample of the state of public opinion in France, would be very much mistaken indeed; they are got up by the middle classes only, and the people are entirely shut out from them. This agitation, if it be confined to the limits of the Bar-le-Duc banquet, will vanish like all bourgeois movements; like the Free Trade movement, which after a few hollow speeches died away very soon."

The first large banquet, after that of Paris, was held at Strasburg, in the beginning of September. It was rather a democratic one, and a working man, at the close of it, proposed a toast to the organisation of labour, which term, in France, expresses that which in England the National Association of United Trades[181] are trying to carry out; viz. the freeing of labour from the oppression of capital by carrying on manufacturing, agricultural, and other purposes, for the account, either of the associated working men themselves, or of the people at large, under a democratic government.

Then came the banquets of Bar-le-Duc, a bourgeois demonstration, finished by the Mayor proposing the health of the Constitutional
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[181] "Banquet de Bar-le-Duc".—Ed.
King (very constitutional, indeed); of Colmar, Rheims, and Meaux, all of them entirely dominated by the bourgeoisie, who, in those secondary towns, always have it all their own way.

But the banquet of Saint-Quentin, again, was more or less democratic; and that of Orleans, in the last days of September, was, from beginning to end, a thoroughly democratic meeting. Judge of it by the toast to the working classes, responded to by M. Marie, one of the most celebrated barristers of Paris, and a democrat. He commenced his speech in the following terms:

"To the working men—to those men, always neglected and forgotten, but always faithful to the interests of their country, always ready to die for its cause, be it in defending their native land against foreign aggression, be it in guarding our institutions, when menaced by inward foes! To those, from whom we demanded the days of July,\(^{182}\) and who gave them to us; terrible in their actions, generous in their triumph, resplendent with courage, probity, and disinterestedness!"\(^{a}\)

and concluded the toast in these words: "Liberty, equality, fraternity!" It is characteristic that the Orleans banquet was the only one at which we find it stated that covers were reserved for the representatives of the working people.

The banquets of Culommiers, Melun, and Cosne, again, were mere bourgeoisie gatherings. The "Left Centre", the middle-class Liberals of the Constitutionnel and Siècle, amused themselves in listening to the speeches of MM. Barrot, Beaumont, Drouyn de Lhuys, and such like retailers of Reform. At Cosne, the democrats openly declared against the demonstration, because the king's health was insisted upon. The same narrow spirit prevailed at the banquet of La Charité, on the Loire.

In return, the Reform dinner of Chartres was thoroughly democratic. No toast to the king—toasts for Electoral and Parliamentary Reform upon the largest base, for Poland and Italy, for the organisation of labour.

This week banquets will take place at Lille, Valenciennes, Avesnes, and throughout the Department of the North generally. Those of Lille and Valenciennes, at least, will probably take a decidedly democratic turn. In the South of France, at Lyons, and in the West, other demonstrations are preparing. The Reform Movement is far from being near to its close.

You see from this account that, from its very beginning, the Reform Movement of 1847 has been marked by a struggle betwixt the Liberals and the Democrats; that while the Liberals carried their ends in all the smaller localities, the Democrats were the stronger in

\(^{a}\) Quoted from the article "Banquet réformiste du département du Loiret".—Ed.
all large towns: in Paris, Strasburg, Orleans, Chartres, and even in one smaller town, in Saint-Quentin; that the Liberals were very anxious of having the support of the Democrats; that they shuffled and made concessions, while the Democrats never retracted an iota of the condition under which they were ready to give their support, and that wherever the Democrats assisted, they had it all their own way. Thus, after all, the whole movement has been turned to the profit of democracy, for all those banquets which excited public attention in some degree, were, one and all, democratic.

The Reform movement was seconded by the Departmental Councils, who met in September, and who are entirely composed by bourgeois. The Councils of the Departments of the Côté-d'Or, of Finisterre, of the Aisne, the Moselle, the Haut-Rhin, the Oise, the Vosges, the North, and others, demanded, more or less, extensive reforms, all of them, of course, confined to the limits of bourgeois Liberalism.

But what, will you ask, are the reforms demanded? There are as many different systems of reform, as there are shades of Liberals and Radicals. The least thing asked for, is the extension of the Suffrage, to what is called the capacities, or what you, in England, would call the learned professions, even if they do not pay the 200 francs of direct taxes, which make, at present, a man a voter. Then the Liberals have some other propositions, more or less in common with the Radicals. These are:—

1st. The extension of the incompatibilities, or the declaring of certain government offices to be incompatible with the functions of a representative. The government have, at present, more than 150 of their subordinate employees in the Deputies, all of which may, at any moment, be cashiered, and are, therefore, entirely dependent upon the Ministry.

2nd. The enlargement of some electoral districts, some of which are composed of less than 150 voters, who are, therefore, entirely ruled through the influence of the government upon their local and personal interests.

3rd. The electing of all deputies of a Department in a full meeting of all the electors, assembled at its principal town, by which means local interests are intended to be more or less submerged in the common interests of the whole Department, and thus render nugatory the corruption and influence of the government.

Then, there are proposals for lowering the amount of the voting qualification in different degrees. The most radical of these propositions is that of the National, the paper of the Republican small tradesmen, for extending the suffrage to all men belonging to
the National Guard. This would give the vote to the entire class of small tradesmen and shopkeepers, and extend the suffrage in the same degree as the Reform Bill has done in England; but the consequences of such a measure would, in France, be much more important. The small bourgeoisie in this country are so much oppressed and squeezed by the large capitalists, that they would be obliged to have recourse to direct aggressive measures against the moneylords, as soon as they get the suffrage. As I said in an article I sent you some months ago, they would be carried further and further, even against their own consent; they would be forced either to give up the positions already won, or to form an open alliance with the working classes, and that would, sooner or later, lead to the Republic. They know this in some measure. Most of them support Universal Suffrage, and so does the National, which goes for the above measure only, as far as it is considered as a preliminary step in the road of reform. Of all Parisian daily papers, there is, however, but one which will not be satisfied with anything less than Universal Suffrage, and which, by the term “Republic”, understands not merely Political Reforms, which will, after all, leave the working classes as miserable as before—but Social Reforms, and very definite ones too. This paper is the Réforme.

The Reform movement is, however, not to be considered as the totality of the agitation now going on in France. Far from it! At all these banquets be they Liberal or Democratic, the middle classes were predominating; that of Orleans was the only one in which working men took part. The movement of the working people is going on, side by side, with these banquets, silently, underground, almost invisible, for every one who does not take the trouble of looking after it. But it is going on more lively than ever. The government know this very well. They have given their permission to all these middle-class banquets; but when the typographic working men of Paris, in September, asked for the permission to hold their annual banquet, which, up to the present time, they had held every year, and which was in no manner of a political character, it was refused to them. The government are so afraid of the working people, that they do not allow them the slightest liberty. They are afraid, because the people have entirely given up all attempts at insurrection and rioting. The government desire a riot, they provoke it by every means. The police throw out small bombshells filled with incendiary papers; which, by the explosion of the shell, are spread all over the streets. A trades’ affair in the Rue S. Honoré was profited by
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* See this volume, p. 219.—*Ed.
to make the most brutal attacks upon the people, in order to provoke them to riot and violence. Tens of thousands assembled every evening during a fortnight; they were treated in the most infamous manner; they were on the very brink of repelling force by force; but they held out and no pretext for more gagging laws are to be forced from them. And think, what a tacit understanding, what a common feeling of what was to be done, at the moment, must have prevailed; what an effort it must have cost to the people of Paris, to submit to such infamous treatment rather than try a hopeless insurrection. What an enormous progress this forebearance proves in those very same working men of Paris, who seldom went into the streets, without battering to pieces every thing before them; who are accustomed to insurrection, and who go into a revolution just as gaily as they go to the wineshop! But if you would draw from this the conclusion that the revolutionary ardour of the people is decreasing, you would be quite mistaken. On the contrary, the necessity of a revolution, and a revolution more thoroughgoing, more radical by far than the first one, is deeper than ever felt by the working people here. But they know from the experience of 1830, that mere fighting will not do; that the enemy once beaten, they must establish measures that will guarantee the stability of their conquest; that will destroy not only the political, but the social power of capital, that will guarantee their social welfare, along with their political strength. And, therefore, they very quietly await their opportunity, but, in the meantime, earnestly apply themselves to the study of those questions of social economy, the solution of which will show what measures alone can establish, upon a firm basis, the welfare of all. Within a month or two, six thousand copies of M. Louis Blanc’s work on “The Organisation of Labour”, have been sold in the workshops of Paris, and you must consider, that five editions of this book had been published before. They read likewise a number of other works upon these questions; they meet in small numbers of from ten to twenty, and discuss the different plans propounded therein. They talk not much of revolution, this being a thing admitting of no doubt, a subject upon which they one and all agree; and when the moment will have arrived, at which a collision between the people and the government will be inevitable, down they will be in the streets and squares at a moment’s notice, tearing up the pavement, laying omnibuses, carts and coaches, across the streets, barricading every alley, making every narrow lane a fortress, and advancing, in spite of all resistance, from the Bastille to the Tuileries. And then, I fear,
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most of the reform banquet gentry will hide themselves in the darkest corner of their houses, or be scattered like dead leaves before the popular thunderstorm. Then it will be all over with Messrs Odilon Barrot, de Beaumont and other Liberal thunderers, and then the people will judge them quite as severely as they now judge the Conservative Governments.

Written in early November 1847
Reprinted from the newspaper

First published in The Northern Star
No. 526, November 20, 1847
with an editorial note:
"From Our Paris Correspondent"
The opening of the recently elected Parliament that counts among its members distinguished representatives of the People's Party could not but produce extraordinary excitement in the ranks of democracy. Everywhere the local Chartist associations are being reorganised. The number of meetings increases and the most diverse ways and means of taking action are being proposed and discussed. The Executive of the National Charter Association has just assumed leadership of this movement, outlining in an address to the British democrats the plan of campaign which the party will follow during the present session.

“In a few days,” we are told, “a meeting will be held which in the face of the people dares to call itself the assembly of the commons of England. In a few days this assembly, elected by only one class of society, will begin its iniquitous and odious work of strengthening the interests of this class, to the detriment of the people.

“The people must protest en masse at the very beginning against the exercise of the legislative functions usurped by this assembly. You, Chartists of the United Kingdom, you have the means to do so; it is your duty to use them to advantage. We therefore submit to you a new national petition with the demands of the People's Charter. Cover it with millions of your signatures. Make it possible for us to present it as the expression of the will of the nation, as the solemn protest of the people against every law passed without the consent of the people, as a Bill, finally, for the restoration of the sovereignty out of which the nation has been tricked for so many centuries.

“But the petition by itself will not suffice to meet the needs of the moment. True, we have won a seat in the legislative chamber by electing Mr. O'Connor. The democratic members will find him to be a vigilant and energetic leader. But O'Connor must be supported by pressure from without, and it is you who should create this pressure from without, this strong and imposing public opinion. Let the sections of our Association be reorganised everywhere; let all our former members rejoin our ranks; let meetings be called everywhere; let everywhere the Charter be made the issue of the day; let each locality contribute its share to increase our funds. Be active,
give proof of the old energy of the English and the campaign we are opening will be the most glorious ever undertaken for the victory of democracy.\(^3\)

The Fraternal Democrats,\(^1\) a society consisting of democrats from almost every nation in Europe, has also just joined, openly and unreservedly, in the agitation of the Chartists. They adopted a resolution of the following tenor:

"Whereas the English people will be unable effectively to support democracy's struggle in other countries until it has won democratic government for itself; and

"whereas our society, established to succour the militant democracy of every country, is duty-bound to come to the aid of the English democrats in their effort to obtain an electoral reform on the basis of the Charter;

"therefore the Fraternal Democrats undertake to support with all their strength the agitation for the People's Charter."

This fraternal society, which counts among its members the most distinguished democrats, both English and foreigners residing in London, is daily gaining in importance. It has grown to such proportions that the London liberals have considered it advisable to set up in opposition to it a bourgeois International League\(^2\) headed by Free-Trade parliamentary celebrities. The sole object of this new association, whose leadership includes Dr. Bowring, Col. Thompson and other champions of Free Trade, is to carry on Free-Trade propaganda abroad under cover of philanthropic and liberal phrases. But it seems that the association will not make much headway. During the six months of its existence it has done almost nothing, whereas the Fraternal Democrats have openly come out against any act of oppression, no matter who may attempt to commit it. Hence the democrats, both English and foreign, in so far as the latter are represented in London, have attached themselves to the Fraternal Democrats, declaring at the same time that they will not allow themselves to be exploited for the benefit of England's Free-Trade manufacturers.

Written on November 21, 1847
First published in *La Réforme,* November 22, 1847
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French

\(^1\) "The Executive Committee to the Chartists of the United Kingdom", November 18, 1847.—*Ed.*
\(^2\) Resolution of the Fraternal Democrats, November 15, 1847.—*Ed.*
Since my last a the banquets of Lille, Avesnes, and Valenciennes, have been held. Avesnes was merely constitutional; Valenciennes half-and-half; Lille a decided triumph of democracy over middle-class intrigue. Here are, shortly, the facts concerning this most important meeting:—

Besides the liberals and the party of the National the democrats of the Réforme had been invited, and Messrs Ledru-Rollin and Flocon, editor of the last-named paper, had accepted the invitation. M. Odilon Barrot, the virtuous middle-class thunderer, was also invited. Everything was ready, the toasts were prepared, when all of a sudden M. Odilon Barrot declared he could not assist, nor speak to his toast, “Parliamentary Reform”, unless that reform was qualified by adding:—“as a means to insure the purity and sincerity of the institutions conquered in July 1830.” This addition excluded, of course, the republicans. Great consternation of the committee ensued. M. Barrot was inflexible. At last it was resolved to submit the decision to the whole meeting. But the meeting very plainly declared they would have no alterations in the programme; they would not violate the understanding upon which the democrats had come to Lille. M. Odilon Barrot, along with his tail of liberal deputies and editors, scornfully retired; Messrs Flocon and Ledru-Rollin were sent for, the banquet took place in spite of the liberals, and M. Ledru’s speech was rapturously applauded.

Thus the treachery plot of the middle-class reformers resulted in a glorious triumph of democracy. M. Odilon Barrot had to decamp shamefully and will never dare to show his face again in the democratic city of Lille. His only excuse was, he had understood the
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a See this volume, pp. 375-82.—Ed.
gentlemen of the *Réforme* intended to profit by the Lille banquet to get up a revolution—in the very depth of tranquillity!

A few days after, M. Barrot got some consolation in the Avesnes banquet, a mere family meeting of some middle-class liberals. Here he had the pleasure of toasting the King. But at Valenciennes he was again obliged to pocket his favourite sentiment, dropped so sadly at Lille; no King's health was to be drunk, although the formidable getters-up of revolutions, at the shortest notice, were not at hand. The discomfited thunderer will have to devour his virtuous indignation until another hole-and-corner banquet will allow him to denounce “anarchism”, “physical forcism”, and “communism”, to the astounded grocers and tallow-chandlers of some petty provincial town.

The Lille banquet produced extraordinary discussions in the press. The Conservative papers shouted triumph at the division in the ranks of the reformers. M. Thiers' old and drowsy *Constitutionnel*, and the *Siècle*, M. Barrot's “own”, all of a sudden were seized with the most dreadful convulsions.

“No,” shouted the indignant *Siècle* to its shopkeeping public, “no, we are none of these anarchists, we have nothing in common with these restorers of the reign of terror, with these followers of Marat and Robespierre: we would prefer to their reign of blood the present system, were it even a hundred times worse than it is!”

And quite rightly; for such peaceful grocers and tallow-chandlers the white nightcap is a hundred times more fit than the red cap of the Jacobin. At the same time, however, that these papers heaped their vilest and most virulent abuse upon the *Réforme*, they treated the *National* with the utmost esteem. The *National*, indeed, has behaved, on this occasion, in a more than doubtful manner. Already at the banquet of Cosne, this paper blamed the conduct of several democrats who would not assist on account of the King's health being proposed. Now, again, it spoke very coolly of the Lille banquet, and deplored the accident which for a moment troubled the demonstration, while several provincial allies of the *National* openly attacked the conduct of Messrs Ledru and Flocon. The *Réforme* now asked of that paper a more explicit declaration. The *National* declared his article to be quite explicit enough. Then, asked the *Réforme*, what was the deplorable accident at Lille? What is it you deplore? Is it M. Barrot's or M. Ledru-Rollin's conduct you deplore? Is it M. Barrot's impudence or his bad luck you deplore? Is it M. Ledru's speech in favour of Universal Suffrage? Is it the discomfiture of monarchism, the triumph of democracy, you deplore? Do you avow, or not, what your provincial allies say on this occasion? Do you accept the praise
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of the Siècle, or do you take our part of the abuse it heaps upon us? Would you have advised M. Marie, your friend, to submit, if, at Orleans, M. Odilon Barrot had made similar pretensions? The National replied, from party motives they would have no controversy with the Réforme: they were not responsible for articles sent to provincial papers by a "friend" of theirs; as to the other questions, the past of the National allowed them to pass them unnoticed, and not to trouble themselves with a reply. The Réforme gave the whole of this reply, with this remark only:—"Our questions remain."* Democrats now have the documents under their eyes—they may judge for themselves. This they have done; a whole host of radical, and even liberal, papers of France have declared in the most decided terms for the Réforme.

The conduct of the National, indeed, deserves the strongest blame. This paper is getting more and more into the hands of the middle classes. It has of late always deserted the cause of democracy at the decisive moment; it has always preached union with the middle classes, and has on more than one occasion served none but Thiers and Odilon Barrot. If the National does not very soon change its conduct, it will cease to be counted as a democratic paper. And in this Lille affair, the National, out of mere personal antipathy against men more radical than itself, has not hesitated to sacrifice the very principles upon which [it] itself had contracted an alliance with the liberals in order to get up banquets. After what has passed, the National will never again be able to oppose seriously toasting the King at future banquets. The "past" of the National is not so very bright as to allow of its answering by silence only the questions of its contemporary. Think only of its defence of the Parisian Bastilles!191

P.S.—The Reform Banquet of Dijon has come off this week. Thirteen hundred sat down at dinner. The whole affair was thoroughly democratic. No toast to the King, of course. All the speakers belonged to the party of the Réforme. MM. Louis Blanc, Flocon, E. Arago, and Ledru-Rollin, were the chief speakers. M. Flocon, editor of the Réforme, spoke to the toast of the foreign democrats, and mentioned the English Chartists in a very honourable manner. Next week I shall give you his speech at full length, as well as a full report of the whole proceedings of this most important meeting.\b

Written at the end of November 1847

First published in The Northern Star
No. 528, December 4, 1847

\a La Réforme, November 16, 1847.—Ed.
\b See this volume, pp. 397-401 and 409-11.—Ed.
The unification and brotherhood of nations is a phrase on the lips of all parties today, especially those of bourgeois free traders. A certain kind of brotherhood does of course exist among the bourgeois classes of all nations. It is the brotherhood of the oppressors against the oppressed, of the exploiters against the exploited. Just as, despite the competition and conflicts existing between the members of the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois class of one country is united by brotherly ties against the proletariat of that country, so the bourgeois of all countries, despite their mutual conflicts and competition on the world market, are united by brotherly ties against the proletariat of all countries. For the peoples to be able truly to unite, they must have common interests. And in order that their interests may become common, the existing property relations must be done away with, for these property relations involve the exploitation of some nations by others: the abolition of existing property relations is the concern only of the working class. It alone has also the means for doing this. The victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie is, at the same time, victory over the national and industrial conflicts which today range the peoples of the various countries against one another in hostility and enmity. And so the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie is at the same time the signal of liberation for all oppressed nations.

The old Poland is lost in any case and we would be the last to wish for its restoration. But it is not only the old Poland that is lost. The old Germany, the old France, the old England, the whole of the old society is lost. But the loss of the old society is no loss for those who have nothing to lose in the old society, and this is the case of the great majority in all countries at the present time. They have rather
everything to gain by the downfall of the old society, which is the condition for the establishment of a new society, one no longer based on class antagonisms.

Of all countries, England is the one where the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is most highly developed. The victory of the English proletariat over the English bourgeoisie is, therefore, decisive for the victory of all the oppressed over their oppressors. Hence Poland must be liberated not in Poland but in England. So you Chartists must not simply express pious wishes for the liberation of nations. Defeat your own internal enemies and you will then be able to pride yourselves on having defeated the entire old society.

ENGELS' SPEECH

Allow me, dear friends, to speak here today as an exception in my capacity as a German. For we German democrats have a special interest in the liberation of Poland. It was German princes who derived great advantages from the division of Poland and it is German soldiers who are still holding down Galicia and Posen. The responsibility for removing this disgrace from our nation rests on us Germans, on us German democrats above all. A nation cannot become free and at the same time continue to oppress other nations. The liberation of Germany cannot therefore take place without the liberation of Poland from German oppression. And because of this, Poland and Germany have a common interest, and because of this, Polish and German democrats can work together for the liberation of both nations.—I also believe that the first decisive blow which will lead to the victory of democracy, to the liberation of all European nations, will be struck by the English Chartists. I have lived in England for a number of years now and openly aligned myself with the Chartist movement during this period. The English Chartists will be the first to rise because it is precisely in England that the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is the most intense. And why is it the most intense? Because in England, as a result of modern industry, of the introduction of machinery, all oppressed classes are being merged together into a single great class with common interests, the class of the proletariat; because as a consequence, on the opposite side all classes of oppressors have likewise been united into a single class, the bourgeoisie. The struggle has thus been simplified and so it will be possible to decide it by one single heavy blow. Isn't this so? The aristocracy no longer has any power in
England; the bourgeoisie alone rules and it has taken the aristocracy in tow. But the whole great mass of the people stands opposed to the bourgeoisie, united in a formidable phalanx, whose victory over the ruling capitalists draws nearer and nearer. And you have to thank machinery for this elimination of opposed interests which previously divided the different sections of workers, for this levelling of the living standards of all workers. Without machinery no Chartism, and although machinery may temporarily worsen your position it is nevertheless machinery that makes our victory possible. But not only in England; in all other countries it has had the same effect on the workers. In Belgium, in America, in France, in Germany it has evened out the position of all workers and daily continues to do so more and more; in all these countries the workers now have the same interest, which is the overthrow of the class that oppresses them—the bourgeoisie. This levelling of living standards, this identification of the party interests of the workers of all nations is the result of machinery, and so machinery is an enormous historical advance.

What follows from this for us? Because the condition of the workers of all countries is the same, because their interests are the same, their enemies the same, they must also fight together, they must oppose the brotherhood of the bourgeoisie of all nations with a brotherhood of the workers of all nations.

First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 98, December 9, 1847
Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
Dear Citizen!

I arrived yesterday evening just in time to attend the public meeting called to celebrate the anniversary of the Polish revolution of 1830.

I have been present at many similar celebrations but I have never seen such general enthusiasm, such perfect and cordial agreement between men of all nations.

The chairmanship was given to Mr. Arnott, an English workman.

The first speech was by Mr. Ernest Jones, editor of *The Northern Star*, who, while speaking against the behaviour of the Polish aristocracy during the insurrection of 1830, gave much praise to the efforts made by Poland to escape from the yoke of her oppressors. His brilliant and powerful speech was loudly applauded.

After him, M. Michelot gave a speech in French.

Mr. Schapper from Germany followed him. He told the meeting that the Brussels Democratic Association had delegated to London Mr. Marx, German democrat and one of its vice-presidents, to establish relations of correspondence between the Brussels society and the London society of Fraternal Democrats, and also to prepare for a democratic congress of the different European nations.

Mr. Marx was received with prolonged applause, when he came forward to address the assembly.

In a speech in German, translated by Mr. Schapper, Mr. Marx declared that England would give the signal for the deliverance of Poland. Poland, he said, would be free only when the civilised nations of Western Europe had won democracy. Now, of all the democracies of Europe, the strongest and most numerous was that of England, organised throughout the whole country. It was in England that the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was most developed, that the decisive struggle between these two classes...
became more and more inevitable. It was therefore in England that in all probability the fight would begin which would end with the universal triumph of democracy and which would also break the Polish yoke. The success of other European democrats depended on the victory of the English Chartists; therefore Poland would be saved by England.

Mr. Harney, chief editor of The Northern Star, followed by thanking the democrats of Brussels for having immediately approached the democrats of London, taking no account of the advances made to them by the bourgeoisie of the London International League, a society founded by the free traders in order to exploit foreign democrats in the interests of free trade and to compete with the society of Fraternal Democrats which was almost exclusively composed of workers.

Mr. Engels, from Paris, a German democrat, then declared that Germany had a special interest in the freedom of Poland because the German governments exercised their despotism over a part of Poland. German democracy ought to have at heart the ending of this tyranny which shamed Germany.

Mr. Tedesco, from Liège, in a vigorous speech, thanked the Polish fighters of 1830 for having loudly proclaimed the principle of insurrection. His speech, translated by Mr. Schapper, was warmly applauded.

After some remarks by Mr. Charles Keen, Colonel Oborski replied for Poland.

Mr. Wilson, an English workman who by his vigorous opposition recently almost brought about the break-up of a meeting of the International League, was the last to address the assembly.

On the proposal of Messrs Harney and Engels, three cheers were given for the three great European democratic newspapers: the Réforme, The Northern Star, and the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung; on the proposal of Mr. Schapper, three groans were given for the three anti-democratic papers: the Journal des Débats, The Times and the Augsburg Zeitung.a

The meeting ended with the singing of the Marseillaise, in which everybody joined, standing and with hats off.

Written on November 30, 1847
First published in La Réforme, December 5, 1847

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

a Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung.—Ed.
In response to the toast:—“To the labourers,—to their imprescriptible rights,—to their sacred interests, hitherto unknown.”

“Citizens,—Yes, to the labourers! to their imprescriptible rights,—to their sacred interests, hitherto unknown. To the unalienable rights of man, proclaimed in principle, by two glorious revolutions; but artfully eluded in their application, and successfully re-wrested from the people, and which are now only a glorious, yet bitter remembrance! Political rights to the people, it is said, is madness. How entrust them with them, in their state of incapacity, of ignorance, of moral depravity? To give the people political freedom is a blind and dangerous power; it is revolution—blood—anarchy—chaos! Gentlemen, you know the people; you in this industrial city, at once so wealthy and so poor, believe you this picture to be true! Oh! doubtless, if we cast our eyes over the pages of certain romance writers, to whom the grand side of things has appeared trivial, vulgar—who have sought for effect in the humorous, the fantastic, the exceptional, the people—is it thus! Taking the normal life of our towns, from one point, where criminals escaped from justice, find a refuge, the way of life, the dregs of society, they have said, 'Such are the people!' Doubtless such would still be the people, did we put faith in those mercenary writers, who, to terrify the wealthy, cry out against the invasion of the barbarians! Barbarians! they have cast that epithet upon the people, as the most outrageous of insults. Ah! if barbarians always signify men full of simplicity, of strength, of social and youthful energy, those barbarians can alone save our worn-out official world, fast hastening to decay in powerlessness and corruption. No; a thousand times no, it is not the people. It is not upon the theatre of crime and debauchery, that it must be sought for. To be acquainted with it, we must transport ourselves into those manufacturing towns, where the merchant, struggling against unrestricted competition which crushes him, between the tyrannical pressure

---

a Ledru-Rollin's speech at the banquet at Lille on November 7, 1847 was translated by Engels according to the report in La Réforme, November 10, 1847.—Ed.

b The reference is evidently to the revolutions of 1789-94 and 1830.—Ed.
of capital and opposition to wages, which eat him up, he is compelled to reduce those wages, in order to avoid bankruptcy and dishonour. Ah! believe not that the people, in their spirit of justice, always accuse the masters as the cause of that cruel necessity. Know they not that our industry fails for want of outlet; that we have seen the greatest number of the markets of the world closed against us; and that our commerce has perished, where our flag has been trampled under foot? Well; in the midst of those vicissitudes, of those fluctuations, of this crisis of wages, what befalls the workman? The labour of the father, no longer sufficing to procure bread for the family, the daughter prostitutes herself for food; the child must go to aid the formidable machine, and exhaust his unevolved strength; and by the side of those beauteous fabrics, the product of our industry, the eye wanders over rickety boys, faded girls, worn-out men, bent under the pressure of premature labour. And, nevertheless, of that physically decayed population—those who have escaped enervation, sickness—who have attained their proper height, will go forth to do battle for their country—nobly to encounter death beneath her banner. Such are the people of the towns, sociable, good, patient in the midst of those daily evils,—doing more, deriving from within themselves the light of knowledge, dealt out to them with such a niggardly hand, reading, sometimes composing verses upon their sufferings or their prospects, publishing journals, which enlighten and prepare those formidable problems, respecting the future fate of mankind! It is those people of the towns whom some writers, who only judge by their own flimsy minds, call barbarians!... In this slight and rapid sketch, we have only seen the people in their habitual life—their daily struggles; but were one of those unforeseen scourges, in which a fearful inundation sweeps off everything in its destructive course, a terrible fire, or a severe cholera suddenly to arise, who would be foremost in the cause of humanity? who would forget their families and their wives, upon their lowly couches? their children, who might die on the morrow? who would peril life, without counting the cost; and fly when the service was performed, without even leaving their names?—the people! Intelligence or devotedness, head or heart, the people are, therefore, worthy to exercise the rights to which they lay claim. And who are better aware of it than the citizens, who by the superhuman efforts of the people, have conquered the twofold tyranny of the nobility and the priesthood. It was to that clergy, to that nobility, as to the States of 1614, that a member of the bourgeoisie once said—‘You, our elder brothers, you, our younger brothers—for we are all brothers—forming but one and the same nation.’ And the clergy and the nobles attempted to make that courageous member of the third retract and their minions to scourge him, regarding a plebeian as of a conquered and inferior race.... Not only are the people worthy to represent themselves, but if justice is to be rendered, they can only be efficiently represented by themselves. Who, then, in a legislative chamber knows sufficiently, at this present moment, their interests, their wants to dare to defend them? There are many men, gentlemen, who would unite in our principle of Reform; for it is now made evident—but they still dread the advance of democracy; yet never has a solemn and decisive movement, in the onward march of humanity, been preceded by more significant auguries! Let us pass rapidly in review those transcendent men of our own age. Towering above all, is one, whose prophetic speech is engraven on every heart. ‘Before fifty years,’ said Napoleon, ‘Europe will be Cossack or Republican.’... It shall not be Cossack—and in this patriotic city exists the right so to say. If doubt could ever have prevailed, it would assuredly not have been in the midst of those whose love of national independence and of the revolution of 1792, transformed each citizen into a hero! Republican—but I pause, gentlemen—the laws of September 198 are in force, and in order to be strong, when armed in a good cause, we must know how to keep within the law. I shall, therefore, only permit myself to choose, as interpreters of my thoughts, a few men, whose very names shed a glory over
their country. He, for example, who has sung the high hymn of legitimacy, and who has achieved renown, in essaying to restore the ancient ruins of the past. Chateaubriand, in his sincerity, has been unable to avoid regarding the approaching future of the world, as tending towards democracy.... Beranger, whose patriotic hymns will be eternally repeated by the world—hymns, which we, his contemporaries, ought to teach to our children as a prayer, whilst a Waterloo remains to be avenged!! Beranger believes in the approaching sovereignty of the people. And Lamartine, sparkling with poetry, with eloquence, has passed by legitimacy—he has traversed the marshes of the plain, in order to approach nearer to us. Though an ardent admirer of the Girondists, yet the noble candour of his mind leads him to draw conclusions favourable to the Radicals. There is a something, however, which still divides him from pure democracy; as for myself, I only behold the steps of giants, each day rapidly striding towards us. So much for men of letters, gentlemen, and that unanimous testimony rendered by such illustrations in favour of our party, might suffice for its hopes. But cast your eyes into the domain of science; behold a man who is at the summit of all—of whom the two worlds would deprive us—Arago! But for an imperious duty he would have been here in the midst of you. He would, much better than I am able, have spoken to you of the rights of the people; he who was the first to advocate their cause in another assembly, where to do so required no small amount of moral courage. Is not, then, Arago entirely for democracy? And in the arts, who with his powerful chisel draws forth, from marble, those men who have best served the people? Who confides to the eternity of bronze those grand revolutionary figures, to bequeath them to the admiration of future ages? David of Angers! Is he not, also, for the cause of the people? Well, when so many illustrious men declare in favour of democracy, or struggle for its attainment, how conclude otherwise than that right and Providence combat with us, and for us? Those are the teachings of talented men; but have not the teachings of the people also their manifestations? Look at Poland—heroic Poland—the last pulsations of whose heart still throb for liberty—no longer possessing an army; each day some martyr consecrates himself to her cause. Italy; she too longs for unity. She emerges from her ruins, which constituted her glory, in order to acquire fresh renown. May she on awakening distrust herself; let her remember Masaniello. Switzerland:—I feel that I ought well to weigh my words at this solemn moment. We can do one thing, gentlemen, we can unite ourselves for an instant, by recollection, by thought, with those whom we look upon as brothers, in order to pray that victory may be with them, as have hitherto been right and reason! The cause of Switzerland is ours, gentlemen; the Radicals there wage war against two things, which are the plague-spots of our era—aristocrats and worthless priests. Respect our creeds, but war against those who, under the mask of religion, are the abettors of despotism, and of tyranny. Short-sighted beings! who see not in this double association of genius and of the people, the near advent of a Messiah of equality! Thus then, O people, to whom I would sacrifice all that I possess of devotedness and strength, hope, and believe. Between this period, in which thy ancient faith is extinguished, and in which the new light has not yet been showered upon you, each evening in thy desolate dwelling piously repeat the immortal symbol—LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY! Yes, liberty for all; liberty of conscience; liberty of thought, liberty of association; for man cannot become moral without communing with man, and it is in order the better to subjugate him that he is isolated by a system of corruption. They know that a bundle of sticks cannot be broken. Equality likewise for all—equality in presence of civil law, equality in political matters, equality in education, in order that man may have no superior, except in morals or in virtue! Fraternity—inexhaustible source, from whence will spring noble and celebrated institutions; of association, of strength. Then labour will no longer be a right, it will be a duty. Let there be no more
revenues, except from labour and for labour. Yes, salvation. O great and immortal symbol, thy advent draws nigh! People, may the plaudits bestowed on thy humble interpreter be wafted to thee, and prove at once a consolation and a hope!"

Compiled and translated into English in the first half of December 1847

First published in *The Northern Star* No. 530, December 18, 1847

with editorial note:
"From Our Paris Correspondent"
Frederick Engels

REFORM MOVEMENT IN FRANCE.—
BANQUET OF DIJON

This meeting of the Democracy of the Department of the Côte d'Or, was incontestably the most splendid one of the whole series of Reform Banquets. 1,300 sat down to dinner. There were present deputations from almost all the neighbouring towns, and even a Swiss deputation, composed of citizens from Neufchâtel, Geneva and Lucerne. The character of the meeting is very clearly marked out by the names of the principal speakers—MM. Louis Blanc, Flocon, Ledru-Rollin, Etienne Arago—all of them belonging to the Ultra-Democratic party, represented by the Réforme. We need not say that Louis Philippe was not toasted at this dinner.

M. Signard, of Gray, a neighbouring town, spoke to the toast—“The Democrats of Lille who, at the late banquet of their town sternly refused to compromise with the sham-Liberals; and by their energy, union, and intelligence, saved the honour of Democracy.”

M. Etienne Arago, a well-known literary character of Paris, and who but recently brought upon the stage an exceedingly successful comedy, entitled The Aristocracies, then spoke to the sentiment—“The development of literature, science, and the fine arts”; exposing, in a brilliant speech, the rapid advance literature and science were sure to make under a free and democratic system.

At the toast—“The future progress of France”, the chairman called upon M. Louis Blanc, who was very enthusiastically received by the meeting. He delivered a splendid speech, containing many

---

a Here and below speeches are quoted according to the reports on the banquet of Dijon printed in La Réforme, November 24 and 25, 1847.—Ed.
just and striking observations on the past development of France; on the conclusions to draw from it with regard to the future; on the particular character impressed indelibly upon the French Democratic Movement by the revolution. He was repeatedly and deservedly interrupted by applause. It was a speech quite worthy of the first historical writer France now possesses. There is, however, one point upon which we would make a few observations, which we hope will be taken in the same friendly spirit in which we write them.

M. Blanc says—

"We want union in Democracy. And no one may deceive himself, we do not think and labour for France only, but for the whole world, because the future of France contains in it the future of mankind. In fact, we are placed in this admirable position, that, without ever ceasing to be national, we are necessarily cosmopolite, and are even more cosmopolite than national. Whoever would call himself a Democrat, and be at the same time an Englishman, would give the lie to the history of his own country, for the part which England has always played, has been a struggle of egotism against fraternity. In the same manner, he who is a Frenchman, and would not be a cosmopolite, would give the lie to his country’s past; for France never could make predominant any idea, except it was for the benefit of the whole world. Gentlemen, at the time of the Crusades, when Europe went to conquer the grave of Christ, it was France who took the movement under her wing. Afterwards, when the priests would impose upon us the yoke of Papist supremacy, the Gallican bishops defended the rights of conscience. And in the last days of the ancient monarchy, who supported young, republican America? France, always France! And what was true of monarchical France, how should it not be true of Republican France? Where, in the book of history, do we find anything resembling that admirable, self-sacrificing disinterestedness of the Republic, when, exhausted by the blood she had shed on our frontiers and on the scaffold, she found yet more blood to shed for her Batavian brethren? When beaten or victorious, she enlightens her very enemies by the sparks of her genius! Let Europe send us sixteen armies, and we shall send her liberty in return."

Now, without intending to deprecate in any manner the heroic efforts of the French Revolution, and the immense gratitude the world owes to the great men of the Republic, we think that the relative position of France and England, with regard to cosmopolitanism, is not at all justly delineated in the above sketch. We entirely deny the cosmopolitan character ascribed to France before the revolution, and the times of Louis XI and Richelieu may serve as proofs. But what is it M. Blanc ascribes to France? That she never could make predominant any idea, except it was to benefit the whole world. Well, we should think M. Louis Blanc could not show us any country in the world which could do otherwise than France is said to have done. Take England, for instance, which M. Blanc places in direct opposition to France. England invented the steam-engine; England erected the railway; two things which, we believe, are worth a good many ideas. Well, did England invent them for herself,
or for the world? The French glory in spreading civilisation everywhere, principally in Algiers. Well, who has spread civilisation in America, Asia, Africa, and Australia, but England? Who founded the very Republic, in the freeing of which France took some part? England—always England. If France assisted in freeing the American Republic from English tyranny, England freed the Dutch Republic, just two hundred years sooner, from Spanish oppression. If France gave, at the end of the last century, a glorious example to the whole world, we cannot silently pass by the fact that England, a hundred and fifty years sooner, gave that example, and found at that time, not even France prepared to follow. And, as far as ideas are concerned, those very ideas, which the French philosophers of the 18th century—which Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert, and others, did so much to popularise—where had these ideas first been originated, but in England? Let us never forget Milton, the first defender of regicide, Algernon Sydney, Bolingbroke, and Shaftesbury, over their French more brilliant followers.

If an Englishman “would call himself a democrat he would give the lie to the history of his own country”, says M. Blanc. Well, we consider it as the veriest proof of sterling democracy, that it must give the lie to its country, that it must repudiate all responsibility for a past filled up with misery, tyranny, class oppression, and superstition. Let the French not make an exception to the other democrats; let them not take the responsibility for the doings of their Kings and Aristocrats of former times. Therefore, what M. Blanc thinks a disadvantage to English democrats, we think to be a great advantage, that they must repudiate the past, and only look to the future.

A Frenchman is necessarily a cosmopolite. Yes, in a world ruled over by French influence, French manners, fashions, ideas, politics. In a world in which every nation has adopted the characteristics of French nationality. But that is exactly what the democrats of other nations will not like. Quite ready to give up the harshness of their own nationality, they expect the same from the French. They will not be satisfied in the assertion, on the part of the French, that they are cosmopolites; assertion which amounts to the demand urged upon all others to become Frenchmen.

Compare Germany. Germany is the fatherland of an immense number of inventions—of the printing press, for instance. Germany has produced—and this is recognised upon all hands—a far greater number of generous and cosmopolitan ideas than France and England put together. And Germany, in practice, has always been humiliated, always been deceived in all her hopes. She can tell best
what French cosmopolitism has been. In the same measure as France has to complain—and quite justly—of the treachery of English policy, Germany has experienced a policy quite as treacherous on the part of France, from Louis XI down to Louis Philippe. If we were to apply the measure of M. Louis Blanc, the Germans would be the true cosmopolites, and yet they do not pretend to this.

So much upon this point. We wish to establish a discussion upon it, as this will only lead to a mutual understanding; to a firm union of French and English Democracy.

After M. Blanc, M. Flocon spoke to the toast: “The Democrats of Europe.”

M. Flocon said:

“Look around you, listen to the voices which arise from foreign countries; complaints or menace; sighs or hopes; what tell they? They invoke the principle of the French Revolution; they proclaim in the face of all despotisms, its immortal motto: Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité. Yes, those very nations, which in the delusions of slavery and ignorance, made an impious war on the revolution; they now come by thousands to take up its standard, and promise to be most ardent defenders of the glorious principles they did not understand in times past. This striking fact is before the eyes of all the world, and I know nothing more terrible to our enemies, nothing which could more effectually recall to our minds our duty. In England, at the side of the old factions, in the face of the richest and most tyrannical aristocracy of the world, the people are organising. An immense association, conducted by experienced leaders, enrols daily thousands of working men, who will undertake to avenge the wrongs of humanity. And the rights of man are not a new watchword in England. At the time of the old civil wars, in the midst of religious fanaticism and political passions, several parties clearly saw the great social truth:

When Adam delved and Eve span
Where was then the gentleman?²⁰⁴

That was proclaimed by the Covenanters²⁰⁵ almost three hundred years ago. The same question is again put; and the cotton lords disdain as much to listen to the complaint of the children of toil, as did the landlords in by-gone times. Therefore, asking what is right will not suffice, the people must be strong enough to take it, and the English people know this. In Belgium, at this very moment, a society is organising, uniting Democrats of all nations, a Democratic Congress²⁰⁶ is being prepared. In Germany, while the princes play the game of granting gracious constitutions, the people prepare themselves for working out their own salvation.”

The speaker then reviewed briefly the Polish, Italian, and Swiss movements, and closed his speech as follows:

“Yes, the seed of the revolution is germinating, the soil is fertile, the splendid flower of hope adorns the fields of the future. But the winter has been long, and we ought soon to take to the sickle, to make our harvest. Let us then take up again the work of the revolution, where our fathers left it. Let us make haste, else we shall have to take it up where they commenced.” (Loud applause.)

The next toast: “The Sovereignty of the people”, was spoken to by M. Ledru-Rollin, deputy.
Letters of apology were read from MM. François Arago, Lamennais, Dupont de L'Eure, and the meeting separated. This demonstration proves that the provincial Democrats are more and more leaving the party of the National, in order to rally around the party of the Réforme.

Written in the first half of December 1847
Reprinted from the newspaper

First published in *The Northern Star*
No. 530, December 18, 1847
with an editorial note:
“From Our Paris Correspondent”
M. Adolphe Bartels claims that public life is finished for him. Indeed, he has withdrawn into private life and does not mean to leave it; he limits himself, each time some public event occurs, to hurling protests and proclaiming loudly that he believes he is his own master, that the movement has been made without him, M. Bartels, and in spite of him, M. Bartels, and that he has the right to refuse it his supreme sanction. It will be agreed that this is just as much a way of participating in public life as any other, and that by all these declarations, proclamations and protestations the public man hides behind the humble appearance of the private individual. This is the way in which the unappreciated and misunderstood genius reveals himself.

M. A. Bartels knows very well that the democrats of the different nations, in forming a body under the name of a democratic association, have had no other object but to exchange ideas and come to an understanding about the principles which will serve to bring about the union and fraternity of peoples. It goes without saying that, in a society which proposes such a goal for itself, it is the duty of all foreigners to state their opinions frankly, and it is truly ridiculous to call them schoolmasters every time they take the floor to fulfil this duty in the association to which they belong. If M. A. Bartels accuses foreigners of wanting to teach lessons it is because they refuse to take lessons from him.

M. A. Bartels will recall, no doubt, that in the provisional committee in which he took part he even proposed to make the Society of German Workers\textsuperscript{208} the nucleus of the new society to be founded. I had to reject this proposal, in the name of the German
Remarks on the Article by M. Adolphe Bartels

workers. Might it perhaps be that M. A. Bartels meant to lay a trap for us, to contrive the means for a false denunciation?

M. Bartels is free to decry our doctrines as "filthy and barbarous". He does not criticise, he does not prove, he condemns; and he gives proof of his orthodoxy by condemning in advance what he does not understand.

We are more tolerant than M. A. Bartels. We overlook his "blue devils"a which are quite innocent devils.

M. A. Bartels being more theocratic than democratic, it is quite natural that he finds an accomplice in the Journal de Bruxelles. This paper accuses us of wanting to "improve the human race".209 Let it calm down! Fortunately, we Germans are not unaware that since 1640 the Congregatio de propaganda fide210 has had the monopoly in improving the human race. We are too modest and too few to want to compete with the reverend fathers in that humanitarian industry. Let them take the trouble to compare the report in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitungb with that of The Northern Star, and they will be able to assure themselves that it is only by a mistake that The Northern Star makes me say "Chartists—you will be hailed as the saviours of the human race."

The Journal de Bruxelles is moved by a more charitable spirit when it reminds us of the example of Anacharsis Cloots mounting the scaffold for having wanted to be more patriotic than the patriots of 1793 and 1794. In this respect the reverend fathers are free from all reproach. They have never been more patriotic than the patriots. On the contrary, they have always and everywhere been accused of wanting to be more reactionary than the reactionaries and, what is still worse, of wanting to be more governmental than the national government. When we think of the said experiences which they have just undergone in Switzerland, we are all ready to recognise that the admonitions they address to us so that we should avoid the opposite extreme and similar dangers, are of a generosity worthy of the early Christians. We thank them for this

Written about December 17, 1847
First published in French in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 101, December 19, 1847
Signed: Karl Marx

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

a Blue devils—delirium tremens.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 388-90.—Ed.
Brussels, December 24. Once again the French papers carry a letter from M. de Lamartine. This time it is communism on which this poetic socialist at last gives his candid opinion having been challenged to do so by Cabet. At the same time Lamartine promises to set forth his views in detail on this “important subject” in the near future. For the present he contents himself with a few brief, oracular utterances:

“My opinion of communism,” he says, “may be summarised in a feeling (!), namely the following: were God to entrust me with a society of savages to civilise them and make into well-mannered people, the first institution I should give them would be that of property.”

“The fact,” continues M. Lamartine, “that man appropriates the elements to himself is a law of nature and a precondition of life. Man appropriates the air by breathing, space by striding through it, the land by cultivating it, and even time, by perpetuating himself through his children; property is the organisation of the life principle in the universe; communism would be the death of labour and of the whole of humanity.”

“Your dream,” M. Lamartine finally consoles M. Cabet, “is too beautiful for this earth.”

M. Lamartine is thus an opponent of communism, and what is more not merely of a communist system; in fact, he enters the lists on behalf of the “perpetuity of private property”. For his “feeling” tells him three things: 1. that property civilises people, 2. that it is the organisation of the life principle in the world, and 3. that its opposite, communism, is too beautiful a dream for this bad world.

No doubt M. Lamartine “feels” a better world, in which the “life principle” is differently “organised”. In this bad world, however, it just so happens that “appropriation” is a precondition of life.
It is not necessary to analyse M. Lamartine’s confused feeling in order to resolve it into its contradictions. We wish only to make one single observation. M. Lamartine believes he has proved the perpetuity of bourgeois property by pointing out that property in general forms the transition from the state of savagery to that of civilisation, and by giving us to understand that the process of breathing and the making of children presuppose the right of property just as much as does social private property.

M. Lamartine sees no distinction between the epoch of transition from savagery to civilisation and our own epoch, any more than between the “appropriation” of air and the “appropriation” of the products of society; for both of these are “appropriations”, forsooth, just as both epochs are “epochs of transition”!

In his “detailed” polemic against communism M. Lamartine will no doubt find an opportunity to deduce “logically” from these general platitudes arising from his “feeling” a whole series of other, still more general platitudes.—Perhaps then we shall likewise find the opportunity to shed light upon his platitudes “in greater detail”.

—For the present we shall content ourselves with passing on to our readers the “feelings” which a monarchist-Catholic newspaper opposes to those of M. Lamartine. The Union monarchique namely, in yesterday’s issue, speaks out against Lamartine’s feelings as follows:

“Here we see how these enlighteners of humanity leave it leaderless. The wretches! ... They have robbed the poor man of the God who comforted him;... they have taken Heaven from him;... they have left man alone with his want and his wretchedness. And then they come and say: ‘You wish to possess the earth—it is not yours. You wish to enjoy the good things of life—they belong to others. You wish to share in wealth—that is out of the question. Stay poor, stay naked, stay abandoned—die!’”

The Union monarchique comforts the proletarians with God. The Bien Public, M. Lamartine’s paper, comforts them with the “life principle”.

Written on December 24, 1847
First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 103, December 26, 1847

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
Frederick Engels

THE RÉFORME AND THE NATIONAL

Following the Lille banquet a controversy developed between the Réforme and the National, which has now led to a decisive split between the two papers.

The facts are as follows:

From the inception of the reform banquets the National has attached itself even more openly than before to the dynastic opposition. At the Lille banquet M. Degeorge of the National withdrew together with Odilon Barrot. The National expressed its opinion of the Lille banquet in terms that were more than equivocal. Challenged by the Réforme to explain itself in more detail, it refused, with the excuse that it did not wish to start polemics with this newspaper. This was no reason at all for failing to comment on facts. To be brief, the Réforme did not let the matter drop and eventually attacked M. Garnier-Pagès of the National for a speech in which he denied the existence of classes and deleted the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the general phrase of citoyens français. Now, at last, the National declared that it would defend its friends against a newspaper which cast suspicion on all worthy patriots, such as Carnot, Garnier-Pagès, etc.

The National, very soon defeated on every point, could finally hit upon no other expedient than to accuse the Réforme of communism.

"You speak of indefinite strivings, of theories and systems which arise among the people, you censure us for openly attacking these—to put it bluntly—communistic strivings. Very well then, declare yourselves directly, either for or against communism. We declare for all to hear that we have nothing in common with the Communists, with these people who deny property, family and country. When the day of battle comes we shall fight not with, but against these abominable strivings. We have no peace, no tolerance for these odious fantasies, for this absurd and barbarous (sauvage) system
which bestialises man and reduces him to the level of a brute (le réduit à l'état de brute). And you believe the people would be with you? The people would surrender what little property they have earned in the sweat of their brow, their family, their country? You believe that the people would ever allow themselves to be persuaded that it is a matter of indifference whether or not Austria brings us under the yoke of her despotism, whether or not the Powers dismember France?

To such grounds against communism the National adds its plans for improving the condition of the workers—postal reform, financial reform, luxury taxes, state subsidies, the abolition of the octrois, and free competition.

Correcting the ridiculous ideas of communism held by the National is not worth the effort. It is ludicrous, however, that the National is still parading the terrifying fantasy of a constantly threatening invasion by the "Great Powers", and that it still believes that beyond the Rhine and across the Channel there are millions of bayonets pointed against France, and hundreds of thousands of cannons aimed at Paris. The Réforme has quite correctly replied to this that in the event of an invasion by the Kings it will not be the fortifications which will serve as a rampart, but the peoples themselves.

With reference to the article from the National quoted above the Réforme declares:

"We are not communistic, and our reason is that communism disregards the laws of production, that it is not concerned with ensuring that enough is produced for the whole of society. But the economic proposals of the Communists stand closer to us than those of the National, which accepts the existing bourgeois economics without further ado. We shall defend the Communists against the police and the National also in the future, because we acknowledge at least their right of discussion, and because the doctrines that originate from the workers themselves always deserve consideration."

We thank the Réforme for the energetic way in which it has stood for true democracy as against the National. We thank the Réforme for defending communism against it. We willingly acknowledge that the Réforme has always defended the Communists whenever they have been persecuted by the government. Alone of all the Paris newspapers, the Réforme defended the materialistic Communists when they were dragged to court by M. Delangle; on this same occasion M. Cabet almost conceded that the government was right as against the materialists. We are glad that the Réforme, even in the more or less undeveloped forms in which communism has so far appeared, has discovered a kernel of truth to which it stands closer

---

a Quoted from the leading article in La Réforme, December 21, 1847; the reply of this newspaper given below is from the same source.— Ed.
than it does to the representatives of bourgeois economics. On the other hand, we hope to be able to prove to the Réforme before long that communism as we defend it is still more closely related to the principles of the Réforme than to communism itself as it has hitherto been presented in France, and as it now is being spread, in part, abroad.

In its repudiation of the National, furthermore, the Réforme is only pronouncing the same judgment that the democratic movement in Germany, England and Belgium, indeed everywhere except in France, has long since passed on it.

Written at the end of December 1847
First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 104, December 30, 1847
Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
Frederick Engels

LOUIS BLANC'S SPEECH AT THE DIJON BANQUET

The Northern Star in its report of the Dijon banquet criticises the speech of Louis Blanc in remarks with which we completely concur. The union of the democrats of different nations does not exclude mutual criticism. It is impossible without such criticism. Without criticism there is no understanding and consequently no union. We reproduce the remarks of The Northern Star in order that we too, for our part, may protest against preconceptions and illusions which are in direct and hostile opposition to the trends of modern democracy and which should be abandoned if the union of democrats of different nations is to remain more than an empty phrase.

At the Dijon banquet, M. Blanc said:

"We want union in Democracy. And no one may deceive himself about this, we do not think and labour for France only, but for the whole world, because the future of France contains in it the future of mankind. In fact, we are placed in this admirable position, that, without ever ceasing to be national, we are necessarily cosmopolite, and are even more cosmopolite than national. Whoever would call himself a Democrat, and be at the same time an Englishman, would give the lie to the history of his own country, for the part which England has always played in history has been the struggle for egotism against 'fraternite'. In the same manner, he who is a Frenchman, and would not be a cosmopolite, would give the lie to his country's past; for France never could make predominant any idea, except it was for the benefit of the whole world. Gentlemen, at the time of the Crusades, when Europe went to conquer the grave of Christ, it was France who took the movement under her wing. Afterwards, when the priests would impose upon us the yoke of Papist supremacy, the Gallican bishops defended the rights of conscience. And in the last days of the ancient monarchy, who supported young, republican America? France, always France! And what was true of monarchical France, how should it not be true of republican France? Where, in the book of history, do we find anything resembling that admirable, self-sacrificing disinterestedness of the French Republic, when, exhausted by the blood she had shed on our frontiers and on the scaffold, she found yet more blood to shed for her
Batavian brethren? When beaten or victorious, she enlightened her very enemies by the sparks of her genius! Let Europe send us sixteen armies, and we shall send her liberty in return."

*The Northern Star* says with regard to this:

"Now, without intending to deprecate in any manner the heroic efforts of the French Revolution, and the immense gratitude the world owes to the great men of the Republic, we think that the relative position of France and England, with regard to cosmopolitanism, is not at all justly delineated in the above sketch. We entirely deny the cosmopolitan character ascribed to France before the revolution, and the times of Louis XI and Richelieu may serve as proofs. But what is it M. Blanc ascribes to France? That she never could make predominant any idea, except it was to benefit the whole world. Well, we should think M. Louis Blanc could not show us any country in the world which could do otherwise than France is said to have done. Take England, for instance, which M. Blanc places in direct opposition to France. England invented the steam-engine; England erected the railway; two things which, we believe, are worth a good many ideas. Well, did England invent them for herself, or for the world? The French glory in spreading civilisation everywhere, principally in Algiers. Well, who has spread civilisation in America, Asia, Africa, and Australia, but England? Who founded the very Republic, in the freeing of which France took some part? England—always England. If France assisted in freeing the American Republic from English tyranny, England freed the Dutch Republic, just two hundred years sooner, from Spanish oppression. If France gave, at the end of the last century, a glorious example to the whole world, we cannot silently pass by the fact that England, a hundred and fifty years sooner, gave that example, and found at that time, not even France prepared to follow. And, as far as ideas are concerned, those very ideas, which the French philosophers of the 18th century—which Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert, and others, did so much to popularise—where had these ideas first been originated, but in England? Let us never forget Milton, the first defender of regicide, Algernon Sydney, Bolingbroke, and Shaftesbury, over their French more brilliant followers.

"'If an Englishman would call himself a democrat he would give the lie to the history of his own country,' says M. Blanc.

"Well, we consider it as the veriest proof of sterling democracy, that it *must* give the lie to its country, that it *must* repudiate all responsibility for a past filled up with misery, tyranny, class oppression, and superstition. Let the French not make an exception
to the other democrats; let them not take the responsibility for the doings of their kings and aristocrats of former times. What M. Blanc thinks a disadvantage to English democrats, we think to be a great advantage, that they must repudiate the past, and only look to the future.

"'A Frenchman is necessarily a cosmopolite,' says M. Blanc. Yes, in a world ruled over only by French influence, French manners, fashions, ideas, politics. In a world in which every nation has adopted the characteristics of French nationality. But that is exactly what the democrats of other nations will not accept. Quite ready to give up the harshness of their own nationality, they expect the same from the French. They will not be satisfied in the assertion, on the part of the French, that they are cosmopolites by the mere fact that they are French, an assertion which amounts to the demand urged upon all others to become Frenchmen.

"Compare Germany. Germany is the fatherland of an immense number of inventions—of the printing press, for instance. Germany has produced—and this is recognised upon all hands—a far greater number of generous and cosmopolitic ideas than France and England put together. And Germany, in practice, has always been humiliated, always been deceived in all her hopes. She can tell best what French cosmopolitanism has been. Just as France had to complain of the treachery of English policy, Germany experienced an equally treacherous policy on the part of France, from Louis XI down to Louis Philippe. If we were to apply the measure of M. Louis Blanc, the Germans would be the true cosmopolites. However the German democrats are far from having any such pretensions."

Written in December 1847

First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 104, December 30, 1847

Published in English for the first time

Printed according to the newspaper
Frederick Engels

CHARTIST AGITATION

Since the opening of Parliament Chartist agitation has developed enormously. Petitions are being prepared, meetings held and Chartist agents are travelling everywhere. Besides the great National Petition for the People's Charter which this time, it is hoped, will collect four million signatures, two other petitions for the Chartist Land Company have just been submitted to the people; the first, edited by O'Connor and published in The Northern Star this week, can be summarised as follows:

"To the Honourable, the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, Gentlemen:

"We, the undersigned, members of the Chartist Land Company and all workmen, considering that excessive speculation in the products of our work, the unlimited competition and the continual increase in the mechanical means of production have everywhere closed outlets for our work;

"that as the mechanical means of production increase, manual labour decreases and workers are sacked;

"that your recent decision about the temporary suspension of work on the railways will throw thousands of workers out of work, which will flood the labour market and will make the employers again reduce the wages already reduced so many times;

"that, nevertheless, we shall ask no more than to live from the products of our work;

"that we reject all poor rates as an insult, serving only to give the capitalists a reserve to throw at any moment on the labour market in order to reduce wages by means of competition between the workers themselves;

"that while manufacturing industry no longer knows how to employ the masses of proletarians which it has produced, agricultural industry still offers a vast field for our work, for it is sure that by the use of labour the yield of the land of our country can be at least quadrupled;

"that therefore we have formed a company for purchasing land whereby each may be enabled to earn a livelihood for himself and family without being at the expense of
the parish or of individual charity, and without reducing the wages of other workers by competition.

"In this way we therefore pray you, gentlemen, to pass such a law which releases and affranchises the Land Company from paying the Stamp duties, as well as the duty on bricks, timber and other building materials and to pass the Bill which will be placed before you to this end."

The Bill has also been drafted by Feargus O'Connor, who is soon going to present it to Parliament.

The second petition demands the return to the people of the uncultivated land that is the property of the parishes. This land, which for thirty years has been sold in blocks to great landowners, ought, as the petition requests, to be divided into small fields to be leased or sold on easy terms of payment to the labourers of this land. This petition was adopted in London at a great meeting where Messrs Harney and Jones, editors of The Northern Star, supported it in the absence of O'Connor, who was kept in Parliament. It was also adopted at a large meeting in Norwich where Mr. Jones, who is one of the best speakers in England, again gave it his brilliant and irresistible support.

The National Petition has finally been adopted by a large meeting in London. The principal speakers here were Messrs Keen, Schapper (German) and Harney. The address by the latter, above all, was marked by its democratic strength.

"What is our entire political and social system," he said, "but a gigantic fraud, erected and maintained for the benefit of idlers and impostors.

"Behold the Church! The bishops and archbishops appropriate to themselves enormous salaries while leaving the hard-working clergy only a few pounds a year. Millions of pounds, in the shape of tithes, are taken annually from the people; these tithes were originally destined mainly for the upkeep of the churches and the support of the poor; now there are separate rates for that, and the Church 'sacks' all the tithes. I ask, is not such a Church an organised imposture? (Loud cheers.)

"Behold our House of Commons, representing not the common people, but the aristocracy and the middle class, and doom six-sevenths of the adult males of this country to political slavery by denying them the right to vote. Is not this house a legalised imposture? (Cheers.)

"Behold those venerable peers who, whilst the wail of distress is heard through the land, can sit, evening after evening, waiting for the Coercion Bill coming up from the Commons. Will any one be good enough to show me the utility of the Hospital of Incurables—will any one attempt to defend this hereditary imposture? (Cheers.)

"Of course, the respect I entertain for that blessed specimen of the 'wisdom of our ancestors'—the monarchy—forbids me to speak in other than the most loyal terms of so interesting a sovereign as Queen Victoria, who regularly, once a year, is delivered of a royal speech and a royal baby. (Laughter.) We have just had the speech, and I see an announcement that in March next we are to have the baby. Her most gracious Majesty expresses great concern for her people's sufferings, admires their patience, and

---

a December 20, 1847.—Ed.
promises them another baby—and when it comes to babies, she has never yet promised in vain. (Bursts of laughter.) Then, there is Prince Albert, a celebrated hatmaker, a capital breeder of pigs, and a distinguished Field Marshal and who, for all his services, is paid thirty thousand pounds a year. No, citizens, the monarchy is no imposture.” (Laughter and applause.)

The speaker, having contrasted with this picture of official society the picture of the people’s sufferings, concluded by demanding the adoption of the National Petition for the Charter. The petition was adopted unanimously. Mr. Duncombe will place it on the table in the House of Commons, when it has toured the country. I shall send you the translation of it as soon as I have obtained a copy.\textsuperscript{218}
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Karl Marx

WAGES

[A]

Explained already:
1. Wages = price of the commodity.
Hence, generally speaking, wages are determined in the same way as prices.
Human activity = commodity.
Manifestation of life, life activity, appears as mere means; existence divorced from this activity as purpose.
2. As commodity wages depend on competition, demand and supply.
3. The supply itself depends on the cost of production, i.e., on the labour time required for the production of a commodity.
4. Inverse proportion of profits and wages. Opposition of the two classes whose economic existence are profits and wages. 220
5. Fight for increase or reduction of wages. Workers' associations.
6. Average or normal price of labour; the minimum is valid only for the class of workers, not for the individual. Combinations of workers to maintain wages.
7. Influence on wages of the removal of taxes, protective tariffs, reduction of armies, etc. The minimum is given on average as = the price of the necessary means of subsistence.

[B]

ADDITIONS

I. ATKINSON

1. Hand-loom weavers (working 15 hours per day). (Half a million of them.) 221

---

a W. Atkinson, Principles of Political Economy.— Ed.
b Marx uses the English word.— Ed.
"Their distress, ... an inevitable condition of a species of labour easily learned, and constantly intruded on and superseded by cheaper means of production. A very short cessation of demand, where the competition for work is so great, ... produces a crisis. ...improvements, which, by superseding manual labour more and more, infallibly bring with them in the transition much of temporary suffering. Example of the hand-loom cotton weavers of the Dacca district of India; either starved or were thrown back into agricultural labour by the competition of English machinery." (Excerpt from the speech of Dr. Bowring in the House of Commons, July 1835.)

(This example on the passing from one trade to another to be used in respect of the debate on free trade.)

2. Something to be said on population theory.
3. Influence of changed and expanded division of labour on the fixing of wages.

II. CARLYLE

1. Not only the quantity of wages is to be considered. They vary in quality, depending on the play of circumstances.
2. The advantage of wages: that from now on necessity, interest, haggling, alone link the worker to the employer. No longer anything patriarchal, as in the Middle Ages.
3. The greater part of labour is not skilled labour.
4. The entire theory of Malthus and the economists amounts to saying that it lies with the workers to reduce the demand by not making any children.

III. M’CULLOCH

"The wages earned by the labourer are only the common and ordinary rate of profit to the proprietors of the machine called man, thereto [dazu] a sum to replace the wear and tear of the machines, or, which is the same thing, to supply the place of the old and decayed labourers with new ones" [p. 319].

---
a Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*
b Bowring’s speech is quoted in W. Atkinson, *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 36-38.—*Ed.*
c Th. Carlyle, *Chartism.*—*Ed.*
e M’Culloch has here: “exclusive of”—*Ed.*
f The words “to replace ... of the machines” and “new ones” are in English in the original.—*Ed.*
First page of Marx's manuscript "Wages"
IV. JOHN WADE

1. "If the object sought be to render an operative a machine, whereby the greatest quantity of work in a given occupation may be extracted from him, no way so effective as division of labour" [p. 125].

2. A reduction of wages drives the workers either to reduce their spending or to increase their productivity, in factories operated by machines, for instance (and in general), by working longer hours; or, with handicraftsmen, hand-loom weavers, etc., by working harder in the same hour. But since their wages have been reduced precisely because the demand has slackened, they thereby increase the supply at the unfavourable moment. The consequence is that their wages drop still lower, and then the bourgeois come along and say "If the people would only work".

3. Altogether, the general law is that there cannot be two market prices, and that the lower market price prevails (given equal quality).

   Take 1,000 workers of equal skill; 50 are without work; the price is then determined not by the 950 who are employed but by the 50 who are unemployed.

   But this law of the market price weighs more heavily on the commodity labour than on other commodities, because the worker cannot lay up his commodity in store but must sell his life activity or, deprived of the means of subsistence, must die.

   The saleable commodity labour differs from other commodities in particular by its evanescent nature, by the impossibility of accumulating it, and by the fact that the supply cannot be increased or reduced with the same facility as with other products.

4. The humanity of the capitalists consists in buying as much labour as possible at the cheapest price. Agricultural labourers earn more in summer than in winter, although in winter they need more food, fuel and warmer clothing.

5. The abolition of Sunday, for example, would be a sheer loss to the workers. The masters seek to reduce wages by leaving them nominally the same but making the workers work a quarter of an hour more, for example, shortening meal times, etc.

6. Wages affected by fashions, the changing seasons, and commercial fluctuations.

7. If the worker, supplanted by the machine, goes into another industry, that is as a rule a worse one. He never gets back into his former position.

---

a J. Wade, History of the Middle and Working Classes.— Ed.
The machine and the division of labour replace dear by cheap labour.

One has suggested to the workers:
1) savings banks;
2) to learn all possible trades (so that when there is a surplus of workers in one industry the same occurs at once in all industries).

8. In times of stagnation:
   a) cessation of work;
   b) reduction of wages;
   c) the same wage, but employment for fewer days in the week. 225

9. Concerning the combinations of trade, a it is to be remarked:
   1. The expenses of the workers (the costs). Invention of machines in consequence of the combinations. Other division of labour. Depression of wages. Deplacement b of factories to other localities.
   2. If they were all to succeed in keeping wages so high that profits were significantly reduced below the average profits of other countries, or so that capital would grow more slowly, the industry of a country would be ruined, and the workers together with the masters even more so.

Although a reduction in taxes does not benefit the workers, a rise in taxation, on the other hand, harms them. The good thing in the rise in taxation in countries with a developed bourgeoisie is that the estate of small farmers and proprietors (craftsmen, etc.) is thereby ruined and thrown into the working class.

Influence of the Irish in England, the Germans in Alsace, on wages.

V. BABBAGE c

*Truck system.* 226

VI. ANDREW URE d

General principle of modern industry: to replace adults by children, skilled workers by unskilled, men by women.

*Equalisation of wages:* Main feature of modern industry [see pp. 34, 35].

---

a The words "combinations of trade" are in English in the original.—Ed.
b The word "déplacement" is in English in the original.—Ed.
c Ch. Babbage, *Traité sur l'économie des machines et des manufactures.*—Ed.
d A. Ure, *Philosophie des manufactures, ou Économie industrielle.*—Ed.
VII. ROSSI

Mr. Rossi thinks:
The manufacturer only advances to the worker his share in the product because the latter cannot wait for its sale. This is a speculation which has no direct bearing on the production process. If the worker can maintain himself until the product is sold he will, as an associé, claim his share in it afterwards.

Hence, wages are not a constituent element of the product as are capital and the land. They are a mere accident, a form of our social condition. Wages do not belong to capital.

Wages are not a factor indispensable to production. In a different organisation of labour they may disappear [see pp. 369, 370].

[VIII.] CHERBULIEZ

1. "...The increase of the productive capital does not necessarily entail an increase of the approvisionnement for the workers. Raw materials and machinery can be increased while approvisionnement is reduced.

"The price of labour depends on a) the absolute quantity of the productive capital; b) on the proportions of the various elements of capital, two social facts on which the will of the workers cannot exert any influence.

2. "It is not so much the absolute consumption of the worker as his relative consumption which makes his position either happy or unhappy. Beyond the necessary consumption ... the value of what we enjoy is essentially relative" [pp. 103-04, 105, 109].

When one speaks of the fall or rise of wages one must never lose sight of the whole world market or of the position of the workers in the various countries.

Egalitarian and other attempts to fix wages justly.

The minimum wage itself changes and constantly falls. Example of spirits.

[IX.] BRAY

SAVINGS BANKS

Triple machine in the hands of despotism and capital.
1. The money flows back into the national bank, which makes profits by lending it back to the capitalists.

---

a P. Rossi, Cours d'économie politique.—Ed.
b A. Cherbuliez, Riche ou pauvre.—Ed.
c J. F. Bray, Labour's Wrong and Labour's Remedy.—Ed.
2. The golden chain by which the government holds a large part of the working class.

3. By this means a new weapon is given into the hands of the capitalists as such [pp. 152, 153].

Once wages have fallen, they never rise to their previous height; absolute and relative wages.

[C]

1. HOW DOES THE GROWTH OF THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES AFFECT WAGES?227

[Cf. VI, 3]a

Machinery: Division of labour.

Labour is simplified. Its cost of production is reduced. It becomes cheaper. The competition among the workers increases.

Passing from one industry to another. On this see Dr. Bowring himself in relation to the hand-loom cotton weavers in the region of Dacca in India, in Parliament 1835.

The new work into which the worker is flung, is worse than the former, more subordinate. Adult labour replaced by children's, men's by women's, more skilled by less skilled.

Either working hours increased or wages reduced.

Competition among workers not only in that one sells himself more cheaply than another, but also in that one does the work of two.

In general, the growth of the productive forces has the following consequences:

a) The position of the worker relative to that of the capitalist worsens, and the value of the things enjoyed is relative. The enjoyments themselves are indeed nothing but social enjoyments, relations, connections.

b) The worker becomes an increasingly one-sided productive force which produces as much as possible in as little time as possible. Skilled labour increasingly transformed into simple labour.

c) Wages become more and more dependent on the world market and the position of the worker increasingly subject to chance.

d) In productive capital the share of machinery and raw materials grows much faster than that of approvisionnement. The increase of productive capital is therefore not accompanied by a similar increase of the demand for labour.

a See this volume, pp. 428-34.—Ed.
Wages depend:

\( \alpha \) on the mass of productive capital as a whole;

\( \beta \) on the proportion of its constituents.

The worker has no influence on either.

(Were it not for the fluctuations of wages, the worker would take no interest at all in the development of civilisation; he would remain stationary.)

In the competition of the workers with the machine it is to be noted that handworkers (e.g., hand-loom cotton weavers) suffer even more than machine workers directly employed in the factory.

Every development of new productive forces is at the same time a weapon against the workers. All improvements in the means of communication, for example, facilitate the competition of workers in different localities and turn local competition into national, etc.

The cheapening of all commodities, which however does not occur in the case of the most immediate means of subsistence, has as a result that the worker wears a collection of rags and his misery displays the colours of civilisation.

II. COMPETITION BETWEEN WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS

\( \alpha \) To determine relative wages it should be noted that one taler for one worker and one taler for one employer do not have the same value. The worker must buy everything worse and dearer. His taler commands neither so many nor such good commodities as that of the employer. The worker must be a spendthrift and buy and sell against all economic principles. We must remark in general that we have in mind here only one aspect, wages themselves. But the exploitation of the worker begins anew as soon as he exchanges the price for his labour back into other commodities.—Épicier,a pawnbroker, landlord, tout le monde l'exploite encore une fois.b

\( \beta \) The employer, by commanding the means of employment, commands the means of subsistence of the worker, i.e., the latter's life depends on him; just as the worker himself degrades his life activity to a mere means of existence.

\( \gamma \) The commodity labour has great disadvantages against other commodities. For the capitalist, competition with the workers is a mere question of profit, for the workers it is a question of their existence.

Labour is of a more evanescent nature than other commodities. It

---

a Grocer.—Ed.
b Everybody exploits him over again.—Ed.
cannot be accumulated. The supply cannot be increased or reduced with the same facility as with other commodities.

b) Factory regime. Housing legislation. Truck system,\(^a\) where the employer cheats the worker by raising the price of goods while leaving the nominal wage the same.

III. COMPETITION AMONG THE WORKERS THEMSELVES

a) By a general economic law there cannot be two market prices. The wages of 1,000 workers of the same skill are determined not by the 950 in employment but by the 50 unemployed. Influence of the Irish on the position of the English workers and of the Germans on the position of the Alsatian workers.

b) The workers compete with each other not merely by one offering himself more cheaply than another, but by one doing the work of two.

Advantages of the unmarried over the married worker, etc. Competition between workers from villages and towns.

IV. FLUCTUATIONS OF WAGES

They are occasioned by:
1) Changes in fashions.
2) The changing seasons.
3) Fluctuations in trade.

In case of a crisis

a) the workers will limit their spending, or, to increase their productivity, they will either work longer hours or produce more in the same hour. But since their wages have been reduced because the demand for their product has slackened, they increase the unfavourable proportion of the supply to the demand, and then the bourgeois says: if the people would only work. Their wages drop still lower through their overexertion.

b) In times of crisis:

Complete unemployment. Reduction in wages. No change in wages and reduction of the working days.\(^{228}\)

\(\gamma\) In all crises the following circular movement relates to the workers:

The employer cannot employ the workers because he cannot sell his product. He cannot sell his product because he has no buyers. He has no buyers because the workers have nothing to offer in exchange

\(^a\) Marx uses the English term.—Ed.
but their labour, and precisely for that reason they cannot exchange their labour.

6) When it is a question of a rise in wages, it is to be noted that one must always have in mind the world market and the fact that the rise in wages is ineffectual since workers in other countries are put out of work.

V. MINIMUM WAGE

1. The daily wage the worker takes home is the profit which his machine, his body, yields to its owner. Included in it is the sum necessary to replace the wear and tear of the machine, or, what is the same thing, to replace old, worn-out workers by new ones.

2. It is inherent in the minimum wage that the abolition of Sunday, for example, would be a sheer loss to the worker. He would have to earn his wages in harder conditions. This is the purpose of the brave philanthropists who zealously argue against the observance of Sabbath.

3. Although the minimum wage is determined on average by the price of the most indispensable provisions, it is nevertheless to be remarked:

Firstly: that the minimum is different in different countries, the potato in Ireland, for example.229

Secondly: not only that. The minimum itself has a historical movement and sinks always further towards the absolutely lowest level. Example of brandy. Distilled first from draff, then from grain, finally from spirits.

Towards bringing about the really lowest level of the minimum contribute not only

1) the general development of the working machines, the division of labour, the increase in competition among the workers themselves and its liberation from local fetters, but also

2) the growth of taxation and the greater costliness of the state budget, for, although, as we have seen, the abolition of a tax does not benefit the worker, he is harmed by the introduction of any new tax so long as the minimum has not yet fallen to its lowest possible expression, and this is the case with all perturbations and difficulties of civil relations. The growth of taxation, incidentally, brings about the ruin of the small farmers, bourgeois and craftsmen.

Example—after the war of liberation.230 The progress of industry, which brings with it cheaper products and substitutes.

---

a Marx uses the English term.—Ed.
3. This minimum tends to become the same in different countries.
4. When wages have once fallen and later rise again, they never rise, however, to their previous level.
   In the course of development, there is a double fall in wages:
   Firstly: relative, in proportion to the development of general wealth.
   Secondly: absolute, since the quantity of commodities which the worker receives in exchange becomes less and less.
5. With the development of large-scale industry time becomes increasingly the measure of the value of commodities, hence also the measure of wages. Simultaneously the production of the commodity labour becomes cheaper and cheaper and costs less and less working time as civilisation progresses.
   The peasant still has free time and can earn something on the side. But big industry (not manufacture) does away with this patriarchal situation. Every moment of the worker’s life, of his very existence, thus becomes more and more a matter of haggling.
   (Here add the following sections:
   1. Suggestions for the improvement of the workers’ position. Malthus; Rossi etc.; Proudhon; Weitling.
   2. Workers’ associations.
   3. Positive significance of wage labour.)

VI. SUGGESTIONS FOR REMEDIES

1. One of the most popular suggestions is the system of savings banks.
   We will say nothing at all of the impossibility for most of the workers to save.
   The purpose, at least the strictly economic meaning of savings banks, is supposed to be: that by their own foresight and wisdom the workers can equalise the good working times with the bad, i.e., distribute their wages in the cycle through which the industrial movement runs in such a way that they actually never spend more than the minimum wage, that which is indispensable to sustain life.
   But we have seen that the fluctuations of wages not only revolutionise the worker, but that without the temporary rise of wages above the minimum he would remain excluded from all advances of production, from public wealth, from civilisation, hence from all possibility of emancipation.
   He must therefore turn himself into a bourgeois calculating machine, make thrift into a system, and give misery a stationary, conservative character.
In addition, the savings bank system is a triple machine of despotism:

a) The savings bank is the golden chain by which the government holds a large part of the working class. By it they not only acquire an interest in the preservation of the existing conditions. Not only does it lead to a split between that portion of the working class which takes part in the savings banks and the portion which does not. The workers themselves thus give into the hands of their enemies the weapons to preserve the existing organisation of society which subjugates them.

b) The money flows back into the national bank, this lends it again to the capitalists and both share in the profits and thus, with the money borrowed from the people at a miserable rate of interest—which only by this centralisation becomes a mighty industrial lever—decrease their capital, their direct ruling power over the people.

2. Another suggestion, very popular with the bourgeoisie, is education, especially comprehensive industrial education.

a) We shall not draw attention to the trite contradiction which lies in the fact that modern industry replaces compound labour more and more with simple labour which requires no education; we shall not draw attention to the fact that it throws more and more children from the age of seven upwards behind the machine and turns them into a source of income not only for the bourgeois class but for their own proletarian parents; the factory system frustrates the school laws, example Prussia; nor shall we draw attention to the fact that the education of the mind, if the worker had such an education, has no direct effect at all on his wages, that education is altogether dependent on the conditions of life, and that by moral education the bourgeois understands indoctrination with bourgeois principles, and that, finally, the bourgeois class neither has the means, nor if it had them would it use them, to offer the people a real education.

We confine ourselves to stressing a purely economic viewpoint.

b) The true purpose which education has with the philanthropic economists is this: every worker should be trained in as many industries as possible, so that if by the introduction of new machines or by a change in the division of labour he is thrown out of one industry, he can as easily as possible find employment in another.

Assuming this to be possible:

The consequence would be that if there were a surplus of hands in one industry, this surplus would at once spread to all other industries, and even more than before the reduction of wages in one business would lead directly to a general reduction in wages.
Even as it is, since modern industry simplifies work everywhere and makes it easy to learn, the rise of wages in one industry at once causes an influx of workers into this industry and the reduction of wages will more or less directly assume a general character.

We cannot here, of course, consider all the many minor palliatives which are suggested from the bourgeois side.\(^a\)

3. We must, however, turn to a third suggestion, which has had, and continues to have, very significant practical consequences—the Malthusian theory.

This entire theory, in so far as we have to consider it here, amounts to the following:

a) The level of wages depends on the proportion of the hands which offer themselves to the hands which are required.

Wages can rise in two ways.

Either when the capital which sets the labour in motion increases so rapidly that the demand for workers increases more rapidly, in quicker progression, than their supply.

Or, secondly, when the population is growing so slowly that competition among the workers remains weak although productive capital does not grow rapidly.

On one side of this proportion, namely the growth of productive capital, you workers can exert no influence.

But you can on the other side.

You can reduce the supply of workers, i.e., the competition among them, by making as few children as possible.

To reveal the utter stupidity, baseness and hypocrisy of this doctrine, the following is sufficient:

β) (This is to be included in I: How does the growth of the productive forces affect wages?)

Wages rise when the demand for labour grows. This demand grows when the capital grows which sets the labour in motion, i.e., when the productive capital grows.

Here there are two main points to be made:

Firstly: A main condition for the rise of wages is the growth of the productive capital, and its most rapid possible growth. The main condition for the worker to be in a passable position is, therefore, to depress his position in relation to the bourgeois class more and more, to increase as much as possible the power of his opponent, capital. That is, he can only be in a passable position provided he creates and reinforces the power which is hostile to him, his own opposite. On this condition of creating this hostile power, the means of

\(^a\) Marx later added: "Pauperism".—Ed.
employment flow to him from that power and turn him anew into part of the productive capital and into the lever which increases the latter and hurls it into an accelerated movement of growth.

Incidentally, when one has grasped this relationship of capital and labour, all Fourierist and other attempts at mediation appear in their true absurdity.

Secondly: Having thus explained this crazy relationship, we must add a second, even more important element.

Namely, what does it mean: Growth of productive capital, and in what conditions does it take place?

Growth of capital = accumulation and concentration of capital. In the same measure in which capital is accumulated and concentrated, it leads:

to work on a larger scale and hence to a new division of labour which simplifies the work still more;
then to the introduction of machinery on a larger scale and to the introduction of new machinery.

That means, therefore, that in the measure in which productive capital grows, there grows the competition among the workers because the division of labour is simplified and every branch of labour is open to everybody.

Competition also grows among them because in the same measure they have to compete with the machines and are thrown out of work by them. By constantly increasing the scale of operations and because the rate of interest tends to fall more and more through the competition among the capitals offered, the concentration and accumulation of productive capital brings about the following:

Small industrial enterprises are ruined and cannot stand up to competition with the big ones. Entire sections of the bourgeois class are thrown down into the working class. The competition among the workers is therefore increased by the ruin of the small industrialists which is fatally linked with the growth of productive capital.

And at the same time as the rate of interest falls, small capitalists formerly not participating in industry directly are forced to become industrial, i.e., to supply big industry with further victims. From this side, too, the working class is enlarged and competition among the workers increased.

While the growth of the productive forces leads to work on a larger scale, momentary overproduction becomes more and more necessary, the world market more and more extensive, and competition more universal. The crises, therefore, become more and more violent. So the workers are given a sudden encouragement to marry and multiply, they are agglomerated and concentrated in
large masses, and their wages fluctuate more and more. Every new crisis, therefore, creates directly much bigger competition among the workers.

Speaking generally, the growth of the productive forces, with their more rapid means of communication, accelerated circulation and feverish turnover of capital consists in the fact that in the same time more can be produced, and hence, under the law of competition, more must be produced. That is, production takes place in more and more difficult conditions, and so that competition can be put up with in these conditions, production must take place on an ever growing scale and capital must be concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. And so that this producing on a larger scale may be fruitful, the division of labour and machinery must be constantly and disproportionately extended.

This producing in more and more difficult conditions also extends to the worker as part of capital. He must produce more, in more and more difficult conditions, i.e., for less and less wages and more work, at constantly decreasing production costs. So the minimum itself is constantly being reduced to greater exertions with minimum enjoyment.

The disproportion rises geometrically, not arithmetically.\(^\text{a}\)

The growth of the productive forces therefore leads to increased power of big capital, to the machine called the worker becoming more and more simple, to an increase in direct competition among the workers through greater division of labour and use of machinery, through a positive premium being placed on the production of people, through the competition of the ruined sections of the bourgeois class, etc.

We can formulate the matter still more simply:

Productive capital consists of three constituent parts:

1) the raw material which is worked up;

2) the machines and materials such as coal, etc., which are necessary to drive the machines; buildings, etc.;

3) the part of capital intended for the maintenance of the workers.

Given the growth of productive capital, in what proportion do these three constituents stand to each other?

The growth of productive capital is linked with its concentration, and with that the fact that it can only be profitable if it is exploited on an ever larger scale.

A large part of capital will therefore be transformed directly into instruments of labour and will operate as such, and the more the

\(^{a}\) This sentence was written by Marx in the margin.—Ed.
productive forces grow, the larger will be this part of capital which is
directly transformed into machinery.

The growth of machinery and of the division of labour has the
consequence that in a shorter time far more can be produced. Hence
the store of raw materials must grow in the same proportion. In the
course of the growth of the productive capital the part of capital
transformed into raw materials necessarily increases.

There is still the third part of capital, that which is intended for the
maintenance of the workers, i.e., transformed into wages.

In what proportion does the growth of this part of productive
capital stand to the two others?

The greater division of labour causes a worker to produce as much
as three, four, or five did formerly. Machinery has as a consequence
the same proportion on a much larger scale.

It further stands to reason that the growth of the parts of
productive capital transformed into machinery and raw materials is
not accompanied by a similar growth of the part of productive capital
intended for wages. In that case the purpose of the use of machinery
and the increased division of labour would, of course, be thwarted. It
stands to reason that the part of productive capital intended for
wages does not grow in the same measure as the part intended for
machinery and raw materials. Moreover, in the same measure in
which productive capital grows, i.e., the power of capital as such, in
the same measure there increases the disproportion between the
capital invested in raw materials and machinery and that spent on
wages. That means, therefore, that the part of productive capital
intended for wages becomes smaller and smaller in relation to that
which acts as machinery and raw material.

After the capitalist has put a larger capital into machinery, he is
compelled to spend a larger capital on the purchase of raw materials
and the fuels required to drive the machines. But if formerly he
employed 100 workers, now he will need perhaps only 50. Otherwise
he would have perhaps to double the other parts of his capital again,
i.e., make the disproportion still greater. He will therefore dismiss
50, or else the 100 must work for the same price as formerly the 50
did. There are, therefore, redundant workers on the market.

With improved division of labour only the capital for raw material
will have to be increased. The place of three workers will perhaps be
taken by one.

But take the most favourable case. Let the capitalist expand his
enterprise so that he can not only retain the previous number of his
workers—and, of course, he does not care a fig about waiting until he
can do so—but even increase it; in this case production must have
been enormously expanded for it to be possible to retain the same number of workers or even increase it, and the proportion of workers to the productive forces has relatively become infinitely more a disproportion. Overproduction is thereby accelerated, and in the next crisis more workers than ever are unemployed.

It is, therefore, a general law which necessarily arises from the nature of the relation between capital and labour that in the course of the growth of the productive forces the part of productive capital which is transformed into machinery and raw material, i.e., capital as such, increases in disproportion to the part which is intended for wages; i.e., in other words, the workers must share among themselves an ever smaller part of the productive capital in relation to its total mass. Their competition, therefore, becomes more and more violent. In other words: the more productive capital grows, the more, in proportion, the means of employment and the means of subsistence for the workers are reduced, and the more rapidly, in other words, the working population grows in proportion to its means of employment. And this increases in the same measure in which the productive capital as a whole grows.

To compensate the above disproportion it must be enlarged in geometrical proportion, and in order afterwards, in a time of crisis, to readjust it, it is enlarged still more.

This law, which arises simply from the relation of the worker to capital, and which turns even the condition most favourable for him, the rapid growth of productive capital, into an unfavourable one, the bourgeois have changed from a social law into a law of nature by saying that by a law of nature the population grows more rapidly than the means of employment or the means of subsistence.

They fail to understand that the growth of this contradiction is inherent in the growth of productive capital.

We shall return to this later.

Productive force, in particular the social force of the workers themselves, not paid for, is even directed against them.

γ) First absurdity:
We have seen that when productive capital grows—the most favourable case presupposed by the economists—when, therefore, the demand for labour increases relatively, it is in the nature of modern industry and in the nature of capital that the means for the employment of workers do not grow in the same proportion, that the same circumstances which make productive capital grow, make the disproportion between the supply of labour and the demand for it grow still more rapidly, in a word, that the growth of the productive
forces makes grow at the same time the disproportion between the number of workers and the means for their employment. This depends neither on the increase of means of subsistence nor on the increase of the population regarded by itself. It follows necessarily from the nature of large-scale industry and the relationship of labour and capital.

If the growth of productive capital progresses only slowly, however, if it remains stationary or even decreases, the number of workers is always too large in proportion to the demand for labour.

In both cases, the most favourable and the most unfavourable, it follows from the relationship of labour to capital, from the nature of capital itself, that the supply of labour will always be too great for the demand for labour.

δ) Leaving aside the nonsense that the entire working class cannot possibly take the decision not to make any children, their condition, on the contrary, makes the sexual instinct their chief pleasure and develops it one-sidedly.

After the bourgeoisie has depressed the existence of the workers to a minimum, it wants in addition to limit their acts of reproduction to a minimum.

ε) That the bourgeoisie, incidentally, does not and cannot mean these phrases and counsels seriously, is clear from the following:

Firstly: By replacing adults with children, modern industry places a veritable premium on the making of children.

Secondly: Big industry constantly requires a reserve army of unemployed workers for times of overproduction. The main purpose of the bourgeois in relation to the worker is, of course, to have the commodity labour as cheaply as possible, which is only possible when the supply of this commodity is as large as possible in relation to the demand for it, i.e., when the overpopulation is the greatest.

Overpopulation is therefore in the interest of the bourgeoisie, and it gives the workers good advice which it knows to be impossible to carry out.

τ) Since capital only increases when it employs workers, the increase of capital involves an increase of the proletariat, and, as we have seen, according to the nature of the relation of capital and labour, the increase of the proletariat must proceed relatively even faster.

κ) The above theory, however, which is also expressed as a law of nature, that population grows faster than the means of subsistence, is the more welcome to the bourgeois as it silences his conscience, makes hard-heartedness into a moral duty and the
consequences of society into the consequences of nature, and finally
gives him the opportunity to watch the destruction of the proletariat
by starvation as calmly as other natural event without bestirring
himself, and, on the other hand, to regard the misery of the
proletariat as its own fault and to punish it. To be sure, the proletarian
can restrain his natural instinct by reason, and so, by moral
supervision, halt the law of nature in its injurious course of
development.

λ) The poor laws may be regarded as an application of this theory.
The treadmill again within civilisation. Barbarism reappears, but
created in the lap of civilisation itself and belonging to it; hence
leprous barbarism, barbarism as leprosy of civilisation. Workhouses
the Bastilles of the workers. Separation of man and wife.

4. We will now briefly speak of those who want to improve the
condition of the workers by a different way of fixing wages.

Proudhon.

5. Finally, among the remarks which philanthropic economists
have made on wages, yet another view must be mentioned.

Α) Among other economists Rossi, in particular, has expounded
the following:
The manufacturer only advances to the worker his share in the
product because the worker cannot wait for its sale. If the worker
could maintain himself until the product was sold he would, as an
associé, afterwards claim his share, as is the case between the actual
and the industrial capitalist. That the worker's share has the
particular form of wages is an accident, the result of a speculation, of
a specific act which takes place alongside the production process and
does not form any necessary constituent element of it. Wages are
merely an accidental form of our social conditions. They do not
necessarily belong to capital. They are not an indispensable factor of
production. They can disappear under another organisation of
society.

Β) This whole trick amounts to the following: If the workers
possessed enough accumulated labour, i.e., enough capital, not to
have to live directly on the sale of their labour, the wage form would
end. That is, if all workers were at the same time capitalists; which is
to presuppose and preserve capital without the contrast of wage
labour without which it cannot exist.

Γ) Nevertheless, the following admission is to be observed: Wages
are no accidental form of bourgeois production, but the whole of

---

*a Marx uses the English word.—Ed.*
bourgeois production is a passing historical form of production. All its relationships, capital as well as wages, rent, etc., are transitory and can be abolished at a certain point of development.

VII. WORKERS' ASSOCIATIONS

An element in the population theory was that it is supposed to lessen the competition among workers. The associations, by contrast, have the purpose of removing it and replacing it by union of workers.

The economists are right when they remark against the associations:

1. The costs which they cause the workers are mostly greater than the rise in the gains they want to get. In the long run they cannot withstand the laws of competition. These combinations bring about new machines, a new division of labour, removal from one place of production to another. In consequence of all this a reduction of wages.

2. If the combinations were to succeed in keeping the price of labour so high in one country that profits fell significantly in relation to the average profit in other countries, or so that capital was held up in its growth, stagnation and recession of industry would be the consequence, and the workers would be ruined together with their masters. For that, as we have seen, is the condition of the worker. His condition deteriorates by leaps and bounds when productive capital grows, and he is ruined from the start when it declines or remains stationary.

3. All these objections of the bourgeois economists are, as we have said, correct, but only correct from their point of view. If in the associations it really were a matter only of what it appears to be, namely the fixing of wages, if the relationship between labour and capital were eternal, these combinations would be wrecked on the necessity of things. But they are the means of uniting the working class, of preparing for the overthrow of the entire old society with its class contradictions. And from this standpoint the workers are right to laugh at the clever bourgeois schoolmasters who reckon up to them what this civil war is costing them in fallen, injured, and financial sacrifices. He who wants to beat his adversary will not discuss with him the costs of the war. And how far the workers are from such mean-spiritedness is proved to the economists by the very fact that the best-paid workers form the most combinations and that the workers spend all they can scrape from their wages on forming
political and industrial associations and meeting [the costs] of this movement. And if in their moments of philanthropy Messrs the bourgeois and their economists are so gracious as to allow in the minimum wage, that is, in the minimum life, a little tea, or rum, or sugar and meat, it must by contrast appear to them as shameful as incomprehensible that the workers reckon in this minimum a little of the costs of war against the bourgeoisie and that out of their revolutionary activity they even make the maximum of their enjoyment of life.

VIII. POSITIVE ASPECT OF WAGE LABOUR

Before we conclude, let us draw attention to the positive aspect of wage labour.

α) If one says “positive aspect of wage labour” one says “positive aspect of capital”, of large-scale industry, of free competition, of the world market, and I do not need to explain to you in detail how without these production relations neither the means of production—the material means for the emancipation of the proletariat and the foundation of a new society—would have been created, nor would the proletariat itself have taken to the unification and development through which it is really capable of revolutionising the old society and itself. Equalisation of wages.

β) Let us take wages themselves in the essence of their evil, that my activity becomes a commodity, that I become utterly and absolutely for sale.

Firstly: thereby everything patriarchal falls away, since haggling, purchase and sale remain the only connection, and the money relationship the sole relationship between employer and workers.

Secondly: the halo of sanctity is entirely gone from all relationships of the old society, since they have dissolved into pure money relationships.

Likewise, all so-called higher kinds of labour, intellectual, artistic, etc., have been turned into articles of commerce and have thereby lost their old sanctity. What a great advance it was that the entire regiment of clerics, doctors, lawyers, etc., hence religion, law, etc., ceased to be judged by anything but their commercial value.3

(Thirdly: since labour has become a commodity and as such subject to free competition, one seeks to produce it as cheaply as possible, i.e., at the lowest possible production cost. All physical labour has

---

3 Here the manuscript has an insertion: “National, class, property relations.”—Ed.
thereby become infinitely easy and simple for the future organisation of society.—To be put in general form.)

Thirdly: as the workers realised through the general saleability that everything was separable, dissoluble from itself, they first became free of their subjection to a given relationship. The advantage both over payment in kind and over the way of life prescribed purely by the (feudal) estate is that the worker can do what he likes with his money.

Written at the end of December 1847
First published in Russian in the journal Sotsialisticheskoye khozyaistvo, 1924 and in German in the journal Unter dem Banner des Marxismus, 1925
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
The French Chambers are now open, and we shall very soon have the pleasure of seeing what effect the Reform agitation has had upon the 225 "satisfied" members of the majority. We shall see whether they will be satisfied, too, with the manner in which Guizot has exposed France in the Swiss question to the ridicule of all Europe. Why, this fat, corrupting and corrupted stock-jobbing, swindling, blood-sucking, and cowardly majority, are the very men to swallow down even that—to say "amen" to the trick which Palmerston, in return for the Spanish marriages, played on his worthy colleague Guizot—to declare that never was France so great, so glorious, so respected, so "satisfied"—as at this very moment.

And it is at this very moment that all the papers of Paris, from the Débats to the Réforme, discuss, as openly as can be done under the circumstances, the eventuality consequent upon the death of Louis Philippe. The Débats afraid of seeing the majority split itself up, warns them every day that this inevitable event, whenever it takes place, will be the signal for the general rendezvous of all political parties; that "republicanism", "communism", "anarchism", "terrorism", and so forth, will then break from their subterranean caverns, to spread desolation, horror and destruction; that France will be lost—liberty, safety, property will be lost, unless the friends of order (M. Guizot and Co., of course) keep them down with a strong hand; that this perilous moment may occur any day; and that if M. Guizot is not supported in office, all will be lost. The other papers, the Presse,

---

a See this volume, pp. 216-17.—Ed.
b Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires.—Ed.
the *Constitutionnel*, the *Siècle*, on the contrary, say that quite the reverse will take place, that all the horrors of a bloody revolution will overrun the country, unless the abominable corruptor, Guizot, shall, at the moment of the king's death, have been replaced by their respective political heroes, by M. de Girardin, M. Thiers, or M. O. Barrot. The Radical papers discuss the question from another point of view, as we shall see by and by.

Thus, even the *Débats* agrees indirectly that "satisfied" France only awaits the proper moment for proving her dissatisfaction, in a manner which the frightened *bourgeois* imagination of the *Débats* depicts most ludicrously to its terrified reason. This, however, does not matter to the "satisfied" two hundred and twenty-five. They have a logic of their own. If the people are satisfied, then there is no reason for a change of system. If they are dissatisfied, why, then, their very dissatisfaction is a reason to stick more to the system; for if only one inch was abandoned, there would be a sudden eruption of all the horrors of revolution. Do whatever you like, these *bourgeois* will always draw the conclusion from it that they are the best rulers of the country.

Nevertheless, Guizot will give a small bit of reform. He will add to the electoral list the "capacities", that is, all persons possessing a university degree, lawyers, doctors, and other such humbugs. A glorious reform, indeed. But this will suffice to disarm the "Progressive Conservatives", or, as they call themselves now—for, in want of something else to do, they change names every quarter—the Conservative opposition. And it will be a ready stroke for M. Thiers, who, while sending his second, M. Duverger de Hauranne, on a Reform banqueting errand, slily prepared his reform-plan, with which he was to surprise the Chambers, and which was equally the same as the one now to be proposed by his rival, Guizot.

There will be a deal of crying, shouting, and noise-making generally in the Chambers; but I hardly think M. Guizot has anything serious to apprehend from his faithful two hundred and twenty-five.

So much for the official world. In the meantime the Reform banquets and the polemic between the *National* and the *Réforme* have continued. The allied oppositions, that is, the left centre (M. Thiers' party), the left (M. Odilon Barrot's party) and the "sensible Radicals" (the *National*), had the banquets of Castres, Montpellier, Neubourg, and others; the ultra-Democrats (the *Réforme*), had the banquet of Châlon. The chief speaker of the banquets of Montpellier and Neubourg was M. Garnier-Pagès, brother of the well-known
democrat of that name, a deceased a few years ago. But M. Garnier-Pagès, the younger, is far from being like his brother; he totally lacks that energy, that courage and never-compromising spirit which secured so prominent a position to the deceased leader of French Democracy. At Neubourg, M. Garnier-Pagès, the younger, came out with assertions proving him to be entirely ignorant of the actual state of society, and consequently of the means of improving it. While all modern democracy is based upon the great fact, that modern society is irreparably divided into two classes—the bourgeoisie, or possessors of all means of production and all produce, and the proletarians, or possessors of nothing but their labour to live upon; that the latter class is socially and politically oppressed by the former; while the acknowledged tendency of modern Democrats in all countries is to make political power pass from the middle classes to the working classes, these latter constituting the immense majority of the people—in the face of all these facts, M. Garnier boldly asserts that the division of the people into middle classes and working classes does in reality not exist, that it is a mischievous invention of M. Guizot's got up to divide the people; that in spite of Guizot he recognises that all Frenchmen are equal—that they all participate in the same life, and that he recognises in France none but French citizens! According to M. Garnier-Pagès, then, the monopolising of all instruments of production in the hands of the bourgeoisie, which abandons the proletarians to the tender mercies of the economical law of wages, reducing the share of the working men to the lowest level of food, is an invention of M. Guizot's too! According to him, the whole of that desperate struggle now going on in all civilised countries of the world, between Labour and Capital, a struggle the different phases of which are marked by coalitions, trades' unions, murders, riots, and bloody insurrections—a struggle whose reality is testified by the death of the proletarians shot at Lyons, at Preston, at Langenbielau, at Prague, this struggle has been carried on upon no better grounds than a lying assertion of a French professor! What else do the words of M. Garnier-Pagès mean but this? "Let the capitalists continue to monopolise all powers of production—let the working man continue to live upon the merest pittance, but give him, as a compensation for his suffering, the title of citizen!" Ay, M. Pagès would under certain circumstances, and with certain restrictions, perhaps, consent to give the people the suffrage; but let them never think of profiting by the gift by passing measures which

a Etienne Joseph Louis Garnier-Pagès.—Ed.
would essentially alter the actual mode of production and distribution of wealth—which would, in course of time, give to the entire people the command of the productive powers of the country, and do away with all individual "employers"! The Réforme was perfectly right in styling this honourable gentleman a bourgeois radical.¹

The Ultra-Democrats had, as I said before, only one banquet, but it was a bumper, and worth a dozen of the coalition party. More than two thousand citizens sat down to dinner at Châlon-sur-Saône. The National had been invited, but very significantly had not come. The men of the Réforme, accordingly, had it all their own way. M. Ledru-Rollin, who had been designated by the National as the chief of the ultra-democratic party, here, accepted this position. He explained his position and the position of his party, by relating in a brilliant abstract, the different phases of French democracy since 1789. He then justified himself against the attacks of the National, attacked that paper in turn, and proposed a jury of Democrats to be nominated from all parts of France—one-half by either party—to decide between the Réforme and the National.

And now (he said), after having settled this home affair, would it not be a good thing if the French democracy entered into relation with the other democracies? There is at this moment a great movement going on in Europe amongst all the disinherited, who suffer by heart or by hunger. This is the moment to console them, to strengthen them, and to enter into communion with them.... Let us, then, hold a congress of Democrats of all nations, now, when the congress of kings has failed!... There is one republic in Europe, which just now has secured in its own territory the ascendency of democracy—there is Switzerland, a country worthy of seeing the Democrats of all nations upon its free soil!... And thus, citizens, let me conclude, by coupling to my toast: "To the Unity of the French Revolution", that other one, "The Union of all Democracies".

This speech excited loud applause, and it merited it. We heartily rejoice in M. Ledru-Rollin's oratorial success at Châlon, but at the same time, must protest against an unguarded expression, which, we are sure, has been said without intention to hurt. M. Ledru-Rollin says, that the moment has arrived for French Democrats to console and to strengthen the suffering working men of other nations. The Democrats of no country, we are sure, want consolation from whomsoever it be. They admire the revolutionary pride of French Democrats, but they take for themselves the right to be quite as proud and independent. The four millions of English Chartists certainly are strong enough to do their own work for themselves. Glad as we are to see the French democracy take up with enthusiasm

¹ The reference is to the leading article in La Réforme, December 17, 1847.—Ed.
the idea of a Democratic Congress, and an alliance of all democracies, we expect, before all things, a perfect reciprocity and equality. Any alliance, which should not recognize this equality as its foundation, would itself be anti-democratic. We know, however, too well the profoundly democratic sentiments of the men of the Réforme to doubt of their perfectly agreeing with us; we only wish them to drop for the interest of our common cause, certain expressions, which far from expressing their real sentiments, are an inheritance from the time when the National alone represented the French Democracy.

At the same banquet, M. Flocon spoke to the toast:—"The Rights of Man and of the Citizen". He read the declaration of rights of the National Convention, which he declared to be, up to this day, the faithful abstract of true Democratic principles. To this, what he called the true French principle, he opposed the present system of moneyocracy, which places man upon a lower level than even cattle, because man is overabundant, and costs more than he gives in nature when his labour is not required. This system, from the country in which it first arose, he called the English system.

But lo, he said, while the English principle is introduced into the fatherland of the revolution, the English people themselves strive to throw its yoke off their shoulders, and write upon their banners the glorious motto:—"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!" Thus, by one of those painful turns, of which history offers more than one example, the very nation which first gave truth to the world, fallen back into darkness and ignorance, would soon be obliged to ask from its neighbours the revolutionary traditions which itself could not conserve. Shall it ever come thus far with us? No, never, as long as there are Democrats like you, and meetings like this! No, we never will prop up the worm-eaten frame of those English institutions, which the English themselves will no longer support! (No, no!) Well then, to your tents, O Israel! Every one of you rally round his standard! Every one for his faith! Here, on our side, Democracy with her twenty-five millions of proletarians to free, whom she greets with the names of citizens, brothers, equal and free men; there the bastard-opposition, with her monopolies and aristocracy of capital! They speak of reducing the qualification by one-half; we, we proclaim the rights of man and of the citizen! (Loud and long-continued applause, which ended by the whole meeting singing the Chant du départ.)

We regret not to have room for giving more of the speeches delivered at this splendid and thoroughly Democratic banquet.

At last, the Réforme has forced the National to enter into a polemic. The former journal, in declaring its adhesion to the principles announced by M. Garnier-Pagès, at the Montpellier banquet, in a speech on the French revolution, at the same time disputed the right of men, like M. Garnier, who had sacrificed the interests of Democracy to M. Odilon Barrot and the middle-class opposition, to
act as the representatives of the principles of the Revolution. This, at last, brought out a reply from the National, in which Ledru-Rollin in his turn was attacked. The principal points of accusation against the National were: 1st. Its support of the bastilles around Paris, by which the inheritance of the revolution was placed under the control of twelve hundred pieces of cannon. 2nd. Its silence last year, upon a pamphlet of M. Carnot, in which he engaged the Democrats to join the Left Centre and the Left, to get them into office as soon as possible, to drop for the moment the Republican principle, and to agitate for an extension of the Suffrage within the limits of the Charter. M. Garnier-Pagès, the younger, had about the same time announced similar principles; the pamphlet declared itself to be the expression of the opinion not of an individual, but of a party in the Chamber. The Réforme attacked both M. Garnier's speech and M. Carnot's (son of the celebrated member of the Convention and Republican minister of war) pamphlet, and tried to provoke the National to a declaration. But the National remained silent. The Réforme rightly declared that the policy proposed by both deputies would tend to nothing but to place the Democratic party wholly under the control of MM. Thiers and Barrot, and break it up entirely as a distinct party. 3rd. The National following up in practice during the Reform banquet agitation the policy proposed by M. Carnot. 4th. Its virulent and calumniating attacks upon the Communists, while proposing at the same time no practicable or effective remedy for the misery of the working people.

The dispute has been going on for a week at least. At last the National retired from the contest, after having conducted it in a very improper manner. It has been regularly beaten; but, in order to mask its defeat, it finally accepted M. Ledru's proposal of a Democratic jury.

We can only declare our full adhesion to the part the Réforme has taken in this affair. It has saved the honour, independence, and the strength of French Democracy as a distinct party. It has maintained the principles of the Revolution, which were endangered by the course pursued by the National. It has asserted the rights of the working classes in opposition to middle-class encroachments. It has unmasked these bourgeois radicals—who would make the people

---

a The reference is to the leading articles in La Réforme, December 15, 17 and 19, 1847.—Ed.

b L. H. Carnot, Les radicaux et la charte.—Ed.

c Lazare Nicolas Carnot.—Ed.

d The reference is to the leading article in La Réforme, December 20, 1847.—Ed.
believe that no class oppression exists—who will not see the frightful civil war of class against class in modern society,—and who have nothing but vain words for the working people. The Réforme, by keeping up this contest, until it has succeeded in forcing its haughty rival to break silence, to wave, to retract, to explain, and at last to withdraw,—the Réforme, we say, has well merited of Democracy.

Written at the beginning of January 1848

First published in The Northern Star No. 533, January 8, 1848 with an editorial note:
“From Our Paris Correspondent”
The Irish Coercion Bill came into force last Wednesday.a The Lord Lieutenantb was not slow in taking advantage of the despotic powers with which this new law invests him; the act has been applied all over the counties of Limerick and Tipperary and to several baronies in the counties of Clare, Waterford, Cork, Roscommon, Leitrim, Cavan, Longford and King's County.c

It remains to be seen what the effect of this odious measure will be. In this connection we already have the opinion of the class in whose interests the measure was taken, namely, the Irish landowners. They announce to the world in their organs that the measure will have no effect whatsoever. And in order to achieve this a whole country is being placed in a state of siege! To achieve this nine-tenths of the Irish representatives have deserted their country!

This is a fact. The desertion has been a general one. During the discussion of the Bill the O'Connell family itself became divided: John and Maurice, two of the deceased "Liberator's"c sons, remained faithful to their homeland, whereas their cousin,d Morgan O'Connell, not only voted for the Bill, but also spoke in its support on several occasions. There were only eighteen members who voted for the outright rejection of the Bill, and only twenty supported the amendment put forward by Mr. Wakley, the Chartist member for a borough on the outskirts of London, who demanded that the

---

a December 29, 1847.—Ed.
b Earl of Clarendon.—Ed.
c Daniel O'Connell.—Ed.
d Read "brother", a mistake in La Réforme.—Ed.
Coercion Bill should also be accompanied by measures aimed at reducing the causes of the crimes which it was proposed to repress. And among these eighteen and twenty voters there were also four or five English Radicals and two Irishmen representing English boroughs, meaning that out of the hundred members which Ireland has in Parliament there were only a dozen who put up serious opposition to the Bill.

This was the first discussion on an important question affecting Ireland which had been held since the death of O'Connell. It was to decide who would take the place of the great agitator in leading Ireland. Up to the opening of Parliament Mr. John O'Connell had been tacitly acknowledged in Ireland as his father's successor. But it soon became evident after the debate had begun that he was not capable of leading the party and, what is more, that he had found a formidable rival in Feargus O'Connor. This democratic leader about whom Daniel O'Connell said, "We are happy to make the English Chartists a present of Mr. F. O'Connor", put himself at the head of the Irish party in a single bound. It was he who proposed the outright rejection of the Coercion Bill; it was he who succeeded in rallying all the opposition behind him; it was he who opposed each clause, who held up the voting whenever possible; it was he who in his speeches summed up all the arguments of the opposition against the Bill; and finally it was he who for the first time since 1835 reintroduced the motion for Repeal of the Union, a motion which none of the Irish members would have put forward.

The Irish members accepted this leader with a bad grace. As simple Whigs in their heart of hearts they fundamentally detest the democratic energy of Mr. O'Connor. He will not allow them to go on using the campaign for repeal as a means for overthrowing the Tories in favour of the Whigs and to forget the very word "repeal" when the latter come to power. But the Irish members who support repeal cannot possibly do without a leader like O'Connor and, although they are trying to undermine his growing popularity in Ireland, they are obliged to submit to his leadership in Parliament.

When the parliamentary session is over O'Connor will probably go on a tour of Ireland to revive the agitation for repeal and to found an Irish Chartist party. There can be no doubt that if O'Connor is successful in doing this he will be the leader of the Irish people in less than six months. By uniting the democratic leadership of the three kingdoms in his hands, he will occupy a position which no agitator, not even O'Connell, has held before him.

---

a England, Scotland and Ireland.—Ed.
We will leave it to our readers to judge the importance of this future alliance between the peoples of the two islands. British democracy will advance much more quickly when its ranks are swelled by two million brave and ardent Irish, and poverty-stricken Ireland will at last have taken an important step towards her liberation.

Written on January 4, 1848
First published in *La Réforme*, January 8, 1848
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
The first issue of The Northern Star for 1848 contains an address to
the Irish people by Feargus O'Connor, the well-known leader of the
English Chartists and their representative in Parliament. This address
deserves to be read from beginning to end and carefully considered by
every democrat, but our restricted space prevents us from repro-
ducing it in full.

We would, however, be remiss in our duty if we were to pass it over
in silence. The consequences of this forceful appeal to the Irish
people will very soon be strongly felt and seen. Feargus O'Connor,
himself of Irish descent, a Protestant and for over ten years a leader
and main pillar of the great labour movement in England, must
henceforth be regarded as the virtual chief of the Irish Repealers242
and advocates of reform. His speeches in the House of Commons
against the recently published disgraceful Irish Coercion Bill243 have
given him the first claim to this status, and the subsequently con-
tinued agitation for the Irish cause shows that Feargus O'Connor is
just the man Ireland needs.

O'Connor is indeed seriously concerned about the well-being of the
millions in Ireland. Repeal— the abolition of the Union, that is, the
achievement of an independent Irish Parliament—is not an empty
word, not a pretext for obtaining posts for himself and his friends
and for making profitable private business transactions.

In his address he shows the Irish people that Daniel O'Connell,
that political juggler, led them by the nose and deceived them for
thirteen years by means of the word “Repeal”.

He shows in its true light the conduct of John O'Connell, who has
taken up his father's political heritage and who like his father is
prepared to sacrifice millions of credulous Irishmen for the sake of

---
a Here and below Engels uses the English term.—Ed.
his personal ventures and interests. All O'Connell's speeches at the Dublin Conciliation Hall and all his hypocrical protestations and beautiful phrases will not obliterate the disrepute he has brought upon himself earlier and in particular now in the House of Commons during the debates on the Irish Coercion Bill.

The Irish people must and will see how things stand, and then it will kick out the entire gang of so-called Repealers, who under cover of this cloak laugh up their sleeves and in their purses and John O'Connell, the fanatical papist and political rogue, will be kicked out first of all.

If this were all the address contained, we should not have especially mentioned it.

But it is of much wider importance. For Feargus O'Connor speaks in it not only as an Irishman but also, and primarily, as an English democrat, as a Chartist.

With a lucidity which cannot escape even the most obtuse mind, O'Connor shows that the Irish people must fight with all their might and in close association with the English working classes and the Chartists in order to win the six points of the People's Charter—annual parliaments, universal suffrage, vote by ballot, abolition of the property qualification for members of Parliament, payment of M.P.s and the establishment of equal electoral districts. Only after these six points are won will the achievement of the Repeal have any advantages for Ireland.

Furthermore O'Connor points out that justice for Ireland has already been demanded earlier by the English workers in a petition which received 3½ million signatures, and that now the English Chartists have again protested against the Irish Coercion Bill in numerous petitions and that the oppressed classes in England and Ireland must at last fight together and conquer together or continue to languish under the same oppression and live in the same misery and dependence on the privileged and ruling capitalist class.

There can be no doubt that henceforth the mass of the Irish people will unite ever more closely with the English Chartists and will act with them according to a common plan. As a result the victory of the English democrats, and hence the liberation of Ireland, will be hastened by many years. That is the significance of O'Connor's address to the Irish people.

Written at the beginning of January 1848

First published in Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 3, January 9, 1848
Gentlemen,—The Repeal of the Corn Laws\textsuperscript{a} in England is the greatest triumph of Free Trade in the nineteenth century. In every country where manufacturers discuss Free Trade, they have in mind chiefly Free Trade in corn or raw material generally. To burden foreign corn with protective duties is infamous, it is to speculate on the hunger of the people.

Cheap food, high wages,\textsuperscript{a} for this alone the English Free Traders\textsuperscript{b} have spent millions, and their enthusiasm has already infected their Continental brethren. And, generally speaking, all those who advocate Free Trade do so in the interests of the working class.\textsuperscript{c}

But, strange to say, the people for whom cheap food is to be procured at all costs are very ungrateful. Cheap food is as ill reputed in England as is cheap government in France. The people see in these self-sacrificing gentlemen, in Bowring, Bright & Co., their worst enemies and the most shameless hypocrites.

Everyone knows that in England the struggle between Liberals and Democrats takes the name of the struggle between Free Traders and Chartists. Let us see how the English Free Traders have proved to the people the good intentions that animate them.

\textsuperscript{a} In the 1848 French edition these words are repeated in English after the French.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} In the 1848 French edition, here and below, as a rule, the English is used, though the French “libre-échangiste” also occurs sometimes.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} In the 1848 French edition the end of this phrase reads: “to ease the condition of the working class”.—\textit{Ed.}
L'abolition des lois céréales en Angleterre est le plus grand
triomphe que le libre échange ait remporté au 19ème siècle. Dans
tous les pays où les fabricants parlent de libre échange ils ont
principalement en vue le libre échange des grains et des matières
premières en général. Frapper de droits protecteurs les grains
étrangers, c'est infâme, c'est spéculer sur la famine des peuples.
This is what they said to the factory hands,—

"The duty on corn is a tax upon wages; this tax you pay to the landlords, those medieval aristocrats; if your position is a wretched one, it is so only on account of the high price of the most indispensable articles of food."

The workers in turn asked of the manufacturers,—

"How is it that in the course of the last thirty years, while our commerce and manufacture has immensely increased, our wages have fallen far more rapidly, in proportion, than the price of corn has gone up?

"The tax which you say we pay the landlords is about three pence a week per worker. And yet the wages of the hand-loom weaver fell, between 1815 and 1843, from 28s. per week to 5s., and the wages of the power-loom weaver, between 1823 and 1843, from 20s. per week to 8s.

"And during the whole of the time that portion of the tax which you say we pay the landlord has never exceeded three pence. And, then, in the year 1834, when bread was very cheap and business lively, what did you tell us? You said, 'If you are poor, it is only because you have too many children, and your marriages are more productive than your labor!'

"These are the very words you spoke to us, and you set about making new Poor Laws, and building workhouses, those bastilles of the proletariat."

To this the manufacturers replied,—

"You are right, worthy laborers: it is not the price of corn alone, but competition of the hands among themselves as well, which determines wages.

"But just bear in mind the circumstance that our soil consists of rocks and sandbanks only. You surely do not imagine that corn can be grown in flower-pots! If, instead of wasting our labor and capital upon a thoroughly sterile soil, we were to give up agriculture, and devote ourselves exclusively to commerce and manufacture, all Europe would abandon its factories, and England would form one huge factory town, with the whole of the rest of Europe for its agricultural districts."

While thus haranguing his own workingmen, the manufacturer is interrogated by the small tradesmen, who exclaim,—

"If we repeal the Corn Laws, we shall indeed ruin agriculture; but, for all that, we shall not compel other nations to give up their own

---

a The 1848 French edition has here and below "industry" instead of "commerce and manufacture".—Ed.
factories, and buy our goods. What will the consequences be? I lose my customers in the country, and the home market is destroyed.”

The manufacturer turns his back upon the workingmen and replies to the shopkeeper,—

“As to that, you leave it to us! Once rid of the duty on corn, we shall import cheaper corn from abroad. Then we shall reduce wages at the very time when they are rising in the countries where we get our corn. Thus in addition to the advantages which we already enjoy we shall have lower wages, and, with all these advantages, we shall easily force the Continent to buy of us.”

But now the farmers and agricultural laborers join in the discussion.

“And what, pray, is to become of us? Are we to help in passing a sentence of death upon agriculture, when we get our living by it? Are we to let the soil be torn from beneath our feet?”

For all answer the Anti-Corn Law League contended itself with offering prizes for the three best essays upon the wholesome influence of the Repeal of the Corn Laws on English agriculture. These prizes were carried off by Messrs Hope, Morse, and Greg, whose essays were distributed broadcast throughout the agricultural districts. One of the prize essayists devotes himself to proving that neither the tenant farmer nor the agricultural laborer would lose by the repeal of the Corn Laws, and that the landlord alone would lose.

“The English tenant farmer,” he exclaims, “need not fear repeal, because no other country can produce such good corn so cheaply as England. Thus, even if the price of corn fell, it would not hurt you, because this fall would only affect rent, which would go down, while the profit of capital and the wages of labor remain stationary.”

The second prize essayist, Mr. Morse, maintains, on the contrary, that the price of corn will rise in consequence of repeal. He is at infinite pains to prove that protective duties have never been able to secure a remunerative price for corn.

In support of his assertion he quotes the fact that, whenever foreign corn has been imported, the price of corn in England has gone up considerably, and that when little corn has been imported the price has fallen extremely. This prize-winner forgets that the importation was not the cause of the high price, but that the high price was the cause of the importation. In direct contradiction of his

---

a The Three Prize Essays on Agriculture and the Corn Law. Published by the National Anti-Corn Law League.—Ed.

b The 1848 French edition has: “whose books were circulated in the rural districts in thousands of copies.”—Ed.
colleague he asserts that every rise in the price of corn is profitable to both the tenant farmer and laborer, but does not benefit the landlord.

The third prize essayist, Mr. Greg, who is a large manufacturer and whose work is addressed to the large tenant farmers, could not afford to echo such silly stuff. His language is more scientific.

He admits that the Corn Laws can increase rent only by increasing the price of corn, and that they can raise the price of corn only by inducing the investment of capital upon land of inferior quality, and this is explained quite simply.

In proportion as population increases, it inevitably follows, if foreign corn cannot be imported, that less fruitful soil must be placed under cultivation. This involves more expense and the product of this soil is consequently dearer. There being a demand for all the corn thus produced,\(^a\) it will all be sold. The price for all of it will of necessity be determined by the price of the product of the inferior soil.\(^b\) The difference between this price and the cost of production upon soil of better quality constitutes the rent paid for the use of the better soil.\(^c\)

If, therefore, in consequence of the repeal of the Corn Laws, the price of corn falls, and if, as a matter of course, rent falls along with it, it is because inferior soil will no longer be cultivated. Thus the reduction of rent must inevitably ruin a part of the tenant farmers.

These remarks were necessary in order to make Mr. Greg’s language comprehensible.

"The small farmers," he says, "who cannot support themselves by agriculture must take refuge in manufacture. As to the large tenant farmers, they cannot fail to profit by the arrangement: either the landlord will be obliged to sell them their land very cheap, or leases will be made out for long periods. This will enable tenant farmers to invest more capital in their farms, to use agricultural machinery on a larger scale, and to save manual labor, which will, moreover, be cheaper, on account of the general fall in wages, the immediate consequence of the repeal of the Corn Laws."

Dr. Bowring conferred upon all these arguments the consecration of religion, by exclaiming at a public meeting, "Jesus Christ is Free Trade, and Free Trade is Jesus Christ."

---

\(^a\) The 1848 French edition does not have the words "thus produced".—Ed.

\(^b\) The 1848 French edition has here "requiring greater expenses".—Ed.

\(^c\) The 1848 French edition does not have the words "paid for the use of the better soil".—Ed.
It will be evident that all this can't was not calculated to make cheap bread tasteful to workingmen.

Besides, how should the workingmen understand the sudden philanthropy of the manufacturers, the very men still busy fighting against the Ten-Hours Bill, which was to reduce the working day of the mill hands from twelve hours to ten?\(^{249}\)

To give you an idea of the philanthropy of these manufacturers I would remind you of the factory regulations in force in all their mills. Every manufacturer has for his own private use a regular penal code by means of which fines are inflicted for every voluntary or involuntary offence. For instance, the hand pays so much when he has the misfortune to sit down on a chair, or whisper, or speak, or laugh; if he is a few moments late; if any part of a machine breaks, or if he turns out work of an inferior quality, etc. The fines are always greater than the damage really done by the workman. And to give the workingman every opportunity for incurring fines the factory clock is set forward, and he is given bad material to make into good stuff. An overseer unskilful in multiplying infractions of rules is soon discharged.

You see, gentlemen, this private legislation is enacted for the especial purpose of creating such infractions, and infractions are manufactured for the purpose of making money. Thus the manufacturer uses every means of reducing the nominal wage, and even profiting by accidents over which the workers have no control.

And these manufacturers are the same philanthropists who have tried to persuade the workers that they were capable of going to immense expense for the sole and express purpose of improving the condition of these same workingmen! On the one hand they nibble at the workers' wages in the pettiest way, by means of factory legislation, and, on the other, they are prepared to make the greatest sacrifices to raise those wages by means of the Anti-Corn Law League.

They build great palaces, at immense expense, in which the League takes up its official residence. They send an army of missionaries to all corners of England to preach the gospel of Free Trade; they print and distribute gratis thousands of pamphlets to enlighten the workingman upon his own interests. They spend enormous sums to buy over the press to their side. They organize a vast administrative system for the conduct of the Free Trade movement, and bestow all

\(^{a}\) The 1848 French edition does not have the words "the especial purpose of".—_Ed._

\(^{b}\) The 1848 French edition has here "as it were".—_Ed._
the wealth of their eloquence upon public meetings. It was at one of these meetings that a workingman cried out,—

"If the landlords were to sell our bones, you manufacturers would be the first to buy them, and to put them through the mill and make flour of them."

The English workingmen have appreciated to the fullest extent the significance of the struggle between the lords of the land and of capital. They know very well that the price of bread was to be reduced in order to reduce wages, and that the profit of capital would rise by as much as rent fell.

Ricardo, the apostle of the English Free Traders, the leading economist of our century, entirely agrees with the workers upon this point.

In his celebrated work upon Political Economy\(^a\) he says:

"If instead of growing our own corn ... we discover a new market from which we can supply ourselves ... at a cheaper price, wages will fall and profits rise. The fall in the price of agricultural produce reduces the wages, not only of the laborer employed in cultivating the soil, but also of all those employed in commerce or manufacture" [t. I, pp. 178-79; Eng. ed., p. 137].

And do not believe, gentlemen, that it is a matter of indifference to the workingman whether he receives only four francs on account of corn being cheaper, when he had been receiving five francs before.

Have not his wages always fallen in comparison with profit? And is it not clear that his social position has grown worse as compared with that of the capitalist? Beside which he loses actually. So long as the price of corn was higher and wages were also higher, a small saving in the consumption of bread sufficed to procure him other enjoyments. But as soon as bread is cheap, and wages are therefore low, he can save almost nothing on bread, for the purchase of other articles.

The English workingmen have shown the English\(^b\) Free Traders that they are not the dupes of their illusions or of their lies; and if, in spite of this, the workers have made common cause with the manufacturers against the landlords, it is for the purpose of destroying the last remnant of feudalism, that henceforth they may have only one enemy to deal with. The workers have not miscalculated, for the landlords, in order to revenge themselves upon the manufacturers, have made common cause with the workers to carry the Ten-Hours Bill, which the latter had been vainly

---

\(^a\) D. Ricardo, *Des principes de l'économie politique et de l'impôt.* — Ed.

\(^b\) The 1848 French edition does not have the word "English". — Ed.
demanding for thirty years, and which was passed immediately after the repeal of the Corn Laws.

When Dr. Bowring, at the Congress of Economists, drew from his pocket a long list to show how many head of cattle, how much ham, bacon, poultry, etc., is imported into England, to be consumed—as he asserted—by the workers, he forgot to state that at the same time the workers of Manchester and other factory towns were thrown out of work by the beginning of the crisis.

As a matter of principle in Political Economy, the figures of a single year must never be taken as the basis for formulating general laws. We must always take the average of from six to seven years, a period during which modern industry passes through the successive phases of prosperity, overproduction, crisis, thus completing the inevitable cycle.

Doubtless, if the price of all commodities falls,—and this is the necessary consequence of Free Trade—I can buy far more for a franc than before. And the workingman's franc is as good as any other man's. Therefore, Free Trade must be advantageous to the workingman. There is only one little difficulty in this, namely that the workman, before he exchanges his franc for other commodities, has first exchanged his labor for the money of the capitalist. If in this exchange he always received the said franc while the price of all other commodities fell, he would always be the gainer by such a bargain. The difficulty does not lie in proving that, the price of all commodities falling, more commodities can be bought for the same sum of money.

Economists always take the price of labor at the moment of its exchange with other commodities, and altogether ignore the moment at which labor accomplishes its own exchange with capital. When it costs less to set in motion the machinery which produces commodities, then the things necessary for the maintenance of this machine, called workman, will also cost less. If all commodities are cheaper, labor, which is a commodity too, will also fall in price, and we shall see later that this commodity, labor, will fall far lower in proportion than all other commodities. If the workingman still pins his faith to the arguments of the economists, he will find, one fine
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a See this volume, pp. 274-78 and pp. 282-90.—Ed.
b The 1848 French edition has "prosperity, overproduction, stagnation, crisis".—Ed.
c The 1848 French edition has "for capital" instead of "for the money of capitalist".—Ed.
d The 1848 French edition has "the said franc for the same work".—Ed.
morning, that the franc has dwindled in his pocket, and that he has only five sous left.

Thereupon the economists will tell you,—

"We admit that competition among the workers will certainly not be lessened under Free Trade, and will very soon bring wages into harmony with the low price of commodities. But, on the other hand, the low price of commodities will increase consumption, the larger consumption will increase production, which will in turn necessitate a larger demand for labor and this larger demand will be followed by a rise in wages."

The whole line of argument amounts to this: Free Trade increases productive forces. When manufactures keep advancing, when wealth, when the productive forces, when, in a word, productive capital increases, the demand for the labor, the price of labor, and consequently the rate of wages, rises also.

The most favorable condition for the workingman is the growth of capital. This must be admitted: when capital remains stationary, commerce and manufacture are not merely stationary but decline, and in this case the workman is the first victim. He goes to the wall before the capitalist. And in the case of the growth of capital, under the circumstances, which, as we have said, are the best for the workingman, what will be his lot? He will go to the wall just the same. The growth of capital implies the accumulation and the concentration of capital. This centralization involves a greater division of labor and a greater use of machinery. The greater division of labor destroys the especial skill of the laborer; and by putting in the place of this skilled work labor which any one can perform it increases competition among the workers.

This competition becomes more fierce as the division of labor enables a single man to do the work of three. Machinery accomplishes the same result on a much larger scale. The accumulation of productive capital forces the industrial capitalist to work with constantly increasing means of production, ruins the small manufacturer, and drives him into the proletariat. Then, the rate of interest falling in proportion as capital accumulates, the little rentiers and retired tradespeople, who can no longer live upon their small incomes, will be forced to look out for some business again and ultimately to swell the number of proletarians. Finally, the more productive capital grows, the more it is compelled to produce for a

---

a The 1848 French edition does not have the words "one fine morning".—Ed.
b The 1848 French edition does not have the words "and retired tradespeople".—Ed.
market whose requirements it does not know,—the more supply tries to force demand, and consequently crises increase in frequency and in intensity. But every crisis in turn hastens the concentration of capital, adds to the proletariat. Thus, as productive capital grows, competition among the workers grows too, and grows in a far greater proportion. The reward of labor is less for all, and the burden of labor is increased for some at least.

In 1829 there were, in Manchester, 1,088 cotton spinners employed in 36 factories. In 1841 there were but 448, and they tended 53,353 more spindles than the 1,088 spinners did in 1829. If manual labor had increased in the same proportion as productive force, the number of spinners ought to have risen to 1,848; improved machinery had, therefore, deprived 1,400 workers of employment.

We know beforehand the reply of the economists—the people thus thrown out of work will find other kinds of employment. Dr. Bowring did not fail to reproduce this argument at the Congress of Economists. But neither did he fail to refute himself. In 1835, Dr. Bowring made a speech in the House of Commons upon the 50,000 hand-loom weavers of London who have been starving without being able to find that new kind of employment which the Free Traders hold out to them in the distance. Let us hear the most striking portion of this speech of Mr. Bowring.\(^b\)

"The misery of the hand-loom weavers," he says, "is the inevitable fate of all kinds of labor which are easily acquired, and which may, at any moment, be replaced by less costly means. As in these cases competition amongst the work-people is very great, the slightest falling-off in demand brings on a crisis. The hand-loom weavers are, in a certain sense, placed on the borders of human existence. One step further, and that existence becomes impossible. The slightest shock is sufficient to throw them on to the road to ruin. By more and more superseding manual labor, the progress of mechanical science must bring on, during the period of transition, a deal of temporary suffering. National well-being cannot be bought except at the price of some individual evils. The advance of industry is achieved at the expense of those who lag behind, and of all discoveries that of the power-loom weighs most heavily upon the hand-loom weavers. In a great many articles formerly made by hand, the weaver has been placed hors de combat; but he is sure to be beaten in a good many more stuffs that are now made by hand."

Further on he says,—"I hold in my hand a correspondence of the governor-general with the East India Company. This correspondence is concerning the weavers of the Dacca district. The governor says in his letter,—A few years ago the East India Company received from six to eight million pieces of calico woven upon the looms of

---

\(^a\) The 1848 French edition has: "the more production outstrips consumption, the more supply tries to force demand".—Ed.

\(^b\) Marx quotes Dr. Bowring according to *Principles of Political Economy* by W. Atkinson.—Ed.
the country. The demand fell off gradually and was reduced to about a million pieces. At this moment it has almost entirely ceased. Moreover, in 1800 North America received from India nearly 800,000 pieces of cotton goods. In 1830 it did not take even 4,000. Finally, in 1800 a million of pieces were shipped for Portugal; in 1850 Portugal did not receive above 20,000.

"The reports on the distress of the Indian weavers are terrible. And what is the origin of that distress? The presence on the market of English manufactures, the production of the same article by means of the power-loom. A great number of the weavers died of starvation; the remainder has gone over to the other employment, and chiefly to field labor. Not to be able to change employment amounted to a sentence of death. And at this moment the Dacca district is crammed with English yarns and calicoes. The Dacca muslin, renowned all over the world for its beauty and firm texture, has also been eclipsed by the competition of English machinery. In the whole history of commerce, it would, perhaps, be difficult to find suffering equal to what these whole classes in India had to submit to" [W. Atkinson, pp. 36-38].

Mr. Bowring's speech is the more remarkable because the facts quoted by him are correct, and the phrases with which he seeks to palliate them are characterized by the hypocrisy common to all Free Trade discourses. He represents the workers as means of production which must be superseded by less expensive means of production, pretends to see in the labor of which he speaks a wholly exceptional kind of labor, and in the machine which has crushed out the weavers an equally exceptional kind of machine. He forgets that there is no kind of manual labor which may not any day share the fate of the hand-loom weavers.

"The constant aim and tendency of every improvement of mechanism is indeed to do entirely without the labor of men, or to reduce its price, by superseding the labor of the adult males by that of women and children, or the work of the skilled by that of the unskilled workman. In most of the throttle mills, spinning is now entirely done by girls of sixteen years and less. The introduction of the self-acting mule has caused the discharge of most of the (adult male) spinners, while the children and young persons have been kept on" [p. 34; Eng. ed., p. 23].

The above words of the most enthusiastic of Free Traders, Dr. Ure, are calculated to complete the confessions of Dr. Bowring. Mr. Bowring speaks of certain individual evils, and, at the same time, says that these individual evils destroy whole classes; he speaks of the temporary sufferings during a transition period, and does not deny that these temporary evils have implied for the majority the transition from life to death, and for the rest a transition from a better to a worse condition. When he asserts, farther on, that the sufferings of the working class are inseparable from the progress of

---

a A. Ure, _Philosophie des manufactures, ou Économie industrielle_, t. I.—Ed.
b The 1848 French edition has "these workers" instead of "the working class".—Ed.
industry, and are necessary to the prosperity of the nation, he simply says that the prosperity of the bourgeois class presupposes as necessary the suffering of the laboring class.

All the comfort which Mr. Bowring offers the workers who perish, and, indeed, the whole doctrine of compensation which the Free Traders propound, amounts to this—

You thousands of workers who are perishing, do not despair! You can die with an easy conscience. Your class will not perish. It will always be numerous enough for the capitalist class to decimate it without fear of annihilating it. Besides, how could capital be usefully applied if it did not take care to keep up its exploitable material, i.e., the workingmen, to be exploited over and over again?

But, then, why propound as a problem still to be solved the question: What influence will the adoption of the Free Trade have upon the condition of the working class? All the laws formulated by the political economists from Quesnay to Ricardo, have been based upon the hypothesis that the trammels which still interfere with commercial freedom have disappeared. These laws are confirmed in proportion as Free Trade is adopted. The first of these laws is that competition reduces the price of every commodity to the minimum cost of production. Thus the minimum of wages is the natural price of labor. And what is the minimum of wages? Just so much as is required for production of the articles absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the worker, for the continuation, by hook or by crook, of his own existence and that of his class.

But do not imagine that the worker receives only this minimum wage, and still less that he always receives it. No, according to this law, the working class will sometimes be more fortunate, will sometimes receive something above the minimum, but this surplus will merely make up for the deficit which they will have received below the minimum in times of industrial depression. That is to say that within a given time which recurs periodically, in other words, in the cycle which commerce and industry describe while passing through the successive phases of prosperity, overproduction, stagnation, and crisis, when reckoning all that the working class has had above and below mere necessaries, we shall see that, after all, they have received neither more nor less than the minimum; i.e., the working class will have maintained itself as a class after enduring any amount of misery and misfortune, and after leaving many corpses upon the industrial battle-field. But what of that? The class will still exist; nay, more, it will have increased.

a The 1848 French edition has "circle" instead of "cycle".—Ed.
But this is not all. The progress of industry creates less and less expensive means of subsistence. Thus spirits have taken the place of beer, cotton that of wool and linen, and potatoes that of bread.

Thus, as means are constantly being found for the maintenance of labor on cheaper and more wretched food, the minimum of wages is constantly sinking. If these wages began by letting the man work to live, they end by forcing him to live the life of a machine. His existence has no other value than that of a simple productive force, and the capitalist treats him accordingly. This law of the commodity labor, of the minimum of wages will be confirmed in proportion as the supposition of the economists, Free Trade, becomes an actual fact. Thus, of two things one: either we must reject all political economy based upon the assumption of Free Trade, or we must admit that under this same Free Trade the whole severity of the economic laws will fall upon the workers.

To sum up, what is Free Trade under the present conditions of society? Freedom of Capital. When you have torn down the few national barriers which still restrict the free development of capital, you will merely have given it complete freedom of action. So long as you let the relation of wages-labor to capital exist, no matter how favorable the conditions under which you accomplish the exchange of commodities, there will always be a class which exploits and a class which is exploited. It is really difficult to understand the presumption of the Free Traders who imagine that the more advantageous application of capital will abolish the antagonism between industrial capitalists and wage-workers. On the contrary. The only result will be that the antagonism of these two classes will stand out more clearly.

Let us assume for a moment that there are no more Corn Laws or national and municipal import duties; that in a word all the accidental circumstances which to-day the workingman may look upon as a cause of his miserable condition have vanished, and we shall have removed so many curtains that hide from his eyes his true enemy.

He will see that capital released from all trammels will make him no less a slave than capital trammeled by import duties.

Gentlemen! Do not be deluded by the abstract word Freedom! whose freedom? Not the freedom of one individual in relation to another, but freedom of Capital to crush the worker

---

a The 1848 French edition has "advance" instead of "free development".—Ed.

b The 1848 French edition has "no more customs, no more town dues" (octroi).—Ed.
Why should you desire farther to sanction unlimited competition with this idea of freedom, when the idea of freedom itself is only the product of a social condition based upon Free Competition?

We have shown what sort of fraternity Free Trade begets between the different classes of one and the same nation. The fraternity which Free Trade would establish between the nations of the earth would not be more real, to call cosmopolitan exploitation universal brotherhood is an idea that could only be engendered in the brain of the bourgeoisie. Every one of the destructive phenomena to which unlimited competition gives rise within any one nation is reproduced in more gigantic proportions in the market of the world. We need not pause any longer upon Free Trade sophisms on this subject, which are worth just as much as the arguments of our prize essayists Messrs Hope, Morse, and Greg.

For instance, we are told that Free Trade would create an international division of labor, and thereby give to each country those branches of production most in harmony with its natural advantages.

You believe perhaps, gentlemen, that the production of coffee and sugar is the natural destiny of the West Indies.

Two centuries ago, nature, which does not trouble itself about commerce, had planted neither sugar-cane nor coffee trees there. And it may be that in less than half a century you will find there neither coffee nor sugar, for the East Indies, by means of cheaper production, have already successfully broken down this so-called natural destiny of the West Indies.

And the West Indies, with their natural wealth, are as heavy a burden for England as the weavers of Dacca, who also were destined from the beginning of time to weave by hand.

One other circumstance must not be forgotten, namely that, just as everything has become a monopoly, there are also nowadays some branches of industry which prevail over all others, and secure to the nations which especially foster them the command of the market of the world. Thus in the commerce of the world cotton alone has much greater commercial importance than all the other raw materials used in the manufacture of clothing. It is truly ridiculous for the Free Traders to refer to the few specialties in each branch of industry, throwing them into the balance against the product used in everyday consumption, and produced most cheaply in those countries in which manufacture is most highly developed.

If the Free Traders cannot understand how one nation can grow rich at the expense of another, we need not wonder, since these same
gentlemen also refuse to understand how in the same country one class can enrich itself at the expense of another.

Do not imagine, gentlemen, that in criticising freedom of commerce we have the least intention of defending Protection.

One may be opposed to constitutionalism without being in favor of absolutism.\textsuperscript{a}

Moreover, the Protective system is nothing but a means of establishing manufacture upon a large scale in any given country, that is to say, of making it dependent upon the market of the world; and from the moment that dependence upon the market of the world is established, there is more or less dependence upon Free Trade too. Besides this, the Protective system helps to develop free competition within a nation. Hence we see that in countries where the bourgeoisie is beginning to make itself felt as a class, in Germany for example, it makes great efforts to obtain Protective duties. They serve the bourgeoisie as weapons against feudalism and absolute monarchy,\textsuperscript{b} as a means for the concentration of its own powers for the realization of Free Trade within the country.

But, generally speaking, the Protective system in these days is conservative, while the Free Trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the Free Trade system hastens the Social Revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of Free Trade.

First published in French as a pamphlet at the beginning of February 1848 in Brussels

Signed: Karl Marx

\textsuperscript{a} The 1848 French edition has “ancien régime” instead of “absolutism”.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} The 1848 French edition has “government” instead of “monarchy”.—Ed.
The Society of Fraternal Democrats at its last meeting adopted an address to the workers of Great Britain and Ireland. This address, edited by Mr. Harney, of The Northern Star, is published in the latest number of this newspaper.250

After recalling, in a portrayal as rapid as eloquent, the sufferings of the working class today, this address calls on the workers of the two islands to complete their party organisation:

On all sides the middle class has laid traps for you. In order to divert you from the People's Charter, the only goal important to you, they spawn all sorts of projects for superficial reforms. But within a few years you have twice had to learn the hard lesson that any scheme of reform emanating from the bourgeoisie must be for you "like Dead Sea fruits that tempt the eye, but turn to ashes on the lips". Remember the agitation for the Reform Bill, and that for the repeal of the Corn Laws.

...Nonetheless, you are asked to support a "National League for the Reform of Abuses", an "Anti-State Church Association", an "Anti-Bribery Society", and societies for the reform of the currency, and the abolition of certain taxes, etc., etc. The one design of the projector of these schemes is to perfect the already dominant power of the middle class. They all combine to resist your rightful claim to the privileges of citizenship: they are therefore your enemies. Were they desirous, as they profess to be, of promoting your welfare, they would aid you to obtain sovereign power. They well know that if you controlled the legislature, all the reforms they seek—and reforms of much greater importance—would be forthwith effected. How then can they call themselves your friends, while refusing you the suffrage?

Let this great truth be impressed upon every working man, that it is from the hut and the hovel, the garret and the cellar, that must come the regenerators of his order and the social saviours of the human race. Receive with joy and fraternal love every man who, belonging to the privileged orders, shall renounce class distinctions, and ally himself with you, but look to no class above your own for your emancipation. ...Practically outlawed by the other classes of the state, you must find in your own clear heads, courageous hearts, and powerful arms the means of effecting your regeneration.

...We must call your serious attention to a wicked and abominable conspiracy against your interests, the conspiracy both by the enemies of all reform, and by many of the middle-class sham-reformers. These conspirators seek to revive those national pre-
The Chartist Movement

judices, now all but extinct, which formerly made the working men of these countries the willing butchers of their fellow men of other lands. They desire to inflame the people of these islands with a dread and hatred of the people of France, under the pretext that the French contemplate the invasion and subjugation of England.

Working men of Great Britain and Ireland, your country is already invaded and subjugated by enemies within—enemies who have reduced you politically and socially to the condition of Helots. You will not dislodge these enemies by increasing the physical power of your rulers. We believe that the veritable people of France—the proletarians—have learnt by experience that, like yourselves, their enemies are not to be found on any foreign shore, but in their own country. In France, as in England, a triumphant moneyocracy rules supreme and grinds the sons of labour to the dust. As in England, the people in France fights against this enemy and for the advent of liberty, equality and fraternity.

Even supposing this country were menaced by aggression from without, England would have nothing to apprehend if her people were freemen. It is not armies, navies or fortresses that constitute the true defence of nations; a nation’s best defence consists in a people which is truly free....

Let the privileged classes renounce their unjust usurpations and establish political equality and social justice, and England will have nothing to fear against a world in arms. On the contrary, the people of all countries would hail with joy the march of England’s power, if that power were arrayed on the side of the liberty and social emancipation of mankind.

Working men of Great Britain and Ireland, why should you arm yourselves and fight for the preservation of institutions in the privileges of which you have no share? For the maintenance of laws made not to protect, but to constrain you? For the protection of property which you can regard only as the accumulated plunder of the fruits of your labour? You are deprived of the produce of your industry; and then your poverty is made the pretext for withholding from you your citizens’ rights! Subjected to plunder, wrong, and insult by the possessors of property, you are asked to pour out your blood in defence of property! Let the privileged and the property-holders fight their own battles! And if they are too weak to do so, let them give the people what belongs to it; let them learn to submit to the popular will; if they do so, the whole nation will form a rampart round these islands which no foreign invader could ever break through!

Your great want is political power as the means to effect your social emancipation; and until that political power is yours, let your resolve be: No vote, no musket! Give us the suffrage, or we will not fight!

Working men of Great Britain and Ireland! Hold in abhorrence the conspirators who would set nation against nation, in the name of that wicked lie, that men of different countries are “natural enemies”. Rally round the banner of democracy, with its motto: “All men are brothers!”

Signed on behalf of the Society of Fraternal Democrats: G. Julian Harney, Ernest Jones, Thomas Clark, Charles Keen (Great Britain); J. A. Michelot, H. Bernard (France); Carl Schapper, J. Moll (Germany); J. Schabelitz, H. Krell (Switzerland); Peter Holm, Lünberg (Scandinavia); Louis Oborski (Poland); C. Pohse, P. Bluhm (Russia).

Written on January 9, 1848
First published in La Réforme, January 10, 1848
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time
What does the Ministry do?—Nothing.
What does the parliamentary, legal opposition do?—Nothing.
What can France expect from the present Chambers?—Nothing.
What does M. Guizot want?—To remain Minister.
What do Messrs Thiers, Molé and Company want?—To become ministers again.
What does France gain from this ôte-toi, afin que je m'y mette\(^{a}\)?—Nothing.

Ministry and opposition are thus condemned to do nothing.
Who alone will accomplish the coming French revolution?—The proletariat.
What will the bourgeoisie do for this?—Nothing.

Written about January 16, 1848
First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 5, January 16, 1848 and in La Réforme, January 19, 1848
Printed according to the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung
Published in English for the first time

--
\(^{a}\) Get out so that I can get in.—Ed.
A curious document has just been published and distributed, as if for a New Year's gift to the Chamber of Deputies. It is a statement of facts explaining how a certain M. Petit got the place of a tax collector (received particulier) at Corbeil, near Paris, and has been published by M. Petit himself. M. Petit has been forced to this act in consequence of a suit for separation pending between himself and his wife, and in which action it had been alleged that he had bought his place by prostituting his wife to a gentleman intimately connected with M. Guizot. He now declares in his publication—

"Yes, my place was bought, as all places are bought now-a-day; but it was bought not with prostitution, but with hard cash only."

Then he goes on to detail how he first aspired to the office of a Councillor Referendary at the Court of Accounts. How the ministry promised him that place, if he only could procure the resignation of one of the councillors; how the minister's secretary intimated to him, which of the councillors would most likely sell their charge; how he then, for 15,000 francs, procured the wished-for resignation; how then he was told he must procure a resignation of a Councillor Referendary, not of the second, but of the first class, as the government wanted such a one in order to fulfil a promise made by them on their coming into office; how by make-shifts of different sorts, the difference of price of the two resignations was made up; how at last the resignation was procured; how then the ministry wanted not only a resignation like that tendered, but one of a higher...
degree still, of a Master Councillor; how this new resignation was also procured by the means of “cash down”; how finally it was offered to M. Petit to accept the tax collectorship of Corbeil, rather than the place in the Court of Accounts; how M. Petit accepted this; how then the different resignations were signed and exchanged against the amounts of money stipulated; and how, two days later, the whole of the royal ordinances were published, accepting the resignations, and promoting and naming the several individuals concerned, to the offices stipulated by the transaction.

These are the principal facts of the matter. There are some others of less importance, proving how M. Petit, as soon as he was once hooked by having paid the first sum, was made to pay more and more. But these I pass over. I only mention, that in the publication of M. Petit all the names are given in full.

You will easily imagine what a noise this little pamphlet has made in Paris. All papers are full of it, and the more so, as the Minister of Finance (to which department the Court of Accounts belongs) under whose direction the above transactions took place, had openly denied anything of the sort ever having occurred, when questioned about it in the Chamber by M. Luneau. M. Luneau, at the time, declared the sale of places in the above department to be a matter of public notoriety. Known to the majority, as well as to the opposition. Known to every one, in short, except, it appeared, to the minister himself. M. Lacave met this by a flat denial. Now the matter has come out in a manner which makes all burking impossible. And yet, although all Paris has been full of it for almost a week past, the government has not opened its mouth.

We only repeat the words of M. Dupin the elder, pronounced when M. Luneau brought the matter forward in the Chamber—

“It was hardly worth while to make a revolution to abolish the venality of places, if this infamous system is suffered to lift up its head again.”

The next subject occupying the papers is the capture of Abd-el-Kader, and the resolution which the government will come to as to his future location. There is no doubt they will confirm and execute the Duke D'Aumale's promise, and send the Emir to Egypt. It is curious that almost all the papers of the Opposition, from the National to the Constitutionnel, demanded the breach of that promise. Now, there is no doubt the promise was granted conditionally, and leaving the government free to confirm, or not to confirm it. The refusal of confirmation would not directly imply, as

\[a\] J. P. J. Lacave-Laplagne.—Ed.
the Sun has it, an infamy. But there is no doubt, either, that a similar act on the part of any other government, particularly the English, would have been treated by those very same papers as the most infamous treason. It is evident, that, it being impossible to replace matters in the same state as they were when Abd-el-Kader conditionally surrendered, it would imply a want of generosity of the first order to refuse to him the confirmation of the conditions of surrender. But in such questions these national papers are blind, and would commit the same acts for whose commission they blame others. The only two papers which have spoken in favour of confirming the treaty with Abd-el-Kader, are the Presse and the Réforme. The first, a monarchical paper, wanted it confirmed, because the government could not give the lie to a son of the king, to a son of France; thus reviving the old title of the princes of Royal blood before the revolution.

"No", said the Réforme, "the matter is a delicate one—the honour of our country is implied; in such matters we had better be too generous than too narrow, and therefore, confirm the word given, were it even that of a prince."  

Again, the Réforme alone has taken the right view of the matter.  

Upon the whole it is, in our opinion, very fortunate that the Arabian chief has been taken. The struggle of the Bedouins was a hopeless one, and though the manner in which brutal soldiers, like Bugeaud, have carried on the war is highly blameable, the conquest of Algeria is an important and fortunate fact for the progress of civilisation. The piracies of the Barbaresque states, never interfered with by the English government as long as they did not disturb their ships, could not be put down but by the conquest of one of these states. And the conquest of Algeria has already forced the Beys of Tunis and Tripoli, and even the Emperor of Morocco, to enter upon the road of civilisation. They were obliged to find other employment for their people than piracy, and other means of filling their exchequer than tributes paid to them by the smaller states of Europe. And if we may regret that the liberty of the Bedouins of the desert has been destroyed, we must not forget that these same Bedouins were a nation of robbers,—whose principal means of living consisted of making excursions either upon each other, or upon the settled villagers, taking what they found, slaughtering all those who resisted, and selling the remaining prisoners as slaves. All these nations of free barbarians look very proud, noble and glorious at a

---

a Duke of Aumale, son of Louis Philippe.—Ed.  
b From articles in La Réforme, January 2, 3 and 5, 1848.—Ed.  
c Abd-ur-Rahman.—Ed.
distance, but only come near them and you will find that they, as well
as the more civilised nations, are ruled by the lust of gain, and only
employ ruder and more cruel means. And after all, the modern bourgeoise, with civilisation, industry, order, and at least relative enlighten-ment following him, is preferable to the feudal lord or to the marauding robber, with the barbarian state of society to which they belong.

M. Guizot has laid before the Chambers part of the diplomatic correspondence relating to Switzerland and Italy. The first proves again that he has been regularly done by Lord Palmerston, and both prove the intimate alliance France has entered into with Austria. That was the last infamy which as yet had been spared to Louis-Philippistic France. The representative of tyranny, of oppression attained by means the most infamous,—the country of stability and reaction, the ally of France, as reconstituted by two revolutions! Deeper she cannot sink. But this is quite well. The deeper the bourgeoise brings down this country, the nearer draws the day of reckoning. And it will come, before the bourgeoisie think of it. There is a party they do not take into account, and that party is the noble, the generous, the brave French people.

The dispute between the Réforme and the National has been submitted to a jury selected by both parties. All hostilities are suspended. By the end of this month the decision will be given. May it be as it will, we hope the Réforme will continue in the only course which can save the Democracy of France.

Written in mid-January 1848
First published in The Northern Star
No. 535, January 22, 1848
with an editorial note:
"From Our Paris Correspondent"

a See this volume, pp. 385-87, 406-08 and 438-44.—Ed.
The fourth meeting convened for the adoption of the National Petition by the Chartist Council was held in London last Tuesday.\textsuperscript{a} Mr. Julian Harney presided. Messrs Clark and Dixon, of the Chartist central committee,\textsuperscript{b} West, of Macclesfield, Skelton, Keen, and Fussell spoke in turn. But the orators of the evening were Messrs Harney and Jones. We give extracts of their speeches:\textsuperscript{c}

\textit{Mr. Ernest Jones.---}We are assembled here to assist in passing a \textit{Coercion Bill} against the government, and to produce such a “pressure from without”, as shall squeeze poor little Lord John Russell into something like a decent and statesman-like shape. We need this pressure, seeing that of all the parliaments we have had, the present parliament is assuredly the most hostile to working men. (A voice: No! no!) Someone says No. But I repeat that no class has ever proved as hostile to the working class as the middle class of England. (Hear, hear.) It has cast down aristocracy on the left, democracy on the right, and lives on the ruins of both. I do not wish to raise the aristocracy. No! Let the bruised serpent lie, for it would sting the hand that healed it.... Under feudalism, the people were fat slaves; under your rule, Sir defender of the middle class, they are lean slaves. (Loud cheers.)

Seeing then that we never had a more middle class, and therefore a more hostile parliament, it is time to organise resistance. And the people knows this. We too are increasing our army; the Old Guards of Chartism are in the field again. We too are enrolling our militia, the starving millions. We too are strengthening our “national defences”, courage in our hearts, discipline in our ranks, and unity in our action. (Applause.)

...But there are some gentlemen here who are not satisfied with this, and who say that millions of determined, well organised and well informed men are insufficient to obtain the Charter. These gentlemen tell the people that they must grow rich and then

\textsuperscript{a} January 11, 1848.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} The reference is to the Executive Committee of the National Charter Association.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} Quoted from the report: “The People’s Charter.—Important Public Meeting” published in \textit{The Northern Star}.—\textit{Ed.}
they will be free. But I tell you, you must become free and then you will be rich!
(Applause.)

Become rich! how? In the workhouse or the gaol? Become rich in the deer forests of our nobles? Become rich on six shillings (8 francs)\textsuperscript{a} a week? Become rich in the churchyards of famished Ireland? (Applause.) Go tell it to the unemployed in Manchester—to the 20,000 destitute in Bradford. Go tell it to the Irish tenant, dying by the light of his burning cottage set on fire by his landlord. Go tell it to the beggar at the doors of Grosvenor Square! Go tell him once for all to stay a slave; but do not insult his misery by telling him to become rich! I know you will here point to our glorious Land Company\textsuperscript{254} to prove that the people can become rich.... But do you imagine that the government will let you go on?... This company has succeeded in rescuing 50,000 families from ruin; but rest assured, Parliament will prevent you from forming other companies, unless you obtain political power!... Let the Land Company members remember their forefathers, the yeomanry of England, who all owned the land. How did they lose it? Why, by taxation, which ruined them.

...Now then, gentlemen, make money, it will be wanted for the militia, for the increased army. Make money, it will be wanted for fresh palaces, for new bishops, for new royal babies! Make money, become middle class yourselves, and then, as you know, the middle class will no longer fear you! Make money—and this impossible task will be your only salvation. Not one word about our triumph at Nottingham,\textsuperscript{b} of our organisation, of our national petition and our National Convention, now being prepared.

...No, my friends, above all we need the vote.... And you, men of London, you have it more in your power to obtain it than your brothers in the rest of England.... Our gallant men of the north are a long way off; their voices will not be heard, for there are hundreds of miles and plenty of barracks between those petitioners and Parliament. But you, men of London, can go in person and knock at the doors of St. Stephen's,\textsuperscript{255} knock till your privileged debtors give you back, trembling, what they have owed you for centuries! So knock, and go on knocking until justice has been done. (Thunderous applause.)

Mr. Julian Harney.—We are here to adopt a petition to Parliament.... But we are not asking for mercy or pity. Even were we so degraded as to do such a thing, we know that we have nothing to expect from the pity of our oppressors.... It was not by crying misericordia that our forefathers rescued themselves from the yoke of the traitor Charles I. It was not by begging for mercy that the Americans broke their chains. It was not by crying misericordia that the French people overthrew the tyranny of feudalism, priestcraft and monarchy. (Great cheering.)

No, it would be vain for us to implore Capital for mercy. All our petitions would achieve nothing if they were not followed by other measures. First, we do not ask for pity, we ask for justice. We demand it, not only by the petition, but also by our agitation and our organisation, which is already beginning to terrify the parliamentary middle class. Continue to agitate, then, for when you cease, your petitions are only empty words.

Truly, the prize is worth the struggle. Behold this mighty empire, built up by the strong arms and cemented by the blood of your fathers; this empire of 160 million inhabitants, covering the sixth part of the habitable globe, this empire on which "the sun never sets".\textsuperscript{c} How is it that you, owners and conquerors of millions of miles of this

\textsuperscript{a} Here and below the French equivalents were inserted by Engels.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{b} An allusion to O'Connor's election to Parliament.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{c} A phrase used by contemporaries of king of Spain and German Emperor Charles V about his domains where the "sun never sets".—\textit{Ed.}
fair earth, do not possess a foot of land? That millions of the heirs of this magnificent empire are dying of hunger, that thousands have no shelter from the wintry blast? The natural and manufactured riches of every clime are produced in the limits of the British Empire. Our manufactures are the wonder and envy of the whole world. For skill, industry and heroism our artisans, labourers and sailors are celebrated everywhere. All the elements of greatness and happiness abound, in spite of which you are crushed by misery. This empire is rightfully the property not of an idle, a scheming privileged few, but of the entire people. Is such a prize not worth struggling for? The Charter is the means by which you will win it. (Cheers.) When, therefore, the usurpers ask you to arm in defence of the country, refuse until you have your fair share of its advantages. If you armed yourselves, what would be your fate? Remember the poor soldier who was recently shot in India for insubordination, this is your share; compare it with the share of the Duke of Wellington, who got from the Treasury a sum of two and a half million pounds (60 million francs): So much for the aristocrats.

Well, then! If the aristocracy fears the loss of its broad acres, let it fight for the protection of those acres! If the Church fears the confiscation of its immense revenues, let the parsons and bishops arm themselves! If the Jews and jobbers of Change Alley 256fear the swamping of their funds, let them fight to protect their plunder! If the shopocracy fear the seizure of their tills and their ledgers let them arm and fight to protect their property! But you, men of the people, overworked and ill-paid sons of toil, houseless and shivering serfs of privilege, you who have neither lands, nor revenues, nor rent nor tithes, nor public funds, nor shares, nor profits, nor usury, nor votes, to whom the throne affords no protection and the law no security, fight for something else, or fight not at all! (Great cheering.) If you must fight, fight for yourselves. (Renewed cheering.) When lords and priests and bourgeois ask you to fight, let your answer be: No vote, no musket! Knaves and fools are now rushing into print with talk of national defence; there is only one defence, that of the Chartists: The land for the people, every man a home, every man a vote, and every man a musket! (Thunderous applause.)
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A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the Powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as Communistic by its opponents in power? Where the Opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of Communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

Two things result from this fact:

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European Powers to be itself a Power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the Spectre of Communism with a Manifesto of the party itself.

To this end, Communists of various nationalities have assembled in London, and sketched the following Manifesto, to be published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages.
BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIANS*

The history of all hitherto existing society** is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master*** and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold

* By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern Capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labour. By proletariat, the class of modern wage-labourers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour-power in order to live. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

** That is, all written history. In 1847, the pre-history of society, the social organisation existing previous to recorded history, was all but unknown. Since then, Haxthausen discovered common ownership of land in Russia, Maurer proved it to be the social foundation from which all Teutonic races started in history, and by and by village communities were found to be, or to have been the primitive form of society everywhere from India to Ireland. The inner organisation of this primitive Communistic society was laid bare, in its typical form, by Morgan's crowning discovery of the true nature of the gens and its relation to the tribe. With the dissolution of these primeval communities society begins to be differentiated into separate and finally antagonistic classes. I have attempted to retrace this process of dissolution in Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigenthums und des Staats, 2nd edition, Stuttgart, 1886. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888, and—less the last sentence—to the German edition of 1890.]

*** Guild-master, that is, a full member of a guild, a master within, not a head of a guild. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]
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gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices,\textsuperscript{a} serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, under which industrial production was monopolised by closed guilds,\textsuperscript{b} now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild-masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle class;\textsuperscript{c} division of labour between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labour in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois.

\textsuperscript{a} The German editions of 1848, 1872, 1883 and 1890 have “journeymen” (“Gesellen”) instead of “journeymen, apprentices”.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} In the German editions the beginning of the phrase is: “The former feudal, or guild, organisation of industry”.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} The German editions have here and below “middle estate” (“Mittelstand”) instead of “middle class”.—\textit{Ed.}
Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune; here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), there taxable “third estate” of the monarchy (as in France), afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, cornerstone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part. The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn

* "Commune" was the name taken, in France, by the nascent towns even before they had conquered from their feudal lords and masters local self-government and political rights as the “Third Estate”. Generally speaking, for the economical development of the bourgeoisie, England is here taken as the typical country; for its political development, France. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

This was the name given their urban communities by the townsmen of Italy and France, after they had purchased or wrested their initial rights of self-government from their feudal lords. [Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.]

---

a The German editions have here and below “large-scale” instead of “modern”.—Ed.
b The words “of that class” were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
c The German editions have “estate” instead of “class”.—Ed.
d The words “medieval”, “(as in Italy and Germany)”, “(as in France)” were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
e The German editions have “estate” instead of “semi-feudal”.—Ed.
asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors", and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment". It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which Reactionists so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses, his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere.
The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilised nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Indepen-
dent, or but loosely connected provinces with separate interests, laws, governments and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier and one customs-tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?

We see then: the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces\(^a\); they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put on its trial, each time more threateningly, the existence of the entire bourgeois society. In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In

---

\(^a\) The German editions add: "they hindered production instead of developing it".—Ed.
these crises there breaks out an epidemic\textsuperscript{a} that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property\textsuperscript{b}; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians.\textsuperscript{c}

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, \textit{i.e.}, capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed—a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital. These labourers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labour, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an append-

\textsuperscript{a} The German editions have: "a social epidemic".—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} The German editions of 1848 have: "bourgeois civilisation and the conditions of bourgeois property".—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} The German editions have: "the modern workers, the \textit{proletarians}".—\textit{Ed.}
age of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore also of labour,\(^{258}\) is equal to its cost of production. In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil\(^a\) also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time or by increased speed of the machinery, etc.

Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of labourers, crowded into the factory, are organised like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overseer, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.

The less the skill and exertion of strength implied in manual labour, in other words, the more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labour of men superseded by that of women.\(^b\) Differences of age and sex have no longer any distinctive social validity for the working class. All are instruments of labour, more or less expensive to use, according to their age and sex.

No sooner is the exploitation of the labourer by the manufacturer, so far, at an end, and he receives his wages in cash, than he is set upon by the other portions of the bourgeoisie, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.

The lower strata of the middle class—\(^c\) the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally,\(^d\) the handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly

---

\(^{a}\) The German editions have: “the quantity of labour”.—\(Ed.\)

\(^{b}\) The German 23-page edition of 1848 has: “of women and children”.—\(Ed.\)

\(^{c}\) The German editions have: “The former lower strata of the middle estate”.—\(Ed.\)

\(^{d}\) The German editions have: “and rentiers” instead of “and retired tradesmen generally”.—\(Ed.\)
because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which Modern Industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population.

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeoisie. Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individu-

---

a The German editions have: "They direct their attacks not only against the bourgeois conditions of production, they direct them against the instruments of production themselves."—Ed.

b This word was inserted in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
al bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (Trades' Unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralise the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletariat, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. Thus the ten-hours' bill in England was carried.259

Altogether collisions between the classes of the old society further, in many ways, the course of development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself, whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times, with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for its help, and thus, to drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie.

Further, as we have already seen, entire sections of the ruling classes are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence.

---

a The words in parentheses were inserted in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.

b The words "political and general" were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.\(^a\)

Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of Modern Industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

The lower middle class,\(^b\) the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat, they thus defend not their present, but their future interests, they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.

The “dangerous class”, the social scum,\(^c\) that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.

In the conditions of the proletariat, those of old society at large are already virtually swamped. The proletarian is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labour, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois

---

\(^a\) The German editions have “elements of education” instead of “elements of enlightenment and progress”.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The German editions have here and below “middle estates” instead of “the lower middle class” and “the middle class”.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) The German editions have “lumpen proletariat” instead of “the dangerous class, the social scum”.—*Ed.*
prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests.

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand, sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.

Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeoisie, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois. The modern labourer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident, that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help

---

a This word was added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, is its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.

\[a\] The German editions have here: “The accumulation of wealth in the hands of individuals”.—Ed.
II
PROLETARIANS AND COMMUNISTS

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties.

They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

They do not set up any sectarian\(^a\) principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

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

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and\(^b\) resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

---

\(^a\) The German editions have “separate” instead of “sectarian”.—\(Ed.\)

\(^b\) The words “the most advanced and” were added in the English edition of 1888.—\(Ed.\)
The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered by this or that would-be universal reformer.

They merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes. The abolition of existing property relations is not at all a distinctive feature of Communism.

All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historical change consequent upon the change in historical conditions. a

The French Revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favour of bourgeois property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few. b

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

We Communists have been reproached with the desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labour, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence.

Hard-won, self-acquired, self-earned property! Do you mean the property of the petty artisan c and of the small peasant, a form of property that preceded the bourgeois form? There is no need to abolish that; the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it, and is still destroying it daily.

Or do you mean modern bourgeois private property?

But does wage-labour create any property for the labourer? Not a bit. It creates capital, i.e., that kind of property which exploits wage-labour, and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labour for fresh exploitation.

---

a In the German editions this phrase reads: “All property relations have been subject to constant historical replacement, constant historical change.” — Ed.

b The German editions have: “the exploitation of the ones by the others”. — Ed.

c The German editions have: “the property of the petty bourgeois”. — Ed.
Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage-labour. Let us examine both sides of this antagonism.

To be a capitalist is to have not only a purely personal, but a social status in production. Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.

Capital is, therefore, not a personal, it is a social power.

When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, into the property of all members of society, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. It loses its class character.

Let us now take wage-labour.

The average price of wage-labour is the minimum wage, i.e., that quantum of the means of subsistence, which is absolutely requisite to keep the labourer in bare existence as a labourer. What, therefore, the wage-labourer appropriates by means of his labour, merely suffices to prolong and reproduce a bare existence. We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labour, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labour of others. All that we want to do away with is the miserable character of this appropriation, under which the labourer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only in so far as the interest of the ruling class requires it.

In bourgeois society, living labour is but a means to increase accumulated labour. In Communist society, accumulated labour is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the labourer.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.

And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois abolition of individuality and freedom! And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.

By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying.

But if selling and buying disappears, free selling and buying disappears also. This talk about free selling and buying, and all the other "brave words" of our bourgeoisie about freedom in general, have a meaning, if any, only in contrast with restricted selling and
buying, with the fettered traders of the Middle Ages, but have no meaning when opposed to the Communistic abolition of buying and selling, of the bourgeois conditions of production, and of the bourgeoisie itself.

You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few\(^a\) is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society.

In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend.

From the moment when labour can no longer be converted into capital, money, or rent, into a social power capable of being monopolised, \(i.e.,\) from the moment when individual property can no longer be transformed into bourgeois property, into capital,\(^b\) from that moment, you say, individuality vanishes.

You must, therefore, confess that by "individual" you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible.\(^c\)

Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by means of such appropriation.

It has been objected that upon the abolition of private property all work will cease, and universal laziness will overtake us.

According to this, bourgeois society ought long ago to have gone to the dogs through sheer idleness; for those of its members who work, acquire nothing, and those who acquire anything, do not work. The whole of this objection is but another expression of the tautology: that there can no longer be any wage-labour when there is no longer any capital.

All objections urged against the Communistic mode of producing and appropriating material products, have, in the same way, been urged against the Communistic modes of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as, to the bourgeois, the disap-

---

\(^a\) The words "for the few" were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.

\(^b\) The words "into capital" were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.

\(^c\) The words "and made impossible" were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
pearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, &c. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will, whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason, the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property—historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production—this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you. What you see clearly in the case of ancient property, what you admit in the case of feudal property, you are of course forbidden to admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of property.

Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

Do you charge us with wanting to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? To this crime we plead guilty.

But, you will say, we destroy the most hallowed of relations, when we replace home education by social.

---

a The German editions have here and below "education" ["Bildung"] instead of "culture".—Ed.

b The words "our intended" were inserted in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.

c In the German editions the end of this sentence reads as follows: "a will, whose content is determined by the material conditions of existence of your class."—Ed.

d In the German editions this sentence reads as follows: "This selfish conception... you share with all the ruling classes which have perished."—Ed.
And your education! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention, direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, &c.? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.

The bourgeois clap-trap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of Modern Industry, all families among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labour.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, screams the whole bourgeoisie in chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion than that the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women.

He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Our bourgeois, not content with having the wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each other’s wives.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalised community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution both public and private.

The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality.

The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire
political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word.

National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading civilised countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination.

Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?

What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.

When people speak of ideas that revolutionise society, they do but express the fact, that within the old society, the elements of a new one have been created, and that the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence.

When the ancient world was in its last throes, the ancient religions were overcome by Christianity. When Christian ideas succumbed in the 18th century to rationalist ideas, feudal society fought its death battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of conscience merely gave expression to the sway of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

---

a The German editions of 1848 have “the national class” instead of “the leading class of the nation”.—Ed.

b The word “material” was added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.

c The German editions have “the ideas of enlightenment” instead of “rationalist ideas”.—Ed.
“Undoubtedly,” it will be said, “religious, moral, philosophical and juridical ideas” have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality, philosophy, political science, and law, constantly survived this change.

“There are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc., that are common to all states of society. But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience.”

What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs.

But whatever form they may have taken, one fact is common to all past ages, viz., the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

But let us have done with the bourgeois objections to Communism. We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production.

---

a In the German editions the beginning of the sentence reads: "'Undoubtedly,' it will be said, 'religious, moral, philosophical, political, juridical ideas, etc.'"—Ed.

b The German editions have "in forms of consciousness" instead of "or general ideas".—Ed.

c The words “necessitate further inroads upon the old social order” were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
These measures will of course be different in different countries. Nevertheless in the most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equalable distribution of the population over the country.

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class, if, by means of

---

\[\text{a} \text{ The German editions have here "expropriation". — Ed.}\]
\[\text{b} \text{ The German editions have: "A heavy progressive tax." — Ed.}\]
\[\text{c} \text{ The German editions have "all transport" instead of "the means of communication and transport". — Ed.}\]
\[\text{d} \text{ In the editions of 1848, point 9 reads: "Combination of agriculture with industry, promotion of the gradual elimination of the contradictions between town and countryside." In subsequent German editions the word "contradictions" was replaced by "distinctions". — Ed.}\]
\[\text{e} \text{ The German editions have "associated individuals" instead of "a vast association of the whole nation". — Ed.}\]
a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.
III
SOCIALIST AND COMMUNIST LITERATURE

1. REACTIONARY SOCIALISM

a. Feudal Socialism

Owing to their historical position, it became the vocation of the aristocracies of France and England to write pamphlets against modern bourgeois society. In the French revolution of July 1830, and in the English reform agitation, these aristocracies again succumbed to the hateful upstart. Thenceforth, a serious political contest was altogether out of question. A literary battle alone remained possible. But even in the domain of literature the old cries of the restoration period* had become impossible.

In order to arouse sympathy, the aristocracy were obliged to lose sight, apparently, of their own interests, and to formulate their indictment against the bourgeoisie in the interest of the exploited working class alone. Thus the aristocracy took their revenge by singing lampoons on their new master, and whispering in his ears sinister prophecies of coming catastrophe.a

In this way arose feudal Socialism; half lamentation, half lampoon; half echo of the past, half menace of the future; at times, by its bitter, witty and incisive criticism, striking the bourgeoisie to the very heart's core; but always ludicrous in its effect, through total incapacity to comprehend the march of modern history.

The aristocracy, in order to rally the people to them, waved the proletarian alms-bag in front for a banner. But the people, so often as it joined them, saw on their headquarters the old feudal coats of arms, and deserted with loud and irreverent laughter.

* Not the English Restoration 1660 to 1689, but the French Restoration 1814 to 1830. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

a In the German editions the end of this sentence reads: “and whispering in his ears more or less sinister prophecies.”—Ed.
One section of the French Legitimists and "Young England" exhibited this spectacle.

In pointing out that their mode of exploitation was different to that of the bourgeoisie, the feudalists forget that they exploited under circumstances and conditions that were quite different, and that are now antiquated. In showing that, under their rule, the modern proletariat never existed, they forget that the modern bourgeoisie is the necessary offspring of their own form of society.

For the rest, so little do they conceal the reactionary character of their criticism that their chief accusation against the bourgeoisie amounts to this, that under the bourgeois régime a class is being developed, which is destined to cut up root and branch the old order of society.

What they upbraid the bourgeoisie with is not so much that it creates a proletariat, as that it creates a *revolutionary* proletariat.

In political practice, therefore, they join in all coercive measures against the working class; and in ordinary life, despite their high-falutin phrases, they stoop to pick up the golden apples dropped from the tree of industry, and to barter truth, love, and honour for traffic in wool, beetroot-sugar, and potato spirits.*

As the parson has ever gone hand in hand with the landlord, so has Clerical Socialism with Feudal Socialism.

Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. Has not Christianity declared against private property, against marriage, against the State? Has it not preached in the place of these, charity and poverty, celibacy and mortification of the flesh, monastic life and Mother Church? Christian Socialism is but the holy water with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat.

* This applies chiefly to Germany where the landed aristocracy and squirearchy have large portions of their estates cultivated for their own account by stewards, and are, moreover, extensive beetroot-sugar manufacturers and distillers of potato spirits. The wealthier British aristocracy are, as yet, rather above that; but they, too, know how to make up for declining rents by lending their names to floaters of more or less shady joint-stock companies. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

---

*a* The words "dropped from the tree of industry" were added in the English edition of 1888.—*Ed.*

*b* The German editions have here "feudal lord".—*Ed.*

*c* The German editions of 1848 have "holy" instead of "Christian" (the texts of these editions contain an obvious misprint: "heutige"—of today—for "heilige"—holy).—*Ed.*
b. Petty-Bourgeois Socialism

The feudal aristocracy was not the only class that was ruined by the bourgeoisie, not the only class whose conditions of existence pined and perished in the atmosphere of modern bourgeois society. The medieval burgesses and the small peasant proprietors were the precursors of the modern bourgeoisie. In those countries which are but little developed, industrially and commercially, these two classes still vegetate side by side with the rising bourgeoisie.

In countries where modern civilisation has become fully developed, a new class of petty bourgeois has been formed, fluctuating between proletariat and bourgeoisie and ever renewing itself as a supplementary part of bourgeois society. The individual members of this class, however, are being constantly hurled down into the proletariat by the action of competition, and, as modern industry develops, they even see the moment approaching when they will completely disappear as an independent section of modern society, to be replaced, in manufactures, agriculture and commerce, by overlookers, bailiffs and shopmen.

In countries like France, where the peasants constitute far more than half of the population, it was natural that writers who sided with the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, should use, in their criticism of the bourgeois régime, the standard of the peasant and petty bourgeois, and from the standpoint of these intermediate classes should take up the cudgels for the working class. Thus arose petty-bourgeois Socialism. Sismondi was the head of this school, not only in France but also in England.

This school of Socialism dissected with great acuteness the contradictions in the conditions of modern production. It laid bare the hypocritical apologies of economists. It proved, incontrovertibly, the disastrous effects of machinery and division of labour; the concentration of capital and land in a few hands; over-production and crises; it pointed out the inevitable ruin of the petty bourgeois and peasant, the misery of the proletariat, the anarchy in production, the crying inequalities in the distribution of wealth, the industrial war of extermination between nations, the dissolution of old moral bonds, of the old family relations, of the old nationalities.

In its positive aims, however, this form of Socialism aspires either to restoring the old means of production and of exchange, and with

---

\[a\] The German editions have “this class still vegetates” instead of “these two classes still vegetate”.—Ed.

\[b\] The German editions have “the petty bourgeoisie” instead of “these intermediate classes”.—Ed.
them the old property relations, and the old society, or to cramping
the modern means of production and of exchange, within the
framework of the old property relations that have been, and were
bound to be, exploded by those means. In either case, it is both
reactionary and Utopian.

Its last words are: corporate guilds for manufacture; patriarchal
relations in agriculture.

Ultimately, when stubborn historical facts had dispersed all
intoxicating effects of self-deception, this form of Socialism ended in
a miserable fit of the blues.a

c. German, or “True”, Socialism

The Socialist and Communist literature of France, a literature that
originated under the pressure of a bourgeoisie in power, and that
was the expression of the struggle against this power, was introduced
into Germany at a time when the bourgeoisie, in that country, had
just begun its contest with feudal absolutism.

German philosophers, would-be philosophers, and beaux esprits,b
eagerly seized on this literature, only forgetting, that when these
writings immigrated from France into Germany, French social
conditions had not immigrated along with them. In contact with
German social conditions, this French literature lost all its immediate
practical significance, and assumed a purely literary aspect.c Thus, to
the German philosophers of the Eighteenth Century, the demands
of the first French Revolution were nothing more than the demands
of “Practical Reason”262 in general, and the utterance of the will of
the revolutionary French bourgeoisie signified in their eyes the laws
of pure Will, of Will as it was bound to be, of true human Will
generally.

The work of the German literati consisted solely in bringing the
new French ideas into harmony with their ancient philosophical
conscience, or rather, in annexing the French ideas without
deserting their own philosophic point of view.

---

a In the German editions this sentence reads: “In its further development this
trend ended in a cowardly fit of the blues.”—Ed.
b In the German editions the beginning of this sentence reads: “German
philosophers, semi-philosophers and lovers of fine phrases”—Ed.
c In the German editions of 1848 there follows: “It must have appeared as idle
speculation on true society, on the realisation of humanity.” In subsequent German
editions the words “on true society” were omitted.—Ed.
This annexation took place in the same way in which a foreign language is appropriated, namely, by translation.

It is well known how the monks wrote silly lives of Catholic Saints over the manuscripts on which the classical works of ancient heathendom had been written. The German literati reversed this process with the profane French literature. They wrote their philosophical nonsense beneath the French original. For instance, beneath the French criticism of the economic functions of money, they wrote “Alienation of Humanity”, and beneath the French criticism of the bourgeois State they wrote, “Dethronement of the Category of the General”, and so forth.\(^a\)

The introduction of these philosophical phrases at the back of the French historical criticisms\(^b\) they dubbed “Philosophy of Action”, “True Socialism”, “German Science of Socialism”, “Philosophical Foundation of Socialism”, and so on.

The French Socialist and Communist literature was thus completely emasculated. And, since it ceased in the hands of the German to express the struggle of one class with the other, he felt conscious of having overcome “French one-sidedness” and of representing, not true requirements, but the requirements of Truth; not the interests of the proletariat, but the interests of Human Nature, of Man in general, who belongs to no class, has no reality, who exists only in the misty realm of philosophical fantasy.

This German Socialism, which took its schoolboy task so seriously and solemnly, and extolled its poor stock-in-trade in such mountebank fashion, meanwhile gradually lost its pedantic innocence.

The fight of the German, and, especially, of the Prussian bourgeoisie, against feudal aristocracy and absolute monarchy, in other words, the liberal movement, became more earnest.

By this, the long wished-for opportunity was offered to “True” Socialism of confronting the political movement with the Socialist demands, of hurling the traditional anathemas against liberalism, against representative government, against bourgeois competition, bourgeois freedom of the press, bourgeois legislation, bourgeois liberty and equality, and of preaching to the masses that they had nothing to gain, and everything to lose, by this bourgeois movement.

---

\(^a\) In the German editions this sentence reads: “For instance, beneath the French criticism of money relations they wrote, ‘Alienation of Humanity’, and beneath the French criticism of the bourgeois State they wrote, ‘Elimination of the domination of the abstractly General’, etc.”—Ed.

\(^b\) The German editions have “French theories” instead of “French historical criticisms”.—Ed.
German Socialism forgot, in the nick of time, that the French criticism, whose silly echo it was, presupposed the existence of modern bourgeois society, with its corresponding economic conditions of existence, and the political constitution adapted thereto, the very things whose attainment was the object of the pending struggle in Germany.

To the absolute governments, with their following of parsons, professors, country squires and officials, it served as a welcome scarecrow against the threatening bourgeoisie.

It was a sweet finish after the bitter pills of floggings and bullets with which these same governments, just at that time, dosed the German working-class risings.

While this “True” Socialism thus served the governments as a weapon for fighting the German bourgeoisie, it, at the same time, directly represented a reactionary interest, the interest of the German Philistines. In Germany the petty-bourgeois class, a relic of the sixteenth century, and since then constantly cropping up again under various forms, is the real social basis of the existing state of things.

To preserve this class is to preserve the existing state of things in Germany. The industrial and political supremacy of the bourgeoisie threatens it with certain destruction; on the one hand, from the concentration of capital; on the other, from the rise of a revolutionary proletariat. “True” Socialism appeared to kill these two birds with one stone. It spread like an epidemic.

The robe of speculative cobwebs, embroidered with flowers of rhetoric, steeped in the dew of sickly sentiment, this transcendental robe in which the German Socialists wrapped their sorry “eternal truths”, all skin and bone, served to wonderfully increase the sale of their goods amongst such a public.

And on its part, German Socialism recognised, more and more, its own calling as the bombastic representative of the petty-bourgeois Philistine.

It proclaimed the German nation to be the model nation, and the German petty Philistine to be the typical man. To every villainous meanness of this model man it gave a hidden, higher, Socialistic interpretation, the exact contrary of its real character. It went to the extreme length of directly opposing the “brutally destructive” tendency of Communism, and of proclaiming its supreme and

---

a The German editions have “material” instead of “economic”.—Ed.
b The German editions have “To the German absolute governments”.—Ed.
c The words “just at that time” were added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
impartial contempt of all class struggles. With very few exceptions, all the so-called Socialist and Communist publications that now (1847) circulate in Germany belong to the domain of this foul and enervating literature.*

2. CONSERVATIVE, OR BOURGEOIS, SOCIALISM

A part of the bourgeoisie is desirous of redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society.

To this section belong economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, organisers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every imaginable kind. This form of Socialism has, moreover, been worked out into complete systems.

We may cite Proudhon's *Philosophie de la Misère* as an example of this form.

The Socialistic bourgeoisie want all the advantages of modern social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat. The bourgeoisie naturally conceives the world in which it is supreme to be the best; and bourgeois Socialism develops this comfortable conception into various more or less complete systems. In requiring the proletariat to carry out such a system, and thereby to march straightway into the social New Jerusalem, it but requires in reality, that the proletariat should remain within the bounds of existing society, but should cast away all its hateful ideas concerning the bourgeoisie.

A second and more practical, but less systematic, form of this Socialism sought to depreciate every revolutionary movement in the eyes of the working class, by showing that no mere political reform, but only a change in the material conditions of existence, in

---

* The revolutionary storm of 1848 swept away this whole shabby tendency and cured its protagonists of the desire to dabble further in Socialism. The chief representative and classical type of this tendency is Herr Karl Grün. [Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.]

---

a The German editions have: "want the living conditions of modern society".—*Ed.

b The German editions have here: "a more or less complete system".—*Ed.

c This word was added in the English edition of 1888.—*Ed.
economical relations, could be of any advantage to them. By changes in the material conditions of existence, this form of Socialism, however, by no means understands abolition of the bourgeois relations of production, an abolition that can be effected only by a revolution, but administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations; reforms, therefore, that in no respect affect the relations between capital and labour, but, at the best, lessen the cost, and simplify the administrative work, of bourgeois government.

Bourgeois Socialism attains adequate expression, when, and only when, it becomes a mere figure of speech.

Free trade: for the benefit of the working class. Protective duties: for the benefit of the working class. Prison Reform\(^a\): for the benefit of the working class. This is the last word and the only seriously meant word of bourgeois Socialism.

It is summed up in the phrase: the bourgeois is a bourgeois—for the benefit of the working class.

### 3. CRITICAL-UTOPIAN SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

We do not here refer to that literature which, in every great modern revolution, has always given voice to the demands of the proletariat, such as the writings of Babeuf and others.

The first direct attempts of the proletariat to attain its own ends, made in times of universal excitement, when feudal society was being overthrown, these attempts necessarily failed, owing to the then undeveloped state of the proletariat, as well as to the absence of the economic conditions for its emancipation, conditions that had yet to be produced, and could be produced by the impending bourgeois epoch alone.\(^b\) The revolutionary literature that accompanied these first movements of the proletariat had necessarily a reactionary character. It inculcated universal asceticism and social levelling in its crudest form.

The Socialist and Communist systems properly so called, those of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen and others, spring into existence in the early undeveloped period, described above, of the struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie (see Section I. Bourgeois and Proletarians).

\(^a\) The German editions have here: "Solitary confinement".—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The German editions have "material conditions" instead of "economic conditions", and the end of the sentence is: "and could be only the product of the bourgeois epoch".—*Ed.*
The founders of these systems see, indeed, the class antagonisms, as well as the action of the decomposing elements in the prevailing form of society. But the proletariat, as yet in its infancy, offers to them the spectacle of a class without any historical initiative or any independent political movement.

Since the development of class antagonism keeps even pace with the development of industry, the economic situation, as they find it, does not as yet offer to them the material conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat. They therefore search after a new social science, after new social laws, that are to create these conditions.

Historical action is to yield to their personal inventive action, historically created conditions of emancipation to fantastic ones, and the gradual, spontaneous class organisation of the proletariat to an organisation of society specially contrived by these inventors. Future history resolves itself, in their eyes, into the propaganda and the practical carrying out of their social plans.

In the formation of their plans they are conscious of caring chiefly for the interests of the working class, as being the most suffering class. Only from the point of view of being the most suffering class does the proletariat exist for them.

The undeveloped state of the class struggle, as well as their own surroundings, causes Socialists of this kind to consider themselves far superior to all class antagonisms. They want to improve the condition of every member of society, even that of the most favoured. Hence, they habitually appeal to society at large, without distinction of class; nay, by preference, to the ruling class. For how can people, when once they understand their system, fail to see in it the best possible plan of the best possible state of society?

Hence, they reject all political, and especially all revolutionary, action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavour, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by the force of example, to pave the way for the new social Gospel.

Such fantastic pictures of future society, painted at a time when the proletariat is still in a very undeveloped state and has but a fantastic conception of its own position, correspond with the first

---

---

---
instinctive yearnings of that class for a general reconstruction of society.

But these Socialist and Communist publications contain also a critical element. They attack every principle of existing society. Hence they are full of the most valuable materials for the enlightenment of the working class. The practical measures proposed in them—such as the abolition of the distinction between town and country, of the family, of the carrying on of industries for the account of private individuals, and of the wage system, the proclamation of social harmony, the conversion of the functions of the State into a mere superintendence of production, all these proposals point solely to the disappearance of class antagonisms which were, at that time, only just cropping up, and which, in these publications, are recognised in their earliest indistinct and undefined forms only. These proposals, therefore, are of a purely Utopian character.

The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, this fantastic standing apart from the contest, these fantastic attacks on it, lose all practical value and all theoretical justification. Therefore, although the originators of these systems were, in many respects, revolutionary, their disciples have, in every case, formed mere reactionary sects. They hold fast by the original views of their masters, in opposition to the progressive historical development of the proletariat. They, therefore, endeavour, and that consistently, to deaden the class struggle and to reconcile the class antagonisms. They still dream of experimental realisation of their social Utopias, of founding isolated "phalanstères", of establishing "Home Colonies", of setting up a "Little Icaria"*—duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem—and to realise all these castles in the air, they are compelled to appeal to the feelings and purses of the bourgeois. By

* Phalanstères were Socialist colonies on the plan of Charles Fourier; Icaria was the name given by Cabot to his Utopia and, later on, to his American Communist colony. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

"Home Colonies" were what Owen called his Communist model societies. Phalanstères was the name of the public palaces planned by Fourier. Icaria was the name given to the Utopian land of fancy, whose Communist institutions Cabet portrayed. [Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.]

---

a In the German editions the beginning of this sentence reads as follows: "Their positive propositions concerning the future society, for example, abolition of the contradiction between town and country, of the family, of private profit...".—Ed.

b This word was added in the English edition of 1888.—Ed.
degrees they sink into the category of the reactionary [or] conservative Socialists depicted above, differing from these only by more systematic pedantry, and by their fanatical and superstitious belief in the miraculous effects of their social science.

They, therefore, violently oppose all political action on the part of the working class; such action, according to them, can only result from blind unbelief in the new Gospel.

The Owenites in England, and the Fourierists in France, respectively oppose the Chartists and the Réformistes.263

---

a In the English edition of 1888 the word “or” is omitted, but it is given in all other authorised editions.—Ed.

b The German editions have “fanatical superstition”.—Ed.
Section II has made clear the relations of the Communists to the existing working-class parties, such as the Chartists in England and the Agrarian Reformers in America.\textsuperscript{264}

The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of\textsuperscript{a} the future of that movement. In France the Communists ally themselves with the Social-Democrats,* against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie, reserving, however, the right to take up a critical position in regard to phrases and illusions traditionally handed down from the great Revolution.

In Switzerland they support the Radicals, without losing sight of the fact that this party consists of antagonistic elements, partly of Democratic Socialists, in the French sense, partly of radical bourgeois.

In Poland they support the party that insists on an agrarian revolution as the prime condition for national emancipation, that party which fomented the insurrection of Cracow in 1846.\textsuperscript{265}

* The party then represented in Parliament by Ledru-Rollin, in literature by Louis Blanc, in the daily press by the Réforme. The name of Social-Democracy signified, with these its inventors, a section of the Democratic or Republican party more or less tinged with Socialism. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

The party in France which at that time called itself Socialist-Democratic was represented in political life by Ledru-Rollin and in literature by Louis Blanc; thus it differed immeasurably from present-day German Social-Democracy. [Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.]

\textsuperscript{a} The words "and take care of" were added in the English edition of 1888.—\textit{Ed.}
In Germany they fight with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary way, against the absolute monarchy, the feudal squirearchy, and the petty bourgeoisie.\(^a\)

But they never cease, for a single instant, to instil into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, in order that the German workers may straightway use, as so many weapons against the bourgeoisie, the social and political conditions that the bourgeoisie must necessarily introduce along with its supremacy, and in order that, after the fall of the reactionary classes in Germany, the fight against the bourgeoisie itself may immediately begin.

The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution that is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilisation, and with a much more developed proletariat, than that of England was in the seventeenth, and of France in the eighteenth century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution.

In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time.

Finally, they labour everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries.

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

**WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!**

---

\(^a\) In the German editions the end of this sentence reads: "against the absolute monarchy, the feudal landowners and philistinism [Kleinbürgerei]". — *Ed.*
Frederick Engels

THE MOVEMENTS OF 1847

The year 1847 was certainly the most stormy we have experienced for a very long time. A constitution and a United Diet in Prussia; an unexpectedly rapid awakening in political life and a general arming against Austria in Italy; a civil war in Switzerland; a new Parliament of pronounced radical complexion in Britain; in France scandals and Reform banquets; in America the conquest of Mexico by the United States—that is a series of changes and movements such as no other recent year can show.

The last turning point in history was the year 1830. The July revolution in France and the Reform Bill in Britain finally secured the victory of the bourgeoisie; and in Britain this was, indeed, the victory of the industrial bourgeoisie, the manufacturers, over the non-industrial bourgeoisie, the rentiers. Belgium, and to a certain extent Switzerland, followed suit; here again the bourgeoisie triumphed. Poland rose in revolt. Italy chafed under Metternich's heel. Germany was seething. All countries were preparing for a mighty struggle.

But after 1830 there was everywhere a set-back. Poland fell, the insurgents in Romagna were dispersed, the movement in Germany was suppressed. The French bourgeoisie defeated the republicans in France itself, and betrayed the liberals of other countries whom it had spurred on to revolt. The liberal ministry in Britain could accomplish nothing. Finally, in 1840, reaction was in full swing. Poland, Italy, and Germany were politically dead: the Berliner politisches Wochenblatt sat enthroned in Prussia; Herr Dahlmann's

---

*a The allusion is to Frederick William IV, who patronised this reactionary newspaper.—Ed.
The Movements of 1847

all-too-clever constitution was repealed in Hanover; the decisions of the Vienna Conference of 1834 were in full force. The Conservatives and the Jesuits were thriving in Switzerland. In Belgium, the Catholics were at the helm. Guizot ruled supreme over France. In Britain, under pressure from the growing power of Peel, the Whig government was in its last throes, and the Chartists were vainly endeavouring to reorganise their ranks after their great defeat of 1839. Everywhere the reactionary party was victorious; everywhere the progressive parties were broken up and dispersed. The arrest of the historical movement—this seemed to be the final result of the mighty struggles of 1830.

1840 was, however, also the peak of reaction just as 1830 had been the peak of the revolutionary movement of the bourgeoisie. From 1840 onward the movements against the existing state of affairs began afresh. Though often defeated, in the long run they gained more and more ground. While in England the Chartists reorganised themselves and became stronger than ever, Peel was forced time and again to betray his party, dealing it a fatal blow by the repeal of the Corn Laws, and finally himself to resign. The radicals gained ground in Switzerland. In Germany, and especially in Prussia, the liberals were pressing their demands more vigorously with every year. The liberals emerged victorious from the Belgian elections of 1847. France was an exception, for there the reactionary ministry secured a triumphant majority in the 1846 elections; and Italy remained dead, until Pius IX mounted the papal throne, and at the end of 1846 attempted a few dubious reforms.

So came the year 1847, and with it a series of victories for the progressive parties of nearly all countries. Even where they sustained defeat, this was more advantageous to them than an immediate victory would have been.

The year 1847 decided nothing, but everywhere it brought the parties into sharp and clear confrontation; it brought no final solution of any questions, but it posed all questions in such a way that now they must be solved.

Among all the movements and changes of the year 1847 the most important were those in Prussia, in Italy and in Switzerland.

In Prussia, Frederick William IV was at length forced to grant a constitution. The sterile Don Quixote of Sans-Souci, after long struggles and labour-pains, was delivered of a constitution which was to establish for all time the victory of the feudalist, patriarchal, absolutist, bureaucratic, and clerical reaction. But he had miscalculated. The bourgeoisie was strong enough by then to turn even that constitution into a weapon against the king and all the reactionary
classes of society. In Prussia, as everywhere else, the bourgeoisie began by refusing him money. The king was in despair. One could say that in the first days after the refusal of the money Prussia was without a king. The country was in the throes of revolution without knowing it. Then by good luck came the fifteen million from Russia; Frederick William was king again, the bourgeoisie of the Diet crumpled up in alarm, and the revolutionary storm clouds scattered. The Prussian bourgeoisie was, for the time being, defeated. But it had made a great step forward, had won for itself a forum, had given the king a proof of its power, and had worked the country up into a great state of agitation. The question: who shall govern Prussia—the alliance of nobles, bureaucrats, and priests headed by the king, or the bourgeoisie—is now posed in such a way that it must be decided in favour of one side or of the other. In the United Diet a compromise between the two parties was still possible, but today no longer. Now it is a matter of life-and-death struggle between the two. To make matters worse, the committees (those unhappy inventions of the Berlin constitution manufacturers) are now assembling.277 They will make the already complicated legal issues so enormously more involved, that no man will any longer know where he stands. They will tie matters up into a Gordian knot which will have to be cut with the sword. They will complete the final preparations for the bourgeois revolution in Prussia.

We can therefore await the advent of this Prussian revolution with the utmost calm. The United Diet will have to be convened in 1849 whether the king wants it or not. We will give His Majesty a breathing space till then, but not a moment longer. Then he will have to resign his sceptre and his "unimpaired" crown278 to the Christian and the Jewish bourgeoisie of his realm.

Thus 1847 was politically a very good year for the Prussian bourgeoisie in spite of their temporary defeat. The bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie of the other German states have also noted this and shown the most heartfelt sympathy towards them. They know that the victory of the Prussian bourgeoisie is their own victory.

In Italy we have witnessed the amazing spectacle of the man who occupies the most reactionary position in the whole of Europe, who represents the petrified ideology of the Middle Ages, the Pope, taking the lead in a liberal movement. The movement grew to power in a night, carrying along with it the Austrian archduke of Tuscany and the traitor Charles Albert of Sardinia, undermining the throne
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a Pius IX.—Ed.
b Leopold II, duke of Tuscany.—Ed.
of Ferdinand of Naples, its waves sweeping over Lombardy to the Tyrolese and Styrian Alps.

Today the movement in Italy resembles that which took place in Prussia from 1807 to 1812. As in Prussia of those days, there are two issues: external independence and internal reforms. For the moment there is no demand for a constitution, but only for administrative reforms. Any serious conflict with the government is avoided in the meantime so as to maintain as united a front as possible in face of the foreign overlord. What kind of reforms are these? To whose advantage are they? In the first place to that of the bourgeoisie. The press is to be favoured; the bureaucracy to be made to serve the interests of the bourgeoisie (cf. the Sardinian reforms, the Roman consulta, and the reorganisation of the ministries); the bourgeoisie are to be granted extended influence on communal administration; the bon plaisir of the nobles and of the bureaucracy is to be restricted; the bourgeoisie is to be armed as guardia civica. Hitherto all the reforms have been and could be only in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Compare the Prussian reforms of Napoleonic times. These are exactly the same, only that in many respects they go further: the administration made subservient to the interests of the bourgeoisie; the arbitrary power of the nobility and the bureaucracy broken; municipal self-government established; a militia inaugurated; the corvée abolished. As earlier in Prussia, so today in Italy, the bourgeoisie, owing to its growing wealth and, in particular, to the growing importance of industry and commerce in the life of the people as a whole, has become the class upon which the country's liberation from foreign domination mainly depends.

The movement in Italy is thus a decisively bourgeois movement. All the classes now inspired with a zeal for reform, from the princes and the nobility down to the pifferari and the lazzaroni, appear for the nonce as bourgeois, and the Pope himself is the First Bourgeois in Italy. But once the Austrian yoke has finally been thrown off, all these classes will be greatly disillusioned. Once the bourgeoisie has finished off the foreign enemy, it will start on the separation of the sheep from the goats at home; then the princes and the counts will again call out to Austria for help, but it will be too late, and then the workers of Milan, of Florence, and of Naples will realise that their work is only really beginning.

Finally Switzerland. For the first time in its history, this country has played a definite part in the European system of states, for the first time it has dared to act decisively and has had the courage to enter

\[\text{a} \quad \text{Power of arbitrary decision.—Ed.}\]
the arena as a federal republic instead of as heretofore an agglomeration of twenty-two antagonistic cantons, utter strangers to one another. By most resolutely putting down the civil war, it has assured the supremacy of the central power—in a word, has become centralised. The de facto centralisation will have to be legalised through the impending reform of the Federal Pact.

Who, we again ask, is going to profit by the outcome of the war, by federal reform, by the reorganisation of the Sonderbund cantons? The victorious party, the party which was victorious in the individual cantons from 1830 to 1834, the liberals and radicals, i.e., the bourgeoisie and the peasantry. The rule of the patriciate in the former imperial towns was already overthrown as a result of the July revolution. Where it had been practically restored, as in Berne and Geneva, revolutions followed in 1846. Where it as yet remained intact, as for instance in Basle City, it was shaken to its foundations in the same year. There was little feudal aristocracy in Switzerland, and where it still survived it found its chief strength in an alliance with the herdsmen of the upper Alps. These men were the last, the most obstinate and the most rabid enemies of the bourgeoisie. They were the mainstay of the reactionary elements in the liberal cantons. Aided by the Jesuits and the pietists,²⁹² they covered the whole of Switzerland with a network of reactionary conspiracies (cf. the canton of Vaud). They thwarted all the plans laid before the Diet by the bourgeoisie, and hindered the final defeat of the philistine patriciate in the former imperial cities.

In 1847² these last enemies of the Swiss bourgeoisie were completely broken.

In almost all the cantons the Swiss bourgeoisie had had a pretty free hand in commerce and industry. In so far as the guilds still existed, they did little to hamper bourgeois development. Tolls within the country hardly existed. Wherever the bourgeoisie had developed to any considerable extent, political power was in its hands. But although it had made good progress in the individual cantons and had found support there, the main thing was still lacking, namely centralisation. Whereas feudalism, patriarchalism, and philistinism flourish in separated provinces and individual towns, the bourgeoisie needs for its growth as wide a field as possible; instead of twenty-two small cantons it needed one large Switzerland. Cantonal sovereignty, which best suited the conditions in the old Switzerland, had become a crushing handicap for the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie needed a centralised power, strong enough to
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² The original has by mistake "1846".—Ed.
impose a particular course of development on the legislation of the individual cantons and, by sheer weight of influence, to cancel out the differences in their constitutions and laws, to wipe out the vestiges of the feudal, patriarchal and philistine legislation, and energetically to represent the interests of the Swiss bourgeoisie in relation to other countries.

The bourgeoisie has won for itself this centralised power.

But did not the peasants also help in overthrowing the Sonderbund? Certainly they did! So far as the peasants are concerned, they will play the same part towards the bourgeoisie as they played for so long towards the petty bourgeoisie. The peasants will remain the exploited arm of the bourgeoisie, they will fight its battles for it, weave its calico and ribbons, and provide the recruits for its proletariat. What else can they do? They are owners, like the bourgeois, and for the moment their interests are almost identical with those of the bourgeoisie. All the political measures which they are strong enough to put through, are hardly more advantageous to the bourgeoisie than to the peasants themselves. Nevertheless, they are weak in comparison with the bourgeoisie, because the latter are more wealthy and have in their hands the lever of all political power in our century—industry. With the bourgeoisie, the peasantry can achieve much; against the bourgeoisie, nothing.

It is true that a time will come when the fleeced and impoverished section of the peasantry will unite with the proletariat, which by then will be further developed, and will declare war on the bourgeoisie—but that does not concern us here.

Enough that the expulsion of the Jesuits and their associates, those organised opponents of the bourgeoisie, the general introduction of civil instead of religious education, the seizure of most of the church estates by the state, benefit above all the bourgeoisie.

Thus the common factor in the three most noteworthy movements of the year 1847 is that all are primarily and chiefly in the interests of the bourgeoisie. The party of progress was, everywhere, the party of the bourgeoisie.

It is indeed the characteristic feature of these movements that those countries which remained backward in 1830 are precisely those which last year took the first decisive steps to raise themselves to the level of 1830—that is, to secure the victory of the bourgeoisie.

So far, then, we have seen that the year 1847 was a brilliant year for the bourgeoisie.

Let us proceed.

In Britain a new parliament has assembled, a parliament which, in the words of John Bright the Quaker, is the most bourgeois ever.
convened. John Bright is the best authority in the matter, seeing that he himself is the most determined bourgeois in the whole of Britain. But the bourgeois John Bright is not the bourgeois who rules in France or who thunders with pathetic bravado against Frederick William IV. When John Bright speaks of a bourgeois he means a manufacturer. Ever since 1688, separate sections of the bourgeois class have been ruling in England. But, in order to facilitate their seizure of power, the bourgeoisie has allowed the aristocrats, its dependent debtors, to retain their rule in name. Whereas, in reality, the struggle in England is between sections of the bourgeoisie, between rentiers and manufacturers, the manufacturers are able to represent it as a struggle between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, or, in case of necessity, as a struggle between the aristocracy and the people. The manufacturers have no interest in maintaining the appearance of government by the aristocracy, for the lords, the baronets and the squires do not owe them a farthing. On the other hand they have a great interest in destroying this appearance, for with it the rentiers lose their last sheet-anchor. The present bourgeois or manufacturers’ parliament will see to this. It will change the old feudal-looking England into a more or less modern country of bourgeois organisation. It will bring the British constitution nearer to those of France and of Belgium. It will complete the victory of the English industrial bourgeoisie.

Another advance of the bourgeoisie: for an advance within the bourgeoisie is also an extension and a strengthening of bourgeois rule.

France alone appears to be an exception. The power which fell into the hands of the whole of the big bourgeoisie in 1830 is being year by year increasingly limited to the rule of the wealthiest section of this big bourgeoisie, to the rule of the rentiers and the stock exchange speculators. They have made the majority of the big bourgeoisie serve their interest. The minority, which is headed by a section of the manufacturers and shipping owners, is continually diminishing. This minority has now made common cause with the middle and petty bourgeois who have no electoral rights and celebrates its alliance at reform banquets. It despairs of ever coming to power with the present electorate. After long hesitation, it has made up its mind to promise a share of political power to the sections of the bourgeoisie next below itself, and especially the bourgeois ideologists, as being the least dangerous—the lawyers, doctors, and so on. It is, of course, still very far from being able to keep its promise.

Thus also in France we see approaching the struggle within the bourgeoisie which in Britain has already been almost ended. But, as
always in France, the situation is more sharply defined, more revolutionary than elsewhere. This distinct division into two camps is also an advance for the bourgeoisie.

In *Belgium* the bourgeoisie won a decisive victory in the elections of 1847. The Catholic ministry was forced to resign, and here also the liberal bourgeoisie now rule for the time being.

In *America* we have witnessed the conquest of Mexico and have rejoiced at it. It is also an advance when a country which has hitherto been exclusively wrapped up in its own affairs, perpetually rent with civil wars, and completely hindered in its development, a country whose best prospect had been to become industrially subject to Britain—when such a country is forcibly drawn into the historical process. It is to the interest of its own development that Mexico will in future be placed under the tutelage of the United States. The evolution of the whole of America will profit by the fact that the United States, by the possession of California, obtains command of the Pacific. But again we ask: “Who is going to profit immediately by the war?” The bourgeoisie alone. The North Americans acquire new regions in California and New Mexico for the creation of fresh capital, that is, for calling new bourgeois into being, and enriching those already in existence; for all capital created today flows into the hands of the bourgeoisie. And what about the proposed cut through the Tehuantepec isthmus? Who is likely to gain by that? Who else but the American shipping owners? Rule over the Pacific, who will gain by that but these same shipping owners? The new customers for the products of industry, customers who will come into being in the newly acquired territories—who will supply their needs? None other than the American manufacturers.

Thus also in America the bourgeoisie has made great advances, and if its representatives now oppose the war, that only proves that they fear that these advances have in some ways been bought too dear.

Even in quite barbarous lands the bourgeoisie is advancing. In Russia, industry is developing by leaps and bounds and is succeeding in converting even the boyars into bourgeois. Both in Russia and Poland serfdom is being restricted and the nobility thereby weakened in the interest of the bourgeoisie, and a class of free peasants is being created which the bourgeoisie everywhere needs. The Jews are being persecuted—entirely in the interest of the settled Christian bourgeois, whose business was spoiled by the pedlars.—In Hungary, the feudal magnates are more and more changing into wholesale corn and wool merchants and cattle dealers, and consequently now appear in the Diet as bourgeois.—What of all
the glorious advances of “civilisation” in such lands as Turkey, Egypt, Tunis, Persia, and other barbarous countries? They are nothing else but a preparation for the advent of a future bourgeoisie. In these countries the word of the prophet is being fulfilled: “Prepare ye the way of the Lord....” Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory?” The bourgeois!

Wherever we look, the bourgeoisie are making stupendous progress. They are holding their heads high, and haughtily challenge their enemies. They expect a decisive victory, and their hopes will not be disappointed. They intend to shape the whole world according to their standard; and, on a considerable portion of the earth’s surface, they will succeed.

We are no friends of the bourgeoisie. That is common knowledge. But this time we do not grudge the bourgeoisie their triumph. We can chuckle over the haughty looks which the bourgeois deign to bestow (especially in Germany) upon the apparently tiny band of democrats and Communists. We have no objection if everywhere they force through their purposes.

Nay more. We cannot forbear an ironical smile when we observe the terrible earnestness, the pathetic enthusiasm with which the bourgeois strive to achieve their aims. They really believe that they are working on their own behalf! They are so short-sighted as to fancy that through their triumph the world will assume its final configuration. Yet nothing is more clear than that they are everywhere preparing the way for us, for the democrats and the Communists; than that they will at most win a few years of troubled enjoyment, only to be then immediately overthrown. Behind them stands everywhere the proletariat, sometimes participating in their endeavours and partly in their illusions, as in Italy and Switzerland, sometimes silent and reserved, but secretly preparing the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, as in France and Germany; finally, in Britain and America, in open rebellion against the ruling bourgeoisie.

We can do still more. We can say all this to the bourgeoisie straight out, we can lay our cards on the table. Let them know in advance that they are working only in our interest. They still cannot for that reason give up their fight against the absolute monarchy, the nobility, and the clergy. They must conquer—or already now go under.

In Germany in a very short time they will even have to ask for our help.

a Isaiah 40:3.— Ed.

b Psalms 24:7, 8.— Ed.
So just fight bravely on, most gracious masters of capital! We need you for the present; here and there we even need you as rulers. You have to clear the vestiges of the Middle Ages and of absolute monarchy out of our path; you have to annihilate patriarchalism; you have to carry out centralisation; you have to convert the more or less propertyless classes into genuine proletarians, into recruits for us; by your factories and your commercial relationships you must create for us the basis of the material means which the proletariat needs for the attainment of freedom. In recompense whereof you shall be allowed to rule for a short time. You shall be allowed to dictate your laws, to bask in the rays of the majesty you have created, to spread your banquets in the halls of kings, and to take the beautiful princess to wife—but do not forget that

"The hangman stands at the door!"

Written about January 20, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 7, January 23, 1848

Signed: F. E.

\[\text{a Heinrich Heine, 'Ritter Olaf'.—Ed.}\]
“It will endure Metternich and me,” said the late Emperor Franz. If Metternich does not wish to give his emperor the lie, he had better die as soon as possible.

This chequered Austrian monarchy, scraped together by theft and by inheritance, this organised jumble of ten languages and nations, this planless mish-mash of contradictory customs and laws, is at last beginning to disintegrate.

Honest German citizens have for years been fervent admirers of the director of this creaking state machine, the cowardly swindler and assassin—Metternich. Talleyrand, Louis Philippe and Metternich, three most mediocre minds and hence most suitable for our mediocre times, are regarded by German citizens as three gods who for thirty years have manipulated world history as if it were a puppet show. Going by his own daily experience, the honest citizen regards history as a kind of plot hatched in a tavern or as feminine gossip on a somewhat larger scale.

Certainly, there is no country over which the tidal wave of revolution, the triple Napoleonic invasions passed away so completely without trace as Austria. Certainly, there is no country where feudalism, patriarchalism and faint-hearted philistinism defended by the paternal rod, have been maintained so immaculately or harmoniously as in Austria. But is it Metternich’s fault?

On what does the might, the tenacity, the stability, of the House of Austria rest?

When Italy, France, England, Belgium, North and West Germany, one after another extricated themselves from feudal barbarism during the latter half of the Middle Ages, when industry was
developing, trade expanding, the towns thriving and the burghers acquired political importance, one part of Germany lagged behind West European development. Bourgeois civilisation followed the sea coasts and the course of the big rivers. The inland, especially the barren and impassable mountainous regions, remained the seat of barbarism and of feudalism. This barbarism was especially concentrated in the South German and South Slav inland areas. Protected by the Alps from Italian civilisation and by the mountains of Bohemia and Moravia from that of North Germany, these inland countries had the additional good fortune of being the basin of the only reactionary river in Europe. The Danube, far from linking them with civilisation, brought them into contact with a much more vigorous barbarism.

When the great monarchies developed in Western Europe in the wake of bourgeois civilisation, the inland countries of the Upper Danube likewise had to unite in a great monarchy. This was required if only for the needs of defence. Here, in the centre of Europe, the barbarians of all tongues and of all nations associated under the sceptre of the House of Hapsburg. Here they found in Hungary a mainstay of solid barbarism.

The Danube, the Alps, the rocky breastworks of Bohemia—these are the bases for the existence of Austrian barbarism and of the Austrian monarchy.

The House of Hapsburg supported the burghers against the aristocracy and the towns against the princes because this was the only condition on which a great monarchy was possible. When, later on, it again supported the petty bourgeoisie, this was because the petty bourgeoisie in the rest of Europe had become reactionary themselves with regard to the big bourgeoisie. On both occasions it supported the petty bourgeoisie for decidedly reactionary purposes. But now this method has miscarried.

The House of Austria was thus from the first the representative of barbarism, of reactionary stability in Europe. Its power rested on the foolishness of the patriarchalism entrenched behind the impassable mountains, on the inaccessible brutality of barbarism. A dozen nations whose customs, character, and institutions were flagrantly opposed to one another clung together on the strength of their common dislike for civilisation.

Hence the House of Austria was invincible as long as the barbarous character of its subjects remained untouched. Hence it was threatened by only one danger—the penetration of bourgeois civilisation.

But this sole danger was not to be averted. Bourgeois civilisation
could be warded off for a time, it could be temporarily adapted and
subordinated to Austrian barbarism. But it was bound to overcome
feudal barbarism sooner or later, and shatter the only link which had
held the most variegated provinces together.

This explains Austria's passive, hesitant, cowardly, sordid and
underhand policy. Austria can no longer act, as before, in an openly
brutal, thoroughly barbarous way because it must make concessions
to civilisation every year, and because its own subjects become less
reliable every year. Every decisive step would lead to a change at
home or in the neighbouring countries, every change would mean a
breach in the dam behind which Austria laboriously protects itself
against the rising tides of modern civilisation. The first victim of any
change would be the House of Austria itself which stands or falls
with barbarism. Although Austria was still able to disperse the
Piedmontese, Neapolitan and Romagnese rebels with cannon fire in
1823 and 1831, it was forced to set in motion a still undeveloped
revolutionary element—the peasantry—in 1846 in Galicia; it had
to stop the advance of its troops near Ferrara in 1847 and resort
to conspiracy in Rome.\textsuperscript{286} Counter-revolutionary Austria uses
revolutionary means—this is the surest sign that its end is ap-
proaching.

Once the Italian insurrections of 1831, and the Polish revolution
of 1830 had been suppressed and the French bourgeois had given
guarantees of good behaviour, Emperor Franz could go to his grave
in peace; the times seemed miserable enough to endure even his
feeble-minded offspring.\textsuperscript{a}

As yet the realm of the crowned idiot was still safe from
revolutions. But who could ensure it against the \textit{causes} of revolu-
tions?

As long as industry remained domestic industry, as long as every
peasant family or at least every village produced its own industrial
products, without putting much on the market, industry itself
remained feudal and excellently suited to Austrian barbarism. As
long as it remained mere manufactory, rural industry, few products
of the inland countries were made available for export and foreign
trade was minimal, industry existed in a few districts only and was
easily adaptable to the Austrian status quo. If manufacture could
only produce relatively few big bourgeois even in England and
France, then it could only produce a modest middle class in
thinly-populated and remote Austria, and even this only here and
there. As long as hand labour existed, Austria was safe.

\textsuperscript{a} Ferdinand I.—\textit{Ed.}
But machinery was invented and machines ruined hand labour. The prices of industrial products fell so swiftly and so low that first of all manufacture and then, gradually, the old feudal domestic industry went under.

Austria fortified itself against the machines by a consistent system of prohibitive tariffs. But in vain, it was precisely the system of prohibitive tariffs which was responsible for bringing machinery into Austria. Bohemia used machinery in the cotton industry; Lombardy for silk spinning; Vienna even started to produce machinery.

The results were quick to follow. The workers in manufacture became destitute. The entire population of the manufacturing districts was torn out of its hereditary mode of life. The former philistines grew into big bourgeois and lorded it over hundreds of workers just as their princely and aristocratic neighbours lorded it over hundreds of peasant serfs. Through the collapse of the old type of industry, these peasant serfs lost their old occupations and acquired new needs as a result of the new industry. It was no longer possible to carry on feudal agriculture alongside modern industry. The abolition of corvée became a necessity. The feudal position of the peasants in relation to the landowners became untenable. The towns became thriving. The guilds were oppressive for the consumers, useless for those who belonged to them and intolerable for those engaged in industry. Competition had to be permitted surreptitiously. The position of all classes in society was radically changed. The old classes withdrew more and more into the background before the two new classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Agriculture declined in importance compared with industry, the countryside gave way to the towns.

Such were the consequences of machinery in some areas of Austria, especially in Bohemia and Lombardy. They gave rise to a reaction which affected the entire monarchy to a greater or lesser degree; everywhere they undermined the old barbarism, and with it the foundations of the House of Austria.

While in Romagna in 1831 the battered Austrian soldiers replied to cries of *Viva l'Italia* with grape-shot, in England the first railways were built. Like machinery, railways immediately became a necessity for all European countries. Austria had to have them, willy-nilly. In order not to give increased power to the already growing bourgeoisie, the Government built them itself; but it went from Scylla to Charybdis. It prevented the establishment of powerful bourgeois joint stock companies only by borrowing from the same bourgeois the money to build the railways, by putting itself in pawn to Rothschild, Arnstein, Eskeles, Sina, etc.
Still less did the House of Austria escape the effects of the railways. The mountain ranges which separated the Austrian monarchy from the outside world, Bohemia from Moravia and Austria, Austria from Styria, Styria from Illyria, Illyria from Lombardy, fell before the railways. The granite walls behind which each province had maintained a separate nationality and a limited local existence, ceased to be a barrier. All of a sudden the products of large-scale industry, of machinery, forced their way, almost free of transport costs, into the most remote corners of the monarchy, destroyed the old hand labour and shattered the feudal barbarism. Trade between the provinces, and with the civilised outside world, acquired an unheard-of importance. The Danube, flowing towards the backward regions, ceased to be the main artery of the Empire; the Alps and the Bohemian forests no longer exist; the new artery now passes from Trieste to Hamburg, Ostend and Le Havre, far beyond the frontiers of the Empire, through the mountain ranges to the remote coasts of the North Sea and the ocean. Participation in the general interests of the State, in what was happening in the outside world became a necessity. The local barbarism began to disappear, particular interests began to diverge here, to merge there. Nationalities separated in one place to link up somewhere else, and out of the confused agglomeration of mutually alien provinces emerged larger and better defined groups with common tendencies and interests.

"It will endure Metternich and me." The French Revolution, Napoleon and the July upheavals had been withstood. But there was no withstanding steam. Steam forced its way through the Alps and the Bohemian forests, steam robbed the Danube of its role, steam tore Austrian barbarism to shreds and thereby pulled the ground from under the feet of the House of Hapsburg.

In Europe and America they now have the pleasure of seeing Metternich and the whole House of Hapsburg crushed between the wheels of the steam-driven machines, and the Austrian monarchy being cut to pieces by its own locomotives. It is an exhilarating sight. The vassals rebel in Italy, and Austria dare not utter a word, the liberal pestilence invades Lombardy and Austria hesitates, vacillates, quakes before its own subjects. In Switzerland the oldest rebels against Austria, the Ur-Swiss, yield to Austrian suzerainty; they are attacked, but Austria shivers at the bold words of Ochsenbein: If only one single Austrian soldier enters Switzerland I will throw twenty thousand men into Lombardy and proclaim the Italian Republic. And Austria goes off to beg in vain for assistance from the despised courts of Munich, Stuttgart and Karlsruhe. In Bohemia, the estates refuse to pay their taxes of fifty thousand guilders; Austria still wants
to enforce payment but needs its troops in the Alps so badly that for
the first time since the foundation of Austria it has to give way to the
estates and do without the fifty thousand guilders. In Hungary, the
Diet is preparing revolutionary proposals and is sure of a majority
for them. And Austria, which needs the Hungarian Hussars in
Milan, Modena and Parma, Austria itself puts forward revolutionary
proposals\textsuperscript{288} to the Diet although it knows very well that these are its
own death warrant. This unshakable Austria, this eternal bulwark of
barbarism, no longer knows where to turn. It is suffering from the
most terrible rash; if it scratches itself in front then it itches behind,
and if it scratches behind, then it itches in front.

And with these comical scratchings, the House of Austria scratches
itself out of existence.

If old Metternich does not follow his "upright" Franz pretty
quickly he may live to see the imperial monarchy which he held
together at the price of such exertions falling apart and most of it
into the hands of the bourgeoisie; he may live to have the
unspeakable experience of seeing the "burgher tailors" and
"burgher grocers" refusing to doff their hats to him in the Prater\textsuperscript{289}
and calling him plain Herr Metternich. A few more shocks, one or
two more costly mobilisations and Charles Rothschild will buy up the
whole Austrian monarchy.

We observe the victory of the bourgeois over the Austrian imperial
monarchy with real satisfaction. We only wish that it may be the
really vile, really dirty, really Jewish bourgeoisie who buy up this
venerable empire. Such a repulsive, flogging, paternal, lousy
government deserves to be under the heel of a really lousy, unkempt
stinking adversary. Herr Metternich can depend on us to shear this
adversary later as ruthlessly as Metternich will soon be shorn by
him.

The fall of Austria has a special significance for us Germans. It is
Austria which is responsible for our reputation of being the
oppressors of foreign nations, the hirelings of reaction in all
countries. Under the Austrian flag Germans have held Poland,
Bohemia, Italy in bondage. We have to thank the Austrian monarchy
for the Germans being hated as vile mercenaries of despotism from
Syracuse to Trento, from Genoa to Venice. Anyone who has seen
what deadly hatred, the bloody and completely justified thirst for
revenge against the Tedeschi\textsuperscript{a} reign in Italy must be moved to an
undying hatred of Austria and applaud when this bulwark of
barbarism, this scourge of Germany collapses.

\textsuperscript{a} Germans.—\textit{Ed.}
We have every reason to hope that the Germans will revenge themselves on Austria for the infamy with which it has covered the German name. We have every reason to hope that it will be Germans who will overthrow Austria and clear away the obstacles in the way of freedom for the Slavs and Italians. Everything is ready: the victim lies there awaiting the knife which will cut its throat. May the Germans not lose their chance this time; may they be bold enough to say the words which Napoleon himself did not dare to utter—

*La dynastie de Habsbourg a cessé de régner.*

Written about January 25, 1848

First published in the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* No. 8, January 27, 1848

Signed: F. E.

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

---

* The Hapsburg dynasty has ceased to reign.—*Ed.*
The Débat social of February 6 defends the Brussels Association Démocratique and its branches. We shall permit ourselves a few comments on the character of this defence.

It may well be in the interest of the Belgian radical party to point out to the Catholics that they are acting against their own interest in denouncing the Belgian radical party. It may well be in the interest of the Belgian radical party to distinguish between lower and higher clergy and to compensate the clergy in general with compliments for the truths it addresses to a part of it. We understand nothing of this. We are merely astonished that the Débat could overtook the fact that the attacks of the Flemish Catholic papers against the associations démocratiques were printed immediately in the Indépendance, and the Indépendance is not, as far as we know, a Catholic newspaper.

The Débat social declares that the Belgians are demanding political reforms through the democratic associations.

We realise that the Débat has forgotten the cosmopolitan character of the Association Démocratique for a moment. Or perhaps it has not even forgotten it. It has merely remembered that a society which strives to promote democracy in all countries will work first on the country in which it resides.

The Débat social is not content with saying what the Belgians want of the associations démocratiques; it goes further, it says what the Belgians do not want of them, what one consequently should not want if one belongs to the Association, which the Belgians have founded to demand political reforms. Avis aux étrangers!

“...The political reforms which the Belgians wish to demand through the democratic associations,” says the Débat, “are not those utopias pursued by certain democrats in

---

a L'Indépendance belge.—Ed.
b See Note 8.—Ed.
c Warning to foreigners!—Ed.
countries where the social institutions permit no hope of any effective reforms, where it is therefore just as reasonable to think of castles in the air as of the modest well-being of the already free nations. He who possesses nothing does just as well in dreaming of millions at a stroke as of a hundred talers of rent or profit.”

Here the Débat is evidently speaking of the Communists.

We should like to ask it if the “modest well-being” of “free” England manifests itself in the Poor Rate growing faster than the population.

We should like to ask it if by the “modest well-being of the free nations” it understands the destitution in Flanders.

We should like it to let us into the secret whereby it intends to replace wages with a 100 talers of profit or rent. Or does it understand by the “modest well-being of the free nations” the modest well-being of the free capitalists and landowners?

We should finally like to ask it if it has been charged by the Brussels Association Démocratique to give the lie to those utopians who do not believe in “the modest happiness of the free nations”.

However, the Débat social is evidently not speaking of Communists in general, but of the German Communists, who, because political developments in their homeland do not allow them to found a German alliance or a German association libérale, sink in despair into the arms of communism.

We remind the Débat that communism originated in England and France, and not in Germany.

German communism is the most determined opponent of all utopianism, and far from excluding historical development in fact bases itself upon it—for the time being we give this assurance to the Débat social in return for its own assurance.

Germany is retarded in its political development, it still has a long political development to undergo. We should be the last to deny this. On the other hand, however, we believe that a country of more than 40 million inhabitants, when it prepares for a revolution, will not seek the model for its movement in the radicalism of small free countries.

Does the Débat understand by communism the throwing of class antagonisms and of class struggle into sharp relief? In that case, it is not communism which is communistic, but political economy and bourgeois society.

We know that Robert Peel has prophesied that the class antagonism in modern society must erupt in a terrible crisis. We know that Guizot himself in his History of Civilisation believes he is

---

"a F.-P.-G. Guizot, Histoire générale de la civilisation en Europe....—Ed."
setting forth nothing but particular forms of the class struggle. But Peel and Guizot are utopians. Realists are men who regard the mere statement of social facts as an offence against benevolent worldly wisdom.

The Débat social is quite free to admire and to idealise North America and Switzerland.

We ask it whether the political constitution of North America could ever be introduced in Europe without great social upheavals. We believe, for instance, if the Débat will pardon our boldness, that the English Charter,293 if it were to be put forward not by individual enthusiasts for universal suffrage but by a great national party, presupposed a long and arduous unification of the English workers into a class, and that this Charter is being striven for with quite another purpose and must bring about quite different social consequences than the constitution of America or of Switzerland ever strove for or ever brought about. In our eyes those people are utopians who separate political forms from their social foundation and present them as general, abstract dogmas.

The manner in which the Débat social attempts to defend the Association Démocratique by simultaneously eliminating “certain democrats” who are dissatisfied with the “modest well-being of the free nations” is demonstrated yet again when it comes to speak of the discussions on free trade held within the Association.294

“Six sittings,” says the Débat, “were devoted to the discussion of this interesting question, and many workers from the various workshops of our city asserted here principles which would not have been out of place at the famous congress of economists held in Brussels in September last.”  

Before this the Débat notes that the Association voted almost unanimously that absolute free trade between all nations should be considered as a goal of democracy.

After this, in the same issue of the Débat we find a thoroughly commonplace speech by M. Le Hardy de Beaulieu, scraped together from the most decayed leavings of the English free-trade cookshop.

And to round off, Cobden is glorified.295

After this presentation in the Débat social, will anyone doubt that the Association voted by a great majority for free trade in the sense of the Congress of Economists and of the bourgeois free traders?
Our predictions concerning the imminent triumph of the bourgeoisie are in fact being fulfilled more rapidly than we could have expected. In less than a fortnight three absolute monarchies have been transformed into constitutional states: Denmark, Naples and Sardinia.

The movement in Italy has developed with remarkable rapidity. The Papal State, Tuscany and Sardinia in succession took their place at its head; one country impelled the next further and further, one advance always brought another in its wake. The Italian Customs Union was the first step towards constituting the Italian bourgeoisie, which decisively took the lead in the national movement and came daily more into collision with Austria. The bourgeoisie had achieved almost everything which could be achieved under an absolute monarchy, and a representative constitution daily became a more pressing necessity for it. But the winning of constitutional institutions—this was precisely the difficulty for the Italian bourgeoisie. The princes were reluctant: the bourgeoisie dared not confront them too threateningly as it did not want to throw them into the arms of Austria again. The Italians of the Customs Union might have gone on waiting for a long time, when help suddenly came to them from a quite unexpected quarter—Sicily rebelled; the people of Palermo drove the royal troops out of the city with unprecedented bravery,* the people of Abruzzi, Apulia and Calabria attempted a new insurrection, Naples itself prepared for battle, and Ferdinand

* Palermo with 200,000 inhabitants defeated 13,000 men. Paris with a million inhabitants defeated 7,000 to 8,000 men in the July revolution.

— See this volume, pp. 520-29.— Ed.
the bloodhound, pressed from all sides, with no hope of obtaining Austrian troops, was the first of all the Italian princes to have to grant a constitution and complete freedom of the press. The news reached Genoa and Turin; both cities demanded that Sardinia should not lag behind Naples; Charles Albert, too involved in the movement to withdraw, and also in need of money on account of armament against Austria—had to yield to the very emphatic representations of Turin and Genoa and similarly grant a constitution. There is no doubt at all that Tuscany must follow, and that Pius IX himself will have to make new concessions.

The Italian bourgeoisie has gained its decisive victory in the streets of Palermo. It is now victorious; what will ensue can only be the exploitation of this victory in all respects and the securing of its results against Austria.

This victory of the Italian bourgeoisie is again a defeat for Austria. How old Metternich must have gnashed his teeth in rage—the man who saw the Neapolitan revolution coming from afar, who again and again begged the Pope and Tuscany for permission to march his troops across their territories, and who nonetheless had to hold back his Pandours and Croats on the Po! One courier after another came to him from Naples; Ferdinand, Cocle and Del Carretto were screaming for help, and Metternich, who in 1823 and 1831 had reigned so omnipotently in Italy, could do nothing. He had to look on quietly and see his last, his most reliable ally defeated and humiliated in Italy, and the whole weight of Naples placed on the scales against Austria thanks to a revolution. And he had a hundred and fifty thousand men waiting on the Po! But England was there, and had the Austrians crossed the Po, it would have been the signal for the occupation of Venice and the bombardment of Trieste—and so Metternich's hangmen had to stand still and watch with their rifles in their hands while Naples was snatched from them.

England's conduct in the whole Italian affair has been very proper. While the other great powers, France as much as Russia, have done everything to support Metternich, England has taken its place, quite alone, on the side of the Italian movement. The English bourgeoisie has the greatest interest in thwarting an Austro-Italian protective customs union and conversely in bringing about an anti-Austrian customs union in Italy based on free trade. For this reason it supports the Italian bourgeoisie, which for the time being itself still needs free trade for its development, and which is therefore the natural ally of the English bourgeoisie.

In the meantime Austria is arming. These armaments are completely ruining its finances. Austria has no money, and it has
turned to Rothschild for a loan; Rothschild has declared that he does not want a war and will not, therefore, provide any money in support of war. Indeed, is there any banker who will still advance money to the rotten Austrian monarchy for a war in which a country like England may involve itself? Metternich can thus no longer count on the bourgeoisie. He turns to the Emperor of Russia who, in the last few years, has also become a great capitalist, thanks to the mines of the Ural and Altai regions and to the corn trade—to the white Tsar, who has already once helped Frederick William IV with 15 million silver rubles, and who in general seems to be turning into the Rothschild of all declining absolute monarchies. Tsar Nicholas is said to have granted 75 millions—in return for a Russian percentage, it goes without saying, and on good security. All the better. If the Tsar has to cover the expenses of the Prussian and Austrian monarchies in addition to his own, if his money is wasted on arming unsuccessfully against Italy, then his treasure will soon be exhausted.

Will Austria risk a war? We hardly think so. Its finances are chaotic; Hungary is in full ferment, Bohemia is not secure; on the battlefield itself, in Lombardy, guerillas would spring up everywhere. And more than anything else the fear of England will restrain Metternich. At this moment Lord Palmerston is the most powerful man in Europe; his decision determines the issue, and this time his decision has been made known clearly enough.

At quite the other end of Europe, in Denmark, a king dies. His son, a coarse, jovial schnapps-tippler, immediately convokes an assembly of notables, a committee of the estates, in order to deliberate upon a common constitution for the Duchies and Denmark. And so that the Germans shall disgrace themselves everywhere, the Duchies have to declare that they do not want this constitution, because it would mean their being torn away from their common German homeland.

It is really too ridiculous. The Duchies have a considerably smaller population than Denmark, and yet the number of their representatives is to be the same. Their language is to have equal rights in the assembly, in the official records, in everything. In short, the Danes make every possible concession to the Germans, and the Germans persist in their absurd national obstinacy. The Germans have never been national-minded where the interests of nationality and the interests of progress have coincided; they were always so where

---

2 Christian VIII.—Ed.
b Frederick VII.—Ed.
c Schleswig and Holstein.—Ed.
nationality has turned against progress. Where it was important to be national-minded, they played the cosmopolitans; where it was important not to be directly national-minded, they were so to the point of absurdity. In every case they made themselves ridiculous.

Either the inhabitants of the Duchies are capable people, and more advanced than the Danes—in which case they will obtain preponderance over the Danes in the chamber of estate deputies and have no reason for complaint; or else they are German sluggards and lag behind the Danes in industrial and political development, in which case it is high time they were taken in tow by the Danes. But it is really too absurd for these upright Schleswig-Holsteiners to beg the 40 million Germans to help them against the Danes and to refuse to take up their positions on a battlefield where they can fight with the same advantages as their opponents; it is too absurd that they should appeal to the police of the German Confederation against a constitution.

The Danish constitution is as much a blow against Prussia as the Neapolitan against Austria, although in itself it is only a reaction to abortive Prussian constitutional experiment of February 3. As a further addition to its many embarrassments the Prussian government now has received a new constitutional state as neighbour; at the same time it loses a faithful protegé and ally.

While Italy and Denmark have thus stepped into the ranks of the constitutional states, Germany lags behind. Every nation is moving forward, the smallest, weakest nations are always able to find a point in the European complications which enables them in spite of their big reactionary neighbours to win for themselves one modern institution after another. Only the 40 million Germans never bestir themselves. It is true that they are no longer asleep, but they still only talk and bluster, they have yet to act.

But if the German governments were to set any great hopes on the bourgeoisie's fear of action, then they would be very much deceiving themselves. The Germans are the last in line because their revolution will be quite different from the Sicilian. The German bourgeois and the philistines know very well that behind them stands a daily growing proletariat which on the day after the revolution will put forward quite different demands than they themselves desire. The German bourgeois and philistines therefore behave in a cowardly, indecisive and vacillating manner—they fear a conflict not less than they fear the government.

A German revolution is far more serious than a Neapolitan revolution. In Naples there is a confrontation only between Austria and England; in a German revolution the whole of the East and the
whole of the West will confront each other. A Neapolitan revolution will achieve its aim as soon as downright bourgeois institutions have been won; a German revolution will only really begin when it has got this far.

For this reason the Germans must first of all be thoroughly compromised in the eyes of all other nations, they must become, more than they are already, the laughing-stock of all Europe, they must be compelled to make the revolution. But then they will really arise, not the cowardly German burghers but the German workers; they will rise up, put an end to the whole filthy, muddled official German rule and with a radical revolution restore the honour of Germany.

Written in the middle of February 1848
First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 15, February 20, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

[ON THE POLISH QUESTION]

SPEECHES IN BRUSSELS, ON FEBRUARY 22, 1848
ON THE OCCASION OF THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY
OF THE CRACOW INSURRECTION

SPEECH BY MR. KARL MARX

Gentlemen,

There are striking analogies in history. The Jacobin of 1793 has become the Communist of the present day. In 1793, when Russia, Austria and Prussia divided up Poland, the three powers produced the constitution of 1791, which had been condemned unanimously because of its alleged Jacobin principles.

And what had it proclaimed? The Polish constitution of 1791! Nothing other than a constitutional monarchy: legislation placed in the hands of the representatives of the country, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience, public judicial trial, abolition of serfdom, etc. And all this was then called pure Jacobinism! Thus you see, gentlemen, that history has moved on. The Jacobinism of those days has today become, as far as liberalism goes, the most moderate imaginable.

The three Powers have marched with history. In 1846 when by incorporating Cracow into Austria they confiscated the last remains of Polish nationality, they gave the name communism to what they once called Jacobinism.

Now, what is the communism of the Cracow revolution? Was it communism to have wanted to restore Polish nationality? This is as much as to say that the war waged against Napoleon by the European coalition to save nationalities was a communist war, and that the Congress of Vienna was made up of crowned Communists. Or was the Cracow revolution communist because it wanted to set up a democratic government? Nobody will charge the millionaire citizens of Berne and New York with communist leanings.

Communism denies the necessity for the existence of classes; it wants to abolish all classes, all class distinctions. The revolutionaries of Cracow wanted only to abolish political distinctions between the classes; they wanted to give equal rights to the different classes.
But, briefly, to what extent was the Cracow revolution communist? Was it perhaps that it tried to break the chains of feudalism, to turn tributary property into free property, into modern property?

If one asked French proprietors: “Do you know what Polish democrats want? The Polish democrats want to have the kind of property ownership which you already have”, the French proprietors would answer, “They are quite right.” But if you say, with M. Guizot, to the French proprietors: “The Poles want to abolish property as you instituted it by the revolution of 1789 and as it still exists in your country.” “What!” they will shout, “they are revolutionaries, Communists; these scoundrels must be trampled down!” The abolition of guilds, of corporations, the introduction of free competition, is now called communism in Sweden. The Journal des Débats went further: to abolish the unearned income constituted by the right of corruption for two hundred thousand electors, is to abolish a source of revenue, to destroy an acquired property, to be communist. Doubtless the Cracow revolution also wanted to abolish one kind of property. But what kind of property? One which could not be destroyed in the rest of Europe any more than the Sonderbund in Switzerland, both having already disappeared.

No one will deny that in Poland the political question is tied to the social question. The one has always been inseparable from the other.

Better ask it of the reactionaries! During the Restoration were they only fighting political liberalism and its inevitable load of Voltairianism?

A very renowned reactionary writer loudly professed that the highest metaphysics of a de Maistre and of a de Bonald was in the end a question of money, and is not every question of money a directly social question? The men of the Restoration did not conceal the fact that to bring back good politics it was necessary to bring back good property rights, feudal property, moral property. Everybody knows that loyalty to monarchy cannot dispense with tithes and corvée labour.

Let us go further back. In 1789 the political question of the rights of man included the social question of free competition.

And what then happened in England? In all questions from the Reform Bill until the abolition of the Corn Laws, did the political parties fight about anything except changes in property rights, questions of property, social questions?

Here, in Belgium itself, is the struggle of liberalism with Catholicism anything but the struggle of industrial capital with large landed property?
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And the political questions which have been debated for the last seventeen years, are these not basically social questions?

Thus, however you look at it, whether from a liberal, radical, even aristocratic point of view, could you still reproach the Cracow revolution with having joined a social question to a political question?

The men who led the Cracow revolutionary movement were deeply convinced that only a democratic Poland could be independent, and a democratic Poland was impossible without the abolition of feudal rights, without the agrarian movement which would transform the tied peasants into free proprietors, modern proprieters. Replace the Russian autocrat by Polish aristocrats and you will have given despotism naturalisation papers. It was thus that the Germans, in their war against foreign rule, exchanged one Napoleon for thirty-six Metternichs. 307

If the Polish lord no longer has a Russian lord over him, the Polish peasant will still have a lord over him, but a free lord in place of a slave lord. This political change will have altered nothing in his social position.

The Cracow revolution has given a glorious example to the whole of Europe, by identifying the national cause with the democratic cause and the emancipation of the oppressed class.

If this revolution has been stifled for the moment by the bloody hands of hired assassins it is now rising gloriously and triumphantly in Switzerland and Italy. It sees the confirmation of these principles in Ireland, where the narrowly nationalist party has gone to its grave with O'Connell, and where the new national party is above all reforming and democratic. 308

It is Poland once again which has taken the initiative, no longer feudal Poland, but democratic Poland; and from this moment its emancipation has become the point of honour for all the democrats of Europe.

SPEECH BY MR. FREDERICK ENGELS

Gentlemen,

The insurrection whose anniversary we are celebrating today has failed. After some days of heroic resistance Cracow fell and the bleeding ghost of Poland, which had risen for a moment before the eyes of its assassins, descended again into its grave.

The Cracow revolution was a defeat, a very deplorable defeat. Let us render the last honours to the fallen heroes, lament their setback and offer our sympathy to the twenty million Polish people whom this failure has again enchained.
But, gentlemen, is that all we have to do? Is it enough to shed a tear on the tomb of an unhappy country and to pledge against its oppressors an implacable hatred, till now not very potent?

No, gentlemen! The anniversary of Cracow is not only a day of mourning, it is a day of rejoicing for us other democrats; for the defeat itself contains a victory, a victory whose fruits are ours to gather, while the results of the defeat are only transitory.

This victory is the victory of young democratic Poland over the old aristocratic Poland.

Yes, the latest struggle of Poland against its foreign oppressors has been preceded by a hidden struggle, concealed but decisive within Poland itself, a struggle of oppressed Poles against Polish oppressors, a struggle of democracy against the Polish aristocracy.

Compare 1830 and 1846, compare Warsaw and Cracow. In 1830 the ruling class in Poland was as selfish, narrow-minded and cowardly in the legislative body as it was devoted, enthusiastic and courageous on the field of battle.

What did the Polish aristocracy want in 1830? To safeguard its own acquired rights with regard to the Emperor. It limited the insurrection to the little country which the Congress of Vienna was pleased to call the Kingdom of Poland; it restrained the uprising in the other Polish provinces; it left intact the degrading serfdom of the peasants and the infamous condition of the Jews. If the aristocracy, in the course of the insurrection, had to make concessions to the people, it only made them when it was too late, when the insurrection had failed.

Let it be said clearly: the insurrection of 1830 was neither a national revolution (it excluded three-quarters of Poland) nor a social or a political revolution; it changed nothing in the internal condition of the people; it was a conservative revolution.

But within the conservative revolution, within the national government itself, there was one man who vigorously attacked the narrow views of the ruling class. He proposed really revolutionary measures before whose boldness the aristocrats of the Diet recoiled. By calling the whole of ancient Poland to arms, by thus making the war for Polish independence a European war, by emancipating the Jews and the peasants, by making the latter share in landed property, by reconstructing Poland on the basis of democracy and equality, he wanted to make the national cause the cause of freedom; he wanted to identify the interest of all peoples with that of the Polish people.

\footnote{Nicholas I.—Ed.}
Need I name the genius who conceived this plan, at once so vast and so simple? It was Lelewel.

In 1830, these proposals were continually rejected by the blind self-interest of the aristocratic majority. But these principles, ripened and developed by the experience of fifteen years of servitude, we saw inscribed on the flag of the Cracow uprising. At Cracow, it was clearly seen that there were no longer men who had much to lose; there were no aristocrats; every step that was taken bore the stamp of that democratic, I might almost say proletarian, boldness which has only its misery to lose and a whole country, a whole world, to gain. There, no hesitation, no scruples; the three foreign powers were attacked together; the freeing of the peasants, agrarian reform, the emancipation of the Jews were proclaimed, without caring for a moment whether this offended certain aristocratic interests.

The Cracow revolution wanted neither to re-establish ancient Poland nor to preserve what the foreign governments had let remain of the old Polish institutions; it was neither reactionary nor conservative.

No, it was even more hostile to Poland itself than to its foreign oppressors, hostile to the ancient Poland, barbarous, feudal and aristocratic, based on the serfdom of the majority of the people. Far from wanting to re-establish the ancient Poland, it aimed to overthrow it utterly, and to found on its ruins, with a wholly new class, with the majority of the people, a new Poland, modern, civilised and democratic, worthy of the nineteenth century, and which might be really the outpost of civilisation.

The difference between 1830 and 1846, the immense progress made within unhappy Poland itself, bleeding and torn; the Polish aristocracy completely separated from the Polish people and thrown into the arms of the oppressors of its country; the Polish people irrevocably committed to the democratic cause; and finally the class struggle, the motive force of all social progress, established in Poland as here, that is the victory of democracy proved by the Cracow revolution, that is the result which will bear fruit when the defeat of the insurgents has been avenged.

Yes, gentlemen, by the Cracow insurrection the Polish cause, from being national, as it was, has become the cause of all peoples; from a question of sympathy, as it was, it has become a question of interest of all democrats. Until 1846 we had a crime to avenge; henceforth we have allies to support, and we shall do it.

And it is above all our Germany which ought to congratulate itself on this explosion of democratic passion in Poland. We are, ourselves, on the eve of a democratic revolution; we shall have to fight
barbarian hordes from Austria and Russia. Before 1846 we might have had doubts as to what side Poland would take if there were a democratic revolution in Germany. The Cracow revolution has removed all doubts. Henceforth the German people and the Polish people are irrevocably allied. We have the same enemies, the same oppressors, for the Russian government weighs on us as much as on the Poles. The first condition for the deliverance both of Germany and of Poland is the overturning of the present political state in Germany, the downfall of Prussia and Austria, the driving back of Russia beyond the Dniester and the Dvina.

The alliance of the two nations is therefore not by any means a beautiful dream, a charming illusion; no, gentlemen, it is an inevitable necessity resulting from the common interests of the two nations, and it has become necessary through the Cracow revolution. The German people, which until now had little of its own except words, will now have deeds to offer its Polish brothers; and just as we German democrats present here clasp hands with the Polish democrats, so the whole German people will celebrate its alliance with the Polish people on the very field of the first battle won in common over our common oppressors.

First published in March 1848 in:  
_Célébration, à Bruxelles, du deuxième anniversaire de la Révolution Polonaise du 22 Février 1846, Bruxelles, 1848_

Printed according to the text in  
_Célébration..._

Translated from the French

Published in English in full for the first time
Frederick Engels

A WORD TO THE RIFORMA

The Riforma of Lucca has printed a reply to one of those well-known and vile articles which the Augsburger Zeitung\(^a\) is accustomed to publish on instructions from the Imperial Chancellery in Vienna.\(^311\)

That trashy rag from the Lech\(^b\) had not only praised to the skies the loyalty of the 518,000 Austrian soldiers to their feeble-minded Ferdinand, but had also claimed that all these soldiers, Bohemians, Poles, Slovaks, Croats, Heyducks, Wallachians, Hungarians, Italians, etc., were burning with enthusiasm for German unity and would willingly part with their lives for it, \textit{as soon as it should be the will of the Emperor}!

As though this were not precisely the misfortune—\textit{that so long as Austria exists Germany has to risk seeing its unity defended by Heyducks, Croats and Wallachians, as though the unity of Germany so long as Austria survives could be anything else but the unity of Germany with Croats, Wallachians, Magyars and Italians!}\(^\)\(^c\)

The Riforma replies very aptly to the lying claim of the All-Gemeine\(^c\) that Austria is in fact defending the interests of the German nation in Lombardy, and concludes with an appeal to the Germans, drawing a parallel between the Italian movement of 1848 and the German wars of liberation in 1813 and 1815.

The Riforma evidently thought that by doing so it was paying a compliment to the Germans, otherwise it would never have equated,

\(^a\) Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg).—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) Augsburg is situated on the Lech.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) A pun on the name: Allgemeine Zeitung—"All-Gemeine" means thoroughly vile.—\textit{Ed.}
against its better judgment, today's progressive Italian movement with precisely those reactionary wars to which Italy directly owes its subjugation to Austria, to which Germany owes the restoration of as much as possible of the old confusion, fragmentation and tyranny, and to which the whole of Europe owes the infamous treaties of 1815.\textsuperscript{312}

The \textit{Riforma} may take our word for it: Germany is fully enlightened as to the wars of liberation, both through the consequences of the wars themselves and through the ignominious end to which the heroes of that "glorious" age have come. Only the hired papers of the government still puff their cheeks and trumpet forth praise for that stupidity-intoxicated period, the public laughs and even the iron cross turns red with shame.

Precisely these newspapers, precisely these enthusiastic French-eaters of 1813, are now raising the same outcry against the Italians as they did before against the French, who sing paean of praise to Austria, to Christian-Germanic Austria, and who preach crusades against Romance knavery and Romance frippery—for indeed Italians are just as much Romance as the French.

Would the Italians like an example of the sympathy they may expect from the worthy blusterers of the age of liberation, of the kind of ideas these red-headed visionaries entertain about the Italian nation? We shall merely quote the well-known song by A[ugust] A[dolf] L[udwig] Follen\textsuperscript{a}:

\begin{quote}
Yon land of marvels all may sing,
Where mandolines and soft guitars do ring
And, 'neath darkling leaf, the golden orange gleams;
But I the purple German plum esteem
And Borsdorf's apple on its leafy beam,
\end{quote}

and how these poetic ravings of an ever cool-headed philistine drivel on. Then come the most ludicrous pictures of bandits, daggers, fire-belching mountains, Romance knavery, the infidelity of Italian women, bugs, scorpions, poison, vipers, assassins, etc., seen by this virtuous lover of plums running around in dozens on all the highways of Italy, and finally the gushing philistine thanks his God that he is in the land of Love and Friendship, of shindies with chair-legs, of faithful, blue-eyed pastors' daughters, of probity and cosiness, in short in the land of German Loyalty. Such are the superstitious and novelettish ideas entertained by the heroes of 1813 about Italy, which of course they have never seen.

\textsuperscript{a} August Follen composed the music and Johann Friedrichsen wrote the words.—\textit{Ed.}
The Riforma and the men of the Italian movement in general can rest assured: public opinion in Germany is definitely on the side of the Italians. The German people have just as great an interest in the fall of Austria as the Italian people. They greet with undivided applause every step forward by the Italian people, and, we hope, they will not be missing from the battlefield at the right moment to put an end to all the Austrian magnificence once and for all.

Written about February 22, 1848

First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 16, February 24, 1848

Signed: F. Engels
Frederick Engels

REVOLUTION IN PARIS

The year 1848 is turning out well. The Sicilian revolution with its long train of constitutions is hardly over before Paris experiences a victorious insurrection.

The opposition deputies had publicly pledged themselves to defend the right of assembly against Guizot, Duchâtel and Hébert by means of a courageous demonstration.

All the preparations had been made. The hall was ready and awaited the banquet guests. Then suddenly, when the time had come to act, the poltroons of the Left, M. Odilon Barrot at their head, beat, as always, a cowardly retreat.

The banquet was called off. But the people of Paris, stirred up by the loud-mouths in the Chamber, raging at the cowardice of these épiciers\(^a\) and made discontented at the same time by protracted general unemployment, the people of Paris refused to be called off.

At midday on Tuesday,\(^b\) all Paris was on the streets. The masses were shouting: "Down with Guizot, long live the Reform!" They proceeded to Guizot's residence, which was protected by the troops with difficulty; but the windows were nevertheless broken.

The masses proceeded to Odilon Barrot's house as well, shouted "Down with Barrot!" and broke his windows, too. M. Barrot, the cowardly originator of the whole outbreak, sent to the government and asked for a security guard!

The troops stood by and quietly looked on. Only the Municipal Guard struck out, and that with the greatest brutality. The Municipal Guard is a corps consisting in the main of natives of Alsace and

---

\(^{a}\) Grocers, here philistines.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) February 22, 1848.—Ed.
Lorraine, that is, men who are half German; they receive three and a half francs a day and look very plump and well-nourished. The Municipal Guard is the basest body of soldiers in existence, worse than the Gendarmerie, worse than the old Swiss Guard; if the people win, things will go badly for it.

Towards evening the people began to resist. Barricades were set up, guard posts stormed and set on fire. A police spy was cut down in the Place de la Bastille. Arms shops were looted.

At five o'clock marching orders were sounded for the National Guard. But only a very few turned up, and those who did shouted "Down with Guizot!"

During the night calm was restored. The last barricades were taken and the outbreak appeared to be over.

On Wednesday morning, however, the revolt began again with renewed vigour. A large part of the centre of Paris lying to the east of the Rue Montmartre was strongly barricaded; after eleven o'clock the troops no longer dared venture in there. The National Guard gathered in large numbers, but only to hold the troops back from any attacks on the people and to shout "Down with Guizot, long live the Reform!"

There were 50,000 soldiers in Paris, disposed according to Marshal Gérard's defence plan and holding all strategic points. But these points were so numerous that all of the troops were kept busy with them and were thus already forced into inaction. Apart from the Municipal Guard there were almost no soldiers free for an offensive. Gérard's excellent plan was of infinite help to the outbreak; it paralysed the troops and made it easier for them to maintain the passivity to which they were in any case inclined. The detached forts also proved to be anything but beneficial to the government. They had to be kept manned and thus also withdrew a considerable section of the troops from the battle area. No one thought of a bombardment. In general not a single person gave a thought to the fact that these bastilles even existed. One more proof how fruitless are all defence plans against a mass revolt in a great city!

Towards noon the outcry against the Ministry in the ranks of the National Guard was so strong that several colonels sent word to the Tuileries that they would not hold themselves responsible for their regiments if the Ministry were to remain.

At two o'clock the aged Louis Philippe was forced to drop Guizot and form a new Ministry. Hardly had this been made public when the National Guard went home in jubilation and illuminated their houses.
But the people, the workers, the only ones who had erected the barricades, battled with the Municipal Guard and thrown themselves against the bullets, the bayonets and the horses' hoofs; these workers had no desire to fight merely for M. Molé and M. Billault. They continued the struggle. While the Boulevard des Italiens was full of joy and jubilation, there was heavy shooting in the Rue Sainte-Avoie and Rambuteau. The battle lasted long into the night and was continued on Thursday morning. Evidence of the general participation of the workers in the battle was the tearing up of the rails on all the railways around Paris.

The bourgeoisie has made its revolution, it has toppled Guizot and with him the exclusive rule of the Stock Exchange grandees. Now, however, in the second act of the struggle, it is no longer one section of the bourgeoisie confronting another, now the proletariat confronts the bourgeoisie.

News has just arrived that the people have won and proclaimed the Republic. We confess that we had not dared hope for this brilliant success by the Paris proletariat.

Three members of the provisional government belong to the definitely democratic party, whose organ is the Réforme. The fourth is a worker—a for the first time in any country in the world. The others are Lamartine, Dupont de l'Eure and two men from the National.315

By this glorious revolution the French proletariat has again placed itself at the head of the European movement. All honour to the workers of Paris! They have given the world an impulse which will be felt by every country in turn; for the victory of the Republic in France means the victory of democracy in the whole of Europe.

Our age, the age of democracy, is breaking. The flames of the Tuileries and the Palais Royal are the dawn of the proletariat. Everywhere the rule of the bourgeoisie will now come crashing down, or be dashed to pieces.

Germany, we hope, will follow. Now or never will it raise itself from its degradation. If the Germans have any energy, any pride or any courage, then in a month's time we too shall be able to shout:

"Long live the German Republic!"

Written on February 25-26, 1848
First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 17, February 27, 1848
Printed according to the newspaper Published in English for the first time
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a Albert.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN STAR

Dear Sir,

After the important events accomplished in France, the position taken by the Belgian people and government is of a greater interest than in ordinary times. I hasten, therefore, to inform your readers of what has happened since Friday, 25th of February.

The excitement and inquietude was universal in this town on the evening of that day. All sorts of rumours were spread, but nothing was really believed. The railway station was full of a crowd of people of all classes, anxious for the arrival of news. The French Ambassador, ex-Marquis de Rumigny, himself was there. At half-past twelve at night, the train arrived, with the glorious news of Thursday's revolution, and the whole mass of people shouted, in one sudden outburst of enthusiasm: Vivre la République! The news spread rapidly all over the town. On Saturday all was quiet. On Sunday, however, the streets were crowded with people, and every one was curious to see what steps would be taken by two societies—the Association Démocratique and the Alliance. Both bodies assembled in the evening. The Alliance, a set of middle-class Radicals, resolved to wait, and thus retired from the movement. The Association Démocratique, however, took a series of most important resolutions, by which this body placed itself at the head of the movement. They resolved to meet daily, instead of weekly; to send a petition to the town-council, reclaiming the arming, not only of the middle-class Civic Guard, but of all citizens in districts. In the evening some rioting took place in the streets. The people cried: Vivre la République, and assembled in masses around the Town Hall. Several arrests took place, but nothing of any consequence occurred.

Among the individuals arrested, there were two Germans—a political refugee, M. Wolff, and a working man. Now, you must
know that there existed here, in Brussels, a German working men's
society, in which political and social questions were discussed, and
a German democratic newspaper. The Germans, resident in
Brussels, were known for being generally very active and uncompro-
mising democrats. They were almost all members of the Democratic
Association, and the vice-president of the German society, Dr. Marx,
was also vice-president of the Democratic Association.

The government, perfectly aware of the narrow sentiment of
nationalism prevalent among a certain class of the population of a
small country like Belgium, immediately profited by these circum-
stances, in order to spread the rumour that the whole agitation for
the Republic had been got up by the Germans—men who had
nothing to lose, who had been expelled from three or four countries
for their turpitudes, and who intended to place themselves at the
head of the intended Belgian Republic. This precious piece of news
was reported on Monday through the whole town, and in less than
a day the whole mass of the shopocracy, who form the body of
the Civic Guard, raised one unanimous outcry against the
German rebels, who wanted to revolutionise their happy Belgian
fatherland.

The Germans had fixed a place of meeting in a coffee-house,
where every one of them was to bring the latest news from Paris. But
the outcry of the shopocrats was so great, and the rumours of
government measures against the Germans were so manifold, that
they were obliged to give up even this innocent means of
communicating with each other.

On Sunday evening already the police had succeeded in prevailing
upon the publican, proprietor of the German society's room, to
refuse them the room for any future meeting.

The Germans behaved perfectly well during these times. Exposed
to the most petty persecutions of the police, they yet rested at their
post. They assisted every evening at the meeting of the Democratic
Association. They abstained from all tumultuous crowding in the
streets, but they showed, though personally exposing themselves,
that in the hour of danger they would not abandon their Belgian
brethren.

When, after a few days, the extraordinary agitation of Sunday and
Monday had ceased, when the people had returned to their work,
when the government had recovered from their first terror, then
commenced another series of persecutions against the Germans. The
government published orders, according to which all foreign

\[ ^a \text{Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung.---Ed.} \]
working men, from the moment they had no work, were to be expelled the country; and all foreigners indiscriminately, whose passports were out of order, were to be treated in the same way. Thus, while they took these measures, they excited, by the rumours they spread, the masters against all foreign working men, and made it impossible to any German to find work. Even those who had work lost it, and were, from that moment, exposed to an order of expulsion.

Not only against working men out of work, but also against women, they commenced their persecution. A young German Democrat, who lives, according to the French and Belgian custom, with a French lady, just as married people live—and whose presence at Brussels appears to have importuned the police—was suddenly exposed to a series of persecutions, directed against his mistress. She having no passport—and who ever before thought in Belgium of asking passports from a woman?—was threatened with immediate expulsion! and the police declared that it was not for her sake, but for the sake of the individual with whom she lived. Seven times in three days, the Commissary of Police was at her house; she had to pass at his office several times, and was sent to the central police office, escorted by an agent—and if an influential Belgian Democrat had not interposed, she would certainly have been obliged to leave.

But all this is nothing. The persecutions against working men,—the spreading of rumours about such and such an individual to be arrested, or about a general chase after the Germans to be made in all public houses of the town on Tuesday evening, all this is nothing compared with what I have now to report.

On Friday evening, Dr. Marx, amongst others, received a royal ordinance, ordering him to quit the country within twenty-four hours. He was engaged in arranging his trunks for the journey, when, at one o'clock in the morning, and in spite of the law which forbids the violation of the dwelling of a citizen from sunset to sunrise, ten police agents, armed, headed by a commissary of police, broke into his house, seized upon him and led him to the Town Hall prison. No reason was given but that his passport was not in order, though he presented them at least three passports, and though he had resided in Brussels for three years! He was led off. His wife, seized with terror, instantly ran to see a Belgian lawyer, who always offered his services to persecuted foreigners—the same whose friendly interposition has been mentioned above,—M. Jottrand, President of the Democratic Association. On her return, she met

---

*a March 3. The Northern Star reported this erroneously as “Saturday”.—Ed.*
with a friend, a Belgian, M. Gigot. He accompanied her home. At the
door of Dr. Marx’s house, they found two of the policemen who had
arrested her husband. Where have you taken my husband? asked
she. Why, if you will follow us we will show you where he is. They led
her, along with M. Gigot, to the Town Hall, but instead of fulfilling
their promise, they delivered up both of them to the police, and they
were put into prison. Mrs. Marx, who had left her three little children\at home, with a servant only, was led into a room where she found a
set of prostitutes of the lowest order, with whom she had to pass the
night. Next morning she was led into a room where she had to stay
three hours without fire, shivering with cold. M. Gigot was also
detained. M. Marx had been put into a room with a raving madman,
whom he was obliged to fight every moment. The most brutal
treatment on the part of the jailors was joined to this infamous
conduct.

At three o’clock in the afternoon, at last, they were conducted
before the judge, who very soon ordered their liberation. And of
what had Mrs. Marx and M. Gigot been indicted? Of vagabondage,
because neither of them had a passport in their pockets!

M. Marx was equally liberated, and ordered to leave the country
the same evening. Thus, after having been wantonly imprisoned
during eighteen of the twenty-four hours left him to settle his affairs;
after having had not only himself, but also his wife, separated for all
that time from his three children, the eldest of whom has not
attained her fourth year, he was sent away without a minute to put
his affairs in order.

M. Gigot, on his arrest, had only left the prison the day before. He
had been seized, along with three democrats from Liége, at six
o’clock on Monday morning, in an hotel, and arrested for vag-
abondage, because they had no passports. They were ordered to
be liberated on Tuesday, but yet detained till Thursday against all
law. One of them, M. Tedesco, is yet in prison, accused of nobody
knows what. Both he and M. Wolff will be either liberated or placed
before the tribunal in the course of this week.

I must say, however, that the Belgian working men and several
other democrats of that nation, particularly M. Jottrand, have
behaved exceedingly well towards the persecuted Germans. They
have shown themselves quite above all petty sentiments of national-
ity. They saw in us not foreigners but democrats.

I hear that there is an order of arrest out against a Belgian working
man and brave democrat, M. de Guasco. Another, M. Dassy, arrested

\[a\] Jenny, Laura and Edgar.—Ed.
on Sunday last, for rebellion, was before the tribunal yesterday; his judgment is not yet pronounced.

I am daily and hourly expecting my order of expulsion, if not worse, for nobody can foretell what this Belgio-Russian government is about to dare. I hold myself ready to leave at a moment's notice. Such is the position of a German democrat in this free country, which, as the papers say, has nothing to envy in the French Republic.

Salutation and Fraternity.

Brussels, March 5th

Your old Friend

First published in *The Northern Star*  
No. 544, March 25, 1848

Reprinted from the newspaper
Dear Sir,

At the present moment the Belgian government is aligning itself entirely with the policy of the Holy Alliance. Its reactionary fury falls on the German democrats with unprecedented brutality. Were we not too distressed by the persecution directed specifically against us, we would openly laugh at the ridiculous attitude assumed by the Rogier ministry when it accuses a few Germans of wishing to impose a republic on the Belgians against their wishes; but it so happens that, in the special case to which we refer, the hateful aspect of it outweighs the absurd.

First of all, Sir, it is as well to know that almost all the Brussels newspapers are edited by Frenchmen, most of whom escaped from France to avoid the ignominious punishments which threatened them in their own country. These Frenchmen now have the utmost interest in protecting the Belgian independence which they all betrayed in 1833. The king, the ministry and their supporters have used these rags to give credibility to the idea that a Belgian revolution, in the republican sense, would merely be an imitation of a francequillonnerie, and that all the democratic activity which is now making itself felt in Belgium has only been provoked by some hot-headed Germans.

The Germans do not in the least deny that they openly associated with the Belgian democrats, and this without the slightest degree of

---

a Leopold I.—Ed.

b A scornful expression in Flemish, meaning stupidly copying anything that is French.—Ed.
hot-headedness. In the eyes of the King's Prosecutor this means arousing the workers against the bourgeois, making the Belgians suspicious of a German king they so dearly love, and opening the gates of Belgium to a French invasion.

Having received, on March 3 at five o'clock in the evening, an order to leave the kingdom of Belgium within twenty-four hours, I was busy, that same night, with preparing for the journey when a commissary of police, accompanied by ten municipal guards, burst into the place where I was living, searched the whole house, and ended by putting me under arrest on the pretext that I was without papers. Apart from the quite proper papers sent me by M. Duchâtel in expelling me from France, I had at hand the expulsion papers delivered to me by Belgium only a few hours earlier.

I would not have spoken to you, Sir, about my arrest and the brutalities I suffered, were these not connected with an incident which would be difficult to understand even in Austria.

Immediately after my arrest, my wife went to the home of M. Jottrand, President of the Democratic Association of Belgium, to urge him to take the necessary measures. On returning home she found at her door a policeman who told her, with perfect politeness, that if she should wish to speak to M. Marx, she need only follow him. My wife accepted the offer with alacrity. She was taken to the police station, and the Commissary at first told her that M. Marx was not there; then he brutally demanded who she was, why she had gone to M. Jottrand's house, and whether she had her papers with her. A Belgian democrat, M. Gigot, had followed my wife to the police station with the municipal guard, and when he protested strongly against the Commissary's absurd and insolent questions he was silenced by guards who seized him and threw him into a cell. My wife, under the charge of "vagabondage", was taken to the prison at the Hôtel de Ville and locked up in a dark room with prostitutes. At eleven o'clock in the morning she was taken, under police escort and in broad daylight, to the office of the examining magistrate. For two hours she was held in close custody, despite the most vigorous protests from all sides. She stayed there, in bitter cold, exposed to the most shameless remarks by the gendarmes.

Finally she appeared before the examining magistrate, who was surprised that the police, in their solicitude, had not at the same time arrested the young children. The interrogation was naturally a sham, and my wife's only crime consists in the fact that, although belonging to the Prussian aristocracy, she shares the democratic opinions of her husband.
I have not entered into all the details of this revolting affair. I merely add that, when we were released, the twenty-four hours had just ended, and we had to leave without being able to take even the most essential of our belongings.

*Karl Marx,
Vice-President of the Brussels Democratic Association*

Written about March 6, 1848
First published in *La Réforme*,
March 8, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time
On Sunday, February 27 the Brussels Democratic Association held its first public meeting since the news of the proclamation of the French Republic. It was known in advance that an immense crowd of workers, determined to lend their active help to all measures that the Association would judge it proper to undertake, would be present.

The government, for its part, had spread the rumour that king Leopold was ready to abdicate the moment the people wished it. This was a trap set for the Belgian democrats to make them undertake nothing decisive against such a good king, who asked nothing better than to shed the burden of royalty, provided that he was honourably left a reasonable pension.

At the same time the king’s government had ready a list of people whom it considered proper to arrest that very night as disturbers of public order. It had agreed with M. Hody, the chief of public security, to have on this list the foreigners as chief instigators of an artificial riot, as much to cover the arrest of Belgians known as resolute republicans as to awake national susceptibilities. This explains why, later on, his excellency M. Rogier, who is no more Belgian than His Majesty King Leopold is French, had published an ordinance which commanded the authorities to watch carefully the French and the Germans, the former compatriots of M. Rogier, the latter compatriots of Leopold. This ordinance recalls, in its form of wording, the laws on suspects.

This clever plan was executed in a manner the more perfidious and brutal in that the people arrested on the evening of February 27 had abstained from any provocation.

It might be said that pleasure had been taken in arresting these persons in order to maltreat and abuse them at leisure.
Immediately after their arrest they were showered with punches, kicks and sabre-blows; they were spat in the face, these republicans. They were maltreated in the presence of the philanthropist Hody, who was delighted to give these foreigners proof of his powers.

As there were no charges against them it only remained to release them. But no! They were kept in the cells for six days! Then the foreign prisoners were separated from the rest and taken directly in Black Marias to the railway station. There they were again put into vans, each in a separate cell, and sent in this way to Quiévrain where Belgian police received them and dragged them to the French frontier.

When at last they were able to collect themselves on the soil of liberty, they found they had in their pockets nothing but expulsion papers, dated the eve of their arrests. One of the expelled persons, M. Allard, is French.

At the same time the government of the Petty King proclaimed, in the Chamber of Representatives, that the Belgian kingdom, including the two Flanders, was the best of all possible republics, and that it possessed a model police force, directed by a man such as M. Hody, at one and the same time an old republican, a phalansterist and a rejoined Leopoldist. The chamber wept with joy, the Catholic and liberal papers were in ecstasies about the domestic virtues of King Leopold and the public virtues of his servant Rogier.

The Belgian people are republicans. The only Leopoldists are the big bourgeoisie, the landed aristocracy, the Jesuits, the officials and the ex-Frenchmen who, chased out of France, now find themselves at the head of the Belgian administration and the press.

Metternich is delighted to find so opportunely at the French frontier a Coburg, a born enemy of the French revolution. But he forgets that the Coburgs of today no longer count except in questions of marriage.

Written about March 10, 1848
First published in La Réforme,
March 12, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

a West and East Flanders—two provinces of the Belgian Kingdom.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

[THE SITUATION IN BELGIUM]

Brussels, March 18

The Belgian bourgeoisie refused a republic to the people fifteen days ago; now it is preparing itself to take the initiative in the republican movement. It cannot yet be proclaimed out loud, but it is whispered everywhere in Brussels: "Really, Leopold must go; really, only the republic can save us; but what we need is a good solid republic, without organisation of labour, without universal suffrage, without the workers meddling in it!"

This is already some progress. The good bourgeoisie of Brussels who, only a few days ago, desperately denied any intention of wanting to copy the French Republic, have felt the results of the financial crisis in Paris. While still decrying political imitation they submit to financial imitation. While still singing the praises of Belgian independence and neutrality, they found that the Brussels Stock Exchange was completely and most humiliatingly dependent on the Paris Stock Exchange. The cordon of troops which holds the southern frontier has not stopped the lowering of share prices from invading, unimpeded, the guaranteed neutral territory of Belgium.

Indeed, the consternation which reigns in the Brussels market could not be more general. Bankruptcy is decimating the middling and small traders, shares are finding no buyers, quotations are only nominal, money is disappearing more quickly than in Paris, trade is completely stagnant, and most manufacturers have sacked their workmen. Here are a few examples of the general depression: a few days ago a dealer offered to sell one hundred and fifty shares of the Dendre railway at one hundred francs each, which were quoted above par on the London Stock Exchange before the February revolution. The first day he refused 45 francs, the second 35 francs,
and the third day he sold them at 10 francs per share! Land sold for six thousand francs two years ago no longer finds buyers for one third this price.

And now, at this moment of general panic, the government demands, firstly, two-thirds of direct taxes in advance, and then a forced loan of fifty to sixty millions, measures which terrify the tax-payers already dissatisfied with an ever-increasing budget!

This is a state of affairs which has not failed to persuade our good bourgeoisie that, in being enthusiastic for the monarchy, they have gained only full and complete participation in the troubles in France without having shared any of the advantages. This is the real cause of the growing republicanism.

Meanwhile, the workers are not quiet. Ghent has had several days of disturbances; here two days ago there were meetings of many workers, ending in a petition to the king, which Leopold in person came to receive from the calloused hands which presented it to him. More serious demonstrations will soon follow. Every day puts more workers out of work. If the industrial crisis continues, if feelings in the working class warm up a little, the Belgian bourgeoisie, like that of Paris, will make its "mariage de raison" with the republic.

Written on March 18, 1848
First published in Marx/Engels, Gesamt- ausgabe, I. Abteilung, Bd. 6, Berlin, 1932

Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
1) have never protected small industry, only machine industry. Example: the school of List in Germany. Güllich.a

2) If we believe what the protectionists say, they merely preserve the status quo. Protection will never effect sales of the protected product on foreign markets. Hence reactionary.b

3) The last consolation of the protectionists is that the country is not exploited by foreign but by domestic capitalists.

4) It is said, indeed, that internal reforms must first be made before one can think of free trade.c The power to reform the position of the classes is not ascribed to the protective system itself. But they say it would be foolish to reform international relations before domestic relations have been reformed. But what is the protective system? It is proof that the class which carries it into effect has power in its hands. Therefore, given the protective system [...] the capitalists will not concede anything. Moreover, gentlemen, great social and historical reforms are never made by concessions, by the generosity of the ruling classes, but only through the nécessité des choses. They must therefore be forced through. It is therefore ridiculous to believe that in a country where the protective system prevails [...] [...] [...] the relations between capital and labour are reformed in any way. I shall say no more of the protectionists [...] of the question....c

Written about September 18, 1847
First published in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, I. Abteilung, Bd. 6, Berlin, 1932
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time

a In the original Jülich.—Ed.
b After "reactionary" the following is written between the lines: "conservateurs, and if conserved [?], conservateurs — hommes réactionnaires."—Ed.
c Marx uses the English term.—Ed.
i) Demand. Most economists treat it almost exclusively from the individual standpoint. The world historic development of demand, its first universal development, depends firstly on the products of the various countries of the world becoming known to each other. If in the further course of development demand creates intercourse, initially it is intercourse which creates demand. Demand is the material content of intercourse, the totality of the objects of exchange, of the commodities which come into exchange and trade. Wars, voyages of discovery, etc., all historical events whereby nations are brought into contact, are all so many conditions of expanding demand, of the formation of the world market. The growth of demand consists directly in the first place in the fact that already existing products of various countries (in contact, in A) are being exchanged. Demand gradually loses its local etc. character and becomes cosmopolitan. The production of all countries thus enters more and more into the consumption of the individuals of (all regions) of a country.

The Crusades, for example, by making known the products of the Orient, greatly increased the demand for such products in Western Europe. (Cf. J., Notebook III, p. 106.) Places where these products stream together for exchange constitute the world market towns; the world market appeared in this form in particular before the discovery of America. In the 14th and 15th centuries Constantinople, the Italian cities, Bruges and London.

Also still at the same time like fairs, namely the caravan-like streaming together of merchants. In the 19th century, for example, fairs are of quite subordinate significance. (Cf. J., Notebook III, p. 106.)
How much less these market places depend on their own industry than the latter and its prosperity depend simply on their being the general stores, is proved by the decay of the trade of the Italian cities after 1498, from the moment when Lisbon became the chief market for Indian fabrics and spices. Antwerp, too, still had the same limited character in the 16th century as Bruges etc. earlier.

Trade supremacy. The first dominant trading nation are the Dutch (from end of the 16th to the middle of the 17th century). Until then there were only first trading towns. The Spaniards and Portuguese form the transition from dominant trading towns to dominant trading nations. Carrying trade and fisheries nevertheless still form a decisive constituent of Dutch supremacy.

The <agricultural> European North-East in the relation of an agricultural country to the European West. In the same measure in which here industry and shipbuilding increase, the demand for the raw products of the North-East increases and with it their production.

Holland as the first trading and industrial nation, from the end of the 16th to the middle of the 17th century, is also the first nation for whom its domestic agriculture is insufficient and where the population is growing in far too great a proportion to domestic agriculture. Therefore carries on the first large-scale trade in grain. Amsterdam becomes the chief granary of Western Europe. (Cf. J., Notebook III, p. 107).

Written in December 1847
Published in English for the first time
Printed according to the manuscript
Karl Marx

DRAFT PLAN FOR SECTION III
OF THE MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY\textsuperscript{326}

First draft

1) \langle Critique \rangle \textsuperscript{a} Critical Utopian Systems (Communist).
2)

Second draft

1) Reactionary socialism, feudal, religious petty bourgeois.
2) Bourgeois socialism.
3) German philosophical socialism.\textsuperscript{b}
5) Direct party literature.
6) Communist literature.\textsuperscript{327}

Written at the end of December 1847 or the beginning of January 1848

First published in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, I. Abteilung, Bd. 6, Berlin, 1932

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

\textsuperscript{a} This word is struck out in the manuscript.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} Marx added this point in the left-hand margin and accordingly altered the original numbering from 3 to 4, 4 to 5, 5 to 6.
We have seen, moreover:

The Communists do not put forward a new theory of private property. They merely state the historical fact that the means of production bourgeois production relations and with them bourgeois property relations and the certain development of the social forces of production no longer are appropriate and therefore to the development of industry itself and in the...

But do not argue with us because you measure oppose the abolition of bourgeois property by your bourgeois ideas of freedom, culture, etc. Your ideas themselves are products of the existing bourgeois production and property relations, as your legal system is merely the will of your class elevated into law. Your A will whose content is determined by the material living conditions of your class.

Your You share with all ruling classes that have perished the biased idea of transforming the your bourgeois production and property relations from historical and merely transitory relations corresponding only to a certain stage in the development of the productive forces, into eternal laws of nature and reason.

---
a The first two lines are in Jenny Marx's hand. The rest in Marx's.—Ed.
b Deletions in the original are given here in angular brackets.—Ed.
What you comprehend for feudal property, you no longer comprehend for bourgeois <conditi> property.
And yet, you cannot deny the fact that <in the course> with the development of <bourgeois> industry the one-sided, on....

The Communists do not put forward any new theory of property. They state a fact. You deny the most striking facts. You have to deny them. You are backward looking utopians.

Written in December 1847-January 1848
First published as a facsimile in the journal Der Wahre Jakob No. 565 (6), March 17, 1908
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time

---
a In the M S. the whole sentence including deleted words is struck out.—Ed. -
Bottom of the page from Marx's manuscript, "Protectionists", with drawings by Engels
A page of the rough draft of the Manifesto of the Communist Party
Karl Marx

NOTES ON THE ARREST, MALTREATMENT AND EXPULSION OF WILHELM WOLFF BY THE BRUSSELS POLICE
FEBRUARY 27 TO MARCH 1, 1848

Petits Carmes. Wolff's right eye is so injured it will hardly regain sight.
Sunday February 27, between 10 and 11 o'clock in the evening.
Real maltreatment in the Hôtel de Ville, blows with the fist from all directions. The real maltreatment first in the police station where there were a number of drunken gardes civiques. Police punched Wolff in the right eye so that the sight....
They tore off his glasses, spat in his face, kicked him, punched him, abused him, etc. One of the gardes civiques proved his valour by joining in these manifestations. They tortured him.
In the meantime Hody arrived, chef de la sûreté publique, notorious philanthropist, hypocritical scoundrel.
Wolff had an interview of \( \frac{1}{2} \) with him in the presence of the scoundrel who had arrested him amidst frightful maltreatment.
Hody's indignation at Wolff's visiting him. Spoke furiously against the German Workers' Society. "I knew," he said among other things, "that there would be about \( \frac{2}{3} \) Germans among those arrested tonight." Wolff said ironically: "Oui, insofar as they were already marked in advance for arrest."

Taken from the Permanence to the Amigo. Wolff [...?] t. evening [...?...]
The whole thing that evening was a provocation organised by the police. The Ministry needed prisoners at any cost, including also Germans.

---

\( ^{a} \) See this volume, pp. 567-68.—Ed.
At the Amigo: soon more arrested persons arrived: those who were placed with Wolff: a Belgian. He was so maltreated and injured by the police that he lost at least a quart of blood. A third person see p. 2.

On Monday etc. taken to the Petits Carmes.

On Wednesday the 6 arrested foreigners received their expulsion passports. But Wolff’s was dated Sunday, February 27, before his arrest. In prison horribly maltreated.

Written early in March 1848
First published in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe I. Abteilung, Bd. 6, Berlin, 1932
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
APPENDICES
RULES
OF THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Working Men of All Countries, Unite!

SECTION I

THE LEAGUE

Art. 1. The League aims at the emancipation of humanity by spreading the theory of the community of property and its speediest possible practical introduction.

Art. 2. The League is divided into communities and circles; at its head stands the Central Authority as the executive organ.

Art. 3. Anyone who wishes to join the League is required:
   a. to conduct himself in manly fashion;
   b. never to have committed a dishonourable action;
   c. to recognise the principles of the League;
   d. to have acknowledged means of subsistence;
   e. not to belong to any political or national association;
   f. to be unanimously admitted into a community, and
   g. to give his word of honour to work loyally and to observe secrecy.

Art. 4. All League members are equal and brothers, and as such owe each other assistance in every situation.

Art. 5. All members bear League names.

SECTION II

THE COMMUNITY

Art. 6. A community consists of at least three and at most twelve members. Increase above that number will be prevented by division.

Art. 7. Every community elects a chairman and a deputy chairman. The chairman presides over meetings, the deputy chairman holds the funds, into which the contributions of the members are paid.

Art. 8. The members of communities shall earnestly endeavour to increase the League by attracting capable men and always seek to
work in such a way that principles and not persons are taken as guide.

Art. 9. Admission of new members is effected by the chairman of the community and the member who has introduced the applicant to the League.

Art. 10. The communities do not know each other and bear distinctive names which they choose themselves.

SECTION III

THE CIRCLE

Art. 11. A circle comprises at least two and at most ten communities.

Art. 12. The chairmen and deputy chairmen of the communities form the circle authority. They elect a president from among themselves.

Art. 13. The circle authority is the executive organ for all the communities of the circle.

Art. 14. Isolated communities must either join an already existing circle authority or form a new circle with other isolated communities.

SECTION IV

THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY

Art. 15. The Central Authority is the executive organ of the whole League.

Art. 16. It consists of at least five members and is elected by the circle authority of the place where it is to have its seat.

SECTION V

THE CONGRESS

Art. 17. The Congress is the legislative authority of the League.

Art. 18. Every circle sends one delegate.

Art. 19. A Congress is held every year in the month of August. The Central Authority has the right in important cases to call an extraordinary congress.

Art. 20. The Congress in office decides the place where the Central Authority is to have its seat for the current year.

Art. 21. All legislative decisions of the Congress are submitted to the communities for acceptance or rejection.
Art. 22. As the executive organ of the League the Central Authority is responsible to the Congress for its conduct of its office and therefore has a seat in it, but no deciding vote.

SECTION VI
GENERAL REGULATIONS

Art. 23. Anyone who acts dishonourably to the principles of the League is, according to the circumstances, either removed or expelled. Expulsion precludes re-admission.

Art. 24. Members who commit offences are judged by the circle authority, which also sees to the execution of the verdict.

Art. 25. Every community must keep the strictest watch over those who have been removed or expelled; further, it must observe closely any suspect individuals in its locality and report at once to the circle authority anything they may do to the detriment of the League, whereupon the circle authority must take the necessary measures to safeguard the League.

Art. 26. The communities and circle authorities and also the Central Authority shall meet at least once a fortnight.

Art. 27. The communities pay weekly or monthly contributions, the amount of which is determined by the respective circle authorities. These contributions will be used to spread the principles of the community of property and to pay for postage.

Art. 28. The circle authorities must render account of expenditures and income to their communities every six months.

Art. 29. The members of the circle authorities and of the Central Authority are elected for one year and must then either be confirmed anew in their office or replaced by others.

Art. 30. The elections take place in the month of September. The electors can, moreover, recall their officers at any time should they not be satisfied with their conduct of their office.

Art. 31. The circle authorities have to see to it that there is material in their communities for useful and necessary discussions. The Central Authority, on the other hand, must make it its duty to send to all circle authorities such questions whose discussion is important for our principle.

Art. 32. Every circle authority and failing that the community, even every League member, must, if standing alone, maintain regular correspondence with the Central Authority or a circle authority.
Art. 33. Every League member who wishes to change his residence must first inform his chairman.

Art. 34. Every circle authority is free to take any measures which it considers advisable for the security of the circle and its efficient work. These measures must, however, not be contrary to the general Rules.

Art. 35. All proposals for changes in the Rules must be sent to the Central Authority and submitted by it to the Congress for decision.

SECTION VII
ADMISSION

Art. 36. After the Rules have been read to him, the applicant is asked by the two League members mentioned in Art. 9 to reply to the following five questions. If he replies “Yes”, he is asked to give his word of honour, and is declared a League member.

These five questions are:

a. Are you convinced of the truth of the principles of the community of property?

b. Do you think a strong League is necessary for the realisation of these principles as soon as possible, and do you wish to join such a League?

c. Do you promise always to work by word and deed for spreading and the practical realisation of the principles of the community of property?

d. Do you promise to observe secrecy about the existence and all affairs of the League?

e. Do you promise to comply with the decisions of the League?

Then give us on this your word of honour as guarantee!

In the name and by the order of the Congress

Heide,a
Secretary

The President,
Karl Schillb

London, June 9, 1847

First published in the book: Gründungsdokumente des Bundes der Kommunisten (Juni bis September 1847), Hamburg, 1969

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

---
a Wilhelm Wolff.—Ed.
b Karl Schapper.—Ed.
Dear Brothers!

The First Congress of the League, which was called last February by the Central Authority (Halle) and opened on June 2 here in London, has concluded its deliberations. In view of the whole position of our League, its sessions could not be public.

But it is incumbent on us, members of the Congress, to make them public for you in retrospect, by at least giving you a survey of our proceedings.

This is all the more our duty as the Central Authority in office up to now had to render account to us, and we, therefore, have to tell you how far the Congress was satisfied with this rendering of account. We must also do so, because we have added an article to the new Rules which makes all legislative decisions of the Congress subject to the vote of the individual communities; hence, for this part of our decisions at least, there are two reasons why we owe you a statement of the grounds for them.

After checking credentials the previous Halle had first to give the Congress an account of its conduct of office and to report on the state of the League. The delegates declared themselves completely satisfied with the way in which the Halle had looked after the interests of the League and had made a start with its reorganisation. That point was thereby disposed of. We take the following brief summary from the report of the Central Authority and from the original letters submitted to the Congress.

---

\(^a\) Joseph Moll added afterwards in the original: “IN HAMBURG”. — *Ed.*

\(^b\) The reference is to Art. 21 of the draft Rules of the Communist League (see this volume, p. 586.) — *Ed.*
In London our League is strongest. Freedom of speech and of association immensely facilitates propaganda and gives opportunities to the many able members to use their character and talent for the greatest good of the League and the cause. For this purpose the League uses the German Workers' Educational Society, and also its branch in Whitechapel. Members of the League also take part in the Fraternal Democrats, the French communist discussion clubs, etc.

The previous Paris Halle itself realised in how much better a position the London League would be to take over the central leadership of the affairs of the League. The security of all documents and of members of the Central Authority itself is nowhere else as great as here. During its proceedings the Congress had opportunity enough to see that the London communities have a sufficient number of competent people who can be entrusted with the supreme executive authority of the League. It therefore decided that the Central Authority should remain in London.

In Paris the League has much declined in recent years. The regional and Halle members have for a long time occupied themselves only with quarrels about formalities and alleged breaches of the Rules instead of looking after the affairs of the whole League or of its Gaus. In the communities similar time-wasting, superfluous and divisive trifles were dealt with. At most they discussed the old questions which have been talked over again and again, ever since Weitling's Garantien, to the point of boredom. In the Paris League itself there was no sign of the slightest progress, not the slightest concern with the development of the principle, or with the movement of the proletariat as it was proceeding in other localities of the League, and outside the League. The consequence was that all those who were not satisfied with what they were offered inside the League looked outside the League for further enlightenment. This need for enlightenment was made use of by a literary knight of industry and exploiter of workers, the German writer Karl Grün. This individual had sided with communism when he noticed that there was money to be made by communist writings. After some time he found that it was dangerous to continue to declare himself a Communist and found occasion to resign in the new book by Proudhon on the economic contradictions which he himself had translated into German. This Grün used the economic statements in this otherwise quite insignificant book as the basis of lectures which

---

a Regions or districts.—Ed.
b W. Weitling, Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit.—Ed.
c P.-J. Proudhon, Système des contradictions économiques.—Ed.
he gave in Paris for League members. These lectures were attended by two kinds of people: 1. those who had already enough of communism in general; 2. those who hoped perhaps to get from this Grün enlightenment on a number of questions and doubts never resolved for them in the community meetings. The latter were fairly numerous and consisted of those members of the Paris communities who were the most useful and the most capable of development. For a time this Grün succeeded in dazzling even a number of these with his phrases and his alleged immense learning. The League was thus split. On one side was the party which had exclusively dominated the Halle and the region, the party of the Weitlingians; on the other side were those who still believed one could learn something even from Grün. These soon saw, however, that Grün expressed definite hostility to the Communists and that all his teaching was quite unable to replace communism. Heated discussions took place during which it became clear that almost all League members remained loyal to communism and that only two or three defended this Grün and his Proudhonist system. At the same time it was revealed that this same Grün had defrauded the workers, as was his wont, by using 30 francs, the sum collected for the Polish insurgents, for his private purposes, and had also wheedled several hundred francs out of them for the printing of a miserable pamphlet about the dissolution of the Prussian Provincial Diet. But enough; the majority of Grün’s former listeners stayed away and formed a new party which was mainly concerned to develop further the communist principle in all its implications and in its connection with social relations. By this split, however, the organisation of the League fell to pieces. In the course of the winter the Central Authority sent an emissary who restored the organisation as far as possible. But soon the quarrels arose again; the three different parties and principles were irreconcilable. The party of progress succeeded with the aid of the Weitlingians in removing from the League the three or four stubborn Grünians who had declared themselves openly against communism. But then, when it came to the election of a delegate to the Congress, the two parties clashed in the regional meeting. The split became incurable, and in order at least to achieve an election, the three communities in which the party of progress was most strongly represented resolved to separate from the two communities on which the main strength of the Weitlingians rested and to elect a congress delegate for themselves at a general meeting. This was done. The Weitlingians

\[a\] K. Grün, *Die preussischen Landtags-Abschiede.*—*Ed.*

\[b\] Joseph Moll.—*Ed.*
were thereby provisionally removed from the League and the number of League members was reduced by one third. After examining the reasons advanced by both parties, the Congress declared its agreement with the action of the three communities, because the Weitlingian party had everywhere held up the League in its development; this had also been experienced both in London and in Switzerland. The Congress resolved unanimously to remove the Paris Weitlingians from the League and to admit the delegate of the Paris majority* to the Congress.

Hence, the number of League members in Paris has been greatly reduced; but, at the same time, obstructive elements have also been removed, and, through the struggle, minds have been quickened to renewed activity. A new spirit is making itself felt, and a completely new energy. The police persecutions seem more or less to have ended; they were in any case not directed against the party which is now victorious and from which only one member was expelled, but struck Grün’s party almost alone, proof that information of the Prussian Government was at the bottom of the whole persecution, as will be shown presently. And if the government has dispersed the public meetings at the Barrière, this too mainly hits the Grünians who made loud speeches there and inveighed against the Communists, because here, of course, the Communists could not freely reply to them. Hence, the League is in far better shape in Paris now than at the time when the *Halle* resigned. We are less numerous but we are united and have capable people there.

In *Lyons* the League has regular members who seem to be very active for the cause.

In *Marseilles* we are also established. We have received the following letter about the membership there: “The position of the Marseilles League is not too good. Encouragement by letters would not help much; we shall try to arrange for some of us to go there this autumn and to organise the League anew.”

The League has succeeded in gaining a firm footing in Belgium. Brussels has a competent community whose members are Germans and Belgians and who have already founded a second community in Liège among the Walloon factory workers. In that country the prospects for the League are quite encouraging, and we hope that at the next congress Belgium will already be represented by several delegates.

In Germany we had several communities in Berlin which this spring were suddenly dispersed by the police. League members will

* Engels.—*Ed.
have seen from the newspapers that a meeting of workers directed by League members was cancelled by the police, an enquiry was held, and as a result several leading members were arrested. Among the arrested was a certain Friedrich Mentel, a tailor born in Potsdam, about 27 years old, of medium, stocky build, etc. This man, who had formerly been in London and Paris, and in the latter place had belonged to Grün's party and turned out to be a maudlin sentimentalist, and had, by the way, in the course of his travels got to know the situation in the League pretty accurately, was unable to stand up to this little ordeal. This time too it was seen that the weak-mindedness and vagueness of such sentimentalists can find final satisfaction only in religion. Within a few days this Mentel let himself be completely converted by a priest and twice during his arrest took part in the farce of Holy Communion. A Berlin member writes to us as follows: "...he told in court about the communities in Paris, London, Hamburg and Kiel (all of which he had visited himself) and gave the addresses to which Herrn. Kriege sent his Volks-Tribun to Berlin. To somebody else, he said to his face: 'Did I not sell you these books? Did we not go to meetings at such and such an address? Are you not a member of the League of the Just?' And when the answer to everything was 'No', Mentel said: 'How can you answer for this before God the Almighty and All-knowing?' and other such stupidities." Fortunately, Mentel's baseness did not succeed in confusing the other accused, so the government had no alternative but to let the arrested be acquitted for the time being. Clearly, this Mentel's denunciations are closely connected with the persecutions of the German Communists in Paris. We can only congratulate ourselves that the Grünian Mentel regarded the Grünians themselves as the real leaders of the League and denounced them. Thereby the real Communists were in general protected from the persecutions. Naturally, the entire Berlin circle was disorganised by these events. However, knowing the competence of the members there, we are hopeful that the reorganisation of the League will soon be effected.

Hamburg is also organised. But the members there have let themselves be somewhat intimidated by these persecutions in Berlin. The contacts were not broken for a single moment, however.

The League is also established in Altona, Bremen, Mainz, Munich, Leipzig, Königsberg, Thorn, Kiel, Magdeburg, Stuttgart, Mannheim and Baden-Baden. In Scandinavia it is also already established in Stockholm.

The position of the League in Switzerland is not as satisfactory as we might wish. Here the party of the Weitlingians was dominant
from the beginning. The lack of development in the communities in Switzerland was particularly evident, on the one hand in their inability to bring the long-standing struggle with the Young Germans\textsuperscript{340} to a conclusion, and on the other hand in their religious attitude to the Young Germans and in the fact that they let themselves be exploited in the vilest manner by most despicable knights of industry, such as, for instance, the solemn Georg Kuhlmann of Holstein. As a result of police measures the League was so disorganised in Switzerland that the Congress decided to take extraordinary measures for its reconstitution. The success and the nature of these measures can, of course, only later be made known to the communities.

Concerning America, we must wait for more detailed news from the emissary whom the Central Authority has sent there, before a precise report can be given of the final shape of the League's conditions there.\textsuperscript{a}

From this report and from the League letters produced two things emerge: firstly, that when the London Halle took over the leadership, the League was indeed in a difficult position, that the previous Central Authority\textsuperscript{b} had not at all attended to the duties incumbent on it; that it had utterly neglected to hold the whole together, and that in addition to this disorganisation of the League, elements of opposition had gradually germinated even in the individual communities themselves. In these circumstances, which threatened the existence of the League, the London Central Authority at once took the necessary measures: sent out emissaries, removed individual members who were jeopardising the existence of the whole, re-established contacts, called the general congress, and prepared the questions to be discussed there. At the same time it took steps to draw into the League other elements of the communist movement who until then had stood aside from it,\textsuperscript{341} steps which were highly successful.

After settling these questions the Congress had to make a review of the Rules. The result of these deliberations lies before the communities in the new Rules, all the articles of which were accepted unanimously, and which the Congress moves should be finally adopted. In justification of the changes made, we make the following observations:

\textsuperscript{a} Down to here the handwriting is Wolff's, from the following paragraph somebody else's, either J. Moll's or H. Bauer's.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} The Halle of the League of the Just, which before its transfer from Paris to London consisted mainly of supporters of Weitling.—Ed.
The change of name from League of the Just to Communist League was adopted because, firstly, the old name had become known to the governments through the infamous treachery of that Mentel, and that in itself made a change advisable. Secondly, and chiefly, because the old name had been adopted on a special occasion in view of special events which no longer have the slightest bearing on the present purpose of the League. This name is therefore no longer suited to the time and does not in the least express what we want. How many there are who want justice, that is, what they call justice, without necessarily being Communists! We are not distinguished by wanting justice in general—anyone can claim that for himself—but by our attack on the existing social order and on private property, by wanting community of property, by being Communists. Hence there is only one suitable name for our League, the name which says what we really are, and this name we have chosen. In the same spirit we have altered the traditional names Gau and Halle, which we took over from the political societies and the German character of which produced a disturbing impression given the nature of our anti-nationalist League which is open to all peoples; these names have been replaced by words which really mean what they should mean. The introduction of such simple, clear names serves also to remove from our propagandist League the conspiratorial character which our enemies are so keen to attach to us.

The necessity to re-call the Congress, now called for the first time, to re-call it regularly and to transfer to it the entire legislative power of the League subject to confirmation by the communities, was unanimously recognised without discussion. We hope that in the provisions laid down in this respect we have hit on the points which mattered and through which the effective work of the Congress is ensured in the interest of the whole.

As to the omission of the headings, which insofar as they contained legal provisions are replaced by certain articles of the Rules, and insofar as they contained general communist principles are replaced by the Communist Credo, this gives the Rules a simpler and more uniform shape and has at the same time led to a more precise definition of the position of each particular authority.

After the Rules had been dealt with, various proposals were discussed which had been prepared either by the Central Authority or put forward by individual delegates.

First of all, there was discussion of one delegate's proposal to call a new congress in six months time. The Congress itself felt that, as the First Congress, which has been called and had met at a time when the organisation of the League was flagging, it had to regard itself above
all as an organising and constituent assembly. It felt that a new congress was needed to deal thoroughly with the most important questions before it; since at the same time the new Rules had fixed the next congress for the month of August, so that there would be barely two months interval, and since it was also impossible to defer the Second Congress until August 1848, it was decided to call this Second Congress for Monday, November 29 of this year, here in London. We did not let ourselves be deterred by the bad time of the year any more than by the new costs. The League has survived a crisis and must not fight shy of an extraordinary effort for once.—The new League Rules contain the necessary provisions for the election of delegates and so we hope that a large number of circles will send delegates to the Second Congress.

The proposal of the same delegate to set up a special fund for emissaries also found general approval.—The point was made that our League has at its disposal two kinds of emissaries. Firstly, those who are sent out at the expense of the League with special missions to certain localities, either to establish the League in areas where it does not yet exist, or to organise it again where it is in decline. These emissaries must necessarily be under the direct control of the Central Authority.—Secondly, workers who are returning to their own homes or have to make other journeys. Such workers, often very capable men, could be used to the greatest advantage of the League for visits to many communities not far from their travel route, if they are reimbursed on behalf of the League for the additional expenses caused thereby. Such occasional emissaries can, of course, only be under the direct control of the circle authority and only in special cases be placed under the control of the Central Authority. Hence, the Congress decided to instruct the Central Authority to demand from every circle authority a certain financial contribution every three months and from these contributions to set up a fund for sending out emissaries of the first kind. Further, to instruct the circle authorities more than previously to use capable members leaving on journeys as occasional emissaries in the manner described and to pay the additional travelling expenses in advance from their own funds. In very special cases the circle authorities can apply to the Central Authority for a contribution for this purpose; whether this financial application is granted, is, of course, decided by the Central Authority. Every emissary is responsible to the authority which has supplied him with funds and must report to it.

All of you will see how necessary it is to organise propaganda through emissaries and to subject it to central leadership. We hope
that our decisions, taken after mature consideration, will meet with your approval and that they may be attended by good success for the cause.

The next question was that of the organ of the League; it was recognised without discussion how necessary such a publication is. It was also readily understood that the paper could appear only in London, and that it should not appear more often than weekly and not less often than monthly.—Title, motto and format were agreed and you will be acquainted with them through the specimen number to be published in July. A commission is in existence to act for the editorial board pending the journal's publication; then an editor, who also has already been appointed, will take over the direction in co-operation with the Commission. This considered, the Congress came to the question of costs. Firstly, various things are needed to complete the printing equipment, in particular an iron press, for which the Central Authority was instructed to call for a contribution from the circles. But then the costs were calculated. It was found that at 2 pence, =4 sous, =2 Silbergroschen, =6 Kreuzers for every weekly issue of one sheet the number of subscribers required to cover the costs would be greater than we can rely on with certainty at present. A monthly paper without an editor would be able to exist with fewer subscribers, but would not fulfil the League's requirements. But whether we would be able to get the number of subscribers needed for a weekly paper was, as we have said, too uncertain for us to enter into the necessary engagements. We therefore resolved as follows: To start with, a specimen number will appear in July free of charge. Then the individual communities will have to send word through their circles how many members they have, for the Congress has decided that at least as long as the journal is a monthly, every member pays for one copy, but every community receives only one, and the remainder are distributed free. League members must, moreover, make enquiries regarding the number of copies which can with certainty be sold in their area, gather subscribers and report on this, too. Then in November, taking account of the notices received by the Central Authority, the Congress will take further decisions and if possible launch the journal before the New Year. In the meantime the London printing press will be used to print pamphlets.344

Finally, the question of the Communist Credo. The Congress realised that the public proclamation of the principles of the League was a step of the greatest importance; that a credo which in a few

---

344 Wilhelm Wolff.—*Ed.*
years, perhaps months, might no longer suit the times and no longer correspond to the spirit of the majority, would be as harmful as a suitable credo would be useful; that this step had to be considered with particular care and must not be taken too hastily. Here, just as on the question of the League organ, the Congress became aware that it could not act definitively but only in a constituent role, that it had to give new food to the re-awakening life in the League by discussion on the plan of a credo. Hence, the Congress resolved to draft this plan and to submit it to the communities for discussion, so that proposals could be formulated for amendments and additions to be submitted to the Central Authority. The plan is appended.\(^a\) We recommend it for serious and mature consideration by the communities. We have tried on the one hand to refrain from all system-making and all barrack-room communism, and on the other to avoid the fatuous and rapid sentimentality of the tearful, emotional Communists\(^345\); we have, on the contrary, tried always to keep firm ground under our feet by the constant consideration of the social relations which alone have given rise to communism. We hope that the Central Authority will receive from you very many proposals for additions and amendments, and we will call on you again to discuss the subject with particular zest.\(^b\)

This, dear Brothers, is the survey, the outcome, of our deliberations. We would very much have liked to have definitively settled the items before us, to have founded the League organ, to have proclaimed the communist principles in a credo. But in the interest of the League, in the interest of the comm[unist] movement, we had to set limits to ourselves here, we had to appeal anew to the majority, and to leave it to the second Congress to carry through what we have prepared.

It is now for you, dear Brothers, to prove that you have the cause of the League, the cause of communism, at heart. The League has emerged victorious from a period of decline. Apathy and laxity have been overcome, the hostile elements which had arisen in the League itself have been eliminated. New elements have joined it. The future of the League is secure. But, dear Brothers, our position is not yet such that we can for one moment relax our efforts; all wounds are not yet healed, all gaps have not yet been filled, many painful effects of the struggle we have gone through can still be felt. Therefore the interest of the League, the communist cause, still demands of you a short period of the most strenuous activity;

\(^{a}\) See this volume, pp. 96-103.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) From the following paragraph the handwriting is again Wilhelm Wolff’s.—Ed.
therefore for a few months you must not even for a moment weary in your work. Extraordinary circumstances demand extraordinary effort. A crisis such as our League has gone through, a crisis in which we had first to fight the fatigue caused by the heavy pressure of German and other police harassments and, even more, caused by the hope of an early improvement in social conditions apparently receding ever further from fulfilment; a crisis, furthermore, in which we not only had to fight the persecutions of our enemies, of governments either dominated by or allied to the bourgeoisie against us, but in which we found enemies in our midst who had to be fought and rendered harmless, with regard only for the threatened position of the League, for the menacing disorganisation of the entire German-speaking Communist Party, without any consideration of persons; Brothers, one does not recover from such a crisis overnight. And even if the existence of the League, the strength of the organisation, is re-established, there will have to be months of unceasing work before we can say: We have done our duty as Communists, our duty as League members.

Brothers! In the firm conviction that you will feel the importance of the situation as much as we do; in the firm conviction that you will nevertheless be fully equal to these difficult circumstances, we confidently appeal to you, to your enthusiasm for the cause of the community! We know that the bourgeoisie's infamous lust for gain leaves you hardly a moment to work for the cause; we know that it presses down to the lowest limit even the miserable wage it gives you for your hard work; we know that just now famine and the slump in business weigh on you especially heavily; we know that it persecutes you, imprisons you, ruins your health and endangers your lives if you find time and money despite all to work for the interest of the community; we know all that, and in spite of everything we have not hesitated for one moment to appeal to you for new financial sacrifices, to call on you to redouble your activity. For we ourselves would have to withdraw from the whole movement, blushing and ashamed, if we did not know that the men who elected us to decide on the good of the whole, will vigorously and unhesitatingly put our resolutions into practice; if we did not know that there is no one in our League for whom the interest of the Communist Party, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the victory of the community is not his very own, his dearest interest; if we did not know that people with sufficient determination to organise a league which exposes them to great dangers are also determined and steadfast enough to defy these dangers and to make this League great and mighty over the whole of Europe; if we did not know,
finally, that such people are the more courageous, the more active, the more enthusiastic, the greater the obstacles they face.

Brothers! We represent a great, a wonderful cause. We proclaim the greatest revolution ever proclaimed in the world, a revolution which for its thoroughness and wealth of consequences has no equal in world history. We do not know how far it will be granted to us to share in the fruits of this revolution. But this we know, that this revolution is drawing near in all its might; this we see, that everywhere, in France as in Germany, in England as in America, the angry masses of the proletariat are in motion and are demanding their liberation from the fetters of money rule, from the fetters of the bourgeoisie, with a voice that is often still confused but is becoming ever louder and clearer. This we see, that the bourgeois class is getting ever richer, that the middle classes are being more and more ruined and that thus historical development itself strives towards a great revolution which will one day burst out, through the distress of the people and the wantonness of the rich. Brothers, we all hope to live to see that day, and even if last spring we did not get the chance to take up arms, as the letter of the Halle predicted we might, do not let that disconcert you! The day is coming, and on the day when the masses of the people with their solid ranks scatter the mercenaries of the capitalists: on that day it will be revealed what our League was and how it worked! And even if we should not live to see all the fruits of the great struggle, even if hundreds of us fall under the grapeshot of the bourgeoisie, all of us, even the fallen, have lived to be in the struggle, and this struggle, this victory alone is worth a life of the most strenuous work.

And so, farewell!

In the name of the Congress,

Heide, Secretary

The President, Karl Schill

London, June 9, 1847
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Brothers: 

Working Men of All Countries, Unite!

Three months have now passed since the Congress was held and its Circular\(^a\) was dispatched to you; we therefore now send you another report on our activity since then, and give you a summary of the present state of the League.

We regret that we are unable to send you very encouraging news, but we have resolved to tell you the plain truth, be it encouraging or disheartening. Some of you may well think that emphasis should always be placed on the bright side of the situation so that people should not lose heart; we on the contrary are of the opinion that all should know the enormous and diverse difficulties with which we have to contend. Real men will not be deterred by this, but on the contrary spurred on to new activity.

As long as our League is not strongly and firmly established, as long as it fails to intervene effectively in the course of events, our influence will be insignificant. Admittedly we now have a new basis, and in some places people seem to work with new enthusiasm but on the whole we are still\(^b\) far from the position we should have reached long ago. When the Congress Circular was dispatched we hoped we would receive favourable and definite replies to it from all quarters. The Central Authority had enclosed with it an accompanying letter calling attention once more to the points requiring a response and requesting prompt and definite replies.\(^{347}\)

\(^{a}\) See this volume, pp. 589-600.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{b}\) The original has “noch nicht” (still not).—\textit{Ed.}
So far we have only received a definite reply from the Brussels circle, other places have only acknowledged receipt of the Circular, thanked us for our efforts, made some general comments, and no more.

What is the cause of this negligence and where is it going to lead us? Many German proletarians are anxious to liberate themselves, but, if they do not set about the task more energetically than they have done so far, they will indeed not make much progress. We can't wait for things to fall into our lap. Many people are hindered in their activity by their mental sluggishness; others talk a great deal but when money contributions are requested they pull long faces, make all manner of excuses and give nothing; others again possess a large share of bourgeois cowardice, see policemen and gendarmes at every turn and never believe it is time to act. It gives one the gripes to see all the goings-on. The majority of the proletarians, and the most active at that—those in Silesia, Saxony, Rhenish Prussia, Westphalia and Hesse have poor or indeed no leadership, at least no communist one.

We therefore call upon all members of our League once more to rise up at last out of their sleep and set to work, and we demand that first of all definite replies to the Congress Circular be sent in so that we can at least know whom we can count upon.

After the Congress was over we sent the Congress Circular, the new Rules, the Communist Credo and an accompanying letter from the Central Authority to ten towns in Switzerland, France, Belgium, Germany and Sweden where we have communities. In addition we sent out from London two authorised emissaries to America, one to Norway, one to Germany and one to Holland. All promised the Central Authority to work to the best of their ability and to set up new communities in the places in which they settled and to put them in touch with us.

In accordance with the resolution adopted at the Congress the League's new newspaper should have begun to appear in August and we had been promised articles and also financial support for it; all League members were moreover requested to give all the help

* Yesterday we received a letter from Leipzig, for details see below.

---

a See this volume, pp. 585-88.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 96-103.—Ed.
c Johann Dohl.—Ed.
d Kommunistische Zeitschrift.—Ed.
they could. Unfortunately here again most promises have been confined to words alone. Apart from the Brussels circle, which for the time being made a monthly allocation of one pound sterling for printing expenses and five francs for propaganda and Brother Heide\(^a\) who sent us an article, we have received nothing so far. The editorial commission, which from one week to the next was being promised the necessary articles, was finally compelled to do everything itself, so as at least to be able to get the specimen issue out. If we do not receive better support in the future than we have received so far, we shall not make any progress here either. In order to set up our printing-press properly, so that besides the League newspaper we can also print leaflets and small pamphlets, we still need another 600 francs. We are not in a position to raise this sum in London alone.

Since the Congress Circular was sent out we have received news from the following places.

**Sweden.** We received a letter dated Upsala, May 23 from our emissary\(^b\) who travelled to Sweden via Helsingör, crossing the whole country on foot. Here in London, having nothing else, he had filled his kitbag with communist leaflets which he successfully took over the border into Sweden. He writes that in all towns where there are German workers, he called on them in their workshops, distributed our leaflets among them and found their response to our ideas most enthusiastic. Unfortunately, since he did not find any work he was unable to stay in any one place long enough to set up a community. In Stockholm he transmitted to the local community (our communist outpost in the North) the first two circulars from the Central Authority,\(^{349}\) and his news lent the Brothers there new heart. From Stockholm he went to Upsala, from there on to Gävle, where he worked for a time, and is now on the way to Umeå and Torneå. A communist emissary among the Lapps!

A member of the League who arrived in London from Karlskrona informed us: Brother C., who was previously working in Paris and London, has set up communities in W. and there are already over a hundred League members there now. The Brother from Karlskrona gave us C.'s address and we shall be sending him this Circular together with the New Rules and a special appeal for the League members there. From Stockholm we have received a letter dated July 8 saying that our Brothers there are most zealous supporters of our

\(^{a}\) Wilhelm Wolff.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) Albert August Anders.—Ed.
principles. A public attack on communism made by a local priest was countered by a League member, Brother Forsell, in a pamphlet written in Swedish in which he expounded our principles to the people as well.\(^a\) Sweden's biggest newspaper, the Aftonbladet, also defends communism against the clerics. We were also told in the letter: "The educational society here in Stockholm, which we were formerly able to regard as a gateway to communism has now unfortunately landed in the clutches of the philistines. On the other hand the democratic element within the local Scandinavian society,\(^350\) of which we are all members and which has one of us as President, is pure and unsullied and it is from this society that we recruit our members." Immediately on receiving this letter we made handwritten copies of the Congress Circular, the Communist Credo and the Rules in Latin characters (since most Swedes cannot read German letters) and then sent them everything by post. We are now waiting for their reply to this dispatch.

**Germany.** Approximately six weeks ago an emissary from here went to Berlin taking with him letters from us for the Brothers there, and, in order to put new heart into them, exhorting them to be steadfast. He was to spend only about a week there and then travel to Leipzig, from where he was to send us a report. We are expecting news shortly.

The Brothers in Br.\(^b\) acknowledged receipt of our letters and promised to send us a detailed reply in the immediate future, which they have not yet done.

The Brothers in Hamburg acknowledge receipt of our letters and express their regret that the name League of the Just has been changed and wish the former name restored: they also inform us that it is not at all to their liking when the supporters of W. Weitling and Grün are exposed to such hostile criticism, as was the case in the Congress Circular. They call for moderation and unity and write: "Whether someone stands one rung higher or lower as regards the main principle, that is no reason for us to persecute him and cause a split, for how do you think we can make an impact if we take such a one-sided approach. We attract all forces who wish for progress and then seek to win them over to our ideas gradually by persuasion."

We must reply to the Brothers in Hamburg that the reasons for the change in the name notified in the Congress Circular\(^c\) are

\(^a\) Carl Daniel Forsell, Kommunismen och kristendomen...—Ed.

\(^b\) Probably Breslau or Bremen.—Ed.

\(^c\) See this volume, p. 595.—Ed.
significant ones and that if no important counter-arguments are put forward, the Central Authority will defend the retention of the name Communist League at the next Congress. This latter name says clearly what we are and what we want, which the previous one did not. League of the Just says everything and nothing, but we must be definite. The Hamburg Brothers would do well to read the reasons given in the Congress Circular once more—if they can refute those arguments then we shall agree with them—we have no right to take mere emotions into consideration.

As regards the second point we stress that we are in no way persecuting Weitling’s and Grün’s supporters, but purely and simply representing them in their true colours. It is time we came to our senses and therefore we can no longer waste time on dreamers and system-mongers who have no energy for action—we will drag no corpse along behind us. Grün’s supporters are people who chatter a great deal about equality without knowing what the word means, who criticise everything except themselves, in other words, opinionated men who talk a great deal, but do nothing. We are no elegant bourgeois and therefore do not beat about the bush but say what we think, i.e., call things by their names.

For over ten years moderation, forbearance and unity have been preached in the League and with all this preaching, with all this brotherly love we have accomplished virtually nothing, and last year the League almost collapsed entirely. We must put an end to this; it is wrong to demand that we should spend our whole life on trifles and idle dreams. Our opinion is that 100 active members are better than 1,000 of whom half are indecisive and lukewarm. Instead of looking back and helping the lame to catch up, we march boldly forward, which will probably get others to their feet somewhat more nimbly as well. The Brothers in Hamburg incidentally do not seem to have got very far with their moderation, for they make no allusion to the dispatch of money for propaganda and printing, and as for the League’s newspaper they declare that they are only in a position to take a few copies in view of growing unemployment.

We must make it clear here that every member of the League is bound to take a copy of the newspaper; if he is not able to pay for it, then the community he belongs to must do so for him.

Once more, Brothers, let us not allow all our strength to be undermined through untimely moderation, through lumping together opposing forces and thus become a laughing-stock for the other parties. We can make a powerful impact, if we only have the will, and if we do have the will there is only one thing we need: courage! courage! and once again courage! If people are unable or
unwilling to go as far as we do—all well and good; if their intentions are honest, we shall not cease to respect them, but when we are called upon to step backwards in order to join up with such people, then we reply: Never!

Not long ago our Brothers in Leipzig wrote that several members who had been intimidated by the somewhat stark terms of the Central Authority’s circular had withdrawn their membership. The others promised to remain loyally united and work to the best of their ability. We can only congratulate the Brothers in Leipzig on having rid themselves of people who lacked the courage to behave as men. The letter which we received from Leipzig yesterday was already written in a quite different and more forceful style than previous letters, which shows that the community there is no longer dogged by indecisiveness.

First of all the community in Leipzig believes that it was necessary to phrase the Credo in terms more scientific and more suitable for all social classes. They suggest an almost complete recast and give their reasons for this. We shall put the suggested changes before the next Congress for discussion. The Central Authority agrees with the majority of the points listed in their letter. The community states further that apart from copies of our newspaper for all the members, they wish to take an extra 12 for distribution. If all communities were to follow the example provided in Leipzig, the League’s newspaper could appear weekly and at half the price. We request that all contributions for propaganda and printing that have been collected should be sent in as soon as possible. We hope that a second community can soon be set up in Leipzig; if this does not however take place this community could adhere to those in Berlin351; we shall take the necessary steps for this.

From Mr a we have received no news, nor do we know any address there, for our correspondent in that town is supposed to have left for Paris. We shall try to restore contact with the communities there as soon as possible.

We were unable to send the Congress Circular to Mainz by post. It was not until four weeks ago that a member from here left for that destination with whom we dispatched everything. Thus we could not have received an answer from there yet. In a letter which we received from the Mainz members some time back we were informed that a second community was about to be set up, which means a circle will be formed. Our Brothers in Mainz are being constantly subjected to

\[a\] Probably Munich or Manheim. The Congress Circular to the Communist League (June 1847) mentions communities in both cities.—Ed.
police harassment, but this only serves to spur them on to work all the more energetically for our cause. Credit is due to the gallant proletarians in Mainz; if people were as active as that all over Germany, our prospects would be brilliant.

Holland. In Amsterdam an educational society has been set up which is in touch with us and has competent men. Three weeks ago we sent an authorised emissary there to set up a community.352

America. The emissary who this spring set out for New York from here paints us a sad picture of the state of the League in the New World. In New York the League had already made remarkable progress when Weitling arriveda and sowed discord there. The meetings were soon the scene of violent disputes and the result was that the whole set-up collapsed. The communities in New York had earlier always been urging us to be moderate and begging us most earnestly to be reconciled with Weitling. After they themselves, a fortnight after Weitling's arrival, entered into a bitter conflict with him, our correspondents there lost heart to such an extent that they no longer wished to write to us any more so as not to have to reveal the sad state of the League there. This is what the emissary sent to New York writes; in this situation he himself was unable to do anything in New York and has now left for the state of Wisconsin, where he promises to promote our cause to the best of his ability.

In Philadelphia there are still several League members whom we have earnestly begged to set up communities there again. We have instructed the two emissaries who left from here for New York and Philadelphia to do their utmost so that the League may be restored in the above-mentioned places, in accordance with the improved Rules.

France. In Marseilles things are as before. A number of members from Lyons have gone there, promising to do their very best to inject new life into the League.

From Lyons we have received word that the League members are sparing no effort in our work and are discussing the Credo. The Lyons circle endorses the new Rules with the exception of Section VII, concerning conditions of membership. The Lyons members believe it to be unnecessary to demand that new members take an oath for there are countless cases of people taking all manner of oaths and not keeping any of them; attention should be paid mainly to conduct. We call the Lyons members' attention to the fact that no oath is demanded, but only the new member's word of honour. The Lyons members also write:

---
a Early in 1847.—Ed.
b See this volume, p. 588.—Ed.
“Since now in September we are again in a critical position, we beg you to ask the Parisians if they could not spare a few competent members, who would be ready to make a sacrifice for the common cause and settle in Lyons for a time. The old members all want to leave here and we are therefore short of people who can take over the leadership.

“So try to prevent the possibility of this community breaking up.

“As for the newspaper which you will be putting out, we cannot yet stipulate how many copies we can take, because everything will change.”

Not a word about money for printing and propaganda.

We urgently request our Brothers in Paris to send a few competent members to Lyons as soon as possible.

From Paris we have been informed that the Rules have been unanimously endorsed there, that the Credo is being discussed in the various communities and that the membership has increased considerably. We have not yet heard anything about the results of their discussions or any news as to whether money is being collected for printing and propaganda. But it must be said to the credit of the Parisians that they recently made significant money contributions by sending a delegate to the Congress and an emissary to Switzerland.

It unfortunately emerges from a private letter written by a Parisian League member and handed to the Central Authority, that there are still many people in the Paris communities who have not yet shaken themselves free of Grün's nonsense and Proudhon's most strange ideas. Oddly enough, these people, who are members of the Communist League, seem to reject communism; they want equality and nothing else. This inner split also seems to be the reason why we so seldom receive any news from Paris. Proudhon has become such a truly German philosopher that he no longer knows himself what he wants; Grün has made Proudhon's ideas still more obscure, so it is now clearly impossible to demand that the people who follow these two really know where they are going. We urge Proudhon's and Grün's supporters to read Marx's *Misère de la philosophie*, which we have heard has already been translated into German. Then they will see that their state where all are equal and which they demand with a great deal of talk and fuss is no different from that of today. This leads people round and round in circles, chasing false ideas, only to end up where they started.

---

a Frederick Engels.—*Ed.*
b Stephan Born.—*Ed.*
c Probably Frederick Engels.—*Ed.*
We call upon the Communists in Paris to stand firm together and to work to rid their communities of these false ideas. If Grün’s and Proudhon’s supporters insist on their principles, then, if they wish to remain men of honour, they should leave the League and start working on their own. There is only room for Communists in our League. As long as there are followers of Grün in our communities, neither they nor we can conduct effective propaganda; our forces will be divided and our young people low in spirits; so separation is better than an internal split.\textsuperscript{355}

Weitling’s expelled supporters have again sent us a long letter in which they inveigl against us and the Paris communities maintaining that it is they who are the real Communists. At the end of their letter they ask for a reliable address for they have further instructions for us. Yet they make no reference to the fact that they, although in the minority, appropriated the whole Paris League’s treasury which one of them had in his keeping. Such behaviour most certainly accords with their leader’s theory on theft.\textsuperscript{a}

We wrote to them in very polite terms saying that we had acted in accordance with our duty and convictions and would also insist on what we considered to be right. Their abuse could not therefore hurt us. We sent them the address they asked for but have not heard anything more from them since.

\textit{Switzerland.} The Central Authority informed the Brothers in La Chaux-de-Fonds of the imminent arrival of an emissary\textsuperscript{b} and urged them to work with all their might towards a reorganisation of the League in Switzerland.

The Berne community has of late appeared in a somewhat dubious light. We were informed that they were planning to bring out a communist newspaper, \textit{Der Wanderer} and our support was requested.

We sent off 25 francs and a remittance for 50 francs to Lausanne and La Chaux-de-Fonds. However, this money was used by the Berne members to print leaflets by Karl Heinzen, who even then had already shown himself to be the bitterest enemy of the Communists. On June 29 we received another letter from Berne which informed us that the Young Germany\textsuperscript{356} group were making use of all possible means to work against the Communists in Switzerland and urged us to found a press organ as soon as possible. At the same time they sent us a small leaflet entitled \textit{Der deutsche Hunger und die deutschen Fürsten}

\textsuperscript{a} An allusion to W. Weitling’s book: \textit{Das Evangelium eines armen Sünders} in which he acquires theft as a means of struggle against capitalism (S. 126-33).—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Stephan Born.—\textit{Ed.}
and asked for voluntary contributions so that the "Kriegsartikel", "Vorbereitung", etc., might be more widely distributed. It was stated: "Certain members of the republican party may well have noble intentions, our worthy Heinzen for example, but his hands are tied; he is not the soul of the German republican movement but its right hand for the moment, etc."

Heinzen attacks the Communists most violently; yet the Berne community is printing and circulating his pamphlets and seems to be in close touch with him. This appeared to us suspicious and indeed still does so. We do not want to let ourselves be led by the nose; every honest man must hold up his banner for all to see today. So we wrote a serious letter to the Berne community asking for a prompt explanation, but as yet have received no reply.

Our emissary writes from Geneva that our affairs are progressing in a most heartening way there. Two League members succeeded in setting up a community in Geneva this spring. While the emissary was there a second came into being and a third was planned. In addition there is a public society there which is being used to train efficient Communists. In Geneva our party seems once again to have found a firm footing, and if our Brothers there continue to work as hard as before, then the Communists in Switzerland will soon be stronger than ever. Weitling's expelled supporters, our emissary writes, have already sent to La Chaux-de-Fonds several letters full of the most shameful personal insults to several League members and calling upon the local members to join them. However the communities in La Chaux-de-Fonds have not complied with those people's solicitation and are waiting till our emissary arrives before giving them a final answer. From Geneva the emissary contacted Petersen in Lausanne who still enjoys quite significant influence among the Communists in Switzerland. We hope the former will succeed in winning him over for our movement.

Weitling's followers in Paris have sent a certain Hornschuh as their emissary to Switzerland with the money stolen from our League, in order to bring the communities there over to their side. This Hornschuh is at present in Lausanne. Before that he was in London; we therefore know precisely what he is and can assure you that he is quite incapable of any kind of propaganda work. He is a horribly tedious windbag and in other respects worth precious little as well. When he left London he asked his community for a small advance for the journey promising to pay the money back in the very near

---

² Karl Heinzen, "Dreissig Kriegsartikeln der neuen Zeit für Offiziere und Gemeine".—Ed.
future. The community granted him 25 francs. Two years have passed since then and Hornschuh, despite frequent reminders, has not paid anything back yet. It is really sad that people like Hornschuh, whose sole purpose is to indulge their laziness and self-conceit, still find opportunities to squander away the proletarians' hard earned money.

Our emissary is now touring the towns on Lake Geneva and will then visit La Chaux-de-Fonds, etc. He asked us for additional funds to be able to make this journey and we immediately sent him 50 francs, which we were obliged to borrow however, since our resources are exhausted.

Belgium. In Belgium our prospects are good. Since the Congress two circles have been set up in that country; we have not yet established direct contact with the one based in Liège but are expecting letters from them any day.

The Brussels circle is in touch with the Rhenish Prussia people and working most energetically. It has already set up a singing and an educational society; both are led by League members and serve as a preparatory school for the League.

The Rules were adopted in Brussels; however two alterations were proposed for discussion at the next Congress. The first concerns letter (e), Article 3, section I and the second—Article 21, Section V. The Brussels members write: "We hold it for unpoltic to forbid League members to belong to any political or national organisation, since by doing so we deprive ourselves of all opportunities for influencing such organisations." Further on in connection with Article 21, they add: "If the present period were a more revolutionary one, the whole activity of the Congress would be hindered by this restriction. We recall that in 1794 the aristocrats put the same demand before the Convention, in order to paralyse all action."359

We request the communities to consider these proposals more closely and to give their delegates to the next Congress appropriate instructions.

As regards the Communist Credo a good number of important alterations were suggested, which we shall put before the Congress for discussion.

As was mentioned above the Brussels circle allocated 25 francs for printing and has agreed to send 5 francs for propaganda work each month. We call upon the other circles to follow this example as soon as possible.

---

357 See this volume, p. 585 and p. 586.—Ed.
London. The new Rules were unanimously adopted in London and lively discussion of the Credo is in progress in all communities. The local circle authority will be sending us all suggestions for amendments and additions as soon as the discussions are over. During the last two months a large number of League members have left London but we shall have filled the resulting gaps soon. The educational societies provide us with preparatory schools, whose great benefit makes itself felt more and more with each passing day.

In the London circle a remarkable sense of unity reigns and members are keen to devote all their energies to our cause. In the last six months we have spent here over 1,000 francs for pamphlets, etc., for the journal,\textsuperscript{a} postage and printing costs, Congress expenses, emissaries, etc. In addition, each member has to pay threepence a week into the educational society\textsuperscript{360} fund and, besides, hardly a meeting goes by without private collections being made for the needy. Over half our members are out of work and in dire straits, which means it is becoming impossible for us to bear all these expenses alone as we have done hitherto. We are therefore forced to request all circles and communities most earnestly to contribute as much as they can and as soon as possible to the complete installation of the League printing-press, continued publication of our paper and propaganda work: at the present moment our resources are completely exhausted. In the past we always used to send out money as soon as it was requested and so we believe we can rely on you not to leave us in the lurch now.

The specimen number of our League newspaper sells well in London and arouses great interest among the foreigners living here. We have displayed it for sale in several bookshops and newsstands. We have sent copies to all our regular addresses and have another 1,000 still available, so that we shall be able to send off copies wherever they are required.

With this we come to the end of our report on the state of the League and our work; you can judge now for yourselves how things stand and whether the Central Authority has done its duty as the executive body of the League over the last three months.

You will appreciate that although active work is being carried on here and there, as we noted at the beginning of this letter, in general we are still far from the point we should have reached long since. We therefore hope, Brothers, that you will now muster all your strength so that we shall make rapid steps forward and that in the next report

\textsuperscript{a} Kommunistische Zeitschrift.—Ed.
we shall be able to give you more encouraging news than has been the case so far.

However, before closing this letter we must ask you to pay particular attention to the following points. We earnestly request that:

1) All circles and independent communities, if it is at all possible, must elect a delegate to the next congress and see to it that he will be able to come to London on November 29 of this year. You know that we were unable to adopt any definitive decisions at the First Congress\textsuperscript{361} and that it was thus considered necessary to hold a second one this year. The Second Congress will be most important because it has not only to formulate the Communist Credo but also to determine the final organisation of the League and its press organ and the future pattern of our propaganda work. It is therefore absolutely essential that as many delegates as possible attend this Congress. Brothers! We hope that you will not shrink from any sacrifices which the fulfilment of your duty may require;

2) All circles and communities, which have not yet made any collections for printing and propaganda work must do so without delay. If everyone contributes \textit{something}, then we shall be in a position to engage in forceful action. Without money we cannot carry on any propaganda work. Those circles and communities which have already made collections should dispatch the same to us as soon as possible;

3) All circles and communities, which have not yet sent in definite replies to the Congress Circular should do so without delay;

4) All circles and communities, which have not yet informed us how many copies of our newspaper they wish to take should do so at once. In addition they should inform us of the best and most reliable ways of dispatching the paper to their respective localities;

5) All circles and communities should inform us whether communist propaganda is being carried on in their particular region and if so what form it takes;

6) All members of the League should send to the editorial office essays and poems. Several members promised essays for the first issue, as observed earlier, but these promises have not been kept: we can only attribute this to negligence, which definitely ought not to be prevalent in our organisation.

Hoping to receive favourable and definite news from you soon, we greet you in the name and on behalf of the Central Authority.

\textit{Karl Schapper} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Henry Bauer}

\textit{Joseph Moll}

London, September 14, 1847
P.S. Just as this letter was to be printed, letters arrived from our emissaries in Germany and Switzerland.

From Germany it was reported that the enthusiasm of our Brothers in Berlin is extraordinary, particularly since the important events there. The government has indeed played straight into our hands. Our principles were made public through the uproar about the Communists, and the people, instead of being scared away by these principles, became enthusiastic for them. The emissary concludes his letter with the words: “Brothers, we can look to the future with confidence—there are efficient men on every side who are championing the just cause.”

The news from Switzerland also sounds highly favourable. The League is organised there and now established in more than ten different localities. Petersen has been won over. The emissary writes: “In La Chaux-de-Fonds and Le Locle I believe we have the best and most devoted members of our League. Their courage is unshakable.” Bravo, Brothers—forward! Weitling’s expelled followers have been turned away wherever they went. The misunderstanding with the Berne community has been clarified. We now declare that we were unjust towards the Brothers there. They adhere firmly to our principles. We are extremely happy to be able to announce this.

More details will be supplied in the next report.

The Central Authority

Karl Schapper

Henry Bauer

Joseph Moll

First published in the book: Gründungsdokumente des Bundes der Kommunisten (Juni bis September 1847), Hamburg, 1969

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
The anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1830 was celebrated on Monday last, the 29th of November, by a public meeting, at the German Society's Hall, Drury Lane.

The meeting had been called by the society of Fraternal Democrats, in conjunction with the Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration. The room was crowded with natives of England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, Belgium, and Poland.

Mr. John Arnott was elected president. Having stated the object of the meeting, the Chairman called on Mr. Stallwood to move the first resolution.

Mr. Stallwood, after recounting the heroism of the brave Poles at Warsaw, and their unbounded devotion to the cause of liberty, and eulogising the "Cracow manifesto" as a model for democratic creeds, moved the first resolution as follows:

"That we regard the dismemberment of Poland as an atrocious crime worthy of the everlasting execration of the human race. That we remember with grateful admiration the heroic efforts made by the Polish people in 1830-31 for the recovery of their country's independence. That we honour the sacred memories of the martyrs who have perished in the glorious struggle to redeem their nation from slavery; and that we sympathise with all the victims of oppression at present suffering in dungeons, chains, and exile."

The Chairman then introduced

Mr. Ernest Jones, to second the resolution. Mr. Jones said: To-night, seventeen years ago, Poland woke from her death-sleep, for her death-struggle; to-night, seventeen years ago, she strained her bleeding limbs on the Russian rack, and burst her cords; to-night, seventeen years ago, she rose from a province into a nation! (Cheers.) Warsaw was silent. Russia never less expected insurrec-
tion—when the flame burst forth. Mr. Jones then gave a vivid description of the progress and triumph of the insurrection in Warsaw, particularly dwelling on the circumstance, that until the populace were armed, the issue was doubtful. Then the effect was electrical, and in a few hours, Constantine, the mighty prince, had passed the barrier of Mockstow, with his 11,000 Russians, and spent the night a shivering outcast, beneath a leafless tree. (Applause.) The speaker then alluded to the subsequent course of the insurrection, and expressed his belief that it would have been successful, had it been an insurrection of the people, instead of the aristocracy—had it been based on a manifesto, like the glorious one of Cracow. (Cheers.) But still we need not despond—Poland is ready for a fresh struggle—we have an army of martyrs to canonise—we have an army of heroes to come—and the aspect of Europe forebodes their triumph. The speaker then showed how every country in Europe was on the brink of internal change, analysed the secret weakness of the great powers, and, after a forcible and stirring allusion to Ireland, concluded by calling on his hearers to prepare for the approaching struggle at home and abroad. Mr. Jones' speech was one of great force and eloquence, and excited enthusiastic applause.

M. Michelot, in an energetic speech, delivered in the French language, supported the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Carl Schapper rose, amidst great applause, to move the second resolution, and said: Citizens, when men struggle onwards for truth and liberty in a great cause, though they may not at first succeed, they must ultimately prevail—and such men were worthy of all honour—and hence he said honour to the brave Poles. (Loud cheers.) Honour to those who died before Warsaw—honour to those who died by the hand of the public executioner—honour to those who perished in the mines of Siberia, and to those who fell at Cracow, and to all the martyrs for liberty. (Great applause.) In July 1830, France had her revolution, and in the November following, the cry for universal liberty prevailed, and many wished Poland free from Russia, but did not wish Polish serfdom abolished; and he verily believed, had it not been for this desire on the part of the Polish nobles to perpetuate the slavery of the masses, the revolution would have succeeded, and the whole Slavonic race would now have been free. (Loud cheers.) But the Polish proletarians asked, "What is it to us if Poland be free from Russian domination, whilst I am subject to the knout of the Polish noble?" (Hear, hear.) Well, the revolution failed and Poland's sons emigrated, carrying the seeds of freedom with them to Germany, to France, to England, and other nations, and returned with renewed spirit to the Polish soil in 1845; and
issued their famous and ever glorious manifesto of democratic sentiments from the Republic of Cracow. (Great applause.) But, alas, the effort was futile, the bad seed sown in 1830 produced a bad harvest, the tyrants were enabled to employ the peasantry against the patriots, and the revolt was crushed, and the black spirit of Metternich again gloated in the blood of the fallen martyrs of Poland. (Hear, hear.) But happily fraternity was fast spreading, the principles of political and social equality were abroad. (Loud cheers.) Look at Switzerland. (Great applause.) And liberty would progress in spite of the old bloodless spider of the Tuileries. (Groans for "the spider"). The Swiss Radicals had beaten Louis Philippe and Guizot. Then came the beautiful Lord Palmerston, who said, "Let us have the thing settled amicably." "Ay," responded the helpless old spider of Paris, "that's just what I wanted." (Laughter.) And not a single regiment had entered Switzerland, the old spider dared not send them. (Loud cheers.) Well, this was the progress of democracy. Who were the conspirators now? Why, Metternich, the bloodless old spider in France, Lord Palmerston, and the Jesuits. (Loud cheers.) But the people would very quickly put down their conspiracy. (Great cheering.) He had some glorious news for them, a Democratic Society, that is a Society of Fraternal Democrats, had been established in Brussels, and that society had sent a deputy, the learned Dr. Marx, to represent them at this meeting. (Great applause.) Citizen Schapper here read the following document:—

"To the Members of the Society of Fraternal Democrats
"Assembling in London

"We, the undersigned members of the committee of the Democratic Society, established at Brussels, for advancing the Union and Fraternity of all Nations, have the honour to delegate to you, Dr. Charles Marx, vice-president of this committee, for the purpose of establishing relations of correspondence and sympathy between the two societies. M. Marx has full power to act in the name of this committee for the purposes above mentioned.

"We present to you our fraternal salutations.

"Mellinet (General), honorary president.
"Jottrand, president.
"Imbert, vice-president.
"Picard, secretary.
"George Weerth.
"Lelewel.

"Brussels, Nov. 26th, 1847."
The above address was received with enthusiastic applause. C. Schapper after highly complimenting the great Polish patriot Lelewel, and the grey-haired veteran—"the child of the French Republic"—General Mellinet, concluded by proposing the following resolution:—

"That in pledging all the aid in our power to the Polish patriots, we desire to express our unqualified dissent from the aristocratic spirit which so fatally influenced the struggle of 1830. We recognise in the Cracow Manifesto of 1846 the manifestation of Polish progress, embracing the broad principles of political democracy and social justice, on which alone can be founded veritable liberty and public happiness."

T. Lucas in seconding the resolution, expressed his pleasure in meeting so many of his brother democrats. Certain he was that when the English democrats (the Chartists) obtained their liberty, they would be enabled to say to "the old spider in Paris", and all other tyrants "thus far shall ye go but no farther". (Cheers.) The resolution was then unanimously adopted.

Dr. Marx, the delegate from Brussels, then came forward, and was greeted with every demonstration of welcome, and delivered an energetic oration in the German language, the substance of which was as follows—He had been sent by the Democrats of Brussels to speak in their name to the Democrats of London, and through them to the Democrats of Britain, to call on them to cause to be holden a congress of nations—a congress of working men, to establish liberty all over the world. (Loud cheers.) The middle classes, the Free Traders, had held a congress, but their fraternity was a one-sided one, and the moment they found that such congresses were likely to benefit working men, that moment their fraternity would cease, and their congresses be dissolved.368 (Hear, hear.) The Democrats of Belgium felt that the Chartists of England were the real Democrats, and that the moment they carried the six points of their Charter, the road to liberty would be opened to the whole world. "Effect this grand object, then, you working men of England," said the speaker, "and you will be hailed as the saviours of the whole human race." (Tremendous cheering.)

Julian Harney moved the next resolution as follows:—

"That this meeting rejoices to learn of the establishment of a Society of Fraternal Democrats in Brussels, and responding to the alliance offered by that society, receives its delegate, Dr. Marx, with every feeling of fraternal regard; and this meeting hails with exultation the proposition to hold a Democratic Congress of all nations, pledging itself to send delegates to that Congress whenever
The mover of the resolution then proceeded to address the meeting at considerable length, on the Polish insurrection of 1830, the progress of Chartism; the prospect of an energetic movement in this country for the obtainment of the Charter, the importance of the Society of Fraternal Democrats, and the vast utility of the suggested Democratic Congress of all nations. His remarks were enthusiastically cheered.

Mr. Stallwood seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Three thundering cheers were then given for the glorious Lelewel, three for the heroic General Mellinet, and three for the democrats of Brussels.

Charles Keen moved the fourth resolution as follows:

"That recognising the brotherhood of all men, we consider it our duty to struggle for the triumph of democratic principles in all countries, and believing that the establishment of the 'People's Charter' would enable the people of Great Britain to afford aid to the Polish cause, more effective than the paper 'protests' hitherto employed by the British government, we hail with joy the prospect of an energetic effort on the part of the British people to obtain the legislative recognition and parliamentary enactment of their long-withheld rights and franchises."

The speaker said they taught Universal Brotherhood, because they felt the evils resulting from the want of it. Very true, at churches and chapels on a Sunday, they were told that "we are all brethren", but should it rain on their leaving such churches or chapels, and they were to attempt to get into some of their wealthy brethren's carriages, what a row there would be. (Loud laughter.) Yet, ten minutes before those very same men would have been responding to the sentiment, "All men are brethren." (Hear, hear.) Notwithstanding this, Fraternity was a great truism, and before any great lasting and practical good could be accomplished, it must be universally acknowledged, ay, and practised too. (Loud cheers.) They had met to celebrate the Polish Revolution, and the question was, what could they do to aid Poland? Without power—nothing. Let them get the Charter and they would have power. (Cheers.)

Citizen Engels (from Paris), in seconding the resolution said—Fellow Citizens, this commemoration of the Polish Revolution is not only an advantage to Poland, but to the whole world, as it causes the principles of democracy to be spread far and wide. (Hear, hear. He, as a German, had great interest in Polish success, as it would much
hasten liberty in Germany, and freedom Germany had resolved to obtain sooner or later. (Loud cheers.) And he firmly believed that no one nation could become free without benefitting all others. He had resided for some time in England, and was proud to boast himself a Chartist “name and all”. (Great cheering.) Who were now their chief oppressors? Not the aristocracy, but the wealth takers and scrapers, the middle classes. (Loud cheers.) Hence, it was the duty of the working classes of all nations to unite and establish freedom for all. (Rapturous applause.)

Citizen Tedesco (from Brussels, who addressed the meeting in the French language in most eloquent terms, which the following abstract does anything but justice to), said the men of Belgium looked on the English democrats as a leading party, and trusted they would obtain that great measure, the People’s Charter. He was delighted with the spirit that prevailed. He should return to Brussels, and relate the good and enthusiastic feeling with which the proletarians of this country were imbued, and their determination to proceed until they had obtained their Charter, and sure he was, that that measure would carry with it a fair day’s wages for a fair day’s labour. (Hear, hear.) And give such an impulse to the cause of progress, that the whole continent would follow, and universal liberty be established. (Loud cheers.)

Colonel Oborski, a Polish exile, said, at the outbreak of the Polish Revolution, two hundred non-commissioned officers had kept three Russian regiments at bay, and when some of the regiments found it was against Poland they were fighting, they turned their arms and fought against their oppressors. Although Old Poland was dead, Young Poland would arise, and become far mightier than her ancestor. (Loud cheers.) He yet hoped to see Poland the first battlefield for liberty. With grateful thanks to the English people he would shout “Hurrah for Democracy!” (Great applause.)

Citizen Engels here said, that he had but recently come from Paris, and that the real democrats in that city were in favour of a Congress of Nations. (Loud cheers.) The resolution was then carried unanimously.

Julian Harney again came forward and read extracts from the defence of Louis Mierslawski, one of the chiefs of the insurrection of 1846, and now lying in the dungeons of Berlin under sentence of death. The reading of the said extracts excited great sensation in the meeting. J. Harney then said, he had been particularly gratified by the remarks of his friend Engels. He was glad to see that the feeling of fraternal sympathy for the Poles was strong amongst the Germans. He was sure that if once the Germans obtained their
liberties, they would hasten to perform a great act of national reparation, by undoing the work which the Austrian and Prussian despots helped Catherine to accomplish—the destruction of Poland. He knew that if Frenchmen were free, if they had broken down that disgraceful despotism which had prostrated their country to the lowest depths of shame, their first thought would be the liberation of Poland. (Cheers.) The next time France marched in the direction of Moscow it would not be with an Emperor for her leader. It was a maxim of Napoleon's "that a political blunder was worse than a political crime". He was guilty of both crime and blunder of the worst character; when on reaching Warsaw on his march to Russia, he refused to proclaim the restoration of Poland. Had he proclaimed the republic of Poland to the full extent of its ancient boundaries, he would have re-created the soul of a nation, and twenty millions of people would have formed his army of reserve—an army animated by an unconquerable spirit of enthusiasm and devotion to their emancipator. But no, Napoleon though the scourge of kings was the tyrant of the people; though the most deadly enemy of "divine right", he was not less the enemy of popular sovereignty. He desired to dictate terms to the Northern Autocrat, but for himself, not for Poland, and the other nations trampled under that autocrat's iron heel. His selfishness found the reward it merited. When flying before the avenging lance of the Cossack, and the still more dreadful shafts of the icy tempest and the snow-storm, with their auxiliaries, famine and pestilence; then Napoleon found Poland no rampart of defence, behind which he might have thrown himself to give his stricken hosts time to breathe, and turn upon their pursuers. He had refused to recall Poland to life, and so when he needed her living arm to save him from the blows of the Muscovite, that arm was not. But the coming republic would repair the political crime of the Emperor, and the day was nigh at hand when France would be a Republic and the people of England have their Charter. (Great applause.) The speaker concluded by moving a vote of thanks to the chairman.

Carl Schapper seconded the vote of thanks, which was supported by Mr. Isaac Wilson, who expressed how much more pleased he was with the proceedings he had just witnessed, than he was with those of a meeting held some fortnight since under the presidency of Dr. Bowring, at the Crown and Anchor, at which he was necessitated to

---

\(^{a}\) Alexander I.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) John Arnott.—Ed.
move an amendment. (Cheers.) The vote of thanks was then carried by acclamation.

The chairman having acknowledged the compliment, three cheers were given “for the heroic martyr Mieroslawski”; three for the “Réforme and the French Democrats”; three for “The Northern Star and the German Brussels Gazette”; and three dreadful groans for the Times, Journal des Débats, and Austrian Observer. The Marseillaise Hymn was then sung in splendid style by Citizen Moll, and closed these interesting proceedings.

First published in The Northern Star
Reprinted from the newspaper
No. 528, December 4, 1847

---

a Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung. Reported erroneously in The Northern Star as “Universal Gazette”.—Ed.
b Österreichischer Beobachter.—Ed.
Swiss Brothers,

An unhappy struggle has just ended for you. All the nations have watched it with the anxiety, blended with sorrow, that generous hearts always feel at the sight of a civil war.

We shall not here discuss the causes of this quarrel. The two parties decided to resolve it alone, without calling for intervention from anyone.

Those who, not having been asked, claimed to set themselves up as the official judges of your domestic quarrels must incur the reproach of a culpable imprudence.

But this imprudence threatens to change in character.

All the friends of liberty have the right to be indignant, if not alarmed by it.

More or less ardent, more or less sincere good wishes, and even offers of service for one or other cause, could be explained without resort to any other motives than those of the diversity of human opinions on political or religious matters.

Today it is a question of something else.

The intervention of a congress of royalty in your affairs can only be understood in the sense of an open or hidden attack on your institutions and above all on the development that you have given them in law during the last fifteen years.

Guardians, for nearly six centuries, of the repository of liberty which was exiled by usurping feudalism successively from nearly all other parts of Europe, you owe it to us, Swiss Brothers, you owe it to
yourselves, to defend one last time more this precious heritage, at this supreme hour when all nations are preparing to claim it from you and divide it.

If you let it be seized from your guardianship, the six centuries of persistent vigilance for which we would soon have owed you full gratitude would be lost for you and for the rest of Europe.

Exiled beyond the sea, on the soil of a new world, democratic institutions would have ceased for a long time to be a model for our constant study and imitation.

Government of the State by universally elected leaders;—State administration without crippling financial debts, without the ruin of the worker for the profit of hosts of useless bureaucrats;—the defence of the State without standing armies;—the commercial and industrial prosperity of the State without tariffs;—freedom of belief without theocratic domination;—where shall we find these again, and be able to copy the model of this regime for which all Europe yearns today, if Switzerland allows a concert of kings, bankers, ministers, mercenaries, monopolists, sectarians, to intervene in its affairs?

Their interference can have no other aim but to wipe out once for all from the centre of Europe this example—so fatal for them—of a nation which governs itself without them.

We understand this so well, Swiss Brothers, that, assembled here from all parts of Europe by the political hazards of recent times, and mingling with a small free nation like yours, and rather in your manner, we felt it essential unanimously to express the wish to see you resist the diplomatic intrigues which are contemplated against you.

We urge you therefore not to listen to those treacherous offers of intervention made to you by five Courts (we will not say five peoples) combined to tempt you into a fatal trap.

Fear of their threats, if they carried them out, cannot exist in your hearts. It is only their cunning that you must guard against.

And if their threats were serious, your forces would without boasting be equal to those which the courts in fact control in the midst of the domestic embarrassments increasing for them every day.

Moreover, if they dreamed of constraining you by force, allies would not fail you. Once more, we recommend into your hands, Swiss Brothers, the sacred repository of European democratic liberty which you have guarded so well up to now, and which in recent times you have been able to make flourish to the benefit of the rights and interests of the greatest number.
We offer you, with the future tribute of our gratitude for the firmness which you will show the world,—
the expression of our most sincere sympathy.

On behalf of the above-named Democratic Association, and by virtue of its deliberations in the general assembly of November 29, 1847 after the Polish commemoration celebrated this day at the Hôtel de Ville of Brussels,

The Committee of the Association.

General Mellinet, Chief of the civic legions in 1830, Hon. President.

L. Jottrand, barrister, former member of the National Congress of Belgium in 1830, President.

Maynz, barrister at the Court of Appeal at Brussels.

Imbert, Vice-president, former editor of the Peuple Souverain of Marseilles.

Karl Marx, former editor of the Rheinische Zeitung, Vice-president.a

Lelewel, Joachim, member of the National Government.

George Weerth.

The Secretary of the society, A. Picard, barrister at the Court of Appeal at Brussels.

Spilthoorn, barrister at the court of Ghent. Leader of the provisional government of Flanders in 1830.

Pellering, shoe-maker.


The German workers assembled in the society at Brussels have joined in the present address. This is attested by the undersigned members of the committee of this society.

Chairman—Wallau.

Vice-chairman—Hess.

Wolff, secretary.

Riedel, treasurer.

Writen on November 29, 1847
First published in La Réforme, December 5, 1847

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

a Marx's name was presumably put by proxy for he was in London at that time.—Ed.
Citizens! When Christopher Columbus discovered America 350 years ago, he certainly did not think that not only would the then existing society in Europe together with its institutions be done away with through his discovery, but that the foundation would be laid for the complete liberation of all nations; and yet, it becomes more and more clear that this is indeed the case. Through the discovery of America a new route by sea to the East Indies was found, whereby the European business traffic of the time was completely transformed; the consequence was that Italian and German commerce were totally ruined and other countries came to the fore; commerce came into the hands of the western countries, and England thus came to the fore of the movement. Before the discovery of America the countries even in Europe were still very much separated from one another and trade was on the whole slight. Only after the new route to the East Indies had been found and an extensive field had been opened in America for exploitation by the Europeans engaged in commerce, did England begin more and more to concentrate trade and to take possession of it, whereby the other European countries were more and more compelled to join together. From all this, big commerce originated, and the so-called world market was opened. The enormous treasures which the Europeans brought from America, and the gains which trade in general yielded, had as a consequence the ruin of the old aristocracy, and so the bourgeoisie came into being. The discovery of America was connected with the advent of machinery, and with that the struggle became necessary which we are conducting today, the struggle of the propertyless against the property owners.

Before machines were invented almost every country produced as much as it needed, and commerce consisted only of such products as
one or another country was quite unable to produce; but when machinery came in, so much was produced that in many places it became necessary to stop working and that even people who had previously performed similar work with their own hands bought machine-made goods for their own use. The position of the former workers was thereby completely altered, and the whole of human society, which formerly consisted of four to six different classes, was divided into two mutually hostile classes.

Since the English seized world commerce and raised their manufacturing business to such a height that they could provide almost all the civilised world with their products, and since the bourgeoisie came to political power, they have also succeeded in making further progress in Asia and the bourgeoisie has risen there also; through the rise of machinery the barbarian condition of other countries is constantly being done away with. We know that the Spaniards found East Indies at the same stage of development as the English did and that the Indians nevertheless went on living in the same way for centuries, i.e., they ate and drank and vegetated, and the grandson worked the land just as his grandfather had done, except that a number of revolutions took place, which, however, were nothing but a struggle of various peoples for domination. Since the English came and spread their manufactures, the livelihood of the Indians was torn from their hands and the consequence was that they abandoned their stable condition. The workers are already emigrating from there and through mixing with other nations they become accessible for the first time to civilisation. The old Indian aristocracy is completely ruined and people are there set against one another just as here.

Later we have seen how China, a country which for more than a thousand years has defied development and all history, has now been turned upside down and drawn into civilisation by the English, by machinery.

Austria, the China of Europe, the only country whose internal institutions were not shaken by the French Revolution, and where even Napoleon could do nothing, cannot stand up to steam; everything there has suddenly been changed by machinery; protective tariffs have brought machinery into the country. Thereby the petty bourgeoisie has raised itself up and overthrown the high aristocracy, thereby something has happened to Metternich which he certainly never anticipated; at the last Bohemian Diet 50,000 guilders in taxes were denied him by the bourgeoisie. The classes of society have been changed, the small craftsmen are being ruined and forced to become ordinary workers, whereby an element
has entered which can become dangerous to Metternich. In Italy also industry has raised itself up, the bourgeoisie everywhere sits on Metternich’s neck, so that the government has got into such a dilemma that Metternich has to concede to the Bohemians that they need not pay taxes of 50,000 guilders.

Thus, through the discovery of America all society has been divided into two classes, and without the rise of the world market this would not have happened. The workers of the whole world have everywhere the same interests; everywhere the different classes disappear and the different interests coincide. When, therefore, a revolution breaks out in one country it must necessarily affect the other countries, and only now can real liberation take place.

First published in Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, Jg. 8, Leipzig, 1919
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MINUTES OF MARX'S REPORT
TO THE LONDON GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL
SOCIETY
ON NOVEMBER 30, 1847

From Belgium I have to report that a workers' society has been formed there which at present has 105 members. The German workers in Brussels, who formerly were quite isolated, are now already a power, and whereas formerly they were not asked to take part in anything, this year they have already been requested to send a representative of the society to the celebration of the Polish revolution being arranged in Brussels by the city to speak in the name of this society. Should the government press for the suppression of the society, because it is certainly bound to exercise an influence on the Belgian workers themselves, the society has decided to hand over its library, which consists of 300 volumes, and other objects to the London society.

I will now add a few remarks on literature. Louis Blanc now proves in one of his works that in the French Revolution, at the same moment when the proletariat stormed the Bastille, the prison for the bourgeois, the bourgeoisie took decisions against those who bought the victory for them with their blood. All the leading figures of the revolution are now presented in their true character, a mass of leaflets are being written in the spirit of the proletariat, which are exercising considerable influence on society. The French work more in the interest of a party than for gain. Before the July revolution leaflets circulated in the spirit of the bourgeoisie just as they do now in the spirit of the proletariat.

Of all that has been achieved by German philosophy the critique of religion is the most important thing; this critique, however, has not

---

a L. Blanc, Histoire de la révolution française.—Ed.
b Of 1830.—Ed.
proceeded from social development. Everything that has been written hitherto against the Christian religion has limited itself to proving that it rests on false principles; how, for example, the authors have used one another; what had not yet been examined was the practical cult of Christianity. We know that the supreme thing in Christianity is human sacrifice. Daumer now proves in a recently published work\(^a\) that Christians really slaughtered men and at the Holy Supper ate human flesh and drank human blood. He finds here the explanation why the Romans, who tolerated all religious sects, persecuted the Christians, and why the Christians later destroyed the entire pagan literature directed against Christianity. Paul himself zealously argued against the admission to the Holy Supper of people who were not completely initiated into the mysteries. It is then also easy to explain where, for example, the relics of the 11,000 virgins came from; there is a document dating from the Middle Ages in which the nuns of a French convent made a contract with the Abbess to the effect that without the consent of all no further relics must be found. The occasion for this was given by a monk who was constantly travelling from Cologne to Paris and back and every time left relics behind. Everything that happened in this respect has been regarded as a fraud of the priests, but that would be to attribute to them a skill and cleverness far beyond the time in which they lived. Human sacrifice was sacred and has really existed. Protestantism merely transferred it to the spiritual man and mitigated the thing a little. Hence there are more madmen among Protestants than in any other sect. This story, as presented in Daumer's work, deals Christianity the last blow; the question now is, what significance this has for us. It gives us the certainty that the old society is coming to an end and that the edifice of fraud and prejudice is collapsing.

First published in Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, Jg. 8, Leipzig, 1919
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\(^a\) G. F. Daumer, *Die Geheimnisse des christlichen Altertums.*—Ed.
Citizen Engels gives a lecture in which he proves that commercial crises are caused only by overproduction and that the stock exchanges are the main offices where proletarians are made.
RULES OF THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Working Men of All Countries, Unite!

SECTION I
THE LEAGUE

Art. 1. The aim of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of the old bourgeois society which rests on the antagonism of classes, and the foundation of a new society without classes and without private property.

Art. 2. The conditions of membership are:
   A) A way of life and activity which corresponds to this aim;
   B) Revolutionary energy and zeal in propaganda;
   C) Acknowledgement of communism;
   D) Abstention from participation in any anti-communist political or national association and notification of participation in any kind of association to the superior authority.
   E) Subordination to the decisions of the League;
   F) Observance of secrecy concerning the existence of all League affairs;
   G) Unanimous admission into a community.

Whosoever no longer complies with these conditions is expelled (see Section VIII).

Art. 3. All members are equal and brothers and as such owe each other assistance in every situation.

Art. 4. The members bear League names.

Art. 5. The League is organised in communities, circles, leading circles, Central Authority and congresses.

SECTION II
THE COMMUNITY

Art. 6. The community consists of at least three and at most twenty members.
Art. 7. Every community elects a chairman and deputy chairman. The chairman presides over the meeting, the deputy chairman holds the funds and represents the chairman in case of absence.

Art. 8. The admission of new members is effected by the chairman and the proposing member with previous agreement of the community.

Art. 9. Communities of various kinds do not know each other and do not conduct any correspondence with each other.

Art. 10. Communities bear distinctive names.

Art. 11. Every member who changes his place of residence must first inform his chairman.

SECTION III
THE CIRCLE

Art. 12. The circle comprises at least two and at most ten communities.

Art. 13. The chairmen and deputy chairmen of the communities form the circle authority. The latter elects a president from its midst. It is in correspondence with its communities and the leading circle.

Art. 14. The circle authority is the executive organ for all the communities of the circle.

Art. 15. Isolated communities must either join an already existing circle or form a new circle with other isolated communities.

SECTION IV
THE LEADING CIRCLE

Art. 16. The various circles of a country or province are subordinated to a leading circle.

Art. 17. The division of the circles of the League into provinces and the appointment of the leading circle is effected by the Congress on the proposal of the Central Authority.

Art. 18. The leading circle is the executive authority for all the circles of its province. It is in correspondence with these circles and with the Central Authority.

Art. 19. Newly formed circles join the nearest leading circle.

Art. 20. The leading circles are provisionally responsible to the Central Authority and in the final instance to the Congress.
SECTION V
THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY

Art. 21. The Central Authority is the executive organ of the whole League and as such is responsible to the Congress.

Art. 22. It consists of at least five members and is elected by the circle authority of the place in which the Congress has located its seat.

Art. 23. The Central Authority is in correspondence with the leading circles. Once every three months it gives a report on the state of the whole League.

SECTION VI
COMMON REGULATIONS

Art. 24. The communities, and circle authorities and also the Central Authority meet at least once every fortnight.

Art. 25. The members of the circle authority and of the Central Authority are elected for one year, can be re-elected and recalled by their electors at any time.

Art. 26. The elections take place in the month of September.

Art. 27. The circle authorities have to guide the discussions of the communities in accordance with the purpose of the League.

If the Central Authority deems the discussion of certain questions to be of general and immediate interest it must call on the entire League to discuss them.

Art. 28. Individual members of the League must maintain correspondence with their circle authority at least once every three months, individual communities at least once a month.

Every circle must report on its district to the leading circle at least once every two months, every leading circle to the Central Authority at least once every three months.

Art. 29. Every League authority is obliged to take the measures in accordance with the Rules necessary for the security and efficient work of the League under its responsibility and to notify the superior authority at once of these measures.

SECTION VII
THE CONGRESS

Art. 30. The Congress is the legislative authority of the whole League. All proposals for changes in the Rules are sent to the Central Authority.
Authority through the leading circles and submitted by it to the Congress.

Art. 31. Every circle sends one delegate.

Art. 32. Every individual circle with less than 30 members sends one delegate, with less than 60 two, less than 90 three, etc. The circles can have themselves represented by League members who do not belong to their localities.

In this case, however, they must send to their delegate a detailed mandate.

Art. 33. The Congress meets in the month of August of every year. In urgent cases the Central Authority calls an extraordinary congress.

Art. 34. The Congress decides every time the place where the Central Authority is to have its seat for the coming year and the place where the Congress is next to meet.

Art. 35. The Central Authority sits in the Congress, but has no deciding vote.

Art. 36. After every sitting the Congress issues in addition to its circular a manifesto in the name of the Party.

SECTION VIII

OFFENCES AGAINST THE LEAGUE

Art. 37. Whoever violates the conditions of membership (Art. 2) is according to the circumstances removed from the League or expelled.

Expulsion precludes re-admission.

Art. 38. Only the Congress decides on expulsions.

Art. 39. Individual members can be removed by the circle or the isolated community, with immediate notification of the superior authority. Here also the Congress decides in the last instance.

Art. 40. Re-admission of removed members is effected by the Central Authority on the proposal of the circle.

Art. 41. The circle authority passes judgment on offences against the League and also sees to the execution of the verdict.

Art. 42. Removed and expelled members, like suspect individuals in general, are to be watched in the interest of the League, and prevented from doing harm. Intrigues of such individuals are at once to be reported to the community concerned.
SECTION IX

LEAGUE FUNDS

Art. 43. The Congress fixes for every country the minimum contribution to be paid by every member.

Art. 44. Half of this contribution goes to the Central Authority, the other half remains in the funds of the circle or community.

Art. 45. The funds of the Central Authority are used:

1. to cover the costs of correspondence and administration;
2. to print and distribute propaganda leaflets;
3. to send out emissaries of the Central Authority for particular purposes.

Art. 46. The funds of the local authorities are used:

1. to cover the costs of correspondence;
2. to print and distribute propaganda leaflets;
3. to send out occasional emissaries.

Art. 47. Communities and circles which have not paid their contributions for six months are notified by the Central Authority of their removal from the League.

Art. 48. Circle authorities have to render account of their expenditure and income to their communities at least every three months. The Central Authority renders account to the Congress on the administration of League funds and the state of the League finances. Any embezzlement of League funds is subject to the severest punishment.

Art. 49. Extraordinary and Congress costs are met from extraordinary contributions.

SECTION X

ADMISSION

Art. 50. The chairman of the community reads to the applicant Art. 1 to 49, explains them, emphasises particularly in a short speech the obligations which the new member assumes, and then puts to him the question: “Do you now wish to enter this League?” If he replies “Yes”, the chairman takes his word of honour to the effect
that he will fulfil the obligations of a League member, declares him a member of the League, and introduces him to the community at the next meeting.

London, December 8, 1847

In the name of the Second Congress of the autumn of 1847

The Secretary
Signed Engels

The President
Signed Karl Schapper


Printed according to the book
...Then Karl Marx took the floor and proposed a toast in French to the Brussels Democratic Association, emphasising in an acutely drawn, clear analysis the liberal mission of Belgium in opposition to absolutism, forcefully expressing appreciation of the benefits of a liberal constitution, of a country where there is freedom of discussion, freedom of association, and where a humanitarian seed can flourish to the good of all Europe. (Loud applause.)
THE ASSOCIATION DÉMOCRATIQUE OF BRUSSELS
TO THE FRATERNAL DEMOCRATS
ASSEMBLING IN LONDON

We received your letter of December last, the proposals contained in which concerning the Democratic Congress of all nations and the establishment of a monthly correspondence between your society and ours were immediately taken into consideration.  

The propositions of holding the first Democratic Congress here in Brussels, with a view of calling the second in London; the first Congress to be called by our society for the anniversary of the Belgian revolution in September next, and the programme of business to be prepared by the committee of this society; these propositions were agreed to unanimously and enthusiastically.

The offer of entering into a regular and monthly correspondence with our society was equally hailed with the greatest enthusiasm.  

We now proceed to give you an abstract of our progress and general situation.

The state of our society is as prosperous as can possibly be desired. The number of our members is increasing weekly, and the interest taken by the public in general, and by the working classes in particular, in our proceedings is equally on the increase.

The best proof, however, of our progress is the interest excited in the provinces of the country by our movements. From the most important towns of Belgium we have received summons to send delegates for the purpose of establishing democratic societies similar to ours, and keeping up constant relations with the metropolitan association.

---

a "The Fraternal Democrats assembling in London to the Democratic Association for promoting the fraternity of all nations, assembling in Brussels."—Ed.
We have given to these appeals our immediate attention. We sent a deputation to Ghent to call a public meeting with a view of establishing a branch society. The meeting was exceedingly numerous, and received our deputation, consisting of members belonging to several nations, with an enthusiasm hardly to be described. The foundation of a democratic society was immediately decided upon, and the names of members taken down. Since then we have received from Ghent the news that the society is definitively constituted, and has held a second meeting exceeding the first in numbers and enthusiasm. More than three thousand citizens were present, and, we are happy to say, they mostly consisted of working men.

We consider the ground gained at Ghent as a most important progress of our cause in this country. Ghent is the chief manufacturing town of Belgium, numbering above a hundred thousand inhabitants, and being in a great measure the centre of attraction for the whole labouring population of Flanders. The position taken by Ghent is decisive for all working class movement of the country. Thus we may accept the adhesion of the factory workers of that Belgian Manchester to the revival of a pure democratic movement, as implying and foreboding the adhesion of the generality of the Belgian proletarians.

We hope to report in our next further progress in other towns of the country, thus arriving by-and-by at the reconstitution of a strong, united, and organised democratic party in Belgium.

We entirely share in the view which in your recent address to the working people of Great Britain and Ireland you have taken of the question of "National Defences". We hope that this address will contribute in a great measure to the enlightenment of the people of England as to the question who are their veritable enemies.

We have equally seen with great pleasure the steps taken by the mass of the English Chartists to arrive, at last, at a close alliance between the Irish people and that of Great Britain. We have seen that there is a better chance now than ever before to break down that prejudice which prompted the Irish people to confound in one common hatred the oppressed classes of England with the oppressors of both countries. We hope to see very shortly united in the hands of Feargus O'Connor the direction both of the English and the

---

*a "The Fraternal Democrats (assembling in London), to the Working Classes of Great Britain and Ireland" (the document is reproduced in Engels' report; see this volume, pp. 466-67).—Ed.*
Irish popular movement; and we consider this approaching alliance of the oppressed classes of both countries, under the banner of democracy, as a most important progress of our cause in general. We conclude by offering to you our fraternal salutations.

The Committee of the Association Démocratique

L. Jottrand, Chairman
K. Marx, Vice-President
A. Picard, Avt., Secretary

Brussels, 13th February, 1848

First published in *The Northern Star* No. 541, March 4, 1848

Reprinted from the newspaper
Brussels. Meeting of the Democratic Association of February 20. President: Herr Marx.—Frederick Engels first took the floor to reply to an article concerning his expulsion from France, published by the French Government in the Moniteur Parisien. He related briefly the circumstances in which his expulsion took place.378

The association was completely satisfied with the explanations of Frederick Engels. Several speakers expressed this satisfaction and further added remarks concerning the behaviour of the French Government already on the occasion of earlier expulsions of foreigners.

These proceedings were entered in the official report of the Democratic Association....

First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 16, February 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
The Cracow revolution was celebrated by a numerous gathering on the evening of the 22nd in the hall of the Old Court at Brussels, rue des soeurs noires, which was festively illuminated and decorated with Polish and Belgian flags. Several speakers, including Lelewel, Karl Marx, F. Engels, Wallau and Lubliner, the lawyer, took the floor and spoke passionately for the purely democratic character of the Cracow insurrection. We shall report this celebration in detail in our next issue and only remark here that after the public meeting a dinner was held in which about 100 persons took part and at which several toasts were raised by Belgian and German democrats. Nor was the dinner lacking in song.

First published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 16, February 24, 1848

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

---

a See this volume, pp. 545-52.—Ed.
b This report was never published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung; the seventeenth and last issue of the paper appeared on February 27, 1848.—Ed.
TO THE CITIZENS,
MEMBERS OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT
OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

Citizens!

The Democratic Association having as its aim the union and brotherhood of all peoples, established a few months ago at Brussels, and composed of members of several European nations which enjoy with the Belgians on their soil institutions which have long allowed the free and public expression of all political and religious opinions, hereby offers you the homage of its congratulations upon the great task the French nation has just accomplished, and of its gratitude for the immense service which this nation has just rendered the cause of humanity.

We have already had occasion to congratulate the Swiss for having led, as they did not long ago, in the work for the emancipation of the peoples which it has fallen to you to promote with the vigour which the heroic population of Paris always displays when its turn comes. We were counting before long on repeating to the French the message we had addressed to the Swiss. But France has greatly advanced the time when we counted on addressing her.

This is only one reason why all the nations should hasten to follow in your footsteps.

We believe we can be sure in surmising that the nations nearest to France will be the first to follow her in the career on which she has just entered.

This conjecture is all the more certain in that France has just made a revolution destined rather to strengthen the bonds which link it to all nations than to menace the independence of any of them. We

---

a See this volume, pp. 624-26.—Ed.
salute in the France of February 1848 not the mistress of the peoples but an example for them—France will henceforward look for no other homage.

We already see the great nation whose destinies you direct today, your sole authority the trust of all, we already see it, citizens, forging again, even with peoples whom she has for long regarded as rivals for power, an alliance which the hateful policy of certain men succeeded in shattering.

England and Germany stretch out their hands once more to your great country. Spain, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium are going either to rise or to remain quiet and free under your threefold aegis.

Poland, like Lazarus, will rise again to the appeal you will make in a threefold language.

It is impossible that Russia itself should not join in, with accents as yet only slightly known to the ear of Western and Southern peoples.

Yours, Frenchmen, yours is the honour, yours is the glory to have laid the main foundations of this alliance of peoples so prophetically sung by your immortal Beranger.

We offer you, citizens, in all the flow of feelings of an immutable fraternity, the tribute of our deepest gratitude.

The Committee of the Democratic Association, whose aim is the union and brotherhood of all peoples, at Brussels.

L. Jottrand, barrister, President
Ch. Marx, Vice-president
General Mellinet, Honorary president
Spilthoorn, barrister, President of the Democratic Association at Ghent
Maynz, professor at Brussels University
Lelewel
F. Balliu, treasurer
A. Battaille, Vice-secretary
J. Pellerin, workman
Labiaux, merchant

First published in the newspapers
Le Débat social, March 1, 1848
and La Réforme, March 4, 1848

Printed according to La Réforme
Translated from the French
Published in full in English for the first time
You already know of the glorious revolution which has just been carried out in Paris.

We have to communicate to you that, as a result of this important event, the Democratic Association has initiated here a peaceful but vigorous agitation, to obtain through the ways proper to Belgian political institutions the advantages which the French people have won.

The following resolutions have been passed, with enthusiastic acclaim:

1. The Democratic Association will hold meetings every evening and the public will be admitted;

2. An address will be sent in the name of the Association to the provisional government of France, with the aim of expressing our warm feelings for the revolution of February 24;

3. An address will be presented to the municipal council of Brussels, inviting it to maintain public peace and to avoid all bloodshed by organising the municipal forces generally composed of the civil guard, that is to say, the bourgeois who are armed in normal circumstances, and the artisans who can be armed in abnormal times, according to the laws of the country. Arms will thus be entrusted equally to the middle class and the working class.

We will inform you as often as possible of the measures we shall take later, and of our progress.

We hope that you will soon succeed, on your side, in having the People's Charter passed as a law of your country, and that it will serve you in making further progress.

---

*a See this volume, pp. 645-46.—Ed.*
Finally, we invite you; in this important crisis, to keep in frequent communication with us, and to transmit to us all news of your country of a nature to exercise a favourable effect on the Belgian people.

(Signatures of Committee Members follow)
FERDINAND FLOCON TO MARX
IN BRUSSELS

Provisional Government
French Republic
Liberty, Equality, Fraternity

In the name of the French People

Paris, March 1, 1848

Good and loyal Marx,

The soil of the French Republic is a field of refuge and asylum for all friends of liberty.

Tyranny exiled you, now free France opens its doors to you and to all those who are fighting for the holy cause, the fraternal cause of all the peoples.

Every agent of the French government must interpret his mission in this sense.

Fraternal greetings.

Ferdinand Flocon,
Member of the Provisional Government

First published in the book:

Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time
ORDER OF LEOPOLD I,
KING OF THE BELGIANS,
FOR MARX'S EXPULSION FROM BELGIUM

Leopold, King of the Belgians,
To all present and to come, Greetings

Considering the laws of September 22, 1835, December 25, 1841 and February 23, 1846
On the proposition of our Minister of Justice,
We have decreed and now decree:

Article One and Only

The here-named Marx, Charles, Doctor of Philosophy, aged about 28 years, born at Trèves (Prussia), is ordered to leave the Kingdom of Belgium within twenty-four hours, and forbidden to return in the future under the penalties contained in Article Six of the afore-cited law of September 22, 1835.

Our Minister of Justice is charged with the execution of the present order.

Done at Brussels on March 2, 1848

[Signed:] Leopold

By the royal hand
The Minister of Justice
[Signed:] De Haussy

Certified true copy
The Secretary-General
[Signed:] De Crassier

Published for the first time
Printed from the original
Translated from the French
DECISION OF THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY
OF THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE,
MARCH 3, 1848

Working Men of All Countries, Unite!

The Central Authority of the Communist League, meeting in Brussels, in accordance with the decision of the former London Central Authority to move the seat of the Central Authority to Brussels and to dissolve itself as Central Authority, by which decision the circle authority of the Brussels leading circle is therefore constituted the Central Authority, considering:

that in the present circumstances any association of League members, in particular of Germans, is impossible in Brussels;

that the leading League members there have already been either arrested or expelled or are hourly expecting expulsion from Belgium;

that at the present moment Paris is the centre of the entire revolutionary movement;

that present circumstances require a thoroughly energetic leadership of the League, for which temporary discretionary power is indispensable,

decides:

Art. 1. The Central Authority is transferred to Paris.

Art. 2. The Brussels Central Authority confers on League member Karl Marx full discretionary power for the temporary central direction of all League affairs with responsibility to the Central Authority to be newly constituted and to the next Congress.

Art. 3. It instructs Marx, in Paris, as soon as circumstances permit, to constitute a new Central Authority from the most suitable League members selected by him, and for that purpose even to call to Paris League members not resident there.
Art. 4. The Brussels Central Authority dissolves itself.
Resolved at Brussels, March 3, 1848.

The Central Authority


Printed according to the book
Ministry of Justice  
Administration of Prisons  
and Public Security  
2nd section  
2nd Bureau  
No. 73946

DESCRIPTION

AGE 28 years
HEIGHT 1メートル... centimetres
HAIR Black
FOREHEAD Average
EYEBROWS Black
EYES Brown
NOSE Average
MOUTH do.
BEARD Black
SIDE WHISKERS Black
MOUSTACHE Black
CHIN Round
FACE do.
COMPLEXION Tanned
BUILT Heavy

DISTINGUISHING MARKS

THE ADMINISTRATOR OF PUBLIC SECURITY

invites the civil and military authorities to
allow free passage
from Brussels to Quiévrain
destination France
to M. Marx, Charles
Profession Doctor of Philosophy
born at Trier, Prussia
residing at—and to give him aid and
protection in case of need.
The present travel document is valid
for exit from the Kingdom today.

Done at Brussels, March 4, 1848

For THE ADMINISTRATOR OF PUBLIC SECURITY

The Head of the Passport Office

Becquet

Signature of bearer

Dr. K. Marx

First published as a facsimile in
the book: S. Z. Leviova, Marx in the
German Revolution, 1848-49.
Moscow, 1970

Printed from the original
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

---

a This is followed by the Belgian national coat of arms. — Ed.
b Inaccurate: Marx was born in 1818. — Ed.
c Signature in Marx’s hand. — Ed.

Schapper: proposes to constitute ourselves the Paris Circle, no longer a single community.
Supported by Marx and others. Agreed.
Admitted: Hermann.

Discussion on the re-admission of removed community members;
Born gives a report on the meeting in the café l'Europe; so does Sterbitzki. Resolved by a large majority not to go into this café, where Decker and Venedey hold a meeting.

Engler, Buchfink and Vogler (Weitlingians) unanimously admitted.

Unanimously resolved: the three above-named League members instructed to admit members of the Weitling community whom they consider suitable.

Schilling unanimously admitted.
Admitted to the public workers' society as:
President: H. Bauer.
Vice-president: Hermann.
2 secretaries: Born and Vogel.
Treasurer: Moll.
3 organisers: Buchfink, Schapper, Horne.

Agreed that the President shall use the form of address: Friends; anybody else as he likes.

Marx to submit draft Rules for the workers' society.
The public society shall be called German Workers' Club.381

Wilhelm Höger admitted as League member (proposed by Schapper, supported by H. Bauer).
The meeting place of the public society shall be in the centre of the city. Some members are instructed to look for suitable premises. The League meeting is to be held at No. 6, St. Louis St. Honoré. Sterbitzki proposes Hermann, who is admitted.

Secretary K. Marx

Chairman K. Schapper

Written by Karl Marx on March 8, 1848

First published in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, I. Abteilung, Bd. 7, 1935

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
MEETING OF MARCH 9, 9 P.M.

Marx submits his draft Rules,\(^{a}\) which are discussed.
Article 1 adopted with a minority of 2 against. Article 2 adopted unanimously; also Art. 3, Art. 4, Art. 5 and Art. 6.
The draft Rules are therefore adopted without amendments. The Rules of the Communist League are read out by the Secretary. After hearing the Rules the members newly to be admitted declare that they enter the Communist League.

Marx proposes that all members shall give their names and addresses. This is discussed and it is finally resolved that every League member shall give the name by which he is known here, and his address.

Schapper proposes to add another five members to the President and Secretary, so as to form the circle authority of Paris.
One is to be elected from each of the four communities. The elections to be postponed to the next meeting.

Schapper gives a report on the Central Authority. On Schapper's proposal resolved that everybody who speaks rises and removes his hat.

On Marx's proposal the Central Authority will give at the next meeting a report on the situation of the League in general.

Born, who was sent to give a report on the meeting in the manège, returns after three-quarters of an hour and describes the miserable state of this society.\(^{382}\) The next meeting will be held next Saturday at 8 o'clock, café Belge, Rue Grenelle St. Honoré.

\(^{a}\) Draft Rules of the German Workers' Club (see this volume, p. 654).—Ed.
At the conclusion of the meeting the members give the Secretary their names together with their addresses. Marx proposes that all League members shall wear a red ribbon. Agreed unanimously.

On Schapper's proposal it is agreed that one member shall buy a blood-red ribbon for all. B. Sax is instructed to do this.

Written by Karl Marx on March 9, 1848

First published in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, I. Abteilung, Bd. 7, 1935

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
ANNOUNCEMENT
BY THE GERMAN WORKERS' CLUB IN PARIS

The committee of the German Workers' Club will announce in the newspaper La Réforme the arrangements that it considers to make in order to hold its meetings in public.

H. Bauer, shoemaker; Hermann, cabinet-maker; J. Moll, watch-maker; Wallau, printer; Charles Marx; Charles Schapper.

First published in La Réforme, March 10, 1848
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE GERMAN WORKERS' CLUB IN PARIS

German Workers' Club—Meeting on Tuesday, March 14, at the café Picard, 93, rue Saint-Denis. Those who wish to join the club are asked to give their names to:

Hermann, rue du Faubourg St. Antoine 55, c/o M. Scheuffer;
Stumpf, rue Montorgueil 33, c/o M. Schard;
Seidel, rue Oblin 9, c/o M. Glass;
L. Etrich, rue Saint-Marc 5;
Charles Marx, a rue Neuve-Ménilmontant 10;
Charles Schapper, rue Neuve Saint-Augustin 22.

First published in La Réforme, March 13, 1848
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

a The original has a misprint: Clarck.—Ed.
NOTES
AND
INDEXES
NOTES

1 This article deals with a meeting held in London on September 22, 1845 at which an international society of Fraternal Democrats was formed. The society embraced representatives of Left Chartists, German workers and craftsmen — members of the League of the Just — and revolutionary emigrants of other nationalities. During their stay in England in the summer of 1845, Marx and Engels helped in preparing for the meeting but did not attend it as they had by then left London. Later they kept in constant touch with the Fraternal Democrats trying to influence the proletarian core of the society, which joined the Communist League in 1847, and through it the Chartist movement. The society ceased its activities in 1853.

Engels' article, written to show the significance of international unity of the proletarian and revolutionary democratic forces, was directed at the same time against "true socialism" — the petty-bourgeois socialist trend current among German intellectuals and craftsmen from the end of 1844 onwards. This was Engels' second printed article against "true socialism", the first being "A Fragment of Fourier's On Trade" (see present edition, Vol. 4).

Engels describes the meeting of September 22, 1845 and cites speeches delivered at it according to the report published in The Northern Star No. 411, September 27, 1845. Excerpts from the article were published in English in The Plebs Magazine No. 2, March 1922.

2 Carmagnole — a song popular at the time of the French Revolution. Subsequent changes made in the words reflected mass sentiments at various stages of the popular movement.

The maximum laws and the law against buying up food supplies (June 26, 1793) were adopted by the Convention at the time of deepening food crisis under mass pressures and the campaign for fixed prices conducted by the so-called rabid, representatives of the most radical plebeian trend in the revolutionary camp. The first maximum adopted on May 4, 1793, despite opposition on the part of the Girondists introduced fixed prices on grain; the decree of September 11, 1793, fixed a single price for grain, flour and fodder; fixed prices on other staple goods (second maximum) were introduced on September 29.

3 The Jacobin revolutionary government headed by Robespierre fell as a result of the coup of 9-10 Thermidor (July 27-28), 1794.
The *conspiracy of equality* organised by Babeuf and his followers aimed at provoking an armed uprising of the plebeian masses against the bourgeois regime of the Directory and establishing a revolutionary dictatorship as a transitional stage to "pure democracy" and "egalitarian communism". The conspiracy was disclosed in May 1796. At the end of May 1797 its leaders were executed.

4 The period from May 31, 1793 to July 26, 1794 was one of the Jacobin revolutionary democratic dictatorship in France.

5 The reference is to *associations for improving the conditions of the working classes* set up in a number of Prussian towns in 1844-45 on the initiative of the liberal bourgeoisie who were frightened by the uprising of the Silesian weavers in the summer of 1844. The aim of their founders was to divert the German workers' attention from the struggle for their class interests.

6 At Jemappes (November 6, 1792) and Fleurus (June 26, 1794) the French revolutionary army defeated the forces of the first coalition of the European counterrevolutionary monarchies.

7 *Democratic Association*—a workers' organisation founded in London by the most revolutionary elements among the Chartists (George Julian Harney and others) in 1838; it advocated the revolutionary implementation of the Chartist programme. Many of its members were republicans and supported Babeuf's trend of utopian communism.

8 *Cosmopolitan*—here and below is to be understood as meaning: free from all national limitations and national prejudices.

9 The reference is to the meeting of Chartists and heads of the London communities of the League of the Just with the leading figures of the democratic and revolutionary movements in a number of countries; the meeting took place in London in August 1845. Marx and Engels who were in London at the time took an active part in it. According to a report published in *The Northern Star* No. 406, August 23, 1845, the participants adopted the following resolution proposed by Thomas Cooper and supported by Engels: "That a public meeting of the democrats of all nations, residing in London, be called to consider the propriety of forming an Association for the purpose of meeting each other at certain times, and getting by this means a better knowledge of the movements for the common cause going on in their respective countries."

This event marked an important step towards organising the international meeting held on September 22, 1845 and described by Engels in this article.

10 The reference is to revolutionary events of August 1842 in England when in conditions of economic crisis and increasing poverty violent working-class disturbances broke out in the industrial regions. In Lancashire and a large part of Cheshire and Yorkshire strikes became general, in some places growing into spontaneous insurrections. The government retaliated with massive arrests of Chartist leaders, who afterwards received severe sentences.

11 The reference is to the July revolution of 1830 in France which resulted in the overthrow of the Bourbon dynasty. Decisive events took place on July 27-29 in Paris.

12 *August 10, 1792*—the day when the monarchy in France was overthrown as a result of a popular insurrection.
Julian Harney refers to calls for war against England raised in the French Chamber of Deputies and the French bourgeois press due to strained Anglo-French relations in the mid-forties caused by the colonial rivalry between the two powers in West Indies after the establishment of the French protectorate over Tahiti, the annoyance of the English bourgeoisie at French expansion in North Africa (war against Morocco) and the sharp British reaction against the projected Franco-Belgian-Luxembourg customs union. The planned marriage of the son of Louis Philippe to the Spanish Infanta, opening up the prospects for union of the two monarchies under the Orleans crown, added to the tension.

The trial of April 1834—trial of 167 participants in the French workers' and republican movement, accused of high treason in connection with the uprising in Lyons and revolutionary actions in Paris and other towns in April 1834. Among the accused were the leaders of the secret republican Société des droits de l'homme.

The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation was founded in 962 and lasted till 1806. At different periods it included the German, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian and Bohemian lands, Switzerland and the Netherlands, forming a motley conglomeration of feudal kingdoms and principalities, church lands and free towns with different political structures, legal standards and customs.

Imperial Court Chamber (Reichskammergericht) was the supreme court of the Holy Roman Empire. It was established in 1495 and abolished in 1806; initially it had no fixed seat, but from 1693 to 1806 was permanently located in Wetzlar.

Here the word "metaphysics" is used to denote philosophy as a speculative science transcending practical experience.

Constitution of 1791, approved by the Constituent Assembly, established a constitutional monarchy in France, giving the king full executive powers and the right of veto. This constitution was annulled as a result of the popular uprising of August 10, 1792, which brought about the fall of the monarchy. After the Girondist government (Girondists—the party of the big bourgeoisie) had been overthrown by the uprising of May 31-June 2, 1793 and the revolutionary dictatorship of the Jacobins established, the National Convention adopted a new democratic constitution of the French Republic.

The reference is to the Constituent Assembly's decision to repeal feudal services, passed on the night of August 4, 1789 under the impact of peasant uprisings all over the country.

See Note 3.

After the defeat of Austria in 1805 and of Prussia in 1806 by Napoleon and the establishment of the French protectorate over the German states the latter were obliged to declare war on Britain and join the continental blockade proclaimed by the French Emperor in November 1806, which prohibited all trade with Britain.

In his articles "The State of Germany" Engels tried to refute the reactionary nationalistic interpretation of German history and, in particular, the glorification of the role played by the German ruling classes in the wars of 1813-14 and 1815 against Napoleonic France. But he gave a somewhat one-sided appraisal of the war itself. The war to liberate Germany from French domination following the defeat of Napoleon's army in Russia in 1812 was, indeed, of a contradictory nature. Its character was affected by the counter-revolutionary and expansionist aims and
policy of the ruling circles in the feudal monarchical states. But especially in 1813, when the struggle was aimed at liberating German territory from French occupation, it assumed the character of a genuinely popular national liberation war against foreign oppression. Later, when he once again considered that period in the history of Germany, Engels in a series of articles entitled “Notes on the War” (1870) stressed the progressive nature of the people’s resistance to Napoleon’s rule and in his work The Role of Force in History (1888) he wrote: “The peoples’ war against Napoleon was the reaction of the national feeling of all the peoples, which Napoleon had trampled on.”

23 The reference is to the Spanish Constitution of 1812 adopted at the time of the national liberation war against Napoleonic rule. Expressing the interests of the liberal nobility and liberal bourgeoisie the constitution limited the king’s power by the Cortes, proclaimed the supreme power of the nation and did away with certain survivals of feudalism. The overwhelming power of the feudal and clerical reactionary forces after Napoleon’s defeat in 1814 led to the repeal of the constitution, which then became the banner of the liberal-constitutional movement in Spain and other European countries.

24 The Holy Alliance—an association of European monarchs founded on September 26, 1815 on the initiative of the Russian tsar Alexander I and the Austrian Chancellor Metternich to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries.

25 Peterloo was the name given at the time (by analogy with the battle of Waterloo) to the massacre by the troops of unarmed participants in a mass meeting for electoral reform at St. Peter’s Field near Manchester, on August 16, 1819.

26 The Fundamental Federative Act (Bundesakte)—a part of the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna held by European monarchs and their ministers in 1814-15, which established the political organisation of Europe after the Napoleonic wars. This Act was signed on June 8, 1815 and proclaimed a German Confederation consisting initially of 34 independent states and four free cities. The Act virtually sanctioned the political dismemberment of Germany and the maintenance of the monarchical-estate system in the German states. From 1815 to 1866 the central organ of the German Confederation was the Federal Diet consisting of representatives of the German states.

The promise to introduce constitutions in all the states of the German Confederation, which was stated in Article 13 of the Bundesakte, was never fulfilled. Article 18 of the Act, which vaguely mentioned a forthcoming drafting of uniform instructions providing for “freedom of the press” in the states of the German Confederation, also remained on paper.

27 Vendée—a department in Western France; during the French Revolution a centre of largely peasant-based royalist uprising. The word “Vendée” came to denote counter-revolutionary actions.

28 The Corn Laws (first introduced in the 15th century) imposed high tariffs on agricultural imports in order to maintain high prices on agricultural products on the home market. By the Act of 1815 imports of grain were prohibited as long as grain prices in England remained lower than 80 sh. per quarter. Later further Acts were adopted (1822, 1828 and others) changing the terms for grain imports.

The struggle between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy over the Corn Laws ended in their repeal in June 1846.
The reference is to the revolution in Spain which began in January 1820, and also to revolutionary actions in Naples and Palermo in July 1820, in Portugal in August 1820 and Piedmont in March 1821 under the slogan of a constitution and bourgeois reforms. The revolutionary movements were suppressed by the Holy Alliance powers which sanctioned the Austrian intervention in Italy and the French intervention in Spain, and by domestic reaction.

The first secret society of carbonari in France was founded in late 1820-early 1821 after the pattern of the Italian societies of the same name. The society included representatives of diverse political trends and sought to overthrow the Bourbon monarchy. It was smashed by the police in 1822. Some carbonari organisations existed till the early 1830s, participated in the July revolution of 1830, and soon afterwards merged with republican societies.

In 1816-19 an upsurge of the democratic movement for an electoral reform took place in England. However, no reform was accomplished until 1832.

At the first stage of the national liberation uprising of the Greek people in 1821 the European governments were hostile to the insurgents. However, under pressure from public opinion and as a result of rivalries in the Balkans and the Middle East their attitudes changed. In 1827 Britain, France and Russia signed an agreement undertaking to demand jointly that the Turkish government should stop war in Greece and grant the country autonomy. The refusal of the Sultan to meet these demands led to a military conflict between the European powers and Turkey. The defeat of the Turks in the battle of Navarino (1827) was of great importance for the liberation of Greece. Finally the issue was decided by the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29. The Sultan was compelled to recognise the autonomy of Greece, and soon afterwards its independence. However, the European powers imposed a monarchical form of government on the newly liberated country.

The Polish national liberation uprising of November 1830-October 1831, whose participants belonged mostly to the revolutionary gentry and whose leaders were mainly from aristocratic circles, was crushed by tsarist Russia aided by Prussia and Austria — the states which had taken part in the partition of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century. Despite the defeat the uprising was of a major international significance as it diverted the forces of the counter-revolutionary powers and frustrated their plans to intervene against the bourgeois revolutions of 1830 in France and of 1830-31 in Belgium. As a result of the revolution, Belgium, which had been incorporated into Holland in 1815 by the decision of the Congress of Vienna, became an independent kingdom. For Marx's and Engels' appraisal of the Polish uprising of 1830-31 see pp. 545-52 of this volume.

The 1832 Reform Act in England granted the franchise to property owners and leaseholders with no less than £ 10 annual income. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, who were the main force in the struggle for the reform, remained unenfranchised.

The conference of the representatives of German states held in June 1834 in Vienna passed a decision which obliged the sovereigns to render mutual support in their struggle against liberal and democratic movements. This decision was recorded in the final protocol of the conference of June 12, 1834, the contents of which were long kept secret.
In 1844 the British Home Secretary, Sir James Graham, to please the Austrian government ordered the post office to let the police inspect the correspondence of Italian revolutionary immigrants. p. 33

The editorial board of The Northern Star altered the date from “February 20” to “March 20”. Harney gave this explanation to Engels in a letter of March 30, 1846: “On Saturday I received a long letter from you through We[e]rth, or rather two letters. The one for the Star I like very much, it will appear this week. I have altered the date from Febr. 20th, to March 20th, it will thereby not look so stale.” p. 33

This is a circular of the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee founded by Marx and Engels early in 1846 for the propaganda of communist ideas and correspondence with advanced workers and revolutionary intellectuals in various countries of Europe (similar committees were founded shortly afterwards in London, Paris, Cologne and some other cities). The Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee made use of such circulars, as Engels stated later, “on particular occasions, when it was a question of internal affairs of the Communist Party in process of formation” (F. Engels, “On the History of the Communist League”, 1885).

The “Circular Against Kriege” was directed against “true socialism”, a trend followed by the German journalist Hermann Kriege who had emigrated to New York in the autumn of 1845. It was also to a considerable extent directed against the egalitarian communism of Weitling, which had found a number of advocates among the supporters of Kriege and the staff of Der Volks-Tribun of which he was editor.

It seems likely that the principal part of the “Circular Against Kriege”, which was written by Marx and Engels when they were completing the main part of the work on the manuscript of The German Ideology (see present edition, Vol. 5), was originally intended for inclusion in Vol. II of that work.

The document against Kriege was circulated in lithographic copies (in Wilhelm Wolff's hand without title).

A copy was sent to New York with a covering letter written by Edgar von Westphalen: “To Herr Hermann Kriege, Editor of Der Volks-Tribun.—On behalf of the local communist society and as chairman of the meeting which took place on May 11, I am forwarding to you the decision in which our opinion of Der Volks-Tribun is expressed. In case you do not publish the decision together with its motivation in your paper it will nevertheless be published in the press of Europe and America. We, however, expect that in the nearest future you will send us the issue of Der Volks-Tribun containing our resolution to: M. Gigot, rue de Bodenbroek, No. 8, Brussels, May 16, 1846. Edgar von Westphalen.” Kriege was compelled to comply with this demand and publish the “Circular” in Der Volks-Tribun Nos. 23 and 24 of June 6 and 13, 1846, adding his own insinuations against the authors and the ironical title Eine Bannbulle. It was also published in the July issue of Das Westphälische Dampfboot under the title of “Der Volkstribun, redigirt von Hermann Kriege in New York” without the authors' name. However, the editor of the journal, the “true socialist” Otto Lüning subjected the document to biased re-editing, adding his own introduction and conclusion, in contradiction to the ideas and spirit of the original document and in some cases changing the text arbitrarily. The original text was for a long time unavailable to scholars; in the book Aus dem literarischen Nachlass von Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels und Ferdinand Lassalle, published by Franz Mehring, the document was printed according to the text in Das Westphälische Dampfboot. The authentic version was for the first time reproduced according to the lithographic copy of the “Circular” in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, Erste Abteilung, Bd. 6, Berlin, 1932.
In October 1846, the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee issued a second circular against Kriege written by Marx, the text of which has not yet been found.

Young America — an organisation of American craftsmen and workers; it formed the nucleus of the mass National Reform Association founded in 1845. In the second half of the 1840s the Association agitated for land reform, proclaiming as its aim free allotment of a plot of 160 acres to every working man; it came out against slave-owning planters and land profiteers. It also put forward demands for a ten-hour working day, abolition of slavery, of the standing army, etc. Many German emigrant craftsmen, including members of the League of the Just, took part in the movement headed by the National Reform Association. By 1846 the movement among the German workers began to subside. One of the reasons for this was the activity of Kriege's group whose "true socialism" diverted the German emigrants from the struggle for democratic aims.

The reference is to the following passage from Emmanuel Sieyès' Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état? published in Paris in 1789 on the eve of the French Revolution: "1. What is the third estate? Everything. 2. What was it until now in the political respect? Nothing. 3. What is it striving for? To be something."


The article was published with an introduction by The Northern Star editors informing readers of the supposedly forthcoming publication of the Prussian constitution (the interpretation given in the press to the intention of the King of Prussia to institute a state representative organ on the basis of the united provincial diets) and giving a brief account of the situation in Prussia. The introduction, in particular, stated: "Silesia is in a disordered state, the unhappy people showing every inclination to imitate the Polish peasantry in engaging in an agrarian revolt. Last, not least, financial difficulties add to the embarrassments of the Government and have given rise to a measure involving a further departure from the solemn pledges given by the Crown to the people. On this subject we have been favoured with the following communication from our German correspondent."

According to Verordnung wegen der künftigen Behandlung des gesammten Staatsschulden-Wesens (Decree on the future handling of all state debts) issued in Prussia on January 17, 1820, new loans and state debts had to be guaranteed by the forthcoming Prussian assembly of the estates as well as by the government.

The reference is to the Preussische Seehandlungsgesellschaft (Prussian sea trade society) — a trade credit society founded in Prussia in 1772 which enjoyed a number of important state privileges. It offered large credits to the government and actually played the part of banker and broker. In 1904 it was officially made the Prussian State Bank.

This letter was written by Marx and Engels on behalf of the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee in reply to a statement by the Elberfeld socialist G. A. Köttgen, who tried to unite the supporters of socialist and communist views in Wuppertal (the joint name of Barmen and Elberfeld, in the Rhine province, which subsequently merged). Köttgen's statement, written on May 24, 1846 was sent to Brussels only on June 10 with a covering letter to Engels.

Their internal dissension prevented the socialists and Communists of Wuppertal from following Marx's and Engels' advice concerning, in particular, the organisation of a communist correspondence committee.
The article was supplied with an editorial introduction beginning with the following words: "Again, rumours are rife in Germany, that the long projected Prussian Constitution is at last framed, and will be immediately published. For ourselves, we will believe when we see. The King of Prussia is such a liar that none but asses would repose faith in his most solemn promises. One thing is certain that, if a Constitution is granted, it will be so worthless as to be utterly inadequate to satisfy the popular demands. From our 'German correspondent' we have received the following brief but interesting communication which exhibits his Prussian kingship in a new but not very respectable character. He is about to turn swindler on a large scale. He will borrow, and then 'repudiate'."

The address of the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee to the Chartist leader Feargus O'Connor was written in connection with his victory at the Nottingham election meeting early in July 1846, when he stood for election to the House of Commons. Voting at such meetings (up to 1872) was by show of hands, and all present took part in it. However, only "legitimate" electors (those having property and other qualifications) could take part in subsequent ballot — in which, consequently, candidates who had been outvoted by show of hands could be declared elected. Despite this anti-democratic system, O'Connor was duly elected to Parliament at the August 1847 ballot.

The address of the Brussels Communists was read at a regular meeting of the Fraternal Democrats held on July 20, 1846 and was warmly received there (see The Northern Star No. 454, July 25, 1846).

The reference is to the Repeal of the Corn Laws passed in June 1846. (On the Corn Laws see Note 28.) The movement for the repeal of the Corn Laws was led by the Anti-Corn Law League founded in 1838 by the Manchester manufacturers Cobden and Bright. Acting under the slogan of unrestricted free trade the League fought to weaken the economic and political position of the landed aristocracy and at the same time to reduce workers' wages.

The People's Charter, which contained 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 clauses: universal suffrage (for men of 21 years of age), annual elections to Parliament, secret ballot, equal constituencies, abolition of property qualifications for candidates to Parliament, and salaries for M.P.s. In 1839 and 1842 petitions for the Charter were rejected by Parliament. In 1847-48 the Chartists renewed a mass campaign for the Charter.

Early in June 1846 Thomas Cooper started a campaign against O'Connor. In particular he accused him of misusing the funds of the Chartist Cooperative Land Society (later called the National Land Company) founded by the Chartist leader in 1845 (see Note 162).

Cooper set forth his accusations in an open letter "To the London Chartists" (published in June 1846 in Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper) and in other statements. In answer to this, O'Connor wrote two letters: "To the Members of the Chartist Cooperative Land Society" and "To the Fustian Jackets, the Blistered Hands, and Unshorn Chins", published in The Northern Star Nos. 448 and 449, of June 13 and 20, 1846. The latter issue carried also numerous statements by Chartist organisations expressing confidence in O'Connor.

The Tuileries Palace in Paris was the residence of the French monarchs.
The reference is to the rescripts by Frederick William IV of February 3, 1847 convening the United Diet—a united assembly of the eight provincial diets instituted in 1823. The United Diet as well as the provincial diets consisted of representatives of the estates: the curia of gentry (high aristocracy) and the curia of the other three estates (nobility, representatives of the towns and the peasantry). Its powers were limited to authorising new taxes and loans, to voice without vote during the discussion of Bills, and to the right to present petitions to the King. The dates of its sessions were fixed by the King.

The United Diet opened on April 11, 1847, but it was dissolved as early as June because the majority refused to vote a new loan.

See Note 28.

The Customs Union (Zollverein) of the German states (initially including 18 states), which established a common customs frontier, was founded in 1834 and headed by Prussia. By the 1840s the Union embraced most of the German states with the exception of Austria, the Hanseatic towns (Bremen, Lübeck, Hamburg) and some small states. Brought into being by the necessity for an all-German market the Customs Union subsequently promoted Germany's political unification.

States-general — a body representing the estates in medieval France. It consisted of representatives of the clergy, nobles and burghers. They met in May 1789 — after a 175-year interval — at the time of maturing bourgeois revolution and on June 17 were transformed by the decision of the deputies of the third estate into the National Assembly which proclaimed itself the Constituent Assembly on July 9 and became the supreme organ of revolutionary France.

The reference is to the national liberation uprising in the Cracow republic which by the decision of the Congress of Vienna was controlled jointly by Austria, Russia and Prussia — who had partitioned Poland at the end of the eighteenth century. The seizure of power in Cracow by the insurgents on February 22, 1846 and the establishment of a National Government of the Polish republic, which issued a manifesto abolishing feudal services, were part of the plan for a general uprising in the Polish lands whose main inspirers were the revolutionary democrats (Dembowski and others). In March the Cracow uprising, lacking active support in other parts of Poland, was crushed by the forces of Austria and tsarist Russia; in November 1846, Austria, Prussia and Russia signed a treaty incorporating the “free town of Cracow” into the Austrian Empire.

Karl Grün translated into German Proudhon's work *Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère*. The book was published in Darmstadt in 1847 under the title *Philosophie der Staatsökonomie oder Notwendigkeit des Elends*.

The reference is to Proudhon’s letter to Marx of May 17, 1846 (published in *Correspondance de P. J. Proudhon précédée d’une notice sur P. J. Proudhon par J. A. Langlois*, T. II, Paris, 1875), which was an answer to Marx's letter to him of May 5, suggesting that he correspond with the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee in the capacity of a representative of the French proletariat. While in fact rejecting this proposal, Proudhon nevertheless wrote to Marx that he was eager to know Marx's opinion of his latest work.

The review of Marx's work in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* quoted here has been taken from Karl Grün's article “Meine Stellung zur Judenfrage” published in the *Neue Anekdotha*. 
**Neue Anekdota**—a collection which appeared in Darmstadt late in May 1845 under the editorship of Karl Grün. It contained newspaper articles by Moses Hess, Karl Grün, Otto Lüning and others, written mainly in the first half of 1844 and banned by the censors. Soon after the publication of the collection Marx and Engels, as can be judged from Grün's letters to Hess, made a number of severe critical remarks about its content.

Engels intended to publish this work in 1847 as a pamphlet. In the spring of 1847 he sent the manuscript from Paris (where he arrived in August 1846 to organise communist propaganda) to Marx in Brussels to be forwarded to the publisher C. G. Vogler, who had connections with communist circles. Vogler, however, had meantime been arrested (see Marx's letter to Engels of May 15, 1847). Marx gave a high appraisal of this pamphlet, especially of its first part, but was of the opinion that the other two parts were lacking in precision. The extant manuscript is incomplete. Only seven sheets, each folded in four (28 pages altogether), with the author's paging on the first page of each sheet (1, 5, 9, etc.) have been preserved. Pages 21-24 and the last sheets are missing. There is no title to the manuscript. The extant part was first published in the USSR in 1929 in the first edition of Marx's and Engels' *Works* in Russian under the title “The Constitutional Question in German Socialist Literature” and in 1932 in German in Marx/Engels, *Gesamtausgabe* under the title “Der Status quo in Deutschland”.

The present title is given according to Engels' letter to Marx of March 9, 1847, in which this work was called “a pamphlet on the constitutional question”.

Some of the French legitimists, advocates of the Bourbon dynasty overthrown in 1830, who upheld the interests of the big hereditary landowners (Villeneuve-Bargemont and others), resorted to social demagogy in their struggle against the financial and industrial bourgeoisie, passing themselves off as defenders of the working people.

Young England was a group of conservative writers and politicians, including Disraeli and Ferrand, who were close to the Tory philanthropists and founded a separate group in the House of Commons in 1841. Voicing the discontent of the landed aristocracy at the growing economic and political power of the bourgeoisie, they criticised the capitalist system and supported half-hearted philanthropic measures for improving the conditions of the workers. Young England disintegrated as a political group in 1845 and ceased to exist as a literary circle in 1848.

In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels describe the views of Young England and the above-mentioned ideologists of legitimism as “feudal socialism” (see this volume, pp. 507-08).
The name of the Spandau fortress near Berlin—a drill hall and a place of imprisonment for "state criminals" in Prussia—is used here as a symbol of the Prussian political system. p. 92

The reference is to the Prussian Government's consent to the incorporation of Cracow into the Austrian Empire after the suppression of the Cracow uprising of 1846 (see Note 55). This act led to the inclusion of Cracow within the Austrian customs frontier and to high import duties there on Prussian goods. p. 93

This document is the draft programme discussed at the First Congress of the Communist League in London on June 2-9, 1847.

The Congress was a final stage in the reorganisation of the League of the Just—an organisation of German workers and craftsmen, which was founded in Paris in 1836-37 and soon acquired an international character, having communities in Germany, France, Switzerland, Britain and Sweden. The activity of Marx and Engels directed towards the ideological and organisational unity of the socialists and advanced workers prompted the leaders of the League (Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll, Heinrich Bauer), who resided in London from November 1846, to ask for their help in reorganising the League and drafting its new programme. When Marx and Engels were convinced that the leaders of the League of the Just were ready to accept the principles of scientific communism as its programme they accepted the offer to join the League made to them later in January 1847.

Engels' active participation in the work of the Congress (Marx was unable to go to London) affected the course and the results of its proceedings. The League was renamed the Communist League, the old motto of the League of the Just "All men are brothers" was replaced by a new, Marxist one: "Working Men of All Countries, Unite!" The draft programme and the draft Rules of the League were approved at the last sitting on June 9, 1847.

The full text of the "Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith" (Credo) became known only in 1968. It was found by the Swiss scholar Bert Andréas together with the draft Rules and the circular of the First Congress to the members of the League (see this volume, pp. 585-600) in the archives of Joachim Friedrich Martens, an active member of the Communist League, which are kept in the State and University Library in Hamburg. This discovery made it possible to ascertain a number of important points in the history of the Communist League and the drafting of its programme documents. It had been previously assumed that the First Congress did no more than adopt a decision to draw up a programme and that the draft itself was made by the London Central Authority of the Communist League (Joseph Moll, Karl Schapper and Heinrich Bauer) after the Congress between June and August 1847. The new documents show that the draft was ready by June 9, 1847 and that its author was Engels (the manuscript found in Martens' archives, with the exception of some inserted words, the concluding sentence and the signatures of the president and the secretary of the Congress, was written in Engels' hand).

The document testifies to Engels' great influence on the discussion of the programme at the Congress—the formulation of the answers to most of the questions is a Marxist one. Besides, while drafting the programme, Engels had to take into account that the members of the League had not yet freed themselves from the influence of utopian ideas and this was reflected in the formulation of the first six questions and answers. The form of a "revolutionary catechism" was also commonly used in the League of the Just and other organisations of workers
and craftsmen at the time. It may be assumed that Engels intended to give greater precision to some of the formulations of the programme document in the course of further discussion and revision.

After the First Congress of the Communist League the “Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith” was sent, together with the draft Rules, to the communities for discussion, the results of which were to be taken into account at the time of the final approval of the programme and the Rules at the Second Congress. When working on another, improved draft programme, the Principles of Communism, in late October 1847 (see this volume, pp. 341-57), Engels made direct use of the “Confession of Faith”, as can be seen from the coincidences of the texts, and also from references in the Principles to the earlier document when Engels had apparently decided to leave formulations of some of the answers as they were.


70 In their works of the 1840s and 1850s, prior to Marx having worked out the theory of surplus value, Marx and Engels used the terms “value of labour”, “price of labour”, “sale of labour” which, as Engels noted in 1891 in the introduction to Marx’s pamphlet Wage Labour and Capital, “from the point of view of the later works were inadequate and even wrong”. After he had proved that the worker sells to the capitalist not his labour but his labour power Marx used more precise terms. In later works Marx and Engels used the terms “value of labour power”, “price of labour power”, “sale of labour power”

71 The Poverty of Philosophy. Answer to the “Philosophy of Poverty” by M. Proudhon is one of the most important theoretical works of Marxism and Marx’s principal work directed against P.-J. Proudhon, whom he regarded as an ideologist of the petty bourgeoisie. Marx decided that he must criticise Proudhon’s economic and philosophical views and at the same time clear up a number of questions relating to the theory and tactics of the revolutionary proletarian movement from the scientific-materialist standpoint at the end of 1846, as a result of his reading Proudhon’s Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère, which had appeared a short time earlier. In his letter of December 28, 1846 to the Russian man of letters P. V. Annenkov Marx expounded a number of important ideas which later formed the core of his book against Proudhon. In January 1847, as can be judged from Engels’ letter of January 15, 1847 to Marx, the latter was already working on his reply to Proudhon. In writing this book Marx extensively used notes he had made in 1845-47 from works by various authors, primarily economists. (A description of Marx’s notebooks was published in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe, Erste Abteilung, Bd. 6, Berlin, 1932.) By the beginning of April 1847 Marx’s work was completed in the main and had gone to press (see this volume, p. 72). On June 15, 1847 he wrote a short foreword.

The book was published in Brussels and Paris early in July 1847. Marx’s followers saw it as a theoretical substantiation of the platform of the proletarian party which was taking shape at the time. While establishing contact on behalf of this party in the autumn of 1847 with the French socialists and democrats grouped around the newspaper La Réforme, Engels, speaking to Louis Blanc, one of its editors, called Marx’s book against Proudhon “our programme” (see Engels’ letter to Marx of October 25-26, 1847). Ferdinand Wolff, a member of the Communist League, published a detailed review of The Poverty of Philosophy in Das Westphälische Dampfbote for January and February 1848.
The book was not republished in full during Marx's lifetime. Excerpts from §5 ("Strikes and Combinations of Workers") of Ch. II appeared in different years, mostly between 1872 and 1875, in workers' and socialist publications such as La Emancipation, Der Volksstaat, Social-Demokrat (New York) and others. In 1880 Marx attempted to publish his Poverty of Philosophy in the French socialist newspaper L'Egalité, the organ of the French Workers' Party, but only the foreword and §1 ("The Opposition Between Use Value and Exchange Value") of Ch. I were published.

The first German edition was made in 1885. The translation was edited by Engels, who also wrote a special preface and a number of notes to it. He mentioned in the preface that while editing the translation he had taken into account corrections made in Marx's hand in a copy of the 1847 French edition. (This copy, which contains also numerous underlinings and vertical lines in the margins, is kept in the library of the North-Eastern University at Sendai, Japan; and a photocopy was presented by Japanese scholars to the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow.) It is still not known when Marx made these corrections and alterations. But it was certainly prior to 1876, as a copy presented by Marx to Natalia Utina, wife of N. I. Utin, a member of the Russian Section of the First International, on January 1, 1876 is extant in which almost all of these corrections and alterations are reproduced in an unknown hand.

In 1886, the Russian Marxist Emancipation of Labour group published the first Russian edition of The Poverty of Philosophy in a translation made by Vera Zasulich from the German edition of 1885. In 1892 a second German edition appeared. It was provided with a short preface by Engels, dealing with corrections of certain inaccuracies in the text (see Note 75). Engels planned a second French edition for the mid-eighties. With this aim in view he made a list of necessary corrections to be inserted ("Notes et changements") using for this purpose the copy bearing the corrections in Marx's hand. However, this plan was implemented only after Engels' death by Marx's daughter Laura Lafargue in 1896. The corrections were made in the text according to the list drawn up by Engels.

In the present edition all corrections and changes made by Marx in the copy of the 1847 edition and reproduced in the copy presented to Natalia Utina, as well as the relevant corrections in the German 1885 and 1892 editions and in the French 1896 edition, have been taken into account. The changes affecting meaning and the stylistic improvements made in these copies and editions are introduced in the text itself, the original version being given in a footnote. Where the author's corrections and remarks are intended to revise or give greater precision to the original formulations and terminology, owing to the further development of Marxist economic theory, they are given in footnotes, the original text being left unaltered. This will enable readers to appreciate actual level attained by Marxist economic theory by 1847.

The first English edition of *The Poverty of Philosophy* was published in London in 1900 by the Twentieth Century press. The translation was made by Harry Quelch. Since then the work has been republished several times in English. p. 105

72 The reference is to the period which followed the termination of the Napoleonic wars in 1815 and the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty in France. p. 121


74 See Note 70. p. 127

75 The 1847 edition and the German 1885 edition mistakenly have the name of Hopkins, and lower an inexact date of publication of W. Thompson’s book (1827 instead of 1824). This served as a pretext for the Austrian economist Anton Menger to reproach Marx with wrong quoting (see A. Menger, *Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag in geschichtlicher Darstellung*, Stuttgart, 1886, S. 50). Engels corrected the mistakes by writing in the preface to the second German edition of *The Poverty of Philosophy* in 1892 the following: “For the second edition I have only to remark that the name wrongly written Hopkins in the French text has been replaced by the correct name Hodgskin and that in the same place the date of the work of William Thompson has been corrected to 1824. It is to be hoped that this will appease the bibliographical conscience of Professor Anton Menger. London, March 29, 1892. Frederick Engels.” p. 138

76 The *Ten-Hours’ Bill* was submitted to Parliament several times. In 1847 after a prolonged struggle the Bill was passed, and applied only to children and women. However, many factory owners ignored it. p. 143

77 Equitable-labour-exchange bazaars were organised by Owenites and Ricardian socialists (John Gray, William Thompson, John Bray) in various towns of England in the 1830s for fair exchange without a capitalist intermediary. The products were exchanged for labour notes, or labour money, certificates showing the cost of the products delivered, calculated on the basis of the amount of labour necessary for their production. The organisers considered these bazaars as a means for publicising the advantages of a non-capitalist form of exchange and a peaceful way — together with cooperatives — of transition to socialism. The subsequent and invariably bankruptcy of such enterprises proved their utopian character p. 144

78 The reference is to the following passage from Adam Smith’s work, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*: “In a tribe of hunters or shepherds a particular person makes bows and arrows, for example, with more readiness and dexterity than any other. He frequently exchanges them for cattle or for venison with his companions; and he finds at last that he can in this manner get more cattle and venison, than if he himself went to the field to catch them. From a regard to his own interest, therefore, the making of bows and arrows grows to be his chief business, and he becomes a sort of armourer.” (Vol. I, Book I, Chapter II.) p. 147

79 Marx refers to the first edition of Cooper’s book. In his notebook dating to July-August 1845, this passage is quoted from a second enlarged edition published in London in 1831. p. 153

80 The full text of the passage from Hegel’s *Wissenschaft der Logik* quoted here is as follows: “Die Methode ist deswegen als die ohne Einschränkung allgemeine, innerliche und äußerliche Weise, und als die schlechthin unendliche Kraft anzuerkennen,
welcher kein Objekt, insofern es sich als ein Äußerliches, der Vernunft fernes und von ihr unabhängiges präsentiert — Widerstand leisten, gegen sie von einer besonderen Natur seyn und von ihr nicht durchdrungen werden könnte... Sie ist darum die höchste Kraft oder vielmehr die einzige und absolute Kraft der Vernunft, nicht nur, sondern auch ihr höchster und einziger Trieb, durch sich selbst in Allem sich selbst zu finden und zu erkennen.” (Bd. III, Abschnitt 3, Kap. 3). p. 164

81 Marx refers to Chapter VIII “De la responsabilité de l'homme et de dieu, sous la loi de contradiction, ou solution du problème de la providence”. p. 173

82 Le Creusot (Burgundy) — since the 1830s a big centre of the French metallurgical, machine-building and war industry; at the time referred to, the Creusot works belonged to Schneider and Co. founded in 1836. p. 182

83 The reference is to the first cyclic crisis of overproduction which began in England in 1825. The crisis involved all branches of industry, textiles in particular. It was followed by stagnation in trade, reduction of exports by 16 per cent and imports by 15 per cent and the insolvency of several banks. p. 188

84 In partibus infidelium — beyond the realm of reality (literally “in the country of infidels”) — an addition to the title of Catholic priests appointed to a purely nominal diocese in non-Christian countries. p. 192

85 Quoting from the French edition of J. Steuart's book published in 1789 (the first English edition: J. Steuart. An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy, being an Essay on the Science of Domestic Policy in Free Nations was published in two volumes in London in 1767), Marx made some explanatory additions and changes. Thus he added the words “impôt sur la production” (taxes on production), “impôts sur la consommation” (taxes on consumption) and the last sentence: “Chacun est imposé à raison de la dépense qu'il fait” (Everyone is taxed according to his expenditure). He changed the place of the sentence “Chacun est imposé à raison du profit qu'il est censé faire” (Everyone is taxed in proportion to the gain he is supposed to make), which Steuart has after “Ainsi le monarque met un impôt sur l'industrie” (Thus the monarch imposes a tax upon industry). Instead of “le gouvernement limité” Marx used “le gouvernement constitutionnel”. p. 196

86 See notes 28 and 47. p. 208

87 In 1836-38 a new cyclic crisis of overproduction swept over Britain and other capitalist countries. p. 208

88 In 1824 under mass pressure Parliament repealed the ban on the trade unions. However, in 1825 it passed a Bill on workers' combinations, which confirming the repeal of the ban on the trade unions at the same time greatly restricted their activity. In particular, mere agitation for workers to join unions and take part in strikes was regarded as “compulsion” and “violence” and punished as a crime. p. 209

89 The laws in operation at that time in France—the so-called Le Chapelier law adopted in 1791 during the bourgeois revolution by the Constituent Assembly, and the penal code elaborated under the Napoleonic empire in 1810 (Code pénal)—forbade workers to form labour unions or go on strike under pain of severe punishment. The prohibition of trade unions in France was abolished only in 1884. p. 209

90 The National Association of United Trades was established in England in 1845 by trade union delegates from London, Manchester, Sheffield, Norwich, Hull, Bristol, and
other cities. Its activity was limited to the struggle for improved conditions of sale of labour power ("a fair wage for a fair day's work") and for improved factory legislation. The association existed until the early sixties, but it ceased to play any big part in the trade union movement after 1851.

91 The term "instruments of production" is still used by Marx in a broader sense here than in his later works. Subsequently he drew a more strict distinction between "forces of production" in general and "instruments of production" as a component part of the former.

92 Engels had in mind first of all Ferdinand Lassalle who widely used the term "workers' estate" in his writings, in particular in his pamphlet Arbeiterprogramm (Workers' Programme) published in 1862. The substitution of the terms "workers" or "fourth estate" for "working class" was characteristic of a number of other representatives of petty-bourgeois socialism.

93 See Note 50.

94 The reference is to the conservative majority in the French Chamber of Deputies who supported Guizot.

Further on Engels used materials published in Le Moniteur Universel for June 4, 18, 23 and 26, 1847.

95 See Note 47.

96 This article was written by Marx in reply to the propaganda of feudal and Christian socialism carried on by the conservative Prussian newspaper Rheinischer Beobachter. This propaganda was aimed at diverting the popular masses from revolutionary struggle against the absolutist regime and at using them in the struggle against the bourgeois opposition. Such ideas permeated, in particular, the article criticised by Marx, which was published anonymously in the Rheinischer Beobachter No. 206, July 25, 1847 as the eighth part in the series Politische Gänge. On September 2, 1847 this article was reprinted in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung without a title but with introductory words quoted by Marx. It is probable that the author of this article was Herr Wagener, a consistorial councillor in Magdeburg, subsequently a conservative leader, who enjoyed the protection of the Prussian Minister of Religious Worship, Education and Medicine, Eichhorn.

Later, in the mid-sixties, while exposing Lassalleans' advances to Bismarck's Government, Marx and Engels referred to this article by Marx as a document demonstrating the firm standpoint of the workers' party in relation to "royal-Prussian government socialism" (see Statement by Marx and Engels to the editorial board of the newspaper Social-Demokrat, February 23, 1865).

The article "The Communism of the Rheinischer Beobachter" bore the sign instead of a signature. The publication of this article and also of the first part of Engels' essays "German Socialism in Verse and Prose" (see this volume, pp. 220-49) marked the beginning of Marx's and Engels' regular contribution to the newspaper of the German emigrants, the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung. A special editorial note in the preceding issue of the newspaper of September 9, 1847 announced the forthcoming publication of these articles without mentioning, however, the authors' names. Prior to this, Marx and Engels contributed only occasionally to the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung (see this volume, pp. 72-74, 92-95), though they approved their associates—Wilhelm Wolff and Georg Weerth and others—doing so. Prior to their regular contribution the paper followed mainly the
line of its editor-in-chief, the petty-bourgeois democrat Adalbert Bornstedt, who tried to combine eclectically various oppositional ideological trends. But by the autumn of 1847 the influence of the proletarian revolutionaries in the paper gained momentum and soon it became a mouthpiece of the proletarian party which was being organised at the time, in fact the organ of the Communist League.

An excerpt from this article was published in English in K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Religion*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1957. p. 220

97 See Note 51.

98 In his speech from the throne at the opening of the United Diet in Prussia on April 11, 1847, Frederick William IV declared that he would never let the “natural relations between the monarch and the people” turn into “conditioned, constitutional” relations and a “written sheet of paper” be a substitute for a “genuine sacred loyalty.”

99 Under this common title two essays by Engels were published in the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* in which he analysed the poetry and literary-critical work and also the aesthetic views of representatives of “true socialism”. The first essay dealt with Karl Beck’s book, *Lieder vom armen Mann* (Songs of the Poor Man), published at the end of November 1845 as a sample of the poetry of “true socialism”. There are grounds for assuming that Engels’ essay on Beck may initially have been included as Chapter 3, the manuscript of which is not extant, in Volume II of *The German Ideology* (see present edition, Vol. 5). This work was most probably written in the first half of 1846 in Brussels.

The second essay analysed Karl Grün’s book, *Über Göthe vom menschlichen Standpunkte* (About Goethe from the Human Point of View), published at the end of April 1846, as a sample of the prose or literary critique of “true socialism”. Engels’ letter of January 15, 1847 to Marx shows that he intended to revise it for Volume II of *The German Ideology* (judging by its contents it was to follow Chapter 4 devoted to the analysis of Karl Grün’s book: *Die soziale Bewegung in Frankreich und Belgien*, Darmstadt, 1845 [The Social Movement in France and Belgium] as a sample of the historiography of “true socialism”). This essay was most probably written by Engels after he had moved from Brussels to Paris, i.e., between August 15, 1846 and January 15, 1847.

100 The words “Wahrheit und Recht, Freiheit und Gesetz” (Truth and Right, Freedom and Law) were used as an epigraph to the progressive German newspaper *Leipziger Allgemeine Zeitung*, banned in Prussia in 1842, and in Saxony early in 1843. p 236

101 *Restoration*—see Note 72.

*Carbonari*—see Note 29. The carbonari held their meetings under the guise of charcoal sales (Ventres). p 237

102 *Ventrus*—representatives of the “belly” of the French Chamber (see Note 94). p 258

103 An allusion to “Young Germany”—a literary group which appeared in Germany in the 1830s and was under the influence of Heinrich Heine and Ludwig Börne. The group included such writers as Gutzkow, Wienberg, Mundt, Laube and Jung, whose stories and articles voiced the opposition sentiments of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, advocates of freedom of conscience and the press, the introduction of a constitution, emancipation of women, etc. Some of them advocated granting civil
rights to Jews. Their political views were vague and inconsistent; most of them soon became ordinary liberals.

104 The reference is to a spontaneous rising of textile workers in Prague in the latter half of June 1844. The events in Prague led to workers' uprisings in many other industrial centres of Bohemia. The workers' movement, which was accompanied by factory and machine wrecking, was suppressed by government troops.

105 The Friends of Light was a religious trend opposed to the pietism predominant in the official church and supported by Junker circles.

106 The first edition of P. H. Holbach's *Système de la nature, ou des loix du monde physique et du monde moral* (London 1770) bore, for conspirational reasons, the name of the Secretary of the French Academy J. B. Mirabaud, who died in 1760, as its author.

107 Joseph Addison's tragedy *Cato* was written in 1713; Goethe's *Leiden des jungen Werthers* in 1774.

108 The Federal Decrees of 1819 (the Karlsbad decisions) were drawn up on the insistence of the Austrian Chancellor Metternich at the conference of the German Confederation in Karlsbad in August 1819 and were endorsed by the Federal Diet on September 20, 1819. These decisions envisaged a number of strict measures against the liberal press, the introduction of preliminary censorship in all German states, strict surveillance over universities, prohibition of students' societies, establishment of an investigation commission for the prosecution of participants in the oppositional movement (so-called demagogues).

9 Thermidor—see Note 3.

18 Brumaire—the coup d'état of November 9, 1799 which completed the bourgeois counter-revolution and led to the personal rule of General Napoleon Bonaparte.

110 In one of the scenes in Goethe's comedy *Der Bürgergeneral* a rural barber who pretended he was a Jacobin general drank a jug of milk and thus angered the master of the house.

111 See Note 53.

112 Ghibellines—a political party in Italy formed in the 12th century in the period of strife between the popes and the German emperors. It included mostly feudal lords who supported the emperors and furiously opposed the papal party of the Guelphs, which represented the upper trade and artisan strata of Italian towns. The parties existed till the 15th century. Dante, who hoped that the emperor's rule would help to overcome the feudal dismemberment of Italy, joined the party of the Ghibellines in 1302.

113 The International Congress of Economists held in Brussels on September 16-18, 1847 discussed the attitude towards the movement for the repeal of trade restrictions between individual countries started by the British Anti-Corn Law League (see Note 47).

The Communist League members headed by Marx attended the congress, intending to use it for open criticism of bourgeois economics and for defence of working-class interests.
Marx's name was put on the official list of the congress participants (see *Journal des économistes*, t. XVIII, October 1847, p. 275).

During the congress a sharp controversy arose between the bourgeois majority and a group of Brussels Communists, especially after Georg Weerth's speech criticising the free traders' statements about the benefits of free trade to the working class. The organisers of the congress did not let Marx make his speech and closed the discussion. In reply to this Marx and Engels and their followers carried on the polemic with bourgeois economists in the democratic and proletarian press.

An allusion to the fulfilment of Bentham's will by John Bowring (Bentham bequeathed his body for use for scientific purposes).

The report on other sittings of the congress was not published in the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung*. On these see Engels' article "The Free Trade Congress at Brussels" (this volume, pp. 282-90).

This work is a part of a speech Marx intended to deliver at the International Congress of Economists in Brussels on September 18, 1847. Not being allowed to do so, Marx rewrote it for the press and sent it to a number of Belgian newspapers. It was published only in the *Atelier Démocratique*, September 29, 1847 in French. Announcing the publication of this article the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* wrote on October 7, 1847: "Unfortunately, not a single big Belgian newspaper had the courage or intelligence to print the speech sent to it." Extant are only a preliminary draft of the speech bearing the author's heading "Protectionists" (see this volume, p. 573) and the German translation of its beginning published in Hamm in 1848 by J. Weydemeyer, a friend of Marx and Engels, together with another speech by Marx on the freedom of trade (see this volume, pp. 450-65). Weydemeyer omitted the end of the speech saying that it was repeated in the speech of January 9.

Engels gives the content of Marx's speech in his article "The Free Trade Congress at Brussels" (see this volume, pp. 282-90).

The full text of Weerth's speech (Engels quotes parts of it word for word, and gives a free account of others) was published in a number of newspapers, in particular, in French (the language in which it was delivered) in the *Atelier Démocratique* and in German in *Die Ameise* (Grimma) on October 15, 1847. The text published in *Die Ameise* is reproduced in the book: Georg Weerth, *Sämtliche Werke*, Zweiter Band, Berlin, 1956, S. 128-33. In some places the text differs from the passages cited by Engels. Apparently Engels recorded facts more exactly; in particular, in the first passage cited by him he corrected the number of the English proletariat (5 million instead of 3 million as in Weerth), and in the second passage the date on which the Chartists concluded an agreement with the free traders (1845 instead of 1843).

The reference is to provocations on the part of the Anti-Corn Law League which sought to use for its own ends the workers' unrest in the industrial districts of England in August 1842. (On the general strike of 1842 see Note 10.) The free traders encouraged the workers' action during the first stage of the strike hoping to direct their movement towards the struggle for the repeal of the Corn Laws. However, the independent class and political character which this strike assumed as it became general led to the direct and active participation of the free trade bourgeoisie in suppressing the movement.
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114 An allusion to the fulfilment of Bentham's will by John Bowring (Bentham bequeathed his body for use for scientific purposes).

115 The report on other sittings of the congress was not published in the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung*. On these see Engels' article "The Free Trade Congress at Brussels" (this volume, pp. 282-90).

116 This work is a part of a speech Marx intended to deliver at the International Congress of Economists in Brussels on September 18, 1847. Not being allowed to do so, Marx rewrote it for the press and sent it to a number of Belgian newspapers. It was published only in the *Atelier Démocratique*, September 29, 1847 in French. Announcing the publication of this article the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* wrote on October 7, 1847: "Unfortunately, not a single big Belgian newspaper had the courage or intelligence to print the speech sent to it." Extant are only a preliminary draft of the speech bearing the author's heading "Protectionists" (see this volume, p. 573) and the German translation of its beginning published in Hamm in 1848 by J. Weydemeyer, a friend of Marx and Engels, together with another speech by Marx on the freedom of trade (see this volume, pp. 450-65). Weydemeyer omitted the end of the speech saying that it was repeated in the speech of January 9.

Engels gives the content of Marx's speech in his article "The Free Trade Congress at Brussels" (see this volume, pp. 282-90).

117 See Note 47.

118 The full text of Weerth's speech (Engels quotes parts of it word for word, and gives a free account of others) was published in a number of newspapers, in particular, in French (the language in which it was delivered) in the *Atelier Démocratique* and in German in *Die Ameise* (Grimma) on October 15, 1847. The text published in *Die Ameise* is reproduced in the book: Georg Weerth, *Sämtliche Werke*, Zweiter Band, Berlin, 1956, S. 128-33. In some places the text differs from the passages cited by Engels. Apparently Engels recorded facts more exactly; in particular, in the first passage cited by him he corrected the number of the English proletariat (5 million instead of 3 million as in Weerth), and in the second passage the date on which the Chartists concluded an agreement with the free traders (1845 instead of 1843).

119 The reference is to provocations on the part of the Anti-Corn Law League which sought to use for its own ends the workers' unrest in the industrial districts of England in August 1842. (On the general strike of 1842 see Note 10.) The free traders encouraged the workers' action during the first stage of the strike hoping to direct their movement towards the struggle for the repeal of the Corn Laws. However, the independent class and political character which this strike assumed as it became general led to the direct and active participation of the free trade bourgeoisie in suppressing the movement.
This refers to the movement for Parliamentary reform in England in 1830-31, to the July revolution of 1830 in France and the revolution of 1830-31 in Belgium which led to the separation of Belgium from Holland.

The reference is to the brutal suppression of workers' risings in Lyons in 1831 and 1834 and to atrocities perpetrated by government troops against starving workers in Buzançais (Indre Department) who had looted corn shipments and storehouses belonging to profiteers early in 1847.

On the precision subsequently given by Marx and Engels to these terms which express the relations between the worker and the capitalist, see Note 70.

The two articles by Engels against Karl Heinzen were written in reply to this petty-bourgeois democrat's slanderous attacks against the Communists and communism as a social trend. In particular, the Polemik column of the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 77 for September 26, 1847 contained Heinzen's statement in which, among other things, he accused the Communists of seeking to split the German revolutionary movement. Heinzen used as a pretext an editorial note in No. 73 of the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung, September 12, 1847, in which, while refuting the allegation of a certain German newspaper that the article "Der deutsche Hunger und die deutschen Fürsten" published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung (No. 49, June 20, 1847) was of a communist character, the editors pointed out that the author of the said article was Heinzen who "as is known ... repeatedly attacked communism". Publishing Heinzen's reply to this note, Adalbert Bornstedt, the paper's editor-in-chief, instead of refuting the insinuations it contained called for appeasement between "various shades of German revolutionaries abroad"; in particular he wrote on behalf of the editors: "We consider it our duty to advise both parties in case polemic arises in some other place to give it up."

As is seen from Engels' letter of September 30, 1847 to Marx the first article with a reply to Heinzen was submitted to the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung on September 27. However, Bornstedt, despite his agreement with Marx and Engels on their regularly contributing to the paper, did not publish Engels' article in the next issue (No. 78) on the pretext of lack of space. Compelled to publish it in No. 79 on October 3, 1847 in the Polemik column he again repeated in the editorial note his appeal to both parties to avoid mutual accusations.

Heinzen visualised the future Germany as a republican federation of autonomous lands, similar to the Swiss Confederation. This was the meaning given by many petty-bourgeois democrats to the slogan of German unity, the symbol of which was the black-red-and-gold banner. Marx and Engels considered such an interpretation of the slogan inconsistent with the struggle against the survivals of medieval seclusion and political disunity. To oppose this they put forward the demand of a single, centralised democratic republic of Germany.

Engels enumerates some major peasant rebellions of the Middle Ages: the rebellions of Wat Tyler (1381) and Jack Cade (1450) in England, the peasant revolt in France in 1358 (Jacquerie) and the peasant war in Germany (1524-25). In later years as a result of studying the history of the peasant struggle against feudalism and drawing on the experience of revolutionary actions of the peasantry during the revolution of 1848-49 Engels changed his estimate of the peasant movements' character. In The Peasant War in Germany (1850) and other works he showed the
revolutionary liberation character of peasant revolts and their role in shaking the foundations of feudalism.  

127 The Illuminati (from the Latin illuminatus) — members of a secret society founded in Bavaria in 1776, a variety of Freemasonry. The society consisted of oppositional elements from the bourgeoisie and nobility, who were dissatisfied with princely despotism. At the same time a characteristic feature of this society was the fear of the democratic movement, reflected in the rules, which made rank-and-file members blind tools of their leaders. In 1785 the society was banned by the Bavarian authorities. Similar societies existed also in Spain and France.  

128 With this article Engels began contributing to the newspaper of the French republican democrats and petty-bourgeois socialists La Réforme. Determined to use the French radical press to spread communist ideas and to promote international unity of revolutionary proletariat and democratic circles in the European countries, Engels established close contacts with the editors of La Réforme in the autumn of 1847. In his letter to Marx of October [25-]26, 1847 he wrote that he had made arrangements with Ferdinand Flocon, one of the editors, for the weekly publication of an article on the situation in England. Engels intended to popularise in France the Chartist movement and the material from the Chartist press, primarily The Northern Star. The article Engels proposed to Flocon (at first it was intended for Flocon's personal information) was published, as Engels himself stated, without any alterations.

After this the newspaper carried almost every week Engels' articles or summaries of The Northern Star reports on the Chartist movement which he translated into French. These summaries, as a rule, bore no title. Sometimes they were published in the column "The Chartist Movement", or "The Chartist Agitation", and usually began with the words "They write from London...". Engels contributed to La Réforme up to January 1848. Despite differences in views with the editors (in particular Louis Blanc and Alexandre-Auguste Ledru-Rollin), Engels' articles and his propaganda of Chartistism helped to overcome to some extent this paper's national exclusiveness and had a revolutionising influence on its readers—the French working class and radical-minded middle sections.

129 The intended publication of the Chartist daily newspaper Democrat did not materialise.

130 Only a narrow circle of persons with electoral qualifications took part in the ballot (see Note 46).

131 On the general strike in England in 1842, see Note 10.

132 The editors of L'Atelier prefaced Engels' article with the following note: "A German worker who has been living in England for a long time has sent us a letter we are giving below concerning one of the articles which was published last month. We have to print this letter which deserves being printed for a number of reasons."

On his contacts with L'Atelier editors who were under the influence of Christian socialism Engels wrote to Marx on October [25-]26, 1847 in connection with the publication of this article: "I was ... at L'Atelier. I brought a correction to my article on the English workers in the last issue.... These gentlemen were very cordial.... They kept on suggesting to me to contribute. However, I shall agree only in the last resort...."

This article was published in English in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Articles on Britain. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.
The work is a continuation of the polemic with Karl Heinzen. The latter replied to Engels (see this volume, pp. 291-306) with a long article “Ein 'Repräsentant' der Kommunisten” full of rude abuse of his opponent and of the theory of scientific communism in general (Marx ironically called this article “Heinzen's Manifesto Against the Communists”). After the publication of this article in full in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung (No. 84, October 21, 1847) Bornstedt, the editor of the newspaper, again appealed to the contending parties to take the polemic elsewhere as the newspaper could not afford to publish such long articles. However, the editorial board had to agree to publish Marx's reply to Heinzen in full. When they began to publish the reply in No.86 on October 28, 1847 the editors even censured Heinzen in an editorial note for the harsh tone of his attacks. On November 14, before the whole of Marx's article had appeared, the editors published a special note in answer to Heinzen's attempt to continue the polemic: “We refuse to publish in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung Heinzen's letter of November 1 from Geneva in which he attacks the editorial board of this paper in an infamous way and tries to involve the paper and Karl Marx, for his first article in No. 86, without waiting for the continuation, in a vile private squabble. We declare that this is the way we shall deal with Heinzen's subsequent letters, despite his philistine assertions that he has a right to use our paper to express his views. We shall reply to possible public accusations in the proper time and place if we deem it necessary.”

Marx's work was published in the Polemik column in several issues. There were some editorial notes to the first part of it (to the expression “grobian literature”, literary personages “Solomon and Marcolph”, “goose preacher”). Subsequently, however, author's notes were provided. Nos. 92 and 94 of November 18 and 25, 1847 contained errata. All the corrections, some of which are author's improvements, have been taken into account in the present edition.

This work was published in English abridged in K. Marx, Selected Essays, Parsons, London, 1926.

This note (to the title of the second instalment of the article) published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung No. 87, October 31, 1847 was evidently written by Marx in reply to the editorial appeal to the contending parties (see Note 133) to abstain from private polemics.


Communes—self-governing urban communities in medieval France and Italy. For their description see Engels' note to the 1888 English edition and the 1890 German edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party (this volume, p. 486).

By the German war of liberation is meant the struggle for liberation from Napoleonic rule in 1813-14 (for more details, see Note 22). In this war as well as in the campaign of 1815, after Napoleon's short-lived restoration, the German states, including Austria and Prussia, which were members of the Holy Alliance (see Note 24), fought against Napoleonic France in the 6th anti-French coalition, the main organiser of which was Britain.

Marx refers to the “true Levellers” or “Diggers” who broke away from the democratic republican Levellers' movement during the English bourgeois revolution of the mid-17th century. Representing the poorest sections of the population and suffering from feudal and capitalist exploitation in town and countryside, the Diggers, in contrast to the rest of the Levellers, who defended private property,
carried on propaganda for community of property and other ideas of egalitarian communism, attempting to establish common ownership of the land through collective ploughing of communal waste land.

139 On the struggle of the English bourgeoisie against the Corn Laws, see Note 47.

140 Marx cites the report of the commission under the chairmanship of William Morris Meredith to investigate the operation of the Poor Law. The report submitted to the Pennsylvania Congress on January 29, 1825 was published in The Register of Pennsylvania on August 16, 1828.

141 Apparently Marx is citing the following edition: Th. Cooper, Lectures on the Elements of Political Economy, London, 1831. (The first edition was published in Columbia in 1826.) This is proved by the coincidence of the pages referred to and the relevant passages in the above-mentioned edition, and also by the excerpts copied out by Marx (including the passage cited) in his preparatory notebooks (see MEGA, Abt. I, Bd. 6, Berlin 1932, S. 604).

142 See Note 38.

143 The reference is to the failure of the Peasant War in Germany (1524-25).

144 Thirty Years' War, 1618-48—a European war, in which the Pope, the Spanish and Austrian Hapsburgs and the Catholic German princes rallied under the banner of Catholicism fought the Protestant countries: Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Republic of the Netherlands and a number of German states which had become Protestant. The rulers of Catholic France—rivals of the Hapsburgs—supported the Protestant camp. Germany was the main arena of this struggle, the object of plunder and territorial claims. The Treaty of Westphalia concluded in 1648 sealed the dismemberment of Germany.

145 The September laws promulgated by the French government in September 1835, restricted the rights of jury courts and introduced severe measures against the press. They provided for increased money deposits for periodical publications and introduced imprisonment and large fines for publishing attacks on private property and the existing political system. The enactment of these laws in conditions of the constitutional July monarchy which had formally proclaimed freedom of the press, emphasised the anti-democratic nature of the bourgeois system.

146 Fontanel—an artificial ulcer practised in medieval medicine for the discharge of harmful tumours from the body.

147 The reference is to the uprising of the Silesian weavers on June 4-6, 1844—the first big class battle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Germany, which assumed the greatest scope in the Silesian villages of Langenbielau and Peterswaldau, and to the uprising of the Bohemian workers in the second half of June 1844. (On this see Note 104.)

148 The reference is to the appeals for unity of all Germans against the German monarchs in the name of bourgeois freedoms and constitutional reforms, which were advanced by the participants in the Hambach festival—a political event that took place near the castle of Hambach in the Bavarian Palatinate on May 27, 1832.

149 Movement for the repeal of the Corn Laws—see Note 47. On the election of the Chartist leader Feargus O'Connor to Parliament—see Note 46.
The reference to Mably is not exact: the draft constitution for the Corsicans was drawn up by Rousseau and not by Mably. (J. J. Rousseau, *Lettres sur la légitimation de la Corse*, Paris, 1765). Mably, as well as Rousseau, drew up the draft constitution for the Poles. (G. Mably, “*Du gouvernement et des lois de Pologne*” in: *Collection complète des œuvres*, t. 8, Paris, 1794 à 1795.)

An allusion to the conduct of the representatives of the party of the big bourgeoisie—the Girondists—after they had been removed from government and the Jacobins established their dictatorship in France following the popular uprising of May 31-June 2, 1793. In the summer of the same year the Girondists rose in revolt against the Jacobin government to defend the rights of the departments to autonomy and federation. After the revolt had been suppressed many Girondist leaders (Barbeyroux among them) were sentenced by the revolutionary tribunal and executed.

*Le Comité de salut public* (The Committee of Public Safety) established by the Convention on April 6, 1793 during the Jacobin dictatorship (June 2, 1793-July 27, 1794) was the leading revolutionary government body in France. It lasted till October 26, 1795.

The reference is to the stories for children written by the German pedagogue J. H. Campe, in particular his book *Die Entdeckung von Amerika*, a section of which was devoted to the Peruvian Incas and the Spanish conquest of Peru.

An allusion to articles which appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, distorting the ideas of utopian communism and socialism and attempting to ascribe communist views to the radical organs of the German press. Marx exposed this attempt in his article “Communism and the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*” published in the *Rheinische Zeitung* of October 16, 1842 (see present edition, Vol. 1).

Engels' work *Principles of Communism* reflects the next stage in the elaboration of the programme of the Communist League following the “Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith”. This new version of the programme was worked out by Engels on the instructions of the Paris circle authority of the Communist League. The decision was adopted after Engels' sharp criticism at the committee meeting, on October 22, 1847, of the draft programme drawn up by the “true socialist” M. Hess, which was then rejected.

Comparison of the text of the *Principles of Communism* with that of the “Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith” proves that the document written by Engels at the end of October 1847 is a revised version of the Draft discussed at the First Congress of the Communist League. The first six points of the Draft were completely revised. Engels had felt compelled at that time to make some concessions in them to the as yet immature views of the League of the Just leaders. Some of these points were omitted in the *Principles*, others substantially changed and put in a different order. In the rest the arrangement of both documents coincides, though there are several new questions in the *Principles*: 5, 6, 10-14, 19, 20 and 24-26.

The *Principles of Communism* constituted the immediate basis for the preliminary version of the *Communist Manifesto*. In his letter of November 23-24, 1847 to Marx Engels wrote about the advisability of drafting the programme in the form of a communist manifesto, rejecting the old form of a catechism. In writing the *Manifesto* the founders of Marxism used some propositions formulated in the *Principles of Communism*. 
The *Principles of Communism* were published for the first time in English in *The Plebs-Magazine*, London, in July 1914-January 1915; a separate edition was put out in Chicago in 1925 (The Daily Workers Publishing Co.), in subsequent years they were published several times together with the *Communist Manifesto*. 

156 See Note 70.

157 The reference is to class-divided societies. Subsequently Engels thought it necessary to make special mention of the fact that in their works written in the 1840s, while touching upon the problem of class antagonisms and class struggle in history, Marx and he made no mention of the primitive classless stage of human development because the history of that stage had as yet been but little studied. (See Engels' note to the English edition of the *Communist Manifesto*, 1888, this volume, p. 482).

158 In the Appendix to the 1887 American edition of *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (first published in 1845) and also in the Preface to the English edition and in the Preface to the Second German edition (1892), Engels wrote about the recurrence of crises: "The recurring period of the great industrial crisis is stated in the text as five years. This was the period apparently indicated by the course of events from 1825 to 1842. But the industrial history from 1842 to 1868 has shown that the real period is one of ten years; that the intermediate revulsions were secondary, and tended more and more to disappear."

159 The conclusion that the victory of the proletarian revolution was possible only simultaneously in the advanced capitalist countries, and hence impossible in one country alone, first made by Marx and Engels in *The German Ideology* (see present edition, Vol. 5, Ch. I, 2[5]) and most definitely formulated in the *Principles of Communism*, was arrived at in the period of pre-monopoly capitalism. However, in their later works Marx and Engels found it necessary to give this proposition a more flexible form stressing the fact that a proletarian revolution should be understood as a considerably prolonged and complex process which could develop initially in several main capitalist countries. See, for example, K. Marx, "Revelations about the Cologne Trial" (1853), Marx's letter of February 12, 1870 to Engels and Engels' letter of September 12, 1882 to Kautsky. Under new historical conditions, Lenin, proceeding from the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism in the era of imperialism, came to the conclusion that the socialist revolution could first triumph either in only a few countries or even in a single country. This conclusion was first formulated by Lenin in his article "On the Slogan of the United States of Europe" (1915).

160 See Note 38.

161 This article, written by Engels for *La Réforme* was reprinted in *The Northern Star* No. 524, November 6, 1847 with the following editorial introduction: "The following article, translated from the *Réforme*, the most able of the French journals, and a consistent supporter of the rights of labour in all countries, will cheer the working classes of England with the proud consolation, that henceforth the battle of universal liberty is not to be confined within the limits of our Sea-bound dungeon."

162 The reference is to the Chartist Land Cooperative Society founded on the initiative of O'Connor in 1845 (later the National Land Company, it lasted till 1848). The aim of the Society was to buy plots of land with the money collected and to lease them to worker shareholders on easy terms. Among the positive
aspects of the Society's activity were its petitions to Parliament and printed propaganda against the aristocracy's monopoly on land. However, the idea of liberating the workers from exploitation, of reducing unemployment, etc., by returning them to the land proved utopian. The Society's activity had no practical success.

Subsequently, in the "Third International Review" written in autumn 1850 Marx and Engels stressed that the failure of the Land Society was inevitable. They emphasised at the same time that for a while the workers could mistake O'Connor's project for a revolutionary measure only because objectively it was directed against big landownership and thus accorded with the tendency of bourgeois revolutions to break up the big landed estates; only the demand for nationalisation of land put forward somewhat later by the Chartists revolutionary wing (O'Brien, Ernest Jones and others) corresponded to the true interests of the working class (it was included into the Charter programme of 1851).

Engels thought of sending a detailed report on the activities of the Land Society to La Réforme as can be seen from the second part of the article; but apparently he never wrote it, though he reproduced the content of petitions adopted later by this Society in his report "Chartist Agitation" (see this volume, pp. 412-14).

The banquet in London on October 25, 1847 was to celebrate the election of the Chartist leader Feargus O'Connor and a number of radicals to Parliament. The elections took place on August 5, 1847 in Nottingham. The account of the banquet used by Engels in this article was published in The Northern Star No. 523, October 30, 1847.

The demand for so-called complete suffrage, expressed vaguely in a way capable of varying interpretation, was proposed by the representatives of the English radical bourgeoisie in the early 1840s to counter the Chartist social and political programme laid down in the People's Charter and the Chartist petitions. Early in 1842 the radical J. Sturge, who was close to the free traders, tried to found a universal suffrage league in Birmingham with the aim of diverting the workers from revolutionary struggle for the Charter. However, the efforts of Sturge and his adherents to influence the Chartist movement and use it for their own ends were resolutely rebuffed by the Chartist revolutionary wing.

Later, however, the radicals went on trying to replace the Chartists' struggle for universal suffrage and fundamental reform of the parliamentary system with a movement for moderate parliamentary reforms.

The reference is to the July revolution of 1830 in France.

The National Chartist Association, founded in July 1840, was the first mass workers' party in the history of the working-class movement. In the years of its upsurge it numbered up to 50,000 members. It was headed by an Executive Committee which was re-elected at congresses and conferences of delegates. The Association initiated many political campaigns and Chartists' conventions. However, its work was hindered by lack of ideological and political unity and a certain organisational vagueness. After the defeat of the Chartists in 1848 and the ensuing split in their ranks the Association lost its mass character, but nevertheless under the leadership of the revolutionary Chartists waged a struggle for the revival of Chartistism on a socialist basis. It ceased its activities in 1858.

On the parliamentary reform of 1831-32 in England see Note 33.
The reference is to the Constitution of the French Republic adopted by the Convention during the Jacobins' revolutionary rule, the most democratic of bourgeois constitutions in the 18th and 19th centuries: it established the republican system, proclaimed freedom of the individual, of conscience, of the press, of petitioning, of legislative initiative, the right to education, social relief in case of inability, resistance to oppression.

*The Northern Star* No. 523, October 30, 1847, published excerpts from Alphonse Lamartine's article "Déclaration de principes", originally printed in the newspaper *Le Bien Public* in Mâcon.

See Note 18.

The reference is to comments of the Paris newspapers *La Démocratie pacifique*, October 25 and 26, 1847, *La Presse*, October 24, 1847 and others on Lamartine's programme.

This article was occasioned by the civil war in Switzerland unleashed by the seven economically backward Catholic cantons which in 1843 formed a separatist union—the Sonderbund—to resist progressive bourgeois reforms and defend the privileges of the church and the Jesuits. The reactionary actions of the Sonderbund headed by the Catholics and the city patricians were opposed by bourgeois radicals and liberals who in the mid-40s were in the majority in most of the cantons and in the Swiss Diet, the supreme legislative body of the Swiss Confederation. In July 1847 the Diet decreed the dissolution of the Sonderbund, and this served as a pretext for the latter to start hostilities against other cantons early in November. On November 23 the Sonderbund army was defeated by the Federal forces. As a result of this victory and the adoption of a new constitution in 1848, Switzerland, formerly a union of states, became a federal state.

The struggle between radicals on the one side and reactionary patriarchal patricians and clericals on the other attracted Engels' attention as early as 1844, when he described it in his article, "The Civil War in the Valais", published in *The Northern Star* No. 344, June 15, 1844 (see present edition, Vol. 3).

In the present article Engels contrasted modern civilisation to patriarchal backwardness, exposing the Swiss reactionaries and their attempts to link counter-revolutionary separatist aims with the historical traditions of the Swiss people. Engels considered Switzerland's past from this point of view. As a result he presented a somewhat distorted picture of certain periods of its history, particularly the struggle against Austria and Burgundy in the Middle Ages which was anti-feudal on the whole. In his later works of 1856-59 on the history of warfare ("Mountain Warfare", "Infantry", etc.) Engels showed the great historical significance of Switzerland's struggle for independence in the 14th and 15th centuries. Engels also changed his view of the peasants' role in Norway (in the article the stress was laid on their patriarchal traditions). In "Reply to Herr Paul Ernest" (1890) Engels pointed out in particular that the existence of free peasants who had not experienced serfdom had a positive effect on Norway's historical development though it was a backward country due to isolation and natural peculiarities.

In the battle of *Sempach* (Canton of Lucerne) on July 9, 1386 the Swiss defeated the Austrian troops of Prince Leopold III.

At *Murten* (Canton of Freiberg) on June 22, 1476 the Swiss defeated the troops of Carl the Bold, Duke of Burgundy.
Engels uses this term in relation to the mountain cantons which in the 13th and 14th 
centuries formed the nucleus of the Swiss Confederation.  

The battle in the *Teutoburg Forest* (9 A.D.) ended in the rout of the Roman legions by  
the Germanic tribes who had risen against the Roman conquerors.  

The battle of *Morgarten* between the Swiss volunteers and the troops of Leopold of  
Hapsburg on November 15, 1315 ended in victory for the volunteers.  

*Marathon, Plataea and Salamis*—sites of important battles won by the Greeks  
during the wars between Greece and Persia (500-449 B.C.).  

The *Griüti oath*—one of the legends woven round the foundation of the Swiss  
Confederation, the origin of which dates back to the agreement of the three  
mountain cantons of Schwyz, Uri and Unterwalden in 1291. According to this  
legend representatives of the three cantons met in 1307 in the Grüüti (Rüti)  
meadow and took an oath of loyalty in the joint struggle against Austrian rule.  

At *Granson* (Canton of Vaud), on March 2, 1476, the Swiss infantry defeated Carl  
the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. At *Nancy* (Lorraine), on January 5, 1477, the troops of  
Carl the Bold were routed by the Swiss, the Lorrainians, the Alsatians and the  
Germans.  

The account of the banquet at Château-Rouge was published in *The Northern Star*  
No. 508, July 17, 1847.  

The quotation consists of extracts from the leading articles of the *Journal des Débats*,  
July 13, 15, 18, 19, and August 7, 1847.  

See Note 90.  

See Note 11.  

The events described here took place in Paris at the end of August and the begin-  
nning of September 1847. They were provoked by a conflict between shoemakers at a  
workshop in the Rue St. Honoré and their master, who tried to defraud one of the  
workers of part of his pay.  

See Note 50.  

This article was first published in English in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *On  
Britain*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1953.  

The session of Parliament opened on November 18, 1847. The democratic forces  
were represented by the Chartist leader, Feargus O'Connor.  

See Note 166.  

See Note 1.  

The *International League*, or the People's International League, was founded in  
1847 by English radicals and free traders. Among its foundation and active mem-  
bers were Thomas Cooper, Sir William Fox, Sir John Bowring and the democratic  
publicist, poet and engraver William James Linton. The League was also joined by  
several Italian, Hungarian and Polish emigrants, Giuseppe Mazzini in particular,  
who was one of its initiators. Its activity was limited to organising meetings and lec-
tures on international problems and distributing pamphlets, and ceased completely in 1848. p. 384

190 In this article Engels used material from La Réforme, November 9, 13, 14 and 16, 1847. The banquets of Lille, Avesnes and Valenciennes were held on November 7, 9 and 11, 1847 respectively. p. 385

191 In 1840, under the pretext of fortifying the capital against the external enemy, the French Government began to erect a number of separate forts around Paris. The July monarchy intended them to help safeguard itself against people's revolts. The democratic circles strongly protested against new “Bastilles” being built in Paris. Most of the bourgeois opposition, however, including the followers of the National, supported the construction of the forts, justifying it by national defence interests. p. 387

192 Marx's and Engels' participation in the international meeting organised by the Fraternal Democrats to mark the anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1830 showed their eagerness to use their stay in London during the Second Congress of the Communist League (end of November-beginning of December 1847) to strengthen contacts with the democratic and workers' organisations in England. As Vice-President of the Brussels Democratic Association Marx was empowered to establish correspondence between the Association and the Fraternal Democrats and to enter into negotiations on the organisation of an international democratic congress (for details see Note 206).

Concerning the Polish meeting and the reception accorded the German democrats, see this volume, pp. 391-92.

Apart from the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung, the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung No. 140, December 3, 1847 and The Northern Star No. 528, December 4, 1847 also gave an account of the speeches made by Marx and Engels at the meeting. p. 388

193 This item was in the form of a letter to the editor of La Réforme. p. 391

194 The Democratic Association (Association démocratique) was founded in Brussels in the autumn of 1847 and united proletarian revolutionaries, mainly German emigrants and advanced bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats. Marx and Engels took an active part in setting up the Association. On November 15, 1847 Marx was elected its Vice-President (the President was Lucien Jottrand, a Belgian democrat), and under his influence it became a centre of the international democratic movement. During the February 1848 revolution in France, the proletarian wing of the Brussels Democratic Association sought to arm the Belgian workers and to intensify the struggle for a democratic republic. However, when Marx was banished from Brussels in March 1848 and the most revolutionary elements were repressed by the Belgian authorities its activity assumed a narrower, purely local character and in 1849 the Association ceased to exist.

Fraternal Democrats—see Note 1. p. 391

195 See Note 189. p. 392

196 See Note 145. p. 394

197 The banquet of Dijon, described by Engels, was held on November 21, 1847 and a report on it was given in La Réforme on November 24 and 25. Engels repeated his criticism of Louis Blanc's banquet speech somewhat later in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung (see this volume, pp. 409-11). p. 397
198 The reference is to the military alliance concluded in 1778 between Louis XVI and the United States of America during the American War of Independence (1775-83) and to the participation of the French expeditionary corps and navy in the hostilities against England—France's trade and colonial rival. p. 398

199 The reference is to the entry of the French republican army into the Netherlands in January 1795 in support of a local uprising against the aristocratic regime of the Stadholder Wilhelm V. The latter was deposed and the Batavian Republic was established (1795-1806), which soon became dependent on Napoleonic France. p. 398

200 For the meaning in which Engels uses the word “cosmopolitism” see Note 8. p. 398

201 In his polemic with Blanc Engels made no attempt to disclose the real nature of the bourgeois “civilisation” the capitalist states were spreading in the economically backward countries. He concentrated here on exposing Louis Blanc’s nationalistic bombast about France’s so-called civilising role. In their later articles and letters devoted to India, Ireland, China and Iran, Marx and Engels showed that these countries were drawn into the orbit of capitalist relations through their colonial enslavement by capitalist states. They were turned into agrarian and raw material appendages of the metropolis, their natural resources were plundered and their peoples cruelly exploited by the colonialists. The disastrous consequences of English rule in India were described by Marx, in particular, in his “Speech on the Question of Free Trade” (see this volume, pp. 460-61 and 464). p. 399

202 In the latter half of the 16th century the struggle between England and Spain caused by colonial rivalry was closely interwoven with the Netherlands revolution of 1566-1609. The defeat of the Invincible Spanish Armada in 1588 and other victories scored by England over Spain made it easier for the Dutch republic (the United Provinces) to resist the attempts of Spanish absolutism to restore its domination in that region of the Netherlands. In the war against Spain at that period the English and the Dutch often acted as allies. p. 399

203 The reference is to the English revolution of the mid-17th century which led to the eventual establishment of the bourgeois system in the country. p. 399

204 This rhyme was popular among the peasant rebels led by Wat Tyler in 1381 in England. It was widely used by John Ball, one of the leaders of the rebel peasants, in his sermons. It is apparently a paraphrase of the verse by the 14th-century English poet, Richard Rolle de Hampole:

When Adam dalfe and Eve spanne
To spire of Hou may spede,
Where was then the pride of man,
That now marres his meed? p. 400

205 Covenanters—the Scottish Calvinists of the 16th and 17th centuries who concluded special agreements and alliances (covenants) to defend their religion against encroachments on the part of the aristocratic circles tending to Catholicism. On the eve of the 17th-century English revolution the Covenant became for the Scots the political and ideological rallying point of struggle against the absolutism of the Stuarts, for their country’s independence. p. 400
From the autumn of 1847 onwards the Brussels Democratic Association (see Note 194) discussed the question of convening an international democratic congress to rally the European revolutionary forces in view of impending revolutionary events. Marx and Engels took an active part in preparing for that congress. When in London, at the Second Congress of the Communist League, Marx had talks on the subject with the Chartist leaders and representatives of the proletarian and democratic emigrants. Engels apparently had similar talks with French socialists and democrats. In the beginning of 1848 an agreement was reached to convene the congress in Brussels. It was scheduled for August 25, 1848, the 18th anniversary of the Belgian revolution (see this volume, p. 640). These plans did not materialise, however, because in February 1848 a revolution began in Europe.

This item is Marx's reply to an article by a Belgian publicist, Adolph Bartels, published in the Journal de Charleroi on December 12, 1847. Bartels distorted the activity of the revolutionary emigrants resident in Belgium and attacked in particular the communist views of the proletarian German emigrants, their Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung and the international meeting which they helped to organise in London on November 29, 1847 to mark the 17th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1830.

Bartels' article reflected bourgeoisie's dissatisfaction at the growing influence of the proletarian revolutionaries in the Belgian democratic movement, particularly in the Brussels Democratic Association (see Note 194; Bartels was a foundation member but soon broke away). The article coincided in time with a campaign of slander launched by the Belgian clerical and conservative press, and primarily by the Journal de Bruxelles, against the revolutionary German emigrants.

The German Workers' Society was founded by Marx and Engels in Brussels at the end of August 1847, its aim being the political education of the German workers who lived in Belgium and dissemination of the ideas of scientific communism among them. With Marx, Engels and their followers at its head, the Society became the legal centre rallying the revolutionary proletarian forces in Belgium. Its best activists were members of the Communist League. The Society played an important part in founding the Brussels Democratic Association. It ceased to exist soon after the February 1848 revolution in France when the Belgian police arrested and banished many of its members.

The Journal de Bruxelles of December 14, 1847, gave a distorted account of Marx's speech at the Polish meeting in London on November 29, 1847.

Congregatio de propaganda fide—a Catholic organisation founded by the Pope in 1622 with the aim of spreading Catholicism in all countries and fighting heresies.

Marx refers to the report published in The Northern Star of December 4, 1847 on the London meeting of November 29 in support of fighting Poland. Marx's speech was abridged and inaccurately rendered.

Lamartine's letter was published in a number of other papers besides Le Bien Public, in particular in La Presse, L'Union monarchique, and as a leaflet entitled Opinion du citoyen Lamartine sur le communisme. It was a reply to Etienne Cabet who through the newspaper Populaire requested Lamartine to give his opinion of Cabet's communist views.
Engels' articles in support of the newspaper *La Réforme* in its dispute with the moderate republicans of *Le National* drew the attention of the staff of *La Réforme* and met with their approval, especially that of Ferdinand Flocon, one of its editors. He praised Engels' articles on this subject in *The Northern Star* (see this volume, pp. 375-82, 385-87, 438-44) and in the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* (this article), as Engels informed Marx in a letter of January 14, 1848 from Paris.

The dynastic opposition—an oppositional group in the French Chamber of Deputies during the July monarchy (1830-48). The group headed by Odilon Barrot expressed the sentiments of the liberal industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, and favoured a moderate electoral reform, which they regarded as a means to prevent revolution and preserve the Orleans dynasty.

Octrois—city tolls on imported consumer goods, existed in France from the 13th century up to 1949.

The conspiratorial *Society of Materialistic Communists* was founded by French workers in the 1840s. Its members were influenced by the ideas of Théodore Dézamy, a representative of the revolutionary and materialist trend in French utopian communism.

The trial mentioned by Engels took place in July 1847. The members of the Society were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment.

The article “Louis Blanc's Speech at the Dijon Banquet” is a version of Engels' report “Reform Movement in France.—Banquet of Dijon” published in *The Northern Star* No. 530, December 18, 1847 (see this volume, pp. 397-401). The *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* published its own version in the form of extracts from *The Northern Star* report. The introductory lines were written by Engels specially for this version, the rest of the text, including the quotation from Louis Blanc's speech, was a translation into German of the part of the report where this speech was criticised. The translation was made almost word for word with but slight deviations which are reproduced here.

For comments on the text, see notes 197-203.

The translation of the National Petition was not published in *La Réforme*.

In the latter half of December 1847 Marx delivered several lectures on political economy in the German Workers' Society in Brussels and intended to prepare them for publication in pamphlet form. However, as he later pointed out in the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859), he did not manage to publish his work *Wage-Labour*, written on the basis of these lectures, because of the February 1848 revolution and his subsequent expulsion from Belgium. Marx's intention to publish these lectures in the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* did not materialise either, though on January 6, 1848 the newspaper carried the following note: “At one of the previous meetings of the German Workers' Society Karl Marx made a report on an important subject, 'What Are Wages?' in which the question was presented so clearly, pertinently and comprehensively, the present situation so sharply criticised and practical arguments cited that we intend soon to make it known to our readers.”

Marx's lectures appeared in their final form only in April 1849 in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* as the series of articles *Wage-Labour and Capital* (see present edition, Vol. 9). This series was not finished and did not embrace the whole content of Marx's lectures.
Published below is a draft outline of the concluding lectures which Marx had no time to prepare for the press. The manuscript, whose cover bears the words: "Brussels, December 1847", completes Wage-Labour and Capital.

The quotations cited in the original in German are either a free translation or paraphrase of writings by various economists and are taken by Marx, as a rule, from his notebooks of 1845-47.

For the use of terms “commodity labour”, “value of labour” and “price of labour”, see Note 70.

The first four points refer to those of Marx’s lectures which were published in the articles entitled Wage-Labour and Capital.

The data on the working hours and the number of weavers were taken by Marx from Th. Carlyle’s Chartism, London, 1840, p. 31, where we read: “Half-a-million handloom weavers, working fifteen hours a day, in perpetual inability to procure thereby enough of the coarsest food…”.

An excerpt from Bowring’s speech in the House of Commons was used by Marx in his “Speech on the Question of Free Trade” (see this volume, pp. 460-61).

Marx had in mind Carlyle’s words about the English Poor Laws: “If paupers are made miserable, paupers will needs decline in multitude. It is a secret known to all rat-catchers: stop up the granary-crevices, afflict with continual mewing, alarm, and going off of traps, your ‘chargeable labourers’ disappear, and cease from the establishment. A still briefer method is that of arsenic; perhaps even a milder…” (Th. Carlyle, Chartism, p. 17). The words “chargeable labourers” are in English in the manuscript.

Marx meant the following passage in J. Wade’s History of the Middle and Working Classes, p. 252: “The quantity of employment is not uniform in any branch of industry. It may be affected by changes of seasons, the alterations of fashion, or the vicissitudes of commerce.”

The reference is to piece-rate wages (see J. Wade, op. cit., p. 267).

Concerning the truck system (Marx used the English term in the manuscript) Babbage wrote: “Wherever the workmen are paid in goods, or are compelled to purchase at the master’s shop, much injustice is done to them, and great misery results from it.” “...The temptation to the master, in times of depression, to reduce in effect the wages which he pays (by increasing the price of articles at his shop), without altering the nominal rate of payment, is frequently too great to be withstood” (Ch. Babbage, On the Economy of Machinery and Manufactures, second edition, Ld., 1832, p. 304). At the time Marx apparently used the French translation of Babbage’s book (Paris, 1833).

Marx gave part of this paragraph in a more extended form in his Wage-Labour and Capital, Article V.

See Note 225.

In his notes from Th. Carlyle’s Chartism, Marx quotes the following passage: “Ireland has near seven millions of working people, the third unit of whom, it appears by Statistic Science, has not for thirty weeks each year as many third-rate potatoes as will suffice them” (p. 25).
The reference is to the war waged by the German people against Napoleon's rule in 1813-14.

Later, when Marx had worked out the theory of surplus value and made a more thorough study of the nature of wages, and the laws determining their rate and level, he came to the conclusion that, contrary to bourgeois economists' opinion, the trade union struggle for higher wages and a shorter working day was of great economic importance and could obtain for the workers more favourable terms for the sale of their labour power to the capitalists. Marx set forth his new point of view in *Wages, Price and Profit* (1865) and in Volume I of *Capital* (1867).

In 1846 the Guizot Government managed to arrange the marriage of the Spanish infanta and Louis Philippe's youngest son and thwart England's plans to marry Leopold of Coburg to Isabella II of Spain. In 1847, during the civil war in Switzerland, the British Foreign Secretary Palmerston avenged this failure of English diplomacy. He persuaded Guizot to espouse a project according to which the five powers were to interfere on the side of the Sonderbund but at the same time secretly assisted the latter's defeat. Guizot's diplomatic manoeuvres suffered a complete failure.

The workers were shot at Lyons during the weavers' uprisings in 1831 and 1834. Clashes between workers and troops at Preston took place in August 1842, when spontaneous Chartist disturbances swept through industrial England. Langenbielau (Silesia) was a centre of the weavers' uprising in June 1844. Government troops shot down the rebels. In Prague government troops suppressed the workers' revolt in the summer of 1844.

The reference is to the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* (Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen)—the first part of the French republican constitution of 1793 adopted by the National Convention after the overthrow of the monarchy on August 10, 1792.

Chant du départ (Marching Song)—one of the most popular songs of the French Revolution (its authors were Chénier and Méhul). It also remained popular later.

See Note 191.

The reference is to the *Constitutional Charter* (Charte constitutionnelle) adopted after the 1830 revolution. It was the fundamental law of the July monarchy.

This article was first published in English in the book, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.

King's County was the name given by the English conquerors to the county of Offaly (Central Ireland) in honour of Philip II of Spain, husband of Mary Tudor, Queen of England. At the same time the neighbouring county of Laoighis (Leix) was renamed Queen's County.

The Anglo-Irish Union was imposed on Ireland by the English Government after the suppression of the Irish rebellion of 1798. The Union, which came into force on January 1, 1801, abrogated the autonomy of the Irish Parliament and made Ireland even more dependent on England. After the 1820s the demand for the repeal of the Union was a mass issue in Ireland, but the Irish liberals who headed the national
movement, O'Connell among them, regarded agitation for the repeal only as a means to wrest concessions from the English Government in favour of the Irish bourgeoisie and landowners. In 1835, O'Connell came to an agreement with the English Whigs and discontinued agitation altogether. Under the pressure of the mass movement, however, the Irish liberals were compelled in 1840 to set up the Repeal Association, which they tried to direct towards compromise with the English ruling classes.

The repeal of the Union was put up for discussion in Parliament on November 18, and the Coercion Bill on November 29, 1847. Accounts of O'Connor's part in the debates, his suggestions and petitions demanding the repeal of the Union and protesting against the Coercion Bill were given in The Northern Star Nos. 528 and 529, December 4 and 11, 1847.

241 This article was first published in English in the book, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Ireland and the Irish Question, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.

242 Repealers were advocates of the repeal of the Anglo-Irish Union and restoration of the Irish Parliament's autonomy.

243 See Note 240.

244 Conciliation Hall—a public hall in Dublin where meetings were often organised by the Repeal Association.

245 The reference is to the second national petition presented to Parliament by the Chartists in May 1842. Together with the demand for the adoption of the People's Charter, the petition contained a number of other demands, including that of the repeal of the Union of 1801. The petition was rejected by Parliament.

246 The basis of this “Speech on the Question of Free Trade” was the material Marx prepared for a speech he was to have delivered at the Congress of Economists in September 1847 (see this volume, pp. 270-81 and 287-90 and also Note 116), with the addition of new facts and propositions. The Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung of January 6 announced in advance that Marx was to speak on free trade. At the same meeting of January 9 at which Marx made his speech, the Brussels Democratic Association decided to have it published in French and Flemish at the Association's expense. On January 16, 1848, the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung published a report on the meeting and a detailed summary of Marx's speech. "Thanks to Karl Marx's speech on the question of free trade," the report said, "this meeting turned out to be one of the most interesting of all held by the Association. The report in French took more than an hour, and the audience listened with unflagging attention all the time." La Réforme of January 19, 1848, also carried an item by Bornstedt on Marx's speech.

The speech was published as a pamphlet in French (Discours sur la question du libre échange. Prononcé à l'Association Démocratique de Bruxelles, dans la séance publique du 9 Janvier 1848, par Charles Marx. Imprimé aux frais de l'Association Démocratique) at the end of January 1848. The Flemish edition apparently did not materialise. The Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung published its first notification of the publication on February 3. That same year the pamphlet was translated into German and published in Hamm (Germany) by Joseph Weydemeyer together with the beginning of the speech Marx was to have delivered at the Congress of Economists (Zwei Reden über die Freihandels- und Schutzollfrage von Karl Marx. Aus dem Französischen übersetzt und mit einem Vorwort und erläuternden Anmerkungen versehen von J. Weydemeyer. Hamm, 1848). In 1885 this work was republished on
Engels' wish as a supplement to the first German edition of *The Poverty of Philosophy* which he had prepared, and since then it has repeatedly been republished with that work.

"The Speech on the Question of Free Trade" was first published in English in 1888 in Boston (USA) under Engels' supervision. He actually edited the translation made by Florence Kelley-Wischnewetzky, an American socialist. In a letter of May 2, 1888, Engels wrote to her that he had brought her translation, made from the German version of 1885, nearer to the French original and in several places had "for the sake of clearness taken more liberties". Engels wrote a preface for this edition which was published earlier (July 1888) in German in the journal *Die Neue Zeit* as an article entitled "Protectionism and Free Trade". The American edition of the pamphlet appeared in September 1888 (1889 on the title page). Its title was: *Free Trade. A Speech Delivered before the Democratic Club, Brussels, Belgium, Jan. 9, 1848.* With Extract from *La Misère de la Philosophie* by Karl Marx. Engels was satisfied with the edition (see his letter of September 18, 1888 to Kelley-Wischnewetzky). In this volume "The Speech on the Question of Free Trade" is given in the English translation edited by Engels, except for the title which corresponds to the original. Retained are some technical peculiarities of the Boston edition, e.g., paragraphing which somewhat differs in this respect from the French edition of 1848. Where the texts of the 1888 and 1848 editions differ in meaning this is pointed out in a footnote. Pages of sources quoted by Marx are given in brackets. Reference is also made for the reader's convenience to the English editions of Ricardo and Ure (Third Edition, London, 1821 and Second Edition, London, 1835—respectively) which Marx made use of in French translations at that time.

247 See Note 28.

248 See Note 47.

249 See Note 76.

250 The address "The Fraternal Democrats (assembling in London), to the working classes of Great Britain and Ireland" was adopted at the Society's meeting on January 3, 1848 and published in *The Northern Star* No. 533, January 8, 1848. It is quoted below abridged.

251 Luneau's interpellation in the Chamber of Deputies concerning the sale of appointments in the Finance Ministry was answered in the negative by the then Minister of Finance, Lacave-Laplagne, on June 13, 1846. The publication of Petit's pamphlet and the sharp reaction to it on the part of the public caused *La Réforme* to publish extracts from the above interchange between Luneau and the Minister of Finance, and also the speech on this subject made by H. M. Dupin, an opposition deputy (quoted by Engels below).

252 The liberation struggle of the Algerians led by Emir Abd-el-Kader against the French colonialists lasted with short interruptions from 1832 to 1847. Between 1839 and 1844, the French used their considerable military superiority to conquer Abd-el-Kader's state in Western Algeria. However, he continued guerrilla warfare relying on the help of the sultan of Morocco, and when the latter was defeated in the Franco-Moroccan war of 1844, Abd-el-Kader hid in the Sahara oases. The last stage of this struggle was an insurrection in Western Algeria in 1845-47 which was put down by the French colonialists.
In one of his reports published in *The Northern Star* in 1844 Engels commended the resistance of the local population to the French colonisation of Algeria (see present edition, Vol. 3, pp. 528-29). In this article (1847) Engels considered the Algerian movement under Abd-el-Kader from a different angle. As the text below shows, he denounced the barbaric methods used by bourgeois France in the conquest of Algeria, but saw this as the inevitable way in which capitalist relations superseded more backward feudal and patriarchal ones and regarded any opposition to this process as doomed to failure. Engels' judgment was undoubtedly influenced by the ideas he then had of the proximity of a socialist revolution in the developed countries, which was to put an end for ever to all social and national oppression. He thought that favourable preconditions for this revolution were created by backward countries being drawn into the orbit of capitalism with its centralising and levelling tendencies, despite all their negative aspects. This judgment was not final, however. Later, after a deeper study of the history of colonial conquests and the resistance of the oppressed masses to colonial domination, Engels emphasised the liberating and progressive nature of the struggle of oppressed peoples against the capitalist colonial system which helped create favourable conditions for the working class to overthrow the capitalist system. It was from this point of view, in particular, that he described the liberation movement of the Algerians in the article "Algeria" written for the *New American Encyclopaedia* in 1857.

253 Here the editors of *The Northern Star* gave the following note: "This letter should have reached us last week, but was only delivered to us, by the friend who brought it from Paris, on Tuesday last. Before this time our correspondent will have discovered his error in imagining for a moment the possibility of Louis Philippe, or his man of all work, performing a just or generous action. Abd-el-Kader will not be sent to Egypt; he is to be kept a close prisoner in France. Another specimen of the honour of kings!—the honour of Philippe the Infamous!"

Abd-el-Kader was held in France as a prisoner for about five years. Only in 1852 was he permitted to move to Damascus, Syria.

254 See Note 162.

255 *St. Stephen's Chapel*, where the House of Commons sat since 1547, was destroyed by fire in 1834.

256 'Change Alley—a street in London, where the Board of South Sea Company (founded in the beginning of the 18th century) had its offices; a place where all kinds of money operations and speculative deals were conducted.

257 *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* was written by Marx and Engels as the Communist League's programme on the instruction of its Second Congress (London, November 29-December 8, 1847), which signified a victory for the followers of the new proletarian doctrine who had upheld its principles during the discussion of the programme questions.

When Congress was still in preparation, Marx and Engels arrived at the conclusion that the final programme document should be in the form of a Party manifesto (see Engels' letter to Marx of November 23-24, 1847). The catechism form usual for the secret societies of the time and retained in the "Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith" and *Principles of Communism* (see this volume, pp. 96-103 and 341-57), was not suitable for a full and substantial exposition of the new revolutionary world outlook, for a comprehensive formulation of the proletarian movement's aims and tasks.
Marx and Engels began working together on the *Manifesto* while they were still in London immediately after the congress, and continued until about December 13 when Marx returned to Brussels; they resumed their work four days later (December 17) when Engels arrived there. After Engels' departure for Paris at the end of December and up to his return on January 31, Marx worked on the *Manifesto* alone.

Hurried by the Central Authority of the Communist League which provided him with certain documents (e.g., addresses of the People's Chamber (Halle) of the League of the Just of November 1846 and February 1847, and, apparently, documents of the First Congress of the Communist League pertaining to the discussion of the Party programme), Marx worked intensively on the *Manifesto* through almost the whole of January 1848. At the end of January the manuscript was sent on to London to be printed in the German Workers' Educational Society's printshop owned by a German emigrant J. E. Burghard, a member of the Communist League.

The manuscript of the *Manifesto* has not survived. The only extant materials written in Marx's hand are a draft plan for Section III, showing his efforts to improve the structure of the *Manifesto*, and a page of a rough copy (both are published in this volume in the section "From the Preparatory Materials", pp. 576 and 577-78).

The *Manifesto* came off the press at the end of February 1848. On February 29, the Educational Society decided to cover all the printing expenses.

The first edition of the *Manifesto* was a 23-page pamphlet in a dark green cover. In April-May 1848 another edition was put out. The text took up 30 pages, some misprints of the first edition were corrected, and the punctuation improved. Subsequently this text was used by Marx and Engels as a basis for later authorised editions. Between March and July 1848 the *Manifesto* was printed in the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*, a democratic newspaper of the German emigrants. Already that same year numerous efforts were made to publish the *Manifesto* in other European languages. A Danish, a Polish (in Paris) and a Swedish (under a different title: "The Voice of Communism. Declaration of the Communist Party") editions appeared in 1848. The translations into French, Italian and Spanish made at that time remained unpublished. In April 1848, Engels, then in Barmen, was translating the *Manifesto* into English, but he managed to translate only half of it, and the first English translation, made by Helen Macfarlane, was not published until two years later, between June and November 1850, in the Chartist journal *The Red Republican*. Its editor, Julian Harney, named the authors for the first time in the introduction to this publication. All earlier and many subsequent editions of the *Manifesto* were anonymous.

The growing emancipation struggle of the proletariat in the 60s and 70s of the last century led to new editions of the *Manifesto*. The year 1872 saw a new German edition with minor corrections and a preface by Marx and Engels where they drew some conclusions from the experience of the Paris Commune of 1871. This and subsequent German editions (1883 and 1890) were entitled the *Communist Manifesto*. In 1872 the *Manifesto* was first published in America in *Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly*.

The first Russian edition of the *Manifesto*, translated by Mikhail Bakunin with some distortions, appeared in Geneva in 1869. The faults of this edition were removed in the 1882 edition (translation by Georgi Plekhanov), for which Marx and Engels, who attributed great significance to the dissemination of Marxism in Russia, had written a special preface.

After Marx's death, the *Manifesto* ran into several editions. Engels read through them all, wrote prefaces for the 1883 German edition and for the 1888 English edi-
tion in Samuel Moore's translation, which he also edited and supplied with notes. This edition served as a basis for many subsequent editions of the Manifesto in English—in Britain, the United States and the USSR. In 1890, Engels prepared a further German edition, wrote a new preface to it, and added a number of notes. In 1885, the newspaper Le Socialiste published the French translation of the Manifesto made by Marx's daughter Laura Lafargue and read by Engels. He also wrote prefaces to the 1892 Polish and 1893 Italian editions.

The 1888 English edition is taken as the basis for the present publication. All the differences in reading between this and the German editions and also Engels' notes to it and to the 1890 German edition are given in footnotes.

258 See Note 70.

259 The Ten-Hours' Bill, the struggle for which was carried on a number of years, was passed in 1847 (see Note 76) in the atmosphere of acute contradictions between the landed aristocracy and the industrial bourgeoisie caused by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 (see notes 28 and 47). To avenge themselves on the industrial bourgeoisie some of the Tories supported this Bill. A detailed description of the stand taken by various classes on the problem of limiting the working day was given by Engels in his articles "The Ten Hours Question" and "The English Ten-Hours' Bill" (present edition, Vol. 10).

260 In the Preface to the 1872 German edition of the Communist Manifesto the authors particularly pointed out that "no special stress is laid" on the transitional revolutionary measures proposed at the end of Section II, and that the concrete character and practical application of such measures would always depend on the historical conditions of the time.

261 See Note 61.

262 An allusion to Immanuel Kant's Kritik der praktischen Vernunft (Critique of Practical Reason), published just before the French Revolution (1788).

263 Réformistes (referred to below as Social-Democrats, this volume, p. 518)—see Note 60.

264 See Note 38.

265 See Note 55.

266 This article was first published in English in the book, K. Marx and F. Engels, The Communist Manifesto, Lawrence, London, 1930.

267 The reference is to the Prussian United Diet convened in April 1847 (see Note 51), which the Prussian ruling circles considered as the maximum constitutional concession to the liberal bourgeoisie. To counter the demands of the opposition the Prussian king and his supporters tried to substitute this assembly representing the estates for a genuinely representative one. The fact that the majority of the Diet refused to vote the new loans and taxes showed, however, how far the conflict between the monarchy and the bourgeoisie had gone.

268 See Note 172.
The reference is to the bourgeois revolution in Belgium (autumn 1830) which resulted in Belgium's secession from the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the establishment there of the constitutional monarchy of the Coburg dynasty.

After the July 1830 revolution in France, the movement for liberal reforms intensified also in Switzerland. In a number of cantons, the liberals and radicals succeeded in having the local constitutions revised in a liberal spirit. p. 520

In the beginning of February 1831, revolts took place in a number of provinces of the Papal states—Romagna, Marcia and Umbria—and also the dukedoms of Modena and Parma. They were instigated by the carbonari, members of bourgeois and aristocratic revolutionary secret societies. In the course of this bourgeois revolution in Central Italy an attempt was made to abolish the absolute monarchy (in Modena and Parma), to deprive the Pope of temporal power (in Romagna) and to form a new, larger state—an Alignment of Italian Provinces. The revolt was suppressed by the Austrian army at the end of March 1831. p. 520

From 1833 a moderately liberal constitution was in force in Hanover. A prominent part in drawing it up was played by the historian Dahlmann. In 1837 the King of Hanover, supported by the landowners, abolished the constitution and in 1840 passed a new constitutional Act, which reproduced the main principles of the State Law of 1819 and minimised the rights of the representative institutions. p. 521

The Vienna Conference of ministers of a number of German states was called in 1834 on the initiative of the Austrian Chancellor Metternich and the ruling circles of Prussia to discuss measures to be taken against the liberal opposition and the democratic movement. The conference decided to restrict the rights of the representative institutions which existed in some German states, to intensify censorship, to introduce more strict control over universities and to repress oppositional students' organisations. p. 521

On July 12, 1839, the English Parliament rejected the Chartist petition demanding the adoption of the People's Charter. The Chartists failed in their attempt to organise in reply a general strike and other revolutionary actions, including armed struggle. The miners' revolt in Newport (Wales) in early November 1839, which the Chartists organised, was crushed by troops, and severe repressions followed. p. 521

Sans-Souci (literally "Without Care")—a summer residence of the Prussian kings in Potsdam (near Berlin). p. 521

The reference is to the so-called United Committees consisting of the representatives of the Provincial Diets which met in January 1848 to discuss the draft of a new criminal code. Convening these committees, the Prussian government hoped that the apparent preparation of reforms would calm down the growing public unrest. The work of the committees was interrupted by the revolutionary outbursts that swept over Germany at the beginning of March. p. 522

Engels alludes to the speech of Frederick William IV at the opening of the United Diet on April 11, 1847: "As the heir to an unimpaired crown which I must and will preserve unimpaired for those that shall succeed me...." p. 522
The reference is to the patriotic and reform movement among the liberal nobility and bourgeoisie in Prussia during the country's dependence on Napoleonic France.

**Roman consulta**, or Roman State Council—a consultative body inaugurated by Pope Pius IX in the end of 1847. It included representatives of the liberal landowners and the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie.

_Pifferari_ (from "piffero"—pipe)—herdsmen in the Apennines in Central Italy; a common name for Italian wandering singers.

_Lazzaroni_—a contemptuous nickname for declassed proletarians, primarily in the Kingdom of Naples. Lazzaroni were repeatedly used by the absolutist governments in their struggle against the liberal and democratic movements.

_Pietists_—adherents of a mystical Lutheran trend which arose in Germany in the 17th century and placed religious feeling above religious dogmas. Pietism was directed against the rationalist thinking and philosophy of the Enlightenment and in the 19th century was distinguished by extreme mysticism and hypocrisy.

The reference is to the war of 1846-48 between the United States of America and Mexico; as a result of which the USA seized almost half the Mexican territory, including the whole of Texas, Upper California, New Mexico and other regions.

In assessing these events in his article Engels proceeded from the general conception that it was progressive for patriarchal and feudal countries to be drawn into the orbit of capitalist relations because, he thought, this accelerated the creation of preconditions for a proletarian revolution (see Note 252). In subsequent years however, he and Marx investigated the consequences of colonial conquests and the subjugation of backward countries by large states in all their aspects. In particular, having made a thorough study of the US policy in regard to Mexico and other countries of the American continent, Marx in an article, "The Civil War in the North America" (1861), described it as expansion in the interests of the then dominant slave-owning oligarchy of the Southern States and of the bourgeois elements in the North which supported it, whose overt aim was to seize new territories for spreading slavery.

The project of connecting the Pacific Ocean with the Gulf of Mexico by means of a canal through the Isthmus of Tehuantepec was repeatedly put forward in the USA, which strove to dominate the trade routes and markets in Central America. However, in the 1870s the American capitalists rejected this project, preferring to invest their capital in less expensive railway construction in Mexico.

The reference is to the French army's invasion of Austria during the wars of the European coalitions against the French Republic and Napoleonic France. In March 1797 General Bonaparte's troops defeated the Austrian army in Northern Italy, invaded Austria and launched an offensive on Vienna. This impelled the Austrian government to sign an armistice. In 1805, during the war of England, Austria and Russia against Napoleonic France, most of Austria was occupied by French troops following the capitulation of the Austrian army at Ulm (October 1805). During the Austro-French war of 1809 hostilities took place mainly on Austrian territory and ended in the defeat of the Austrians at Wagram (near Vienna), on July 5 and 6, 1809.
In July 1820 the carbonari, aristocratic and bourgeois revolutionaries, rose in revolt against the absolutist regime in the Kingdom of Naples and succeeded in having a moderate liberal constitution introduced. In March 1821, a revolt took place in the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont). The liberals who headed it proclaimed a constitution and attempted to make use of the anti-Austrian movement in Northern Italy for the unification of the country under the aegis of the Savoy dynasty then in power in Piedmont. Interference by the powers of the Holy Alliance and the occupation of Naples and Piedmont by Austrian troops led to the restoration of absolutist regimes in both states.

For details about the suppression of the revolt in Romagna in 1831 by the Austrians, see Note 271.

During the Polish uprising in the free city of Cracow in 1846 (see Note 55) the Austrian authorities provoked clashes between Ukrainian peasants and detachments of the insurgent nobles in Galicia.

In July 1847, fearing the people’s movement in the Papal states, the Austrian authorities brought in troops to the frontier town of Ferrara. In Rome itself they supported the circles which strove to abolish the liberal reforms of Pius IX. However, the general discontent in Italy caused by the occupation of Ferrara forced the Austrians to withdraw their troops.

The Sonderbund, a separatist alliance of patriarchal and aristocratic cantons, which unleashed civil war in Switzerland in November 1847 (see Note 172), received money and armaments from Austria and France, under the pretext that they were guarantors of Switzerland’s neutrality (under the Paris Treaty of 1815), and counted on their military interference on its side.

In the atmosphere of growing revolutionary unrest in Hungary the Austrian government attempted to seize from the progressive national opposition the initiative in carrying through a number of bourgeois reforms with the aim of splitting its ranks. In 1843 and 1844 Bills were introduced on the development of credit, road construction, the abolition of customs barriers between Austria and Hungary, the regulation of navigation on the Danube, greater representation of cities in the assemblies of the estates, etc. The manoeuvres of the Austrian government could not, however, halt the national movement or make the opposition renounce its demands for radical changes.

Prater—a park in Vienna.

Below Marx gives a critical analysis of the article, “Les Associations démocratiques.—Leur principe.—Leur but” (“Democratic Associations.—Their Principles.—Their Aim”), published in the Belgian radical newspaper Débat social (editor-in-chief A. Bartels) on February 6, 1848.

About the Brussels Democratic Association, see Note 194.

Alliance (founded in 1841) and Association libérale (founded in 1847)—liberal bourgeois political organisations in Belgium.

Marx has in mind Robert Peel’s speech in the House of Commons on June 29, 1846, when the government’s resignation was discussed.

The reference is to the People’s Charter—the main programme of political changes proposed by the Chartists (see Note 48).
References to the discussion on free trade held at the meetings of the Brussels Democratic Association in January and early February 1848. It was initiated by Marx's speech on the question of free trade on January 9 (see this volume, pp. 450-65), in which he opposed the tendency of certain bourgeois democrats to idealise free trade. In this speech Marx expressed the opinion not only of the proletarian section but of the majority of the Democratic Association.

Marx refers to the articles published in the Débat social of February 6, 1848: "Opinion de M. Cobden, sur les dépenses de la guerre et de la marine" ("M. Cobden's opinion of the Expenses on the War and the Navy") and "Discours prononcé par M. Le Hardy de Beaulieu, à la dernière séance de l'Association Belge pour la liberté commerciale" ("Speech by M. Le Hardy de Beaulieu at the Last Meeting of the Belgian Association in Defence of Free Trade").

In November 1847 the King of Sardinia, the Pope and the Duke of Tuscany agreed to convene a conference of Italian states to form a Customs Union. The project of a Customs Union met the interests of the bourgeois circles which strove to unite the country "from above" in the form of a federation of states under the Pope or the Savoy dynasty. However, this plan was frustrated by the 1848-49 revolution in Italy and its defeat in 1849.

On the events of 1823 and 1831 in Italy, see notes 271 and 286.

Prior to the 1848 revolution the movement among the German population in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein against a common constitution with Denmark (the draft constitution was made public on January 28, 1848) was a separatist one and did not go beyond moderate bourgeois opposition. Its aim was to create in the north of Germany yet another small German state dependent on Prussia. During the 1848-49 revolution the situation changed. The events in Germany imparted to the national movement in Schleswig and Holstein a revolutionary, liberation character. The struggle for the secession of these duchies from Denmark became an integral part of the struggle for the national unification of Germany and was resolutely supported by Marx and Engels.

See Note 26.

The reference is to the rescripts of Frederick William IV convening a United Diet in Prussia (see Note 51).

The report on the meeting in Brussels to mark the second anniversary of the Cracow uprising (see Note 55) was published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung on February 24, 1848 (see this volume, p. 644). After the meeting a pamphlet in French was issued, containing the reports of the main speakers. The letters of C. G. Vogler, a German publisher in Brussels, member of the Communist League, to Marx, who on March 5, 1848 moved to Paris after his expulsion from Belgium, show that Marx and Engels took a direct part in the publication of this pamphlet. It came out about March 15, 1848 under the title: "Célébration, à Bruxelles, du deuxième anniversaire de la Révolution Polonaise du 22 février 1846.—Discours prononcés par MM. A. J. Senault, Karl Marx, Lelewel, F. Engels et Louis Lubliner, Avocat, Bruxelles, C. G. Vogler, Libraire-Editeur, 1848." The pamphlet was prefaced with the following short introductory note (possibly written by Marx or Engels):

"Together with the Polish democrats, the Brussels Democratic Association consisting of representatives of various nations celebrated at a public meeting the
second anniversary of the Polish revolution of 1846. The hall was crowded out, and the public most enthusiastically expressed its sympathy for the event.

"Unfortunately, we were unable to reproduce the ardent speeches in Flemish made by two workers, MM. Kats and Pelling. M. Wallau, President of the German Workers' Society in Brussels, himself a working man, spoke in German. His extemporaneous and highly enthusiastic speech testified that the German workers fully share the sentiments of their brothers in France and in England.

"The speeches are given here in the order they were made. They are preceded by the Manifesto of the Provisional Government formed in Cracow on February 22, 1846."

Extracts from Marx's speech were first published in English in the journal Labour Monthly, February 1948, and in the collection, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Ireland and the Irish Question, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.

p. 545

302 The reference is to the constitution of May 3, 1791 adopted by the Four Years' Diet (1788-92). "The Party of Patriots" which constituted a majority in the Diet strove, through a new constitution and reforms, to undermine the rule of feudal anarchy and the domination of the magnates, to strengthen the Polish state (demands to establish a hereditary constitutional monarchy, to abolish the right of every deputy of the nobility to veto the decisions of the Diet) and also to adapt the feudal system to the needs of bourgeois development (the demand to extend the rights of the urban population, and recognise a moderate form of certain bourgeois freedoms). The constitution preserved serfdom, but gave the peasants a certain opportunity to establish state-guaranteed contractual relations with the landowners. The constitution was opposed by the big land magnates, on whose call Prussia and Russia occupied Poland in 1793 and partitioned it for the second time (it was first partitioned by Prussia, Russia and Austria in 1772). After the suppression of the Polish insurrection of 1794 (the insurgents aimed at restoring the 1791 constitution), the Polish state ceased to exist in 1795 as a result of the third partition of Poland by Austria, Prussia and tsarist Russia. p. 545

303 The Congress of Vienna (September 1814-June 1815) composed of European monarchs and their ministers established, after the war of the European powers against Napoleonic France, a system of general treaties embracing the whole of Europe (with the exception of Turkey). The Congress decisions helped to restore feudal order and a number of former dynasties in the states previously conquered by Napoleon, sanctioned the political fragmentation of Germany and Italy, the incorporation of Belgium into Holland and the partition of Poland and outlined repressive measures to be taken against the revolutionary movement. p. 545

304 See Note 172. p. 546

305 See Note 72. p. 546

306 On the Reform Bill of 1832 in England—see Note 33; on the abolition of the Corn Laws—see Note 28. p. 546

307 An allusion to the results of the liberation war of 1813-15 against Napoleon's rule. The victory was taken advantage of by the aristocracy and nobility of the German states to help preserve the political fragmentation of Germany (see Note 26). p. 549

308 The reference is to the Irish Confederation founded in January 1847 by the radical and democratic elements in the Irish national movement who had broken away
from the Repeal Association (see Note 240). The majority of them belonged to the Young Ireland group which was formed in 1842 by the Irish bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectuals. The Left, revolutionary wing of the Irish Confederation advocated a people’s uprising against English rule and tried to combine the struggle for Irish independence with the campaign for democratic reforms. The Irish Confederation ceased to exist in the summer of 1848 after the English authorities crushed the uprising in Ireland. p. 549

309 See note 32.

310 The Congress of Vienna in 1814-15 liquidated the so-called duchy of Warsaw which depended on Napoleonic France. It was formed by Napoleon in 1807, after the defeat of Prussia, on the Polish territory seized by Prussia as a result of the three partitions of Poland. The Congress repartitioned the duchy between Prussia, Austria and Russia with the exception of the free city of Cracow, which was under the joint protection of the three powers up to 1846. The part incorporated into Russia was called the Kingdom of Poland with Warsaw as its capital. p. 550

311 Engels refers to the editorial in *La Riforma* No. 14, February 11, 1848 in reply to the article “Von der italienischen Gränze” published in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* No. 31, January 31, 1848. p. 553

312 *Treaties of 1815*—see Note 303; on the liberation wars against Napoleonic France and Engels’ opinion of them in the forties and subsequent years—see Note 22. p. 554

313 The reference is to the plan of deployment and operation of government troops in case of a revolt in Paris. It was adopted in 1840. p. 557

314 When the Guizot government fell on February 23, 1848, the supporters of the House of Orleans attempted to form a ministry consisting of moderate monarchists (the Orleanists) Thiers, Billault, and others and headed by Count Molé. The victorious people’s insurrection in Paris, however, thwarted the plan to retain the Orleans monarchy. p. 558

315 The posts in the French Provisional Government formed on February 24, 1848, were held mainly by moderate republicans (Lamartine, Depont de l’Eure, Crémieux, Arago, Marie, and the two men mentioned by Engels from the *National*, Marrast and Garnier-Pagès). There were three representatives of the *Réforme* in the government—Ledru-Rollin, Flocon and Louis Blanc, and a mechanic Albert (real name Martin). p. 558

316 The editor George Julian Harney added the following introductory note when publishing this letter in *The Northern Star*, March 25, 1848: “The following letter was received at the time the editor was in Paris; hence its non-appearance until now. Thank God, the days of the contemptible, ‘constitutional’ tyranny of Belgium are numbered. Leopold is packing his carpet bag.” p. 559

317 The Brussels *Association Démocratique* and the *Alliance*—see notes 194 and 291. p. 559

318 See Note 208. p. 560

319 The reference is to the double-faced policy of the French Orleanists on the Belgian question in the early 1830s. During the period of the 1830-31 revolution they fos-
tered plans of annexing Belgium and incited the Belgians to fight for secession from Holland. Simultaneously, at the London Conference of the five powers (Britain, France, Russia, Austria and Prussia) held with intervals in 1830 and 1831, they colluded, at the expense of Belgium, with the powers supporting Holland. As a result the Belgians had to accept the unfavourable terms of the agreement with the Dutch King (finally signed in May 1833) and cede part of their territory to him. p. 564

By order of the French authorities Marx was expelled from France at the beginning of February 1845 together with other editors of the radical newspaper Vorwärts! published in Paris. Its closure was demanded by the Prussian ruling circles. For details about Marx’s expulsion and his move to Belgium, see present edition, Vol. 4, p. 235. p. 565

In this article Marx used notes which he had made at the beginning of March 1848 on the arrest, maltreatment and expulsion of Wilhelm Wolff by the Brussels police (see this volume, pp. 581-82). p. 567

The laws on suspects—the decree passed by the French Convention on September 17, 1793 and other measures of the Jacobin revolutionary government which declared suspect and subject to arrest all persons who in one way or another supported the overthrown monarchy, including all former aristocrats and royal officials who had not testified their loyalty to the revolution. These laws were drawn up in such a form that even people not involved in counter-revolutionary activity could be placed in the category of “suspects”. p. 567

This article was written by Engels shortly before he left Brussels for Paris and was apparently intended for La Réforme. However, it was never published and survived only as a manuscript. p. 569

This is apparently a rough outline of a speech Marx intended to make on September 18, 1847 at the Congress of Economists in Brussels (see this volume, pp. 287-89 and notes 113 and 116). The outline was written on the last page of the tenth notebook containing extracts Marx made in the latter half of 1845 and in 1846. Some places in the manuscript are indecipherable because of ink blots (in the text they are marked by periods in square brackets). At the bottom of the text itself and in the margins there are several drawings by Engels apparently of participants in the Congress (see illustration between p. 578 and p. 579). p. 573

This extract is in Marx’s notebook which contains his manuscript “Wages” and is dated December 1847. There is no direct indication of its purpose in the extant manuscripts or letters. It might have been a preparatory outline either for the “Speech on the Question of Free Trade” which Marx delivered on January 9, 1848 at the meeting of the Brussels Democratic Association, or for lectures on political economy which he delivered in December 1847 to the German Workers’ Society in Brussels (see notes 219 and 246). It may also have been intended for a non-extant economic work by Marx.

Marx made a few references in the text to one of his notebooks of excerpts dating to the summer of 1847. The notebook contains a synopsis of G. Gülich’s book, Geschichtliche Darstellung des Handels, der Gewerbe und des Ackerbaus der bedeutendsten handeltreibenden Staaten unserer Zeit, Bd. 1-5, Jena, 1830-45. The passages referred to are in Vol. 1. Marx usually wrote the author’s name as Jülich and in the manuscript used only the initial letter “J” to denote the author. p. 574

The draft plan is written on the cover of Marx’s notebook containing the manuscript “Wages” (see this volume, pp. 415-37) and dated “Brussels, December 1847”. p. 576
In the final version of the Communist Manifesto points 5 and 6 were not elaborated.

This is the only extant page of the rough version of the Communist Manifesto. The fair copy sent to London at the end of January 1848 to be printed did not survive. The page of the rough copy refers in part to the first and mainly to the second section of the Manifesto.

Petits Carmes—a prison in Brussels.

Permanence—a police station at the Town Hall in Brussels open all round the clock. Amigo—a preliminary detention jail in Brussels, situated near the Town Hall (it derived its name from the Flemish word “vrunte”—a fenced place, interpreted by the Spaniards during their domination in the Netherlands as “vriend”—friend, and rendered in Spanish as “amigo”).

This document is a draft of the Rules of the Communist League adopted at its First Congress in the beginning of June 1847 (see Note 69) and distributed among the circles and communities for discussion. It shows the reorganisation work done by the League of the Just leaders as agreed with Marx and Engels, who consented early in 1847 to join the League on the condition that it would be reorganised on a democratic basis and all elements of conspiracy and sectarianism in its structure and activity would be eliminated. Engels, who was present at the Congress, took a direct part in drawing up the Rules. The draft recorded the change in the League’s name, and it is referred to here as the Communist League for the first time. The new motto, “Working Men of All Countries, Unite!” was also used for the first time. The former leading body, the narrow People’s Chamber (Halle), was replaced by the supreme body—the Congress, composed of delegates from local circles; the executive organ was to be the Central Authority. The relations between all the League organisations were based on principles of democratism and centralism. At the same time a number of points in the draft showed that the reorganisation was not yet complete and that former traditions were still alive, namely: Art. 1 formulating the aims of the League; one of the points in Art. 3, making the sectarian stipulation that members were not to belong to any other political organisation; Art. 21, limiting the powers of the Congress by the right of the communities to accept or reject its decisions, etc. On the insistence of Marx and Engels these points were later deleted or altered. The Second Congress (November 29-December 8, 1847) adopted the Rules in an improved and more perfect form, which finally determined the structure of the Communist League according to the principles of scientific communism.

This document was discovered, together with the “Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith” in 1968 among the papers of Joachim Friedrich Martens, a member of the Communist League in Hamburg.

The Circular, or report of the First Congress of the Communist League to its members, also discovered among Martens’ papers, brings to light important details of the convening and proceedings of the Congress and gives an idea of the process of reorganising the League of the Just.

In February 1847 the leading body of the League of the Just—the People’s Chamber (in November 1846 its seat was transferred from Paris to London)—called upon
the League's local organisations to elect delegates to the congress which was to assemble in London on June 1. The People's Chamber address also defined the agenda of the congress. London remained the seat of the League's executive body which, however, in accordance with the adopted draft Rules, then began to function as the Central Authority.

335 Being an illegal organisation, the Communist League could not hold its congresses openly or publish their materials. p. 589

336 The London German Workers' Educational Society was founded in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll and other members of the League of the Just. After the Communist League had been founded the leading role in the Society belonged to the League's local communities. At various periods of its activity the Society had branches in the workers' districts in London. In 1847 and 1849-50 Marx and Engels took an active part in the Society's work. But on September 17, 1850, Marx, Engels and a number of their followers withdrew because the Willich-Schapper sectarian and adventurist faction had increased their influence in the Society. In the late 1850s Marx and Engels resumed work in the Educational Society. It existed up to 1918, when it was closed down by the British Government.

Fraternal Democrats—see Note 1. p. 590

337 The reference is to the French secret workers' societies of the 1840s in which utopian ideas, both socialist and communist, were current. Some of the societies' members were influenced by the pacifist communism of Cabet, some supported the revolutionary utopian Communists Théodore Désamy and Auguste Blanqui. p. 590

338 The description given below of the situation in the Paris communities of the League of the Just in 1845-46 corresponds to the information which Engels (he had been in Paris since August 15, 1846) sent to Marx and other members of the Communist Correspondence Committee in Brussels (see Engels' letters of August 19, September 18, October 18 and 23, and December 1846 to Marx and of August 19, September 16, October 23, 1846 to the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee). This part of the report was apparently based on information received from Engels, whose role was decisive in overcoming the ideological confusion within the League's Paris communities and in drawing the demarcation line between their revolutionary wing and the petty-bourgeois elements tending towards "true socialism" and Weitling's egalitarian utopian communism. Possibly this section as a whole was written by Engels.

339 This refers apparently to the money collected by the Paris members of the League of the Just for the Cracow insurgents of 1846. p. 591

340 The reference is to the revolutionary conspiratorial organisation of German emigrants in Switzerland in the 1830s and 1840s. Initially it consisted mainly of petty-bourgeois intellectuals. Later members of the workers' unions gained influence in Young Germany. In the mid-30s, under pressure from Austria and Prussia, the Swiss government expelled the German revolutionaries and the craftsmen's unions were closed down. Young Germany actually ceased to exist, but its followers remained in the cantons of Geneva and Vaud. In the 1840s Young Germany was resurrected. Influenced by the ideas of Ludwig Feuerbach, its members carried on mainly atheist propaganda among the German emigrants and resolutely opposed communist trends, especially that of Weitling. In 1845 Young Germany was again suppressed. p. 594
The reference is apparently to the proposal made to Marx and Engels by the leaders of the League of the Just to join the League and take part in its reorganisation on the basis of the principles of scientific communism. On behalf of the People’s Chamber, Joseph Moll had talks with Marx in Brussels and with Engels in Paris at the end of January and the beginning of February 1847. p. 594

This reference is apparently to the circumstances which led to the formation of the League of the Just as a result of a split in the Outlaws’ League, a secret conspiratorial organisation of German emigrants. The latter was set up in Paris in 1834 and headed by petty-bourgeois democrats (Jakob Venedey and others) and socialists (Theodor Schuster and others). The conflict which arose in the Outlaws’ League between the artisan-proletarian elements tending towards utopian communism and the petty-bourgeois republican democrats led to the withdrawal of the supporters of communism, who founded the League of the Just. p. 595

The reference is to the changes in the Rules of the League of the Just which were in force prior to the First Congress where it was reorganised into the Communist League. The Rules of the League of the Just have come down to us in the versions of 1838 and 1843, which contained very vague and immature formulations typical of purely conspiratorial organisations. There was possibly yet another, later version of the Rules which is referred to here. p. 595

The attempt made by the London Central Authority to arrange for the publication of a regular newspaper or journal of the Communist League failed through lack of funds. It managed to put out only a specimen number of Kommunistische Zeitchrift, which appeared in London early in September 1847. It was printed in the print-shop of the London German Workers’ Educational Society owned by J. E. Burghard. The influence of Marx and Engels can be traced in its contents. The articles by Wilhelm Wolff, Karl Schapper and others were critical of “true socialism” and various utopian socialist trends, gave a rebuff to Karl Heinzen’s attacks on the Communists and expounded a number of points concerning the tactics of the proletarian movement. It was in the specimen number that the motto, “Working Men of All Countries, Unite!”, was first used in the press as the epigraph of the journal. When the editing of the Deutshe-Brüsseler-Zeitung devolved to a considerable extent upon Marx and Engels (see Note 96), this newspaper became in fact the Communist League’s regular organ. p. 597

An allusion to the crude egalitarian tendencies in the views of Weitling and his supporters and also utopias of “true socialists”. p. 598

The Address of the Central Authority of the Communist League dated September 14, 1847 is a quarterly report on the activity of the League after the First Congress (June 1847). It describes the situation in the League in general and the measures taken by the Central Authority to prepare for the Second Congress. Giving important data on the discussion of the draft Rules and the “Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith”, the Address reveals the ideological struggle in the local communities between the supporters of Marx and Engels and those of Weitling and Grün. The document testifies to the growing activity of the Brussels circle authority headed by Marx, and to its influence on the affairs of the League as a whole and the elaboration of its programme and organisational principles.

This document, like other documents of the First Congress of the Communist League, was discovered in Hamburg among the papers of J. F. Martens. A note made by Karl Schapper on the last page and addressed to Martens shows that
this copy was intended for the Hamburg community, of which he was a member (it is not reproduced in this volume).

347 The reference is to the letter which the Communist League’s Central Authority elected at the First Congress sent with other Congress documents, in particular its Circular (see this volume, pp. 589-600), to the League’s communities in various countries in June 1847. Extant is a version of the letter addressed to the Hamburg community and dated June 24. In this letter the Central Authority asked the Communist League members in the localities whether they were satisfied with the decisions of the First Congress, whether they accepted or rejected the new Rules, whether they could allot funds for the general needs of the organisation, whether they had formed circles in compliance with the Rules, how many copies of the Kommunistische Zeitung then being prepared they could distribute and to what extent they had managed to launch communist propaganda among the masses. The letter also proposed that the League members should discuss the “Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith” and give their opinion of this programme document, and also take steps to appoint delegates to the next congress.

348 See Note 344.

349 The reference is to the documents of the leading body of the League of the Just—the People’s Chamber—issued prior to its reorganisation as the Communist League at the First Congress in June 1847: the Address of the People’s Chamber of the League of the Just to the League, November 1846 and February 1847.

350 The Scandinavian Society—a radical democratic society in the latter half of the 1840s. It was in contact with the Communist League and consisted mainly of workers and craftsmen. Its chairman was the League member Per Görtrek, a translator, publisher and bookseller.

351 According to the Communist League’s Rules adopted at the First Congress, individual communities in a given locality had either to form a circle or, if there were no other communities, join a circle already in existence (see this volume, p. 586).

352 Johann Dohl, sent to Amsterdam in August 1847, reported to the Central Authority in October on the foundation in Amsterdam of a Communist League community of eight members.

The Workers’ Educational Society in Amsterdam was set up on February 14, 1847. Members of the Communist League played an active part in its foundation and work. In March 1848 the London German Workers’ Educational Society sent its counterpart in Amsterdam a hundred copies of the Communist Manifesto. The leaders of the Educational Society in Amsterdam, who were also Communist League members, were subjected to severe police persecution for organising a mass meeting in Amsterdam on March 24, 1848 in support of the revolution in France and Germany.

353 The reference is to Karl Grün’s propaganda of Proudhon’s views among German workers in Paris and to his free translation into German of Proudhon’s Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère, which he published in Darmstadt in 1847 (see Note 56).

354 Marx’s intention to publish a German translation of The Poverty of Philosophy did not materialise. During his lifetime only extracts from Chapter II were published in
German (see Note 71). The first German edition of this work, edited by Engels, appeared in 1885.

355 By the autumn of 1847 a complicated situation had arisen in the League's communities in Paris. The followers of Weitling, expelled by the First Congress, allied themselves with those of Grün. A split took place in October. One of the communities opposed the communist principles and was expelled from the League by a decision of the Central Authority. Engels, then in Paris, wrote to Marx on October 25-26, 1847: "A few days before my arrival the last Grün followers were thrown out, a whole community, half of which, however, will come back. We are only 30 strong. I have at once organised a propaganda community and have been running around all day and beating the drums. I have at once been elected to the circle authority and entrusted with correspondence. Some 20-30 candidates have been nominated for admission. We shall soon be stronger again."

356 The reference is to the former members of Young Germany, a secret democratic organisation of German emigrants in Switzerland, suppressed by the police in 1845 (see Note 340). They fought against the adherents of communist ideas.

357 The reference is to the communist groups in Cologne, Westphalia, Elberfeld, which had earlier been in contact with the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee founded by Marx and Engels, and set up Communist League communities after the League's First Congress.

358 The reference is to the German Workers' Society in Brussels (see Note 208).

359 The amendments made by the Brussels circle authority to the draft Rules of the Communist League were adopted at the League's Second Congress. They revealed Marx's efforts to work out better organisational principles of the proletarian party and overcome survivals of sectarianism in its structure. The article concerning the approval of Congress decisions by the communities was deleted and the ban of League members belonging to other political organisations was restricted to organisations hostile to the League (see this volume, p. 633).

By aristocrats in the Convention are probably meant the counter-revolutionary elements who opposed the Jacobin centralisation measures aimed at strengthening the revolutionary government.

360 The reference is to the London German Workers' Educational Society (see Note 336).

361 The "Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith" and the Rules adopted by the First Congress were regarded as preliminary drafts to be discussed in the localities, improved and finally approved at the next congress.

362 The reference is to the trial of the members of the League of the Just arrested in Berlin in the spring of 1847. The main witness, Friedrich Mentel, who betrayed the League, withdrew his previous evidence (see this volume, pp. 593-95) and the court was compelled to pass only light sentences on some of the accused and to acquit others.

363 The Chartist Northern Star published a report on the international meeting in London organised by the Fraternal Democrats at the premises of the London German Workers' Educational Society (about these organisations, see notes 1 and
836). It was entitled “The Polish Revolution. Important Meeting”. Speeches by Marx and Engels were reported rather abridged (for the authorised publication of these speeches, see this volume, pp. 388-90). The report gave details about the meeting which supplemented Engels’ short correspondence about it published in La Réforme (see this volume, pp. 391-92).

364 The Manifesto issued by the National Government set up on February 22, 1846 in the course of the national liberation uprising in the Cracow republic (see Note 55) called upon the people to fight resolutely for national independence, proclaimed democratic rights, the abolition of feudal services, and the transfer of land allotments to the peasants.

365 See Note 286.

366 The reference is to the victory of the progressive forces in the civil war in Switzerland (see Note 172) and to the failure of the Sonderbund’s attempts to secure military interference by the European powers in its own interests.

367 See Note 194.

368 Marx counterposes the proposal to call an international democratic congress (on the preparations for it, see Note 206) to the International Congress of Economists held in Brussels from September 16 to 18, 1847 (see this volume, pp. 274-90 and Note 113).

369 In 1845 Ludwik Mieroslawski, in his capacity as a member of the “Centralisation” (the governing body of the Polish Democratic Society), was sent to Posen to organise an uprising in the Polish lands. He was arrested by the Prussian authorities shortly before the scheduled time of the uprising (February 1846) and sentenced to death. The sentence was later commuted to life imprisonment. He was set free after the revolution began in Germany in March 1848.

370 About the civil war in Switzerland, see this volume, pp. 367-74 and Note 172.

371 The reference is to the attempts to organise diplomatic and military interference by the five European powers (France, Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia) in the civil war in Switzerland in the interests of the Sonderbund. They were initiated by the Austrian Chancellor Metternich and supported by the Guizot government. Metternich and Guizot planned to call a conference of the five great powers on the Swiss question to dictate peace terms to the belligerent parties in Switzerland. However, the speedy rout of the Sonderbund’s troops and the negative attitude of the British government thwarted these plans.

372 The reference is to the German Workers’ Society in Brussels (see Note 208).

373 During their stay in London as delegates to the Second Congress of the Communist League in late November and early December 1847, Marx and Engels also took part in the meetings of the London German Workers’ Educational Society (see Note 336). They made several reports to the members of the Society. The extant records of their speeches, very laconic and of poor quality, are given here and below in the same sequence as in the Minutes of the Society.

374 See Note 208.
These Rules of the Communist League are based on the draft Rules elaborated by the League's First Congress (see this volume, pp. 585-88). Marx and Engels, who exerted considerable influence on the elaboration of the League's new organisational principles, greatly contributed to improving the text of the Rules and gave it greater precision. In particular, it was they, in all probability, who drew up the new formulation of Article 1 defining the aim of the League. The Rules in their present version were adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist League.

This document was first published in English in the book: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, The Communist Manifesto, Lawrence, London, 1930.

Proposals to establish more regular contacts between the democrats of different countries and to prepare an international democratic congress were discussed by the representatives of the Fraternal Democrats with Marx acting on behalf of the Committee of the Democratic Association, during his and Engels' stay in London at the end of November and the beginning of December 1847 (see also notes 192 and 206).

The Democratic Association's deputation sent to Ghent for the opening of the Association's local affiliation included Marx.

In mid-December 1847 Engels arrived in Brussels from London, where he had spent some time after the Second Congress of the Communist League, and at the end of December he returned to Paris with the authority of the Brussels Democratic Association to represent it in the capital of France. The French authorities were alarmed by Engels' resumption of revolutionary propaganda among the Paris workers and craftsmen. At the end of January 1848 the Paris police proceeded against Engels under the pretext that his speech at the New Year's Eve banquet of the German revolutionary emigrants on December 31, 1847 contained political allusions hostile to the French government. On January 29, 1848 Engels was ordered to leave France within 24 hours under the threat of extradition to Prussia. Simultaneously with Engels' expulsion and the police breaking into his flat at night, arrests were made among the German emigrant workers. Despite the slander circulated by the governmental press (accusations of defiant behaviour, and of fighting duels), information about the real reasons behind Engels' expulsion filtered into the oppositional newspapers.

The original of this document is kept in the National Archives in Paris among the papers of the Provisional Government of the French Republic of 1848. The Address was published in the Belgian Le Débat social on March 1, 1848, and reprinted in La Réforme on March 4. The texts differ slightly. In this edition use is made of the text in La Réforme.

In English the Address was published with abbreviations in the Labour Monthly No. 2, February 1948.

The Second Congress of the Communist League retained the seat of the Central Authority in London. However, in view of the revolution starting in France, Schapper, Bauer, Moll and other members of the London Central Authority intended to move to the Continent and decided to transfer their powers of general guidance of the League to the Brussels circle authority headed by Marx. But the persecution of revolutionaries which had begun in Belgium, the order for Marx's expulsion and the arrest of other activists of the League compelled the Brussels Central Authority that had been formed to adopt the decision (published below) to dissolve itself and to empower Marx to form a new Central Authority in Paris. Marx arrived in Paris on
March 5 and wrote to Engels (he still remained in Brussels for some time) around March 12, 1848 that the new Central Authority had been recently set up and consisted of Marx (chairman), Schapper (secretary), Wallau, Wolff, Moll, Bauer (members). Engels was appointed in his absence.

An abridged version of this document was first published in French in *Annales parlementaires belges*. Session 1847-1848. Chambre des représentants, séance du 31 mars 1848, p. 1203. This document was first published in English in the *Labour Monthly* No. 3, March 1948.

The German Workers' Club was founded in Paris on March 8 and 9, 1848 on the initiative of the Communist League's leaders. The leading role in it belonged to Marx. The Club's aim was to unite the German emigrant workers in Paris, explain to them the tactics of the proletariat in a bourgeois-democratic revolution and also to counter the attempts of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats (among them, Herwegh, Venedey and Decker, the last two being mentioned in the minutes) to stir up the German workers by nationalist propaganda and enlist them into the adventurist march of volunteer legions into Germany. The Club was successful in arranging the return of German workers one by one to their own country to take part in the revolutionary struggle there.

The German Democratic Society, formed in Paris after the February revolution of 1848, held its meetings in a riding school. The Society was headed by petty-bourgeois democrats, Herwegh, Bornstedt, Decker and others who campaigned to raise volunteer legions of German emigrants with the aim of marching into Germany. In this way they hoped to carry out a revolution in Germany and establish a republic there. Marx and Engels resolutely condemned this adventurist plan of "exporting revolution".
NAME INDEX

A

Abd-el-Kader (1808-1883) — Emir of Algeria, one of the Arab leaders in the national liberation wars of 1832-47 in Morocco and Algeria against the French conquerors.— 469, 470, 471

Abd-ur-Rahman II (c. 1790-1859) — Emperor of Morocco (1822-59).— 471

Abyberg, Johann Theodor (1795-1869) — leader of the Conservative Party in the Swiss canton of Schwyz.— 368

Ackersdijk, Jan (1790-1861) — Dutch economist, professor in Utrecht.— 286

Addison, Joseph (1672-1719) — English essayist and politician.— 252

Albert (pseudonym of Martin, Alexandre) (1815-1895) — French worker, member of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy, member of the Provisional Government (1848).— 558

Albert, Prince Consort of Queen Victoria (1819-1861).— 414

Alembert, Jean Le Rond d’ (1717-1783) — French philosopher and mathematician, Encyclopaedist and leading figure of the French Enlightenment of the 18th century.— 399, 410

Alexander I (1777-1825) — Russian emperor (1801-25).— 26, 622

Allard — French democrat, emigrated to Belgium in 1840s for political reasons.— 568

Anders, Albert August — German journalist, emigrated to London, member of the Communist League and its plenipotentiary emissary to Norway and Sweden in June 1847.— 604

Anderson, Adam (c. 1692-1765) — Scottish economist, author of a treatise on the history of commerce.— 116

Antinous (d. 130 A.D.) — favourite of the Roman Emperor Hadrian (117-138), a youth of matchless beauty.— 371

Arago, Etienne Vincent (1802-1892) — French author, democrat, member of the Provisional Government in 1848.— 387, 395, 397

Arago, François Victor Emmanuel (1812-1896) — French politician, republican.— 401

Ariosto, Lodovico (1474-1533) — Italian poet of the Renaissance.— 324

Arkwright, Sir Richard (1732-1792) — English industrialist, invented the cotton spinning machine named after him.— 188

Armott, John — a Chartist.— 391, 616, 622

Arnstein und Eskeles — representative of a banking firm, founded by Arnstein, Adam Isaak (1715-1785) and Eskeles,
Bernhard, Freiherr von (1753-1839).—533
Asher, Karl Wilhelm (1798-1864)—German lawyer and economist.—286
Atkinson, William—English economist of the 1830s-50s, protectionist.—137, 415
Aumale, Henri Eugène Philippe Louis d'Orléans, duc d' (1822-1897)—son of Louis Philippe, king of the French, participated in the campaigns in Algeria in the 1840s as a general.—470-71

Babbage, Charles (1792-1871)—English mathematician, mechanic and economist.—186, 420
Babeuf, François Noël (Gracchus) (1760-1797)—French revolutionary, advocate of utopian egalitarian communism, organiser of the conspiracy of "equals".—5, 6, 11, 321, 514, 576
Balliu, Felix (b. 1802) —Belgian democrat, treasurer of the Brussels Democratic Association.—646
Barbaroux, Charles Jean Marie (1767-1794)—participant in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Girondist.—10, 335
Barrot, Camille Hyacinthe Odilon (1791-1873)—French lawyer, leader of the liberal dynastic opposition during the July monarchy.—62, 216, 376, 378, 382, 385-87, 406, 439, 442, 443, 556.
Bartels, Adolphe (1802-1862) —Belgian publicist, democrat; editor of the newspaper Le Débat social from 1844 to 1846.—402, 403
Bartels, Jules Théodore (1815-1855) —Belgian lawyer and publicist, liberal.—274
Bastiat, Frédéric (1801-1850)—French economist and politician.—276, 283
Bataille, Arnold (d. 1858)—Belgian worker, participant in the working-class movement, vice-secretary of the Brussels Democratic Association.—646
Baudelaire, Charles (1821-1867) —French romantist, poet, art critic, politician.—10, 22, 131, 157, 162
Bergson, Henri (1859-1941) —French philosopher, first mentioned in 1911.—377
Beaumont de la Bonninière, Gustave Auguste de (1802-1866) —French liberal journalist and politician, author of works on slavery in the United States.—378, 382
Beck, Karl Isidor (1817-1879) —German poet, in the mid-1840s "true socialist".—235-48
Becket—head of the passport office of Public Security in Belgium.—653
Bentham, Jeremy (1748-1832) —English sociologist, theoretician of "utilitarianism".—277
Béranger, Pierre Jean de (1780-1857) —French poet and song writer, author of political satires, democrat.—395, 646
Bernard, H.—a Frenchman, emigrated to London, represented France in the committee of the Fraternal Democrats society in London.—467
Berriére-Fontaine, Camille (born c. 1806) —French physician, democrat.—11, 13
Billault, Adolphe Augustin Marie (1805-1863) —French politician, moderate monarchist, subsequently a Bonapartist.—558
Blanc, Jean Joseph Louis (1811-1882) —French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian.—13, 381, 387, 397-400, 409-11, 518, 630
Blanqui, Jérôme-Adolphe (1798-1854) —French vulgar political economist.—125, 252, 277, 278, 282
Blessington, Marguerite, countess of (1789-1849) — English writer with liberal leanings.—59
Blum, P.—represented Russia on the committee of the Fraternal Democrats society in London in 1847-48.—467
Boisguillebert, Pierre Le Pesant, sieur de (1646-1714) — French economist, predecessor of the Physiocrats, founder of classical bourgeois political economy in France.—137, 151
Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, 1st Viscount (1678-1751) — English deist philosopher, politician.—399, 410
Bonald, Louis Gabriel Ambroise, Vicomte de (1754-1840) — French politician and journalist, ideologist of the reactionary aristocracy and monarchists during the Restoration.—546
Born, Stephan (real name Buttermilch, Simon) (1824-1898) — German typesetter, member of the Communist League; leaned towards reformism during the 1848-49 Revolution.—306, 340, 609, 610, 654, 656
Börne, Ludwig (1786-1837) — German critic and writer.—41, 259, 273
Bornstedt, Adalbert von (1808-1851) — German journalist, founder and editor of the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung (1847-48), a leader of the German Democratic Society, member of the Communist League, expelled from the League in March 1848; agent provocateur of the Prussian police in the 1840s.—626
Bourbon — French dynasty (1589-1792, 1814-1815, 1815-1830).—372
Bouring, Sir John (1792-1872) — English politician, linguist and man of letters, follower of Bentham, a Free Trader.—277, 282, 283, 285-87, 384, 416, 422, 450, 455, 458, 460-61, 622
Bray, John Francis (1809-1897) — English economist, utopian socialist, follower of Robert Owen, developed the theory of "labour money"; printer by trade.—138-42, 144, 421
Bright, John (1811-1889) — English manufacturer, Free Trade leader, a founder of the Anti-Corn Law League.—285, 450, 525-26
Brouckère, Charles de (1796-1860) — Belgian economist, participant in the 1830-31 revolution in Belgium; Minister of Finance (1830-31); Minister of the Interior and War (1831-35); Free Trader, professor at Brussels University.—287
Brown, Sir William, Bart. (1784-1864) — English merchant and banker, Free Trader.—282-83
Brunswick (Braunschweig), Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand, Duke of (1735-1806) — Prussian general, participated in the wars against revolutionary and Napoleonic France.—9
Buchez, Philippe Joseph Benjamin (1796-1865) — French politician and historian, Christian socialist.—253, 263
Buchfink — member of the Communist League in Paris.—654
Bugeaud de la Piconnerie, Thomas Robert, Duc d'Isly (1784-1849) — French marshal from 1843, Orleanist, during the July monarchy an organiser of the wars of conquest in Algeria and Morocco, in 1841-47, governor-general of Algiers.—471
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.—11, 321
Cabinet, Étienne (1788-1856) — French writer, utopian communist, author of Voyage en Icare.—13, 41, 76, 404, 407, 516, 576
Cade, Jack (d. 1450) — leader of the anti-feudal uprising of peasants and artisans in the south of England in 1450.—295
Campan—member of the Board of Trade in Bordeaux in late 1840s, Free Trader.—277
Campe, Joachim Heinrich (1746-1818) — German teacher and linguist, author of books for children and adolescents.— 336

Camphausen, Ludolf (1803-1890) — German banker, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prime Minister of Prussia from March to June of 1848.— 333

Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881) — British writer, historian, philosopher, Tory; preached views bordering on feudal socialism up to 1848; later relentless opponent of the working-class movement.— 10, 416

Carnot, Lazare Hippolyte (1801-1888) — French writer and politician.— 406, 443

Carnot, Lazare Nicolas (1753-1823) — French mathematician, political and military figure in the French Revolution, Jacobin; took part in the Thermidor coup in 1794.— 443

Carrel, Armand (1800-1836) — French journalist, moderate republican, a founder and editor of the newspaper *Le National*.— 214

Catherine II (1729-1796) — Russian empress (1762-96).— 622

Charles I (1600-1649) — King of Great Britain and Ireland (1625-49), executed during the English revolution of the 17th century.— 233, 474

Charles II (1680-1685) — King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).— 206

Charles V (1500-1558) — Holy Roman Emperor (1519-56) and King of Spain as Charles I (1516-55).— 16

Charles X (1757-1836) — King of France (1824-30).— 371

Charles Albert (Carlo Alberto) (1798-1849) — King of Sardinia (1831-49).— 522, 541

Charles Augustus (Karl August) (1757-1828) — grand duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach.— 270

Charles the Great (Charlemagne) (c. 742-1814) — from 768 King of the Franks; Holy Roman Emperor (800-814).— 148

Chateaubriand, François René, Vicomte de (1768-1848) — French romantic writer, statesman and diplomat, supported the policy of the Holy Alliance.— 395

Cherbuliez, Antoine-Élisée (1797-1869) — Swiss economist, tried to combine the teaching of Sismondi with elements of Ricardo’s theory.— 203, 421

Christian VIII (1786-1848) — King of Denmark (1839-48).— 542

Clarendon, George William Frederick, fourth Earl of, fourth Baron Hyde (1800-1870) — English statesman, Whig, Viceroy of Ireland (May 1847-early 1852).— 445

Clark, Thomas — a Chartist leader, in 1847 member of the committee of the Fraternal Democrats society, after 1848 a reformist.— 467, 473

Cloots, Jean Baptiste (Anacharsis) (1755-1794) — participant in the French Revolution, Dutch by birth, was close to Left Jacobins, prior to the Revolution — Prussian baron.— 403

Cobbett, William (1762-1835) — English politician and radical writer.— 359

Cobden, Richard (1804-1865) — English manufacturer, a leader of the Free Traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League.— 5, 285, 539

Coburg — dukes of the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha dynasty, ruled a number of European states.— 568

Cocle, Celestino Maria (1783-1857) — Italian theologian and statesman, father confessor of Ferdinand II of Naples.— 541

Colbert, Jean Baptiste (1619-1683) — French statesman, Controller-General of Finances (1665-83), actually directed France’s foreign and domestic policy.— 192

Columbus, Christopher (Christobal Colon) (1451-1506) — Genoa-born navigator, discoverer of America.— 627
Condorcet, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat, Marquis de (1743-1794) — French sociologist, Enlightener, participant in the French Revolution, Girondist. — 10

Constancio, Francisco Solano (1772-1846) — Portuguese physician, diplomat and writer, translated works of English economists into French. — 114, 121

Conze, Alexander — German emigrant to the USA. — 42, 50

Cooper, Thomas (1759-1840) — American economist and politician. — 153, 323

Cooper, Thomas (1805-1892) — English poet and journalist, a Chartist in the early 1840s, subsequently a non-conformist lay-preacher. — 8, 59

Couthon, Georges (1755-1794) — participant in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Jacobin, adherent of Robespierre. — 10

Craissier de — Chief Secretary of the Ministry of Justice of Belgium. — 650

Cubières, Amédée-Louis-Despans de (1786-1853) — French general, Orleanist, War Minister in 1839 and 1840, degraded in 1847 for bribery and shady dealings. — 213

Dahlmann, Friedrich Christoph (1785-1860) — German liberal historian and politician. — 222, 520

Daire, Louis François Eugène (1798-1847) — French economist, publisher of works on political economy. — 137, 152

Dairvval, G. M. — French worker, author of the pamphlet Histoire édifiante et curieuse de Rothschild I-er, roi des juifs. — 62

Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) — Italian poet. — 271

Danton, Georges Jacques (1759-1794) — prominent figure in the French Revolution, leader of the Right wing of the Jacobins. — 6

Darthé, Augustin Alexandre Joseph (1769-1797) — French lawyer, participant in the French Revolution, Jacobin, follower of Babeuf. — 11

Dassy, Thomas J. (b. 1819) — Belgian democrat, member of the Brussels Democratic Association. — 562

Daumer, Georg Friedrich (1800-1875) — German writer, author of works on the history of religion. — 631

David, Christian Georg Nathan (1793-1874) — Danish economist and politician, liberal. — 275

David d'Angers, Pierre-Jean (1788-1856) — French sculptor. — 395

Decker — German petty-bourgeois democrat, emigrated to Paris. — 654

Degeorge, Frédéric (1797-1854) — French journalist, moderate republican. — 406

Delangle, Claude Alphonse (1797-1869) — French lawyer and politician; from 1847 till the February revolution of 1848 Procurator-General at the Court. — 407

Del Carretto, Francesco Saverio, marchese (1777-1861) — Italian politician, Minister of Police in the Kingdom of Naples (1831-January 1848). — 541

De Witt — see Witt, John de.

Dézamy, Théodore (1803-1850) — French writer, utopian communist. — 41

Dickens, Charles (1812-1870) — English journalist and novelist. — 59

Diderot, Denis (1713-1784) — French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist; leader of the Encyclopädistis. — 399, 410

Diergardt, Friedrich, Freiherr von (1795-1869) — German textile manufacturer, politician. — 6

Dietsch, Andreas (d. 1846) — a German emigrant to the USA, follower of Weitling, founded a communist colony in the State of Missouri in 1844; brushmaker by trade. — 48

Dixon, William — member of the Executive Committee of the National Chartist Association. — 473
**Dohl, Johann Balthasar** — member of the Communist League, emissary to Holland in the autumn of 1847.— 603, 608

**Drouyn de Lhuys, Edouard** (1805-1881) — French politician, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1848-49, 1851, 1852-55, 1862-66).— 378

**Droz, François Xavier Joseph** (1773-1850) — French historian, philosopher and economist.— 125

**Duchateau** — French industrialist, protectionist.— 277, 283

**Duchâtel, Charles Marie Tanneguy, comte** (1803-1867) — French statesman, Orleanist, Minister of Trade (1854-36), Minister of the Interior (1839 and from 1840 till February 1848).— 61, 213-19, 238, 365, 556, 565

**Duesberg, Franz von** (1793-1872) — Prussian Minister of Finance (1846-March 1848).— 230

**Dumas, Jean Baptiste André** (1800-1884) — French chemist.— 251

**Duncombe, Thomas Slingsby** (1796-1861) — English politician, radical, participated in the Chartist movement in the 1840s.— 13, 213, 285, 414

**Dunoyer, Barthélemy Charles Pierre Joseph** (1786-1862) — French economist and politician.— 132, 278, 282

**Dupin, André Marie Jacques** (1783-1865) — French lawyer, politician; Orleanist.— 470

**Dupont de l’Eure, Jacques Charles** (1767-1855) — French politician, liberal, participant in the French revolutions of the 18th century and 1830; was close to the moderate republicans in the 1840s, President of the Council of Ministers in the Provisional Government in 1848.— 401, 558

**Duquesnoy, Ernest Dominique François Joseph** (1749-1795) — participant in the French Revolution, Jacobin.— 11

**Duroy, Jean Michel** (1753-1795) — participant in the French Revolution, deputy to the Convention, Jacobin.— 11

**Duvergier de Hauranne, Prosper** (1798-1881) — French liberal politician and journalist.— 376, 439

**Edmonds, Thomas Rowe** (1803-1889) — English economist, utopian socialist, drew socialist conclusions from Ricardo’s theory.— 138

**Eichhorn, Johann Albrecht Friedrich** (1779-1856) — Prussian statesman, Minister of Worship, Education and Medicine (1840-48).— 222, 233

**Ellis, William** — Chartist, was sentenced on August 6, 1842, to 20 years’ deportation to Australia for participation in workers’ disturbances.— 13

**Engels, Frederick** (1820-1895) — 8, 14, 32, 35, 55, 56, 60, 70, 73, 274, 278, 310, 314-19, 330, 335-36, 338, 380, 385, 388, 391, 392, 414, 482, 563, 592, 609, 620, 621, 632, 644, 652

**Engler** — member of the Communist League in Paris.— 654

**Epps, John** (1805-1869) — English physician and public figure, radical.— 361-63

**Eskeles — see Arnstein und Eskeles.**

**Etrich, L.** — member of the German Workers’ Club in Paris founded in March 1848.— 658

**Ewart, William** (1798-1869) — English politician, Free Trader.— 277, 282, 283

**F**

**Faider, Victor** — Belgian lawyer and politician, moderate democrat.— 274-75

**Faraday, Michael** (1791-1867) — English scientist, physicist and chemist.— 251

**Faucher, Léon** (1803-1854) — French journalist, politician, moderate liberal.— 207

**Ferdinand I** (1793-1875) — Emperor of Austria (1835-48).— 26, 366, 532, 553
Ferdinand II (1810-1859) — King of the Two Sicilies (1830-59).— 372, 523, 541
Ferguson, Adam (1723-1816) — Scottish historian, philosopher and sociologist.— 181
Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804-1872) — German materialist philosopher.— 73, 249, 256, 258, 292, 293
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb (1762-1814) — German classical philosopher of the late 18th century-early 19th century.— 17
Fischer, F. — member of the Communist League in Brussels.— 652
Flocon, Ferdinand (1800-1866) — French politician and journalist, democrat, an editor of the newspaper La Réforme.— 385, 386, 387, 397, 400, 438, 442, 558, 649
Florian, Jean Pierre Claris de (1755-1794) — French fabulist and dramatist, author of a poem about William Tell.— 368
Follen, August Adolf Ludwig (1794-1855) — German journalist and poet, participated in the war against Napoleonic France, was close to the student movement after 1815.— 554
Fontaine — see Berrier-Fontaine, Camille
Forsell, Carl Daniel — member of the Communist League in Sweden.— 605
Forster, Johann Georg (1754-1794) — German democratic writer, founder of the Jacobin Club in Mainz, member of government of the Mainz Republic of 1792; emigrated to France where he took part in revolutionary events.— 27
Fould, Achille (1800-1867) — French banker and politician, Orleanist, subsequently Bonapartist.— 61, 375
Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837) — French utopian socialist.— 256, 514, 516, 517, 576
Franz (Francis) I (1768-1835) — Emperor of Austria (1804-35), the last emperor of the Holy Roman Empire known as Franz II (1792-1806).— 21, 530, 532, 534, 535
Frederick VII (Frederik Carl Christian VII) (1808-1863) — King of Denmark (1848-63) — 542,
Frederick William II (1744-1797) — King of Prussia (1786-97).— 264
Frederick William III (1770-1840) — King of Prussia (1797-1840).— 23, 26, 27, 31, 64
Frederick William IV (1795-1861) — King of Prussia (1840-61).— 23, 52, 55, 57, 64, 65, 69, 71, 92, 93, 232, 233, 333, 521, 522, 526, 542
Freiligrath, Ferdinand (1810-1876) — German romantic and later revolutionary poet, member of the Communist League.— 292
Fröbel, Julius (1805-1893) — German writer and publisher of progressive literature.— 298
Frost, John (1784-1877) — English radical; joined the Chartist movement in 1838, sentenced to deportation for life to Australia for organising a miners' uprising in Wales in 1839, was pardoned in 1856 and returned to England.— 13
Fulchiron, Jean Claude (1774-1859) — French big capitalist and conservative politician.— 365, 375
Fussel, John A. — a Chartist leader in Birmingham.— 473

Garnier-Pagès, Étienne Joseph Louis (1801-1841) — French politician, headed the republican opposition after the revolution of 1830, brother of Garnier-Pagès, Louis Antoine.— 440
Garnier-Pagès, Louis Antoine (1803-1878) — French politician, moderate republican, in 1848 member of the Provisional Government.— 406, 438, 439, 442, 443, 558
Gérard, Étienne Maurice, comte (1773-1852) — Marshal of France and statesman, Orleanist.— 557
Gervinus, Georg Gottfried (1805-1871) — German historian, liberal.— 222
Gescheidtle, Karl — a German worker from Baden, emigrated to the USA.— 49
Name Index

Gessner, Salomon (1730-1788) — Swiss poet and artist. — 318

Gigot, Philippe Charles (1819-1860) — participant in the Belgian working-class and democratic movement, member of the Communist League, close to Marx and Engels in the 1840s. — 35, 55, 56, 60, 562, 565, 601, 652

Girardin, Alexandre, comte de (1776-1855) — French general, father of Émile de Girardin. — 215

Girardin, Emile de (1806-1881) — French journalist and politician, editor of La Presse; lacked principles in politics; in 1847 opposed the Guizot Government. — 213-16, 375, 439

Glass — a house-owner in Paris. — 658

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832) — German poet. — 17, 249-52, 255-73, 316

Graham, Sir James Robert George (1792-1861) — English statesman, a Whig at the beginning of his political career; later supported Peel; Home Secretary (1841-46) in Peel’s Cabinet. — 33, 213, 217

Greg, William Rathbone (1809-1881) — English manufacturer and journalist, a Free Trader. — 454, 455, 464

Grün, Karl Theodor Ferdinand (pen name Ernst von der Haide) (1817-1887) — German writer, became a “true socialist” in the mid-1840s. — 72-74, 250-58, 260-73, 300, 338, 513, 590-93, 605, 609, 610

Guasco, Charles Théodore de (b. 1812) — member of the Belgian democratic and working-class movement; a joiner by trade. — 562

Guédin, Charles Gabriel César (1798-1874) — adjutant of Louis Philippe; from 1846 Marshal of France; was dismissed from his post in 1847 for swindling. — 213

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874) — French historian and statesman; from 1840 up to the February revolution of 1848 actually directed the foreign and domestic policy of France. — 61, 214, 215, 217, 219, 365, 438-40, 468, 469, 472, 481, 521, 538, 539, 546, 556-58, 618

Gülich, Gustav von (1791-1847) — German historian and economist; protectionist. — 279, 280, 573

Hansemann, David Justus (1790-1864) — German capitalist, one of the leaders of Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Minister of Finance of Prussia from March to September 1848. — 333

Harcourt, François Eugène Gabriel, duc d’ (1786-1865) — French politician and diplomat, liberal, advocate of Free Trade. — 287

Hardenberg, Karl August von, Prince (1750-1822) — Prussian statesman, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1804-06, 1807), Chancellor (1810), one of the sponsors of moderate reforms, supported the policy of the Holy Alliance after 1815. — 23

Harney, George Julian (1817-1897) — prominent figure in the English labour movement, a leader of the Chartist Left wing. — 8-11, 13, 308, 363, 392, 413, 414, 466, 467, 473, 474-75, 486, 619, 621, 647

Harring, Harro Paul (1798-1870) — German writer, radical, emigrated in 1828 and lived in various countries of Europe and America, including the USA. — 46, 47, 50

Harvey, William (1578-1657) — English physician, one of the founders of scientific physiology, discovered the circulation of the blood. — 194

Haussy de — Belgian Minister of Justice in 1848. — 650

Haxthausen, August Franz Ludwig Maria, Freiherr von (1792-1866) — Prussian official and economist, author of Studien über die innern Zustände des Volkslebens, und insbesondere die ländlichen Einrichtungen Russlands. — 482

Hébert, Michel Pierre Alexis (1799-1877)
— French lawyer and statesman, Orleanist, Minister of Justice (1847-February 1848).— 217, 556

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German classical philosopher.— 4, 17, 161, 164-68, 169, 254, 256, 258, 265, 270, 292, 317

Heilberg, Louis (Lazarus) (b. 1818)—German journalist, emigrated to Brussels, member of the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee in 1846.— 35

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856) — German revolutionary poet.— 244

Heinrich LXXII (1797-1853)—sovereign of the German principality Reuss-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf (1822-48).— 339

Heinzen, Karl (1809-1880) — German journalist, Radical.— 291-306, 312-22, 324-26, 328, 350-40, 610, 611

Henri, Joseph (b. about 1795) — French merchant; attempted on Louis Philippe's life on July 29, 1846, and was sentenced to penal servitude for life.— 61

Hermann — member of the Communist League, member of the German Workers' Club in Paris founded in March 1848.— 654, 655, 658

Hess, Moses (1812-1875) — German radical journalist, one of the main representatives of "true socialism" in the mid-1840s.— 256, 626

Hilditch, Richard — English economist in the mid-19th century.— 203

Hobbes, Thomas (1588-1679) — English philosopher.— 233

Hobhouse, John Cam, Baron Broughton de Gyfford (1786-1869) — British statesman, liberal.— 58

Hobson, Joshua — English journalist, Chartist.— 8

Hodgskin, Thomas (1787-1869) — English economist and journalist, utopian socialist, drew socialist conclusions from the Ricardian theory.— 138

Hody, Alexis Guillaume, baron (1807-1880) — chief of the secret police in Brussels in the 1840s.— 567, 568, 581

Hofer, Andreas (1767-1810) — leader of guerrilla warfare against the French army in Tirol in 1809.— 26

Höger, Wilhelm — member of the Communist League in Paris.— 654

Holbach, Paul Henri Dietrich, baron d' (1723-1789) — French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist.— 251, 254, 255

Holm, Peter — Danish socialist; in 1847-48 member of the committee of the Fraternal Democrats society, secretary for Scandinavia.— 467

Homer — semi-legendary Greek epic poet.— 314, 315

Hope, George (1811-1876) — English farmer, Free Trader.— 454, 464

Horne — member of the Communist League and German Workers' Society in Paris.— 654

Hornschuh — member of the League of the Just, Weitlingian.— 611-12

Huskinson, William (1770-1830) — British statesman, Tory, Secretary of the Board of Trade (1823-27).— 209

I

Iffland, August Wilhelm (1759-1814) — German actor, dramatist and theatrical manager.— 247

Imbert, Jacques (1793-1851) — French journalist, democrat and socialist, participant of the July revolution of 1830; in 1847 vice-president of the Brussels Democratic Association.— 618, 626

Itzstein, Johann Adam von (1775-1855) — German statesman, a leader of the liberal opposition in the Baden Diet.— 265

J

Jackson, Charles Thomas (1805-1880) — American physician, chemist, discovered anaesthetic effect of ether.— 260

Jacoby, Johann (1805-1877) — German
radical journalist and politician, physician, was close to the Social-Democrats in the 1870s.— 297

Jefferson, Thomas (1743-1826) — US statesman and author, Enlightener, ideologist of democratic circles during the War of Independence, President of the USA (1801-09).— 325

Jerrold, Douglas William (1803-1857) — English author, dramatist and wit.— 59

Jones, Ernest Charles (1819-1869) — a leading figure in the English working-class movement, proletarian poet and journalist, a leader of the Left Chartists, friend of Marx and Engels.— 13, 362, 391, 413, 467, 473, 616, 617

Joseph II (1741-1790) — German Emperor (1765-90).— 293, 330

Jottrand, Lucien Léopold (1804-1877) — Belgian lawyer and journalist, democrat; in 1847 President of the Brussels Democratic Association.— 561, 565, 618, 626, 642, 646

Junge, Adolf Friedrich — German worker, member of the League of the Just and the Communist League; emigrated to America early in 1848.— 601

Juvenal (Decimus Junius Juvenalis) (b. c. 60 A.D.-d. after 127) — Roman satirist and poet.— 131

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804) — German philosopher.— 17, 182, 259

Keen, Charles — Chartist, a leader of the Fraternal Democrats society.— 392, 413, 467, 473, 620

Kleist, Bernd Heinrich Wilhelm von (1777-1811). — German romantic poet and dramatist.— 242

Klopstock, Friedrich Gottlieb (1724-1803) — German poet, representative of the German Enlightenment.— 256

Koch, Heinrich (1800-1879) — German utopian Communist, emigrated to the USA, published several radical and atheist newspapers, Der Antipfaff among them.— 48, 50

Kochlin — manufacturer in Württemberg.— 5

Konstantin Pavlovich (Constantine) (1779-1831) — Russian grand duke, brother of Emperor Nicholas I, army commander-in-chief in Warsaw and actually viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland from 1814.— 617

Kötgen, Gustav Adolf (1805-1882) — German artist and poet; took part in the working-class movement in the 1840s, was close to “true socialism”.— 54, 55

Kotzebue, August Friedrich Ferdinand von (1761-1819) — German writer and journalist, extreme monarchist.— 247

Krell, H. (from Lucerne) — member of the Fraternal Democrats society in London, secretary for Switzerland.— 467

Kriege, Hermann (1820-1850) — German journalist, “true socialist”, founder and editor of the New York emigrant newspaper Der Volks-Tribun.— 37, 39, 51, 593

Kuhlmann, Georg (b. 1812) — agent provocateur of the Austrian government; preached “true socialism” in the 1840s among the German Weitlingian artisans in Switzerland, using religious terminology and passing himself off as a “prophet”.— 594

L

Labiaux, J. L. — Belgian commercial traveller, democrat, member of the Brussels Democratic Association.— 646


La Fayette, Marie Joseph Paul Ives Roch Gilbert Motier, marquis de (1757-1834) — prominent figure in the French Revolution, one of the leaders of the moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants); subsequently participated in the July revolution of 1830.— 9

Laffitte, Jacques (1767-1844) — French banker and liberal politician, Prime
Minister (1830-31) under the July monarchy.—31, 61, 238

Lagentie de Lavaissé—translator of English authors, Lauderdale in particular, into French.—114

Lally-Tollendal, Trophime Gérard, marquis de (1751-1830)—French politician, during the French Revolution belonged to a group of moderate royalists in the Constituent Assembly.—333

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician; one of the leaders of the moderate republicans in the 1840s; Minister of Foreign Affairs and de facto head of the Provisional Government in 1848.—364-66, 395, 404, 405, 558

Lamennais, Hugues Félicité Robert de (1782-1854)—French abbot, writer, Christian socialist.—41, 49, 401

La Sagra, Ramon de (1798-1871)—Spanish economist, historian and naturalist; liberal.—282

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German writer and lawyer, petty-bourgeois socialist, founder of the General Association of German Workers (1863), a founder of the opportunist trend in German Social-Democracy.—125

Lauderdale, James Maitland, 8th Earl of (1759-1839)—British politician and economist, criticised Adam Smith's theory from the viewpoint of vulgar political economy.—114, 123, 156-57

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French writer and politician, a petty-bourgeois democratic leader, editor of the newspaper La Réforme; in 1848, Minister of the Interior in the Provisional Government.—385, 386, 387, 393, 395, 397, 400, 438, 441-43, 518, 568

Le Hardy de Beaulieu, Jean Charles Marie Joseph (1816-1871)—Belgian economist, professor of mineralogy; Free Trader.—274, 539

Lelewel, Joachim (1786-1861)—Polish historian and revolutionary; participant in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, a leader of the democratic wing of the Polish emigrants in 1847-48, a Committee member of the Brussels Democratic Association.—551, 618-20, 626, 644, 646

Lemonley, Pierre Edouard (1762-1826)—French historian and economist.—180, 190

Leopold I (1790-1865)—King of the Belgians (1831-65).—564, 565, 567-70, 650

Leopold II (1797-1870)—Grand Duke of Tuscany (1824-59).—522

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim (1729-1781)—German writer, dramatist, critic and philosopher; early Enlightener.—256, 257

Leverrier, Urbain Jean Joseph (1811-1877)—French astronomer.—260

Liebig, Justus von, baron (1803-1873)—German scientist, agrochemist.—251

List, Friedrich (1789-1846)—German economist, adherent of protectionism.—279, 280, 287, 324, 573

Louis XI (1423-1483)—King of France (1461-83).—398, 400, 410, 411

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—151, 271

Louis XV (1710-1774)—King of France (1715-74).—161, 219

Louis XVI (1754-1793)—King of France (1774-92), guillotined during the French Revolution.—9, 232-34, 333, 371


Lubliner, Ludwik Ozeasz (1809-1868)—Polish revolutionary, emigrated to Brussels; a lawyer by profession.—644

Lucas, T.—democrat, participant in the international meeting on November 29, 1847 in London to mark the 17th anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1830.—619
Lucretius (Titus Lucretius Cams) (99-55 B.C.) — Roman philosopher and poet. — 166

Ludwig (Louis) I (1786-1868) — King of Bavaria (1825-48). — 236, 243, 257

Ludwig (Louis) I (1753-1829) — Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt; from 1806 to 1829 — Grand Duke of Hesse and Rhein. — 25

Luneau, Sébastien (1800-1880) — French politician, member of the Chamber of Deputies in 1831-48. — 470

Lunberg, J. — member of the Fraternal Democrats society, secretary for Scandinavia. — 467

M

Mably, Gabriel Bonnot de (1709-1785) — French sociologist, representative of utopian egalitarian communism. — 334

MacAdam — secretary of the royal society for the improvement of flax-growing in Ireland, Free Trader. — 286

MacCulloch, John Ramsay (1789-1864) — British economist who vulgarised David Ricardo’s theories. — 252, 416

MacGrath, Philip — Chartist, member of the Executive Committee of the National Chartist Association. — 362

Maistre, Joseph Marie, comte de (1753-1821) — French writer, monarchist, an ideologist of aristocratic and clerical reaction. — 546

Malouet, Pierre Victor, baron (1740-1814) — French politician, during the French Revolution belonged to the group of moderate royalists in the Constituent Assembly. — 333

Malthus, Thomas Robert (1766-1834) — English clergyman, economist, founder of the misanthropic theory of population. — 290, 426, 428

Marat, Jean Paul (1743-1793) — a Jacobin leader in the French Revolution. — 6, 11, 386

Marie de Saint-Georges, Alexandre Thomas (1795-1870) — a French lawyer and politician, liberal, moderate republican, in 1848 member of the Provisional Government. — 378, 387

Marie Louise (1791-1847) — daughter of Francis I of Austria; was married to Napoleon I in 1810. — 21

Marrast, Armand (1801-1852) — French journalist and politician, leader of moderate republicans, editor of Le National; in 1848 member of the Provisional Government and Mayor of Paris. — 558

Marx, Edgar (1847-1855) — Karl Marx’s son. — 562

Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen) (1814-1881) — Karl Marx’s wife. — 562, 565-66

Marx, Jenny (1844-1883) — Karl Marx’s eldest daughter. — 562


Marx, Laura (1845-1911) — Karl Marx’s second daughter. — 562

Masaniello, properly Tommaso Aniello (1620-1647) — an Italian fisherman; leader of the popular anti-feudal revolt in July 1647 against the Spanish Viceroy of Naples. — 395

Maurer, Georg Ludwig (1790-1872) — German historian, studied the social system of ancient and medieval Germany. — 482

Maynz, Karl Gustav (1812-1882) — German lawyer, professor at Brussels University, member of the Brussels Democratic Association. — 626, 646

Mellinet, François Aimé (1768-1852) — Belgian general, participant in the democratic movement and the revolution of 1830 in Belgium, honorary president of the Brussels Democratic Association. — 618-20, 626, 646

Mentel, Christian Friedrich (b. 1812) — German tailor, member of the League of the Just; was arrested by the Prussian authorities and betrayed the organisation. — 593, 595

Menzel, Wolfgang (1798-1873) — German
conservative writer and literary critic.— 259, 273

**Meredith, William Morris** (1799-1873) — American lawyer, held several state offices, Secretary of the Treasury in 1849-50.— 323

**Metternich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Fürst von** (1773-1859) — Austrian statesman and diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1809-21), Chancellor (1821-48), an organiser of the Holy Alliance.— 366, 481, 520, 530, 534, 535, 541, 542, 549, 618, 628, 629

**Meyen, Eduard** (1812-1870) — German writer, Young Hegelian; in 1847, Berlin correspondent of the Trier'sche Zeitung.— 72-74

**Michelot, Jean A.** — French democrat, emigrated to London, in 1847-48 secretary for France in the Fraternal Democrats society.— 391, 467, 617

**Mieroslawski, Ludwik** (1814-1878) — prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement, participant in the insurrection of 1830-31, in the preparation of a revolt in Poland in 1846 and the revolution of 1848-49; later, a leader of the moderate wing among the Polish democratic emigrants, sided with Bonapartism.— 621, 623

**Mill, James** (1773-1836) — English economist and philosopher, adherent of Ricardo's theory, follower of Bentham in philosophy.— 203
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Rheinische Jahrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen Reform — a journal of German “true socialists”, published by Hermann Püttmann, only two volumes appeared, the first in Darmstadt in August 1845, the second at Bellevue on the German-Swiss border at the end of 1846.— 14, 254

Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe — a daily founded on January 1, 1842 as an organ of the oppositional Rhine bourgeoisie, published up to March 31, 1843 in Cologne. Marx was its editor-in-chief from October 15, 1842 to March 17, 1843, and the newspaper acquired a distinct revolutionary-democratic character, which became the reason for its suppression; Engels was one of its contributors.— 72, 73, 626

Rhein- und Mosel-Zeitung — a Catholic daily published in Koblenz from 1831 to 1850.— 72
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The Times — a conservative daily founded in London in 1785.— 64, 285, 392, 623

Trier'sche Zeitung — a daily founded in 1757; published under this title since 1815; in the early 1840s it was a radical organ, later influenced by “true socialism”.— 34, 72-74, 227, 300, 302

L’Union. Bulletin des ouvriers rédigé et publié par eux-mêmes — a monthly published in Paris from December 1843 to September 1846 by a group of workers influenced by Saint-Simon’s ideas.— 8

L’Union monarchique — a Catholic daily newspaper of monarchist trend, published in Paris in 1847 and 1848.— 405

Der Volks-Tribun. Organ des Jungen Amerika — a weekly newspaper founded by the German “true socialists” in New York, published from January 5 to December 31, 1846 and edited by Hermann Kriege.— 35, 36, 40-44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 593

The Weekly Dispatch — a newspaper of the English radical bourgeoisie, published under this title in London from 1801 to 1928.— 359

Das Westphälische Dampfboot — a monthly of the German “true socialists”; published and edited by Otto Lüning in Bielefeld from January 1845 to December 1846, and in Paderborn from January 1847 to March 1848. It carried some works by Marx and Engels.— 73, 300
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See also Feuerbach's philosophy, Fichte's doctrine, Hegel's philosophy, Kantianism, Young Hegelianism

German Workers' Club in Paris—654, 658

German Workers' Educational Society (London)—590, 630

German Workers' Society in Brussels—403, 560, 581, 626, 630

Germany—411
— peculiarities of its historical development—17-18, 76, 78-79, 84-85, 259, 267, 326-27, 331-32, 512, 538, 543-44
— in antiquity—367, 368, 373, 482
— in the Middle Ages—15, 17, 80, 84-85, 179, 326-27, 530-31
— survivals of feudalism—16, 17, 19-20, 23, 30, 79, 81, 83, 85, 94-95, 332, 333, 335, 511, 519, 530-31
— during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars—18-28, 78, 80, 81, 259, 510
— between 1815 and early 1848—23-26, 28, 30-33, 78-95, 520-22
— industry—17, 19, 30, 78, 80-81, 83-85, 87-89, 91-93, 188, 276, 279, 293, 296, 326-27, 332, 53
— agriculture—17, 78-79, 81-82, 83, 201
— home and foreign trade—17, 66, 78, 86, 87, 90-93, 326-32, 531
— protectionist policy—84, 87, 89, 90-94, 232
— estates, classes—17, 84, 92, 248-49, 332
— state and political system—78, 79, 294, 326-27, 328, 332, 511-12, 519
— disunity and problems of unification—24, 31, 32-33, 85, 293, 335, 552, 553
— political parties — 78
— bourgeois liberal movement — 20-
21, 24-26, 30-33, 66, 69, 71, 77,
220-25, 292-94, 299, 332-33, 356,
510-11, 519-22
— Hambach festival, 1832 — 332
— youth, students — 20, 24, 30, 31,
32
— education — 17, 81, 427, 512
— religion and church — 20, 248
— foreign policy — 16, 84, 90, 535-36
— and oppression of Poland — 389,
391-92, 535, 551-52
— and other European states — 15,
16, 23, 24, 27, 411, 551-52
— prospects of revolution — 85, 86,
293, 352, 512, 519, 522, 538, 543,
551-52, 554
See also Austria, Bourgeoisie in Ger-
manship, Burghers in Germany, Customs
Union, Federal Diet, Federative Act,
German Confederation, German philos-
ophy, Holy Roman Empire of the Ger-
man Nation, Peasant War in Germany,
Prussia, Rhine province, Saxony, Work-
ing class in Germany, Württemberg,
Young Germany
Girondists — 18
God, gods — 20, 171, 174, 231, 235, 241-
42, 257
Good and evil — 167, 169, 172, 180
Gothic — 487
Greco-Persian wars, 500-449 B.C. — 368,
371
Guilds, fraternities, corporations — 88, 101,
174, 179, 184, 186, 190, 192, 267, 270,
276, 322, 330, 345, 348-49, 355

H

Hamburg — 86
Hanseatic towns — 80, 85
Heathens — 258
Hegel's philosophy — 18, 265
— dialectical method of — 163-67,
169, 256
— and Feuerbach's philosophy —
256, 258
Historiography — 326
History — 50, 133, 164, 170, 174, 178,
179, 192, 204, 253, 319, 337, 345, 494,
507, 521, 530
Hobbes' philosophy — 233
Holbach's philosophy — 254, 256
Holy Alliance, the — 22, 31, 93, 320
Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation
— 15, 17, 19, 271
Humanism — 6, 48, 125, 256, 270, 292,
293
Hungary — 7, 343, 527, 531, 535, 542

I

Ideas — 162, 165, 170-71, 177, 179, 184,
196, 197, 501, 504
Illuminati — 303
Immigration — 43, 167, 309
India — 167, 185, 187, 345, 422, 628
Industrial revolution — 341, 343-47, 485
Industry
— under feudalism — 191, 320, 328,
489
— domestic — 174
— and protectionist policy — 80, 93,
279, 280, 287, 288, 328, 465, 573
— large-scale — 79, 81, 87-89, 99,
127, 137, 138, 143, 183, 187, 207,
210-11, 279, 287-88, 296, 328, 342,
345-47, 349, 351-53, 355, 429,
432-33, 465, 485, 486
— contradictions within it under
bourgeois mode of production —
135, 515
— and property relations — 159,
303-04, 322-23
— and trade — 113, 167
— small-scale — 138, 279, 429, 509,
573
— and peasantry — 83
— and bourgeoisie — 79, 81, 486,
493, 494, 524, 527
— ousting of skilled workers and use
of women's and children's labour
— 420, 422, 427, 433, 491, 501,
502
— during the period of transition
from capitalism to communism and
under communism — 299, 304,
305, 322, 350-51, 352-53, 505
See also Guilds, Industrial revolution,
Machines, Manufacture, Production cycle,
Trade
Interest, interests
— and private property — 388, 487
— and social and economic progress — 85, 368, 493, 527, 542-43,
— opposite, and their elimination — 6, 24, 28, 83-84, 87, 175, 211, 368, 388-90
— identity of — 390, 550
— alleged harmony of, in bourgeois society — 144, 362, 514
— material, economic — 76, 83, 93, 211, 493
— political — 31 350
— national — 6, 84-85, 368, 372, 489, 534, 542-43, 550, 552
— social under communism — 348
— and law — 89, 90, 494
— their expression in ideology and theory — 333, 511-12
— estate — 79, 333
— class — 76, 83-85, 95, 175, 211, 489
— party — 75, 76, 78, 333, 390
— during transition from capitalism to communism — 299
— in communist society — 348, 388

Internationalism, proletarian — 6, 390, 497

Inventions — 156, 159, 187, 188, 204, 207, 284, 341, 346

Iran — 528

Ireland — 13, 200, 286, 307-09, 425, 445-49, 466, 482, 549

Irish Confederation — 549

Italy
— in the Middle Ages — 205, 486, 530
— industry and trade — 523, 531, 533, 541
— home policy — 371-72
— Austrian rule in — 520, 523
— in the first half of the 19th century — 31, 371-72, 520, 532-34, 541, 554
— struggle for national liberation and reunification — 31, 371-72, 523, 534, 540
— revolution in Naples, 1799 — 371-72
— revolution of 1820-21 — 31, 371-72, 540
— revolutionary events of 1830 — 31, 366, 371-72, 520, 532, 533
— liberal reforms in Papal states — 521-23
— revolutionary upsurge in 1847 — 520-21, 523, 528, 532
— and other European states — 366, 371-72

See also Carbonari, Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Lombardy, Papal states, Piedmont (kingdom of Sardinia), Revolution of 1848 in Italian states, Rome

J

Jack Cade's rebellion, 1450 — 295

Jacobins, Jacobin dictatorship, the — 4, 5, 18, 19, 319, 335, 372, 376, 386, 403, 545

Jacquerie (France, 1358) — 295

Jesuits — 524, 525

Jews — 158, 237, 239, 243, 276

July revolution of 1830 in France — 29, 31, 52, 266, 371, 507, 520-21, 534, 540

Junkers — see Nobility

K

Kantianism — 17, 182, 259

Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (Naples) — 371, 522, 539-40

L

Labour
— as the source of value — 120, 127, 132, 149, 150
— simple and compound — 127, 182, 185, 422, 427, 429
— machine — 79, 345
— as an element of bourgeois production — 82, 346
— and capital — 133, 428, 463, 490, 500, 573
— struggle between labour and capital — 58, 178, 288, 310, 435, 440, 515
— as a commodity in bourgeois society — 130, 341, 343, 344, 415, 433, 436, 462, 491
— mental, as an article of trade in bourgeois society — 436
— child — 422, 427, 491, 505
— women’s — 422, 491
— in the period of transition from capitalism to communism — 295, 350, 351, 377
— under communism — 499
See also Manual labour, Productivity of labour, Wage labour

Labour power — 125, 127, 130, 285
Labour time — 127, 134-35, 143, 150, 154, 203

Landed property
— as a basis of feudal system — 519
— and industrial capital — 201, 203, 322
— and bourgeois revolution — 66, 322, 546
— bourgeois — 89, 173, 199-202
— evolution under capitalism — 89, 90, 173, 197-99, 200-03, 205, 322
— tendency to abolish and nationalise it under capitalism — 203, 322
— preconditions for its transformation into social property — 352-53, 505
— small-peasant — 173, 322, 352
— critique of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theories — 42, 197-99, 201-03, 322
— in England — 201-02, 322
— in Germany — 201, 519
— in Poland — 546
— in Scotland — 173
— in USA — 42

Law — 31, 81, 83, 88-90, 119, 147, 150, 164, 177, 184-85, 194, 197, 209, 253, 494, 501, 504, 511, 577
See also Legislation, Penal code, Right of inheritance

League of the Just, the — 589-600

Legal procedure — 66, 88, 228

Legislation
— as expression of economic relations — 28, 147, 209, 346
— and classes — 58, 61, 79, 80, 87-90, 346, 467, 488-89, 493, 524-25
— in England — 58, 187, 209, 213, 456
— in France — 61, 213, 218
— in Prussia — 65, 228
— in Switzerland — 524-25

Legitimization — 20, 22, 24, 31, 77, 331, 508
Levant, the — 187

Liberalism
— and democracy — 29, 59, 384-86, 450
— in Belgium — 331, 521, 546
— in England — 384, 450
— in France — 22, 331, 377, 379, 380-82, 385-87
— in Germany and Prussia — 26, 30-33, 66, 70, 221-25, 230, 243, 292, 299, 331-33, 356, 511, 519, 521, 522
— in Italy — 522
See also Free Trade movement
Lisbon — 575

Literature
— world — 488
— English — 7, 59
— French — 397
— German — 18, 75, 244-45, 256-61, 268-69, 270-71, 273-74, 312-16, 332, 337, 339
See also Poetry
Logic — 116, 158, 163-67, 169, 193, 196
Logos — 163
Lombardy — 523, 533, 534, 542
Lorraine — 16
Lumpen proletariat — 83, 246, 494

M

Machiavellianism — 254, 262


Malthusianism — 416, 426, 428

Man, individual, personality
— nature and essence of — 43, 45, 76, 147, 257, 265-66, 271, 415, 487, 510-11
— and Nature — 111, 197, 201-02
— and society — 155
— and production — 111-13, 125, 127, 166, 170, 174-75, 186-87, 188-90, 319-20, 347
— and private property — 498-99
— and division of labour — 127, 180, 187, 188-90, 304-05, 353
— and classes — 330-31
— in feudal society — 486
— in bourgeois society — 133, 176, 442, 463, 486-87, 498-500
— in communist society — 348, 351, 353, 498-500, 505
— and freedom — 29, 463, 498-500
— as seen by Feuerbach — 249-50
Manchester — 208
Market — 66, 69, 394
— and industrial development — 173, 186, 351
— of labour power — 431
— continental — 24, 65, 275
— world — 90, 187, 210, 217, 303, 322, 327, 332, 345, 351, 388, 421, 422, 429, 436, 465
— struggle of the bourgeoisie for markets — 20, 22, 24, 25, 66-69, 90, 173, 217, 311
— cotton — 311
Masses — 3, 5, 71, 75, 222, 226, 232-33, 294, 350, 440
— as decisive force in revolutions — 17, 19, 71, 232-34, 319, 337
Materialism — 254, 255, 407
Mechanics — 146, 187, 188, 207
Mediterranean Sea — 179
Metaphysics — 18, 49, 161, 163-65, 169, 197, 546
Method — 161, 164-66
Mexico — 527
Middle Ages, the — 82, 94, 113, 133, 182, 185, 190, 231, 252, 267, 270, 271, 326, 327, 330, 343, 348-49, 482, 522
Mode of production — 144, 146, 166, 170, 174, 296, 304, 342, 348, 441, 486, 487, 504
See also Capitalist mode of production, Communist society, Feudalism, Primitive communism, Production relations, Productive forces
Monarchy — 325-28, 345, 531
— origin — 325-27, 345, 540
— with estate representation — 26, 66, 71, 486
— and bourgeoisie — 28, 30, 80, 87-90, 318-19, 330
See also Absolute monarchy
Money — as a social relation — 145
— as a measure of commodity value — 123
— as the universal agent of exchange — 117, 145, 151
— paper — 57, 150
— metal — 57, 145-50, 252
— in bourgeois society — 28, 29, 79, 238, 271, 345, 421, 427, 436, 500
— and political power — 320-21, 324
— its abolition under communism — 351
Morality — 169, 194, 247, 259, 272, 301, 317-18, 325, 494, 504
See also Good and evil
Mystic, mysticism — 50, 153, 158, 197, 199, 258, 512
Mythology — 157-60, 214, 313-15, 335-39

N

Naples — see Kingdom of the Two Sicilies
Napoleonic wars — 19-28, 65, 320, 549, 554
See also Wars of revolutionary France at the end of 18th century
Nation — 3, 372, 465, 488, 503
— under communism — 102, 354, 388, 503
See also National question
National Charter Association — 383
Nationalism — 3, 6, 411, 488-89, 534, 560, 562
National question — 3, 4, 389, 390, 392, 402-03, 449, 503, 540, 544-49, 551-52
National reformers, National Reform As-
sociation (USA) — 41, 42, 43, 48, 324, 356
See also Society
Negation — 163-64, 172, 182, 187, 192, 195, 317
Negation of the negation, the — 163, 164, 195
Netherlands, the — 22, 116, 179, 186, 286, 399, 575
New York — 43
Nobility
— in feudal society — 16, 17, 79, 81, 82, 84-86, 326-28, 343, 486, 494
— and peasantry — 79, 83, 84
— and monarchy — 86, 235, 486
— in bourgeois society — 79, 82, 83, 89, 345-46, 528
— in Germany — 16, 19, 79-88, 294, 327, 511
— in Italy — 371, 523, 533
— in Prussia — 65, 66, 69-70, 82, 83, 86, 89-90, 522
Norway — 83, 367, 368, 381

O

Objects of prime necessity — 133, 147, 217, 226, 453
Officials — see Bureaucracy
Opposition — 84, 114, 116, 133, 193, 208
Orleanists — 378, 380, 386, 387
Overproduction — 136, 143, 284, 290, 352, 458, 489, 490, 509, 632
Owen’s system — 209, 514, 517, 576

P

Palestine — 205
Pantheism — 264
Papal states — 205, 371, 521, 522, 523, 532
Paris — 5, 8, 13, 18, 62, 63, 376, 380, 381, 407
Party, parties
— social basis of — 546
— and sects — 30-31

— inter-party struggle — 47, 294
— leaders of — 7, 76
— and revolution — 101, 349
— progressive — 64, 71, 521, 525
— revolutionary — 13, 29, 30, 220
— democratic — 63, 71, 355-57
— reactionary — 202
— bourgeois — 86
See also Chartism, Communist party, Democracy, Girondists, Jacobins, Legitimism, Orleanists, Proletarian party, Tory
Pauperism — 43, 323, 324, 434, 495, 509
Peasantry, peasants — 44
— in feudal society — 79, 83, 84, 186, 533
— and commodity relations — 533
— expropriation of — 187
— free — 527, 549
— role in bourgeois revolutions — 498
— in capitalist society — 353
— conservatism of — 19, 83, 295, 494
— small — 83, 233, 294-95, 420-425
— and bourgeoisie — 82-83, 488, 494, 525, 527
— and working class — 294-95, 350, 491, 494, 525
— and proletarian revolution — 525
See also Serf peasants
Peasant War in Germany, 1524-25 — 27, 295, 326
Penal Code — 209
People’s Charter — 14, 29, 59, 308, 361, 414, 466, 647
Period of transition from capitalism to communism — 101, 102, 104, 295-96, 299, 350-51, 355, 377-78, 505-06
See Political domination of the proletariat
Personal property — 498-500
Peterloo — 23, 29
Petty bourgeoisie — 7, 17, 81, 84-86, 178, 339, 356
— and bourgeoisie — 79-80, 82, 88-90, 267, 509, 512
— and working class — 82, 294-95, 350, 380, 509, 512
Philistinism — 242, 245, 248, 253, 259, 264, 266, 273, 302, 313, 316-17, 512, 519
Philosophy — 163, 164, 178, 179, 181, 255-56, 293, 317, 503, 511
See also Deism, Dialectics, French phi-
losophy, German philosophy, Logos, Materialism, Metaphysics, Mystic, Pantheism, Sensationism

Physics—146

Piedmont (Kingdom of Sardinia)—523, 540

Poetry—240-42, 247-49
— German—17, 20, 236, 243-44, 255, 259, 272-73
— of the “true socialists”—235-49, 252, 265-66, 272-73

See also Cracow insurrection of 1846, Polish insurrection of 1830-31, Polish question

Polish insurrection of 1830-31—388, 391-92, 532, 549, 550

Polish question—388-89, 391-92, 518, 545-52

Political domination of the proletariat (idea of dictatorship of proletariat)
— historical necessity and inevitability of winning political power by proletariat—299, 319, 440, 495, 497-98, 502, 504-05
— as condition of proletariat’s liberation—467
— tasks of—299, 351, 372, 504-05
— and democracy—294-95, 299, 350, 351, 368
See also Classes, Class struggle, Period of transition from capitalism to communism, Proletarian revolution

Political economy, bourgeois
— representatives of, as theoreticians of the class of the bourgeoisie—121, 125, 178
— attitude of, to the working-class struggle—206-11, 289-90, 329
— humanistic school—177
— romantic trend—176
— philanthropic school—177
See also Malthusian school, Free Trade movement

Political freedoms—31, 218, 225, 228

Political power—28, 29, 81, 82, 212, 294, 318-21, 345-46, 381, 440, 505, 524
See also Political domination of the proletariat, State

Political rights—32, 233, 254, 255, 362, 393

Political system—78, 102, 174, 222, 489

Politics
— as an expression of economic relations—147, 319, 320, 327, 381, 546-49
— and social relations—4, 5, 7, 17, 75-76, 212, 292, 294-95, 321, 324, 328-31, 364, 380, 381, 546
See also Class struggle

Poor laws (England)—434, 453

Portugal—28, 31, 179, 575

Practice—see Theory and practice

Press, the
— partisanship of—291, 294-95, 297-99
— bourgeois—360
— aristocratic—294-95, 392
— democratic—64, 294-95, 298, 311, 387, 392, 407-08, 439-42
— in England—59, 225, 331, 360
— in France—64, 82, 225, 387
— in Germany—17, 19, 64, 253, 294-95, 297
— in Italy—528
See also Censorship, Freedom of the press

Price, prices
— as a result of the fluctuation of demand and supply—115, 116, 123, 125, 126, 132, 134, 148-50, 156, 208, 459
— and competition—199-200, 202, 343, 462
— and costs of commodity production—490-91
— of industrial products and luxuries—137, 199, 200, 207, 217, 345
— of agricultural products—199, 202, 204, 453, 455
— of staple goods—133, 160, 217, 225
— and wages—126, 129, 160, 206, 208, 217
— market—132, 199, 204, 208, 210, 419

Primitive communism—482
Principles—5, 86, 162, 165, 170, 303, 337

Private property
— as an embodiment of bourgeois production relations—197, 337, 489
— and productive forces—304, 348-49, 489, 490
— historically transient character of forms of—348-49, 498, 501
— in the primitive and patriarchal family—355
— feudal form of—323, 332, 337, 338, 489
— cooperative, or guild—322, 348
— based on producer’s own labour—345, 498
— transformation of feudal into bourgeois—322-23, 337-38, 344, 348, 498, 545-49
— bourgeois—296, 318-19, 348-49, 388, 489, 498, 500
— and law—501
— abolition of, in course of proletarian revolution—295, 350-51, 504-05
— as seen by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois reformists—44, 405, 501-02

Privilege—16, 18, 28, 29, 101, 174, 181, 191, 216, 218, 318, 320, 345, 466, 467

Production
— development of—118, 349, 352-55, 488
— under feudalism—337
— under capitalism—491
— forms and methods of—144, 492
— and division of labour—111
— and classes—132, 348-49, 503
— of means of subsistence—111, 143, 166, 184, 488, 500, 503, 505
— of social relations—162, 165
— and needs—111, 118, 352
— intellectual—488, 500, 503
— in communist society—352-54, 505

See also Cost of production, Means of production, Mode of production, Production relations, Productive forces

Production cycle—137, 426, 458, 462

Production relations
— as a social form of productive forces—162, 166, 174-75, 193, 197, 577
— contradiction between productive forces and production relations—165, 174-75, 212, 348-49, 489
— and classes—506
— criticism of anti-historical approach to understanding of—162, 173, 174, 202, 319-20
— bourgeois—160, 162, 175, 176, 194, 197, 202, 319-20, 337, 436, 489, 499, 502, 504, 509, 513

Productive forces—99, 119, 137, 152-60, 183, 184, 290, 489
— prerequisites for development of—132, 159, 174, 176
— and mode of production—166, 348-49
— and production relations as social form of—166, 174-76, 193, 577
— and superstructure—170
— contradiction between productive forces and production relations—165, 174-75, 212, 348-49, 489, 490
— and condition of the working class—422, 423, 428, 432-33, 459
— development of, as a material condition of transition to communism—212, 303, 349, 352, 490, 495

Productivity of labour—158, 419


Progress—345, 367, 390, 527, 528
— and class struggle—85, 132
— and national interests—542
— in science and technology—152, 293
— in industry—137, 493, 495-96
— and bourgeois society — 29, 81, 168, 217-18, 372, 526, 540, 569
— under communism — 212, 352

"Progressive conservatives" in France — 214, 439

Proletarian party — 3, 5, 210-11, 222-25, 324, 493, 498, 519

See also Communist party

Proletarian revolution, the — 519
— historical inevitability of — 94-95, 319, 372, 495-96, 528-29, 599
— as a means of the proletariat’s liberation — 178, 290, 345, 436, 504, 515
— as a means of liquidating social oppression — 294, 381
— as the peak of class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat — 212, 290, 495
— international character of — 352, 388, 629
— and possibility of a peaceful way of development — 101, 349

Proletariat — see Working class


See also Appropriation, Landed property, Personal property, Private property, Social property, State property

Prostitution — 250, 354, 501, 502

Protectionism — 92, 276-83, 287-89, 464, 465, 573, 628

See also Protective tariffs

Protective tariffs, duties — 6, 65, 69, 80, 84, 87, 90-94, 196, 232, 266, 267, 279, 280, 284, 287, 288, 290, 324, 450, 454, 465

Protestantism — 218, 631

Proudhon’s doctrine
— as ideology of petty bourgeoisie — 191
— philosophical foundations of — 109, 166, 178, 195
— and Hegelian philosophy — 109, 161, 165, 167, 168, 169
— distortion of dialectics — 119, 163, 172, 182, 183, 195
— elements of mysticism — 153, 158, 173, 197, 199
— theory of the person-society — 152-57, 159, 171
— teaching on human reason ("social genius") — 171-73
— view on the origin of authority — 184-86
— view on man — 118, 119, 152-54, 159, 192, 193, 197
— political economy — 73, 74, 109, 110, 147, 151, 158, 161, 162, 164, 165, 168, 178-79
— and classical political economy — 120-25, 127, 128, 135, 138, 146, 151, 156, 179, 180, 186, 188, 199
— metaphysical method — 113, 181, 184
— views on property — 197-99, 260
— views on labour — 120, 124, 125, 128-30, 136, 138, 144, 149, 150, 153, 156, 158, 159, 190, 194
— theory of utility — 115-17, 132, 134
— views on industry and its origin — 111, 112, 133, 174
— views on needs — 112
— views on division of labour and machines — 112, 118, 158, 178, 179, 181-84, 186, 187, 188
— teaching on commodity and money — 113, 118, 144-52, 162
— views on capital — 154-55, 205
— views on demand and supply — 115-17, 119, 131, 134, 137, 149, 150
— exchange bank — 145
— views on wages — 125, 128-29, 160, 182, 192, 206, 207, 208
— views on competition — 119, 166, 191-95
— on taxes — 168
— on science — 178
— petty-bourgeois equalisation — 124, 126-29, 158, 159, 172, 173, 181, 184, 193, 196, 202, 203, 204
— equalised distribution — 159, 181, 203
— negation of economic struggle of the working class—206-209

Prussia—26, 27
— feudalism and its aftermath—23, 66, 83, 227, 333
— during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars—22, 23, 26, 27, 65, 80, 523
— reforms of 1801-14—23, 523
— in 1815-early 1848—26, 27, 52, 63-71, 89-90, 520
— industry—65, 66, 80
— railways—69
— finance, budget, taxes—52, 53, 57, 58, 69, 231-32, 522
— trade—65, 66
— peasantry—66, 83, 225, 227, 229
— political and state system—30, 65, 71, 92, 225, 227, 333, 522
— provincial assemblies of the estates—31, 55, 64, 83, 243
— prospects of revolution—522
— foreign policy—89-90
— oppression of Poland—93, 545, 552
— and the German Confederation—25, 26, 32, 65, 71
— and other European countries—26, 65, 542, 543
See also Bourgeoisie in Prussia, Working class in Prussia

Prussian society of maritime trade (Preußische Seehandlungsgesellschaft)—52
Publicity—66, 89, 213, 218, 253
Public opinion—17, 26, 61, 64, 219, 227, 361
Puritans—85

Q

Qualification—28, 32, 379, 467
Quality and quantity—73, 124, 127, 128, 130, 163

R


Reason, understanding—162, 164, 165, 166, 168-73, 195, 325, 577
Reformation—16, 312
Reform Bill of 1832 (in England)—31
Reforms—280-81, 288-89, 295, 305, 309, 355, 380, 466, 467, 573
Religion—20, 164, 256, 405
— illusory character of conceptions of—48, 317
— ancient religions—503
— religious fanaticism—24, 26
— religious wars—20
— and anti-scientific explanation of its origin—174, 325-26
— criticism of, by German philosophy—630
— as a tool for spiritual enslavement—24, 26, 225
— creation of new religions—46-50, 248
— and bourgeoisie—486, 525
— the proletariat's and communists' attitude towards it—7, 59, 102, 231, 355, 494, 503
— overcoming of, under communism—45, 47, 102, 355
See also Atheism, Christianity, Church, Clergy, God, Mythology
Rent—122, 124, 185, 197-206, 322, 455, 457, 500, 505
Rent, tenants—83, 173, 200, 201, 203, 205, 344, 455
Repealers—448, 449
Representative system—76, 77, 80, 324, 325, 511
Republicans—4, 7, 13, 22, 292, 321, 324, 325, 334, 335, 377, 385, 438
Republicans, moderate ("National" party) in France—63, 364, 376, 377, 379-80, 385-87, 406-08, 439-43
Republics of antiquity—179
See also Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome
Revolution—101, 349
— objective character of—349
— as the principal means of transforming class society—212, 482
— and people—333
— revolutionary epochs—69, 312, 317
See also Bourgeois revolution, Proletarian revolution
Revolution of 1848 in France—556-59, 645-47, 649
Revolution of 1848 in Italian states—540-44, 549, 553-56
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