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_Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union_
KARL MARX

THESES ON FEUERBACH

I

The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism—that of Feuerbach included—is that the thing \([\text{Gegenstand}]\), reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the object \([\text{Objekt}]\) or of contemplation\([\text{Anschauung}]\), but not as human sensuous activity, practice, not subjectively. Hence it happened that the active side, in contradistinction to materialism, was developed by idealism—but only abstractly, since, of course, idealism does not know real, sensuous activity as such. Feuerbach wants sensuous objects, really differentiated from the thought objects, but he does not conceive human activity itself as objective \([\text{gegenständliche}]\) activity. Hence, in the Essence of Christianity, he regards the theoretical attitude as the only genuinely human attitude, while practice is conceived and fixed only in its dirty-judaical form of appearance. Hence he does not grasp the significance of "revolutionary", of "practical-critical", activity.

II

The question whether objective \([\text{gegenständliche}]\) truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but is a practical question. In practice man must prove the truth, that is, the reality and power, the this-sidedness \([\text{Diesseitigkeit}]\) of his thinking. The dispute over the reality or non-reality of thinking which is isolated from practice is a purely scholastic question.

III

The materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing, forgets that it is men that change circumstances and that the educator himself needs educating. Hence, this doctrine necessarily arrives at dividing society into two parts, of which one is superior to society (in Robert Owen, for example).
The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionising practice.

IV

Feuerbach starts out from the fact of religious self-alienation, the duplication of the world into a religious, imaginary world and a real one. His work consists in the dissolution of the religious world into its secular basis. He overlooks the fact that after completing this work, the chief thing still remains to be done. For the fact that the secular foundation detaches itself from itself and establishes itself in the clouds as an independent realm is really only to be explained by the self-cleavage and self-contradictoriness of this secular basis. The latter must itself, therefore, first be understood in its contradiction and then, by the removal of the contradiction, revolutionised in practice. Thus, for instance, once the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the holy family, the former must then itself be criticised in theory and revolutionised in practice.

V

Feuerbach, not satisfied with abstract thinking, appeals to sensuous contemplation; but he does not conceive sensuousness as practical, human-sensuous activity.

VI

Feuerbach resolves the religious essence into the human essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations.

Feuerbach, who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence, is consequently compelled:

1. To abstract from the historical process and to fix the religious sentiment (Gemüt) as something by itself and to presuppose an abstract—isolated—human individual.

2. The human essence, therefore, can with him be comprehended only as a "genus", as an internal, dumb generality which merely naturally unites the many individuals.

VII

Feuerbach, consequently, does not see that the "religious sentiment" is itself a social product, and that the abstract individual whom he analyses belongs in reality to a particular form of society.
VIII

Social life is essentially practical. All mysteries which mislead theory to mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice.

IX

The highest point attained by contemplative materialism, that is, materialism which does not understand sensuousness as practical activity, is the contemplation of single individuals in "civil society".

X

The standpoint of the old materialism is "civil" society; the standpoint of the new is human society, or socialised humanity.

XI

The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it.

Written by Marx in the spring of 1845

Originally published by Engels in 1888 in the Appendix to the separate edition of his Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy

Printed according to the text of the separate 1888 edition, checked with the manuscript of Karl Marx

Translated from the German
[s. 1] As we hear from German ideologists, Germany has in the last few years gone through an unparalleled revolution. The decomposition of the Hegelian philosophy, which began with Strauss, has developed into a universal ferment into which all the “powers of the past” are swept. In the general chaos mighty empires have arisen only to meet with immediate doom, heroes have emerged momentarily only to be hurled back into obscurity by bolder and stronger rivals. It was a revolution beside which the French Revolution was child’s play, a world struggle beside which the struggles of the Diadochi appear insignificant. Principles ousted one another, heroes of the mind overthrew each other with unheard-of rapidity, and in the three years 1842-45 more of the past was swept away in Germany than at other times in three centuries.

All this is supposed to have taken place in the realm of pure thought.

Certainly it is an interesting event we are dealing with: the putrescence of the absolute spirit. When the last spark of its life had failed, the various components of this caput mortuum began to decompose, entered into new combinations and formed new substances. The industrialists of philosophy, who till then had lived on the exploitation of the absolute spirit, now seized upon the new combinations. Each with all possible zeal set about retailing his apportioned share. This naturally gave rise to competition, which, to start with, was carried on in moderately staid bourgeois fashion. Later when the German market was glutted, and the commodity in spite of all efforts found no response in the world market, the business was spoiled in the usual German manner by fabricated and fictitious production, deterioration in quality, adulteration of the raw materials, falsification of labels, fictitious purchases, bill-jobbing and a credit system devoid of any real basis. The competition turned into a bitter struggle,

* Literally: dead head, a term used in chemistry for the residuum left after distillation; here: remainder, residue.—Ed.
which is now being extolled and interpreted to us as a revolution of world significance, the begetter of the most prodigious results and achievements.

If we wish to rate at its true value this philosophic charlatanry, which awakens even in the breast of the honest German citizen a glow of national pride, if we wish to bring out clearly the pettiness, the parochial narrowness of this whole Young-Hegelian movement and in particular the tragicomic contrast between the illusions of these heroes about their achievements and the actual achievements themselves, we must look at the whole spectacle from a standpoint beyond the frontiers of Germany.  

[1.] Ideology in General, German Ideology in Particular

[s. 2] German criticism has, right up to its latest efforts, never quitted the realm of philosophy. Far from examining its general philosophic premises, the whole body of its inquiries has actually sprung from the soil of a definite philosophical system, that of Hegel. Not only in their answers but in their very questions there was a mystification. This dependence on Hegel is the reason why not one of these modern critics has even attempted a comprehensive criticism of the Hegelian system, however much each

* [Here the following passage is crossed out in the first version of the clean copy:]

[p. 2] We preface therefore the specific criticism of individual representatives of this movement with a few general observations, elucidating the ideological premises common to all of them. These remarks will suffice to indicate the standpoint of our criticism insofar as it is required for the understanding and the motivation of the subsequent individual criticisms. We oppose these remarks [p. 3] to Feuerbach in particular because he is the only one who has at least made some progress and whose works can be examined de bonne foi.

1. Ideology in General, German Ideology in Particular

A. We know only a single science, the science of history. One can look at history from two sides and divide it into the history of nature and the history of men. The two sides are, however, inseparable; the history of nature and the history of men are dependent on each other so long as men exist. The history of nature, so-called natural science, does not concern us here; but we will have to examine the history of men, since almost the whole ideology amounts either to a distorted interpretation of this history or to a complete abstraction from it. Ideology is itself only one of the aspects of this history.

[In the first version of the clean copy further comes a passage, which has not been crossed out, about the premises of the materialistic conception of history. In this volume, this passage is included in the text of the main (second) version of the clean copy as Section 2 (see pp. 19-20).—Ed.]
professes to have advanced beyond Hegel. Their polemics against Hegel and against one another are confined to this—each extracts one side of the Hegelian system and turns this against the whole system as well as against the sides extracted by the others. To begin with they extracted pure unfalsified Hegelian categories such as “substance” and “self-consciousness”,* later they desecrated these categories with more secular names such as “species”, “the Unique”, “Man”,** etc.

The entire body of German philosophical criticism from Strauss to Stirner is confined to criticism of religious conceptions.*** The critics started from real religion and actual theology. What religious consciousness and a religious conception really meant was determined variously as they went along. Their advance consisted in subsuming the allegedly dominant metaphysical, political, juridical, moral and other conceptions under the class of religious or theological conceptions; and similarly in pronouncing political, juridical, moral consciousness as religious or theological, and the political, juridical, moral man—“man” in the last resort—as religious. The dominance of religion was taken for granted. Gradually every dominant relationship was pronounced a religious relationship and transformed into a cult, a cult of law, a cult of the State, etc. On all sides it was only a question of dogmas and belief in dogmas. The world was sanctified to an ever-increasing extent till at last our venerable Saint Max**** was able to canonise it en bloc and thus dispose of it once for all.

The Old Hegelians had comprehended everything as soon as it was reduced to an Hegelian logical category. The Young Hegelians criticised everything by attributing to it religious conceptions or by pronouncing it a theological matter. The Young Hegelians are in agreement with the Old Hegelians in their belief in the rule of religion, of concepts, of a universal principle in the existing world. Only, the one party attacks this dominion as usurpation, while the other extols it as legitimate.

Since the Young Hegelians consider conceptions, thoughts, ideas, in fact all the products of consciousness, to which they attribute an independent existence, as the real chains of men.

---

* The basic categories of David Strauss and Bruno Bauer.—Ed.
** The basic categories of Ludwig Feuerbach and Max Stirner.—Ed.
*** [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] ... claiming to be the absolute redeemer of the world from all evil. Religion was continually regarded and treated as the arch-enemy, as the ultimate cause of all relationships repugnant to these philosophers.
**** Max Stirner.—Ed.
(just as the Old Hegelians declared them the true bonds of human society), it is evident that the Young Hegelians have to fight only against these illusions of the consciousness. Since, according to their fantasy, the relationships of men, all their doings, their chains and their limitations are products of their consciousness, the Young Hegelians logically put to men the moral postulate of exchanging their present consciousness for human, critical or egoistic consciousness, and thus of removing their limitations. This demand to change consciousness amounts to a demand to interpret reality in another way, i.e., to recognise it by means of another interpretation. The Young-Hegelian ideologists, in spite of their allegedly "world-shattering" statements, are the staunchest conservatives. The most recent of them have found the correct expression for their activity when they declare they are only fighting against "phrases". They forget, however, that to these phrases they themselves are only opposing other phrases, and that they are in no way combating the real existing world when they are merely combating the phrases of this world. The only results which this philosophic criticism could achieve were a few (and at that thoroughly one-sided) elucidations of Christianity from the point of view of religious history; all the rest of their assertions are only further embellishments of their claim to have furnished, in these unimportant elucidations, discoveries of universal importance.

It has not occurred to any one of these philosophers to inquire into the connection of German philosophy with German reality, the relation of their criticism to their own material surroundings.*

[2. Premises of the Materialistic Conception of History]**

[p. 3] The premises from which we begin are not arbitrary ones, not dogmas, but real premises from which abstraction can only be made in the imagination. They are the real individuals, their activity and the material conditions under which they live, both those which they find already existing and those produced by

---

* The reference is to Ludwig Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer and Max Stirner.—Ed.
** Further, in the manuscript of the main version of the clean copy, the remaining part of the page is left blank. The text following on the next page is reproduced in this volume as Section 3.—Ed.
*** The text of this section is taken from the first version of the clean copy.—Ed.
their activity. These premises can thus be [p. 4] verified in a purely empirical way.

The first premise of all human history is, of course, the existence of living human individuals.* Thus the first fact to be established is the physical organisation of these individuals and their consequent relation to the rest of nature. Of course, we cannot here go either into the actual physical nature of man, or into the natural conditions in which man finds himself—geological, orohydrographical, climatic and so on.** The writing of history must always set out from these natural bases and their modification in the course of history through the action of men.

Men can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion or anything else you like. They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organisation. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their actual material life.

The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the actual means of subsistence they find in existence and have to reproduce.

[p. 5] This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production.

This production only makes its appearance with the increase of population. In its turn this presupposes the intercourse [Verkehr] of individuals with one another.6 The form of this intercourse is again determined by production.***

---

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] The first historical act of these individuals distinguishing them from animals is not that they think, but that they begin to produce their means of subsistence.

** [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] Not only the original, spontaneous organisation of men, especially racial differences, depends on these conditions but also the entire further development, or lack of development, of men up to the present time.

*** The first version of the clean copy ends here. Further this volume contains the text of the main version of the clean copy.—Ed.
[3. Production and Intercourse. Division of Labour and Forms of Property: Tribal, Ancient, Feudal]

[s. 3] The relations of different nations among themselves depend upon the extent to which each has developed its productive forces, the division of labour and internal intercourse. This statement is generally recognised. But not only the relation of one nation to others, but also the whole internal structure of the nation itself depends on the stage of development reached by its production and its internal and external intercourse. How far the productive forces of a nation are developed is shown most manifestly by the degree to which the division of labour has been carried. Each new productive force, insofar as it is not merely a quantitative extension of productive forces already known (for instance the bringing into cultivation of fresh land), causes a further development of the division of labour.

The division of labour inside a nation leads at first to the separation of industrial and commercial from agricultural labour, and hence to the separation of town and country and to the conflict of their interests. Its further development leads to the separation of commercial from industrial labour. At the same time through the division of labour inside these various branches there develop various divisions among the individuals co-operating in definite kinds of labour. The relative position of these individual groups is determined by the methods employed in agriculture, industry and commerce (patriarchalism, slavery, estates, classes). These same conditions are to be seen (given a more developed intercourse) in the relations of different nations to one another.

The various stages of development in the division of labour are just so many different forms of ownership, i.e., the existing stage in the division of labour determines also the relations of individuals to one another with reference to the material, instrument and product of labour.

The first form of ownership is tribal [Stammeigentum] ownership. It corresponds to the undeveloped stage of production, at which a people lives by hunting and fishing, by the rearing of cattle or, in the highest stage, agriculture. In the latter case it presupposes a great mass of uncultivated stretches of land. The division of labour is at this stage still very elementary and is confined to a further extension of the natural division of labour existing in the family. The social structure is, therefore, limited to an extension of the family: patriarchal family chieftains, below them the members of the tribe, finally slaves. The slavery
latent in the family only develops gradually with the increase of population, the growth of wants, and with the extension of external relations, both of war and of barter.

The second form is the ancient communal and State ownership which proceeds especially from the union of several tribes into a city by agreement or by conquest, and which is still accompanied by slavery. Beside communal ownership we already find movable, and later also immovable, private property developing, but as an abnormal form subordinate to communal ownership. The citizens hold power over their labouring slaves only in their community, and on this account alone, therefore, they are bound to the form of communal ownership. It is the communal private property which compels the active citizens to remain in this spontaneously derived form of association over against their slaves. For this reason the whole structure of society based on this communal ownership, and with it the power of the people, decays in the same measure as, in particular, immovable private property evolves. The division of labour is already more developed. We already find the antagonism of town and country; later the antagonism between those states which represent town interests and those which represent country interests, and inside the towns themselves the antagonism between industry and maritime commerce. The class relation between citizens and slaves is now completely developed.

With the development of private property, we find here for the first time the same conditions which we shall find again, only on a more extensive scale, with modern private property. On the one hand, the concentration of private property, which began very early in Rome (as the Licinian agrarian law proves) and proceeded very rapidly from the time of the civil wars and especially under the Emperors; on the other hand, coupled with this, the transformation of the plebeian small peasantry into a proletariat, which, however, owing to its intermediate position between propertied citizens and slaves, never achieved an independent development.

The third form of ownership is feudal or estate property. If antiquity started out from the town and its little territory, the Middle Ages started out from the country. This different starting-point was determined by the sparseness of the population at that time, which was scattered over a large area and which received no large increase from the conquerors. In contrast to Greece and Rome, feudal development at the outset, therefore, extends over a much wider territory, prepared by the Roman conquests and the spread of agriculture at first associated with them. The last centuries of the declining Roman Empire and its
conquest by the barbarians destroyed a number of productive forces; agriculture had declined, industry had decayed for want of a market, trade had died out or been violently suspended, the rural and urban population had decreased. From these conditions and the mode of organisation of the conquest determined by them, feudal property developed under the influence of the Germanic military constitution. Like tribal and communal ownership, it is based again on a community; but the directly producing class standing over against it is not, as in the case of the ancient community, the slaves, but the enserfed small peasantry. As soon as feudalism is fully developed, there also arises antagonism to the towns. The hierarchical structure of landownership, and the armed bodies of retainers associated with it, gave the nobility power over the serfs. This feudal organisation was, just as much as the ancient communal ownership, an association against a subjected producing class; but the form of association and the relation to the direct producers were different because of the different conditions of production.

This feudal system of landownership had its counterpart in the towns in the shape of corporative property, the feudal organisation of trades. Here property consisted [s. 4] chiefly in the labour of each individual person. The necessity for association against the organised robber-nobility, the need for communal covered markets in an age when the industrialist was at the same time a merchant, the growing competition of the escaped serfs swarming into the rising towns, the feudal structure of the whole country: these combined to bring about the gilds. The gradually accumulated small capital of individual craftsmen and their stable numbers, as against the growing population, evolved the relation of journeyman and apprentice, which brought into being in the towns a hierarchy similar to that in the country.

Thus the chief form of property during the feudal epoch consisted on the one hand of landed property with serf labour chained to it, and on the other of the labour of the individual with small capital commanding the labour of journeymen. The organisation of both was determined by the restricted conditions of production—the small-scale and primitive cultivation of the land, and the craft type of industry. There was little division of labour in the heyday of feudalism. Each country bore in itself the antithesis of town and country; the division into estates was certainly strongly marked; but apart from the differentiation of princes, nobility, clergy and peasants in the country, and masters, journeymen, apprentices and soon also the rabble of casual labourers in the towns, no division of importance took place. In agriculture it was rendered difficult by the strip-system, beside
which the cottage industry of the peasants themselves emerged. In industry there was no division of labour at all in the individual trades themselves, and very little between them. The separation of industry and commerce was found already in existence in older towns; in the newer it only developed later, when the towns entered into mutual relations.

The grouping of larger territories into feudal kingdoms was a necessity for the landed nobility as for the towns. The organisation of the ruling class, the nobility, had, therefore, everywhere a monarch at its head. *

[4. The Essence of the Materialistic Conception of History. Social Being and Social Consciousness]

[s. 5] The fact is, therefore, that definite individuals who are productively active in a definite way** enter into definite social and political relations. Empirical observation must in each separate instance bring out empirically, and without any mystification and speculation, the connection of the social and political structure with production. The social structure and the State are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals, but of individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other people's imagination, but as they really are; i.e., as they operate, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material limits, presuppositions and conditions independent of their will.***

The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the

* Further, in the manuscript, the remainder of the page is left blank. On the next page begins the summary of the materialistic conception of history. The fourth, bourgeois, form of property is dealt with in Part IV of the chapter, Sections 2-4.—Ed.
** [The original version:] definite individuals under definite relations of production.
*** [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] The ideas which these individuals form are ideas either about their relation to nature or about their mutual relations or about their own nature. It is evident that in all these cases their ideas are the conscious expression—real or illusory—of their real relationships and activities, of their production and intercourse and of their social and political organisation. The opposite assumption is only possible if in addition to the spirit of the real, materially evolved individuals a separate spirit is presupposed. If the conscious expression of the real relations of these individuals is illusory, if in their imagination they turn reality upside-down, then this in its turn is the result of their limited material mode of activity and their limited social relations arising from it.
material intercourse of men, the language of real life. Conceiv-
ing, thinking, the mental intercourse of men, appear at this stage
as the direct efflux of their material behaviour. The same applies
to mental production as expressed in the language of politics,
laws, morality, religion, metaphysics, etc., of a people. Men are
the producers of their conceptions, ideas, etc.—real, active men,
as they are conditioned by a definite development of their pro-
ductive forces and of the intercourse corresponding to these, up
to its furthest forms. Consciousness can never be anything else
than conscious existence, and the existence of men is their actual
life-process. If in all ideology men and their circumstances ap-
pear upside-down as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises
just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion
of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process.

In direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from
heaven to earth, here we ascend from earth to heaven. That is
to say, we do not set out from what men say, imagine, conceive,
nor from men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived, in
order to arrive at men in the flesh. We set out from real, active
men, and on the basis of their real life-process we demonstrate
the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this
life-process. The phantoms formed in the human brain are also,
necessarily, sublites of the material life-process, which is
empirically verifiable and bound to material premises. Morality,
religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corres-
ponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the sem-
blance of independence. They have no history, no development;
but men, developing their material production and their ma-
terial intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their
thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not deter-
mained by consciousness, but consciousness by life. In the first
method of approach the starting-point is consciousness taken as
the living individual; in the second method, which conforms to
real life, it is the real living individuals themselves, and con-
sciousness is considered solely as their consciousness.

This method of approach is not devoid of premises. It starts
out from the real premises and does not abandon them for a
moment. Its premises are men, not in any fantastic isolation and
rigidity, but in their actual, empirically perceptible process of
development under definite conditions. As soon as this active

* [The original version:] Men are the producers of their conceptions,
ideas, etc., and precisely men conditioned by the mode of production of
their material life, their material intercourse and its further development
in the social and political structure.
life-process is described, history ceases to be a collection of dead facts as it is with the empiricists (themselves still abstract), or an imagined activity of imagined subjects, as with the idealists.

Where speculation ends—in real life—there real, positive science begins: the representation of the practical activity, of the practical process of development of men. Empty talk about consciousness ceases, and real knowledge has to take its place. When reality is depicted, philosophy as an independent branch of knowledge loses its medium of existence. At the best its place can only be taken by a summing-up of the most general results, abstractions which arise from the observation of the historical development of men. Viewed apart from real history, these abstractions have in themselves no value whatsoever. They can only serve to facilitate the arrangement of historical material, to indicate the sequence of its separate strata. But they by no means afford a recipe or schema, as does philosophy, for neatly trimming the epochs of history. On the contrary, our difficulties begin only when we set about the observation and the arrangement—the real depiction—of our historical material, whether of a past epoch or of the present. The removal of these difficulties is governed by premises which it is quite impossible to state here, but which only the study of the actual life-process and the activity of the individuals of each epoch will make evident. We shall select here some of these abstractions, which we use in contradistinction to the ideologists, and shall illustrate them by historical examples.*

[II]

[1. Conditions of the Real Liberation of Man]

[1] We shall, of course, not take the trouble to enlighten our wise philosophers by explaining to them that the "liberation" of "man" is not advanced a single step by reducing philosophy, theology, substance and all the trash to "self-consciousness" and by liberating "man" from the domination of these phrases, which have never held him in thrall.** Nor will we explain to them that it is only possible to achieve real liberation in the real world and by employing real means, that slavery cannot be abolished without the steam-engine and the mule and spinning-jenny, serfdom cannot be abolished without improved agriculture, and that,

---

* The main (second) version of the clean copy ends here. Further, this volume continues with three parts of the original manuscript.—Ed.
** [Marginal notes by Marx:] Philosophic liberation and real liberation; Man. The Unique one. The individual; Geological, hydrographical, etc., conditions; The human body. Need and labour.
in general, people cannot be liberated as long as they are unable to obtain food and drink, housing and clothing in adequate quality and quantity. "Liberation" is a historical and not a mental act, and it is brought about by historical conditions, the [development] of industry, commerce, [agri]culture, the [conditions of intercourse] [. . .] [2] then subsequently, in accordance with the different stages of their development, the nonsense of substance, subject, self-consciousness and pure criticism, as well as religious and theological nonsense, and later remove it again when they have advanced far enough in their development,**

In Germany, a country where only a trivial historical development is taking place, these mental developments, these glorified and ineffective trivialities, naturally serve as a substitute for the lack of historical development, and they take root and have to be combated. But this fight is of local importance.*****

[2. Criticism of Feuerbach's Contemplative and Inconsistent Materialism]

[. . .]**** [8] in reality and for the practical materialist, i.e., the communist, it is a question of revolutionising the existing world, of practically attacking and changing existing things. When occasionally we find such views with Feuerbach, they are never more than isolated surmises and have much too little influence on his general outlook to be considered here as anything else than embryos capable of development. Feuerbach's "conception" of the sensuous world is confined on the one hand to mere contemplation of it, and on the other to mere feeling; he says "Man" instead of "real historical man". "Man" is really "the German". In the first case, the contemplation of the sensuous world, he necessarily lights on things which contradict his consciousness and feeling, which disturb the harmony he presupposes, the harmony of all parts of the sensuous world and especially of man and nature.***** To remove this disturbance, he must take refuge in a double perception, a profane one which only per-

* The manuscript is damaged here: the lower part of the sheet is torn off; one line of the text is missing.—Ed.

** [Marginal note by Marx:] Phrases and real movement. The importance of phrases in Germany.

*** [Marginal note by Marx:] Language is the language of reality.

**** Five pages of the manuscript are missing here.—Ed.

***** NB. Feuerbach's failing is not that he subordinates the flatly obvious, the sensuous appearance, to the sensuous reality established by more accurate investigation of the sensuous facts, but that he cannot in the last resort cope with the sensuous world except by looking at it with the "eyes", i.e., through the "spectacles", of the philosopher.
ceives the "flatly obvious" and a higher, philosophical, one which perceives the "true essence" of things. He does not see how the sensuous world around him is, not a thing given direct from all eternity, remaining ever the same, but the product of industry and of the state of society; and, indeed, in the sense that it is an historical product, the result of the activity of a whole succession of generations, each standing on the shoulders of the preceding one, developing its industry and its intercourse, modifying its social system according to the changed needs. Even the objects of the simplest "sensuous certainty" are only given him through social development, industry and commercial intercourse. The cherry-tree, like almost all fruit-trees, was, as is well known, only a few centuries ago transplanted by commerce into our zone, and therefore only by this action of a definite society in a definite age it has become "sensuous certainty" for Feuerbach.

Incidentally, when we conceive things thus, as they really are and happened, every profound philosophical problem is resolved, as will be seen even more clearly later, quite simply into an empirical fact. For instance, the important question of the relation of man to nature (Bruno goes so far as to speak of "the antitheses in nature and history" (p. 110), as though these were two separate "things" and man did not always have before him an historical nature and a natural history), out of which all the "unfathomably lofty works" on "substance" and "self-consciousness" were born, crumbles of itself when we understand that the celebrated "unity of man with nature" has always existed in industry and has existed in varying forms in every epoch according to the lesser or greater development of industry, just like the "struggle" of man with nature, right up to the development of his productive powers on a corresponding basis. Industry and commerce, production and the exchange of the necessities of life, themselves determine distribution, the structure of the different social classes and are, in turn, determined by it as to the mode in which they are carried on; and so it happens that in Manchester, for instance, Feuerbach sees only factories and machines, where a hundred years ago only spinning-wheels and weaving-looms were to be seen, or in the Campagna of Rome he finds only pasture lands and swamps, where in the time of Augustus he would have found nothing but the vineyards and villas of Roman capitalists. Feuerbach speaks in particular of the perception of natural science; he mentions secrets which are disclosed only to the eye of the physicist and chemist; but where

* Goethe, Faust, "Prolog im Himmel" ("Prologue in Heaven").—Ed.
would natural science be without industry and commerce? Even this "pure" natural science is provided with an aim, as with its material, only through trade and industry, through the sensuous activity of men. So much is this activity, this unceasing sensuous labour and creation, this production, the basis of the whole sensuous world as it now exists, that, were it interrupted only for a year, Feuerbach would not only find an enormous change in the natural world, but would very soon find that the whole world of men and his own perceptive faculty, nay his own existence, were missing. Of course, in all this the priority of external nature remains unassailed, and all this has no application to the original men produced by *generatio aequivoca*; but this differentiation has meaning only insofar as man is considered to be distinct from nature. For that matter, nature, the nature that preceded human history, is not by any means the nature in which Feuerbach lives, it is nature which today no longer exists anywhere (except perhaps on a few Australian coral-islands of recent origin) and which, therefore, does not exist for Feuerbach.

Certainly Feuerbach [10] has a great advantage over the "pure" materialists in that he realises how man too is an "object of the senses". But apart from the fact that he only conceives him as an "object of the senses", not as "sensuous activity", because he still remains in the realm of theory and conceives of men not in their given social connection, not under their existing conditions of life, which have made them what they are, he never arrives at the really existing active men, but stops at the abstraction "man", and gets no further than recognising "the true, individual, corporeal man" emotionally, i.e., he knows no other "human relationships" "of man to man" than love and friendship, and even then idealised. He gives no criticism of the present conditions of life. Thus he never manages to conceive the sensuous world as the total living sensuous activity of the individuals composing it; and therefore when, for example, he sees instead of healthy men a crowd of scrofulous, overworked and consumptive starvelings, he is compelled to take refuge in the "higher perception" and in the ideal "compensation in the species", and thus to relapse into idealism at the very point where the communist materialist sees the necessity, and at the same time the condition, of a transformation both of industry and of the social structure.

As far as Feuerbach is a materialist he does not deal with history, and as far as he considers history he is not a mate-

* Spontaneous generation.—Ed.
rialist. With him materialism and history diverge completely, a fact which incidentally is already obvious from what has been said.\*  

[3. Primary Historical Relationships, or the Basic Aspects of Social Activity: Production of the Means of Subsistence, Production of New Needs, Reproduction of People (the Family), Social Communication, Consciousness]  

[11]\*\* Since we are dealing with the Germans, who are devoid of premises, we must begin by stating the first premise of all human existence and, therefore, of all history, the premise, namely, that men must be in a position to live in order to be able to "make history".\*\*\* But life involves before everything else eating and drinking, a habitation, clothing and many other things.\*\*\*\* The first historical act is thus the production of the means to satisfy these needs, the production of material life itself. And indeed this is an historical act, a fundamental condition of all history, which today, as thousands of years ago, must daily and hourly be fulfilled merely in order to sustain human life. Even when the sensuous world is reduced to a minimum, to a stick as with Saint Bruno,\*\* it presupposes the action of producing the stick. Therefore in any interpretation of history one has first of all to observe this fundamental fact in all its significance and all its implications and to accord it its due importance. It is well known that the Germans have never done this, and they have never, therefore, had an earthly basis for history and consequently never a historian. The French and the English, even if they have conceived the relation of this fact with so-called history only in an extremely one-sided fashion, particularly as long as they remained in the toils of political ideology, have nevertheless made the first attempts to give the writing of history a materialistic basis by being the first to write histories of civil society, of commerce and industry.  
The second point is [12] that the satisfaction of the first need (the action of satisfying, and the instrument of satisfaction which  

\* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] The reason why we nevertheless discuss history here in greater detail is that the words "history" and "historical" usually mean everything possible to the Germans except reality, a brilliant example of this is in particular Saint Bruno with his "pulpit eloquence".  
\*\* [Marginal note by Marx:] History.  
\*\*\* Cf. p. 44 of this volume.—Ed.  
has been acquired) leads to new needs; and this production of new needs is the first historical act. Here we recognise immedi-
ately the spiritual ancestry of the great historical wisdom of
the Germans who, when they run out of positive material and
when they can serve up neither theological nor political nor
literary rubbish, assert that this is not history at all, but the
"prehistoric era". They do not, however, enlighten us as to how
we proceed from this nonsensical "prehistory" to history proper;
although, on the other hand, in their historical speculation they
seize upon this "prehistory" with especial eagerness because they
imagine themselves safe there from interference on the part of
"crude facts", and, at the same time, because there they can
give full rein to their speculative impulse and set up and knock
down hypotheses by the thousand.

The third circumstance which, from the very outset, enters
into historical development, is that men, who daily remake their
own life, begin to make other men, to propagate their kind: the
relation between man and woman, parents and children, the
family. The family, which to begin with is the only social re-
lationship, becomes later, when increased needs create new so-
cial relations and the increased population new needs, a subordi-
nate one (except in Germany), and must then be treated and
analysed according to the existing empirical data, not according
to "the concept of the family", as is the custom in Germany.

These three aspects of social activity are not of course to be
taken as three different stages, but just as three aspects or, to
make it clear to the Germans, three "moments", which have
existed simultaneously since the dawn of history and the first
men, and which still assert themselves in history today.

The production of life, both of one's own in labour and of
fresh life in procreation, now appears as a double [13] relation-
ship: on the one hand as a natural, on the other as a social
relationship. By social we understand the co-operation of several
individuals, no matter under what conditions, in what manner
and to what end. It follows from this that a certain mode of
production, or industrial stage, is always combined with a certain
mode of co-operation, or social stage, and this mode of co-
operation is itself a "productive force". Further, that the multi-
tude of productive forces accessible to men determines the na-
ture of society, hence, that the "history of humanity" must
always be studied and treated in relation to the history of indus-
try and exchange. But it is also clear how in Germany it is
impossible to write this sort of history, because the Germans
lack not only the necessary power of comprehension and the
material but also the "evidence of their senses", for across the
Rhine you cannot have any experience of these things since history has stopped happening. Thus it is quite obvious from the start that there exists a materialistic connection of men with one another, which is determined by their needs and their mode of production, and which is as old as men themselves. This connection is ever taking on new forms, and thus presents a "history" independently of the existence of any political or religious nonsense which would especially hold men together.

Only now, after having considered four moments, four aspects of the primary historical relationships, do we find that man also possesses "consciousness"*; but, even so, not inherent, not "pure" consciousness. From the start the "spirit" is afflicted with [14] the curse of being "burdened" with matter, which here makes its appearance in the form of agitated layers of air, sounds, in short, of language. Language is as old as consciousness, language is practical consciousness that exists also for other men, and for that reason alone it really exists for me personally as well; language, like consciousness, only arises from the need, the necessity, of intercourse with other men.** Where there exists a relationship, it exists for me: the animal does not enter into "relations" with anything, it does not enter into any relation at all. For the animal, its relation to others does not exist as a relation. Consciousness is, therefore, from the very beginning a social product, and remains so as long as men exist at all. Consciousness is at first, of course, merely consciousness concerning the immediate sensuous environment and consciousness of the limited connection with other persons and things outside the individual who is growing self-conscious. At the same time it is consciousness of nature, which first appears to men as a completely alien, all-powerful and unassailable force, with which men's relations are purely animal and by which they are overawed like beasts; it is thus a purely animal consciousness of nature (natural religion).

We see here immediately: this natural religion or this particular relation of men to nature is determined by the form of society and vice versa. Here, as everywhere, the identity of nature and man appears in such a way that the restricted relation of men to nature determines their restricted relation to one another, and their restricted relation to one another determines

* [Marginal note by Marx:] Men have history because they must produce their life, and because they must produce it moreover in a certain way: this is determined by their physical organisation; their consciousness is determined in just the same way.

** [The following words are crossed out in the manuscript:] My relationship to my surroundings is my consciousness.
men’s restricted relation to nature, just because nature is as yet hardly modified historically; and, on the other hand, man’s consciousness of the necessity of associating with the individuals around him is the beginning of the consciousness that he is living in society at all. This beginning is as animal as social life itself at this stage. It is mere herd-consciousness, and at this point man is only distinguished from sheep by the fact that with him consciousness takes the place of instinct or that his instinct is a conscious one. This sheep-like or tribal consciousness receives its further development and extension through increased productivity, the increase of needs, and, what is fundamental to both of these,[15] the increase of population. With these there develops the division of labour, which was originally nothing but the division of labour in the sexual act, then that division of labour which develops spontaneously or “naturally” by virtue of natural predisposition (e.g., physical strength), needs, accidents, etc., etc. Division of labour only becomes truly such from the moment when a division of material and mental labour appears.* From this moment onwards consciousness can really flatter itself that it is something other than consciousness of existing practice, that it really represents something without representing something real; from now on consciousness is in a position to emancipate itself from the world and to proceed to the formation of “pure” theory, theology, philosophy, ethics, etc. But even if this theory, theology, philosophy, ethics, etc., comes into contradiction with the existing relations, this can only occur because existing social relations have come into contradiction with existing forces of production; this, moreover, can also occur in a particular national sphere of relations through the appearance of the contradiction, not within the national orbit, but between this national consciousness and the practice of other nations,** i.e., between the national and the general consciousness of a nation (as we see it now in Germany); but since this contradiction seems to exist only as a contradiction within the national consciousness, it seems to this nation then that the struggle too is confined to this national muck.

[16] Moreover, it is quite immaterial what consciousness starts to do on its own: out of all such muck we get only the one inference that these three moments, the forces of production, the state of society, and consciousness, can and must come into con-

* [Marginal note by Marx:] The first form of ideologists, priests, is concurrent.
** [Marginal note by Marx:] Religion. The Germans and ideology as such.
tradiction with one another, because the division of labour implies the possibility, nay the fact that intellectual and material activity—enjoyment and labour, production and consumption—devolve on different individuals, and that the only possibility of their not coming into contradiction lies in the negation in its turn of the division of labour. It is self-evident, moreover, that “spectres”, “bonds”, “the higher being”, “concept”, “scruple”, are merely the idealistic, spiritual expression, the conception apparently of the isolated individual, the image of very empirical fetters and limitations, within which the mode of production of life and the form of intercourse coupled with it move.

[4. Social Division of Labour and Its Consequences: Private Property, the State, “Estrangement” of Social Activity]

With the division of labour, in which all these contradictions are implicit, and which in its turn is based on the natural division of labour in the family and the separation of society into individual families opposed to one another, is given simultaneously the distribution, and indeed the unequal distribution, both quantitative and qualitative, of labour and its products, hence property: [17] the nucleus, the first form of which lies in the family, where wife and children are the slaves of the husband. This latent slavery in the family, though still very crude, is the first property, but even at this early stage it corresponds perfectly to the definition of modern economists who call it the power of disposing of the labour-power of others. Division of labour and private property are, moreover, identical expressions: in the one the same thing is affirmed with reference to activity as is affirmed in the other with reference to the product of the activity.

Further, the division of labour implies the contradiction between the interest of the separate individual or the individual family and the communal interest of all individuals who have intercourse with one another. And indeed, this communal interest does not exist merely in the imagination, as the “general interest”, but first of all in reality, as the mutual interdependence of the individuals among whom the labour is divided.

And out of this very contradiction between the interest of the individual and that of the community the latter takes an independent form as the State, divorced from the real interests of

* [Marginal note by Marx that has been crossed out:] activity and thinking, i.e., activity deprived of thought and inactive thinking.
individual and community, and at the same time as an illusory communal life, always based, however, on the real ties existing in every family and tribal conglomeration—such as flesh and blood, language, division of labour on a larger scale, and other interests—and especially, as we shall enlarge upon later, on the classes, already determined by the division of labour, which in every such mass of men separate out, and of which one dominates all the others. It follows from this that all struggles within the State, the struggle between democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy, the struggle for the franchise, etc., etc., are merely the illusory forms in which the real struggles of the different classes are fought out among one another (of this the German theoreticians have not the faintest inkling, although they have received a sufficient introduction to the subject in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher\textsuperscript{12} and Die heilige Familie). Further, it follows that every class which is struggling for mastery, even when its domination, as is the case with the proletariat, postulates the abolition of the old form of society in its entirety and of domination itself, must first conquer for itself political power in order to represent its interest in turn as the general interest, which in the first moment it is forced to do.

Just because individuals seek only their particular interest, which for them does not coincide with their communal interest (in fact the general is the illusory form of communal life), the latter will be imposed on them as an interest “alien” to them, and [18] “independent” of them, as in its turn a particular, peculiar “general” interest; or they themselves must remain within this discord, as in democracy. On the other hand, too, the practical struggle of these particular interests, which constantly really run counter to the communal and illusory communal interests, makes practical intervention and control necessary through the illusory “general” interest in the form of the State.\textsuperscript{*}

[17] And finally, the division of labour offers us the first example of how, as long as man remains in natural society, that is, as long as a cleavage exists between the particular and the common interest, as long, therefore, as activity is not voluntarily, but naturally, divided, man’s own deed becomes an alien power opposed to him, which enslaves him instead of being controlled by him. For as soon as the distribution of labour comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd, or a critical critic, and must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of liveli-

\textsuperscript{*} These two paragraphs are inserted by Engels in the margin.—\textit{Ed.}
hood; while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic.

[18] This fixation of social activity, this consolidation of what we ourselves produce into an objective power above us, growing out of our control, thwarting our expectations, bringing to naught our calculations, is one of the chief factors in historical development up till now. The social power, i.e., the multiplied productive force, which arises through the co-operation of different individuals as it is determined by the division of labour, appears to these individuals, since their co-operation is not voluntary but has come about naturally, not as their own united power, but as an alien force existing outside them, of the origin and goal of which they are ignorant, which they thus cannot control, which on the contrary passes through a peculiar series of phases and stages independent of the will and the action of man, nay even being the prime governor of these. How otherwise could for instance property have had a history at all, have taken on different forms, and landed property, for example, according to the different premises given, have proceeded in France from parcellation to centralisation in the hands of a few, in England from centralisation in the hands of a few to parcellation, as is actually the case today? Or how does it happen that trade, which after all is nothing more than the exchange of products of various individuals and countries, rules the whole world through the relation of supply and demand—a relation which, as an English economist says, hovers over the earth like the fate of the ancients, and with invisible hand allots fortune and misfortune to men, sets up empires [19] and overthrows empires, causes nations to rise and to disappear—while with the abolition of the basis of private property, with the communistic regulation of production (and, implicit in this, the destruction of the alien relation between men and what they themselves produce), the power of the relation of supply and demand is dissolved into nothing, and men get exchange, production, the mode of their mutual relation, under their own control again?

* To this passage Marx wrote in the margin the text which is reproduced in this volume as the first two paragraphs of the next section (5) immediately following this paragraph.—Ed.
[5. Development of the Productive Forces as a Material Premise of Communism]

[18] This “estrangement” (to use a term which will be comprehensible to the philosophers) can, of course, only be abolished given two practical premises. For it to become an “intolerable” power, i.e., a power against which men make a revolution, it must necessarily have rendered the great mass of humanity “propertyless”, and produced, at the same time, the contradiction of an existing world of wealth and culture, both of which conditions presuppose a great increase in productive power, a high degree of its development. And, on the other hand, this development of productive forces (which itself implies the actual empirical existence of men in their world-historical, instead of local, being) is an absolutely necessary practical premise because without it want is merely made general, and with destitution the struggle for necessities and all the old filthy business would necessarily be reproduced; and furthermore, because only with this universal development of productive forces is a universal intercourse between men established, which produces in all nations simultaneously the phenomenon of the “propertyless” mass (universal competition), makes each nation dependent on the revolutions of the others, and finally has put world-historical, empirically universal individuals in place of local ones. Without this, (1) communism could only exist as a local event; (2) the forces of intercourse themselves could not have developed as universal, hence intolerable powers: they would have remained home-bred “conditions” surrounded by superstition; and (3) each extension of intercourse would abolish local communism. Empirically, communism is only possible as the act of the dominant peoples “all at once” and simultaneously, 13 which presupposes the universal development of productive forces and the world intercourse bound up with them.*

[19] Moreover, the mass of propertyless workers—the utterly precarious position of labour-power on a mass scale cut off from capital or from even a limited satisfaction and, therefore, no longer merely temporarily deprived of work itself as a secure source of life—presupposes the world market through competition. The proletariat can thus only exist world-historically, just as communism, its activity, can only have a “world-historical” existence. World-historical existence of individuals, i.e., existence of individuals which is directly linked up with world history:

* [Marx's remark on top of the next page of the manuscript continuing the text:] Communism.
[18] Communism is for us not a state of affairs which is to be established, an ideal to which reality [will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence.*

* * *

[19] The form of intercourse determined by the existing productive forces at all previous historical stages, and in its turn determining these, is civil society. The latter, as is clear from what we have said above, has as its premises and basis the simple family and the multiple, the so-called tribe, and the more precise determinants of this society are enumerated in our remarks above. Already here we see how this civil society is the true source and theatre of all history, and how absurd is the conception of history held hitherto, which neglects the real relationships and confines itself to high-sounding dramas of princes and states.

In the main we have so far considered only one aspect of human activity, the reshaping of nature by men. The other aspect, the reshaping of men by men...**

Origin of the State and the relation of the State to civil society.***

[6. Conclusions from the Materialistic Conception of History: Continuity of the Historical Process, Transformation of History into World History, the Necessity of a Communist Revolution]

[20] History is nothing but the succession of the separate generations, each of which exploits the materials, the capital funds, the productive forces handed down to it by all preceding generations, and thus, on the one hand, continues the traditional activity in completely changed circumstances and, on the other, modifies the old circumstances with a completely changed activity. This can be speculatively distorted so that later history is made the goal of earlier history, e.g., the goal ascribed to the discovery of America is to further the eruption of the French

---

* In the manuscript this paragraph is inserted by Marx above the first paragraph of this section.—Ed.

** [Marginal note by Marx:] Intercourse and productive power.

*** The end of the page in the manuscript is left blank. The next page begins with the exposition of the conclusions from the materialistic conception of history.—Ed.
Revolution. Thereby history receives its own special aims and becomes "a person ranking with other persons" (to wit: "Self-Consciousness, Criticism, the Unique", etc.), while what is designated with the words "destiny", "goal", "germ", or "idea" of earlier history is nothing more than an abstraction formed from later history, from the active influence which earlier history exercises on later history.

The further the separate spheres, which act on one another, extend in the course of this development, the more the original isolation of the separate nationalities is destroyed by the developed mode of production and intercourse and the division of labour between various nations naturally brought forth by these, the more history becomes world history. Thus, for instance, if in England a machine is invented, which deprives countless workers of bread in India and China, and overturns the whole form of existence of these empires, this invention becomes a world-historical fact. Or again, take the case of sugar and coffee which have proved their world-historical importance in the nineteenth century by the fact that the lack of these products, occasioned by the Napoleonic Continental System, caused the Germans [21] to rise against Napoleon, and thus became the real basis of the glorious Wars of Liberation of 1813. From this it follows that this transformation of history into world history is not indeed a mere abstract act on the part of the "self-consciousness", the world spirit, or of any other metaphysical spectre, but a quite material, empirically verifiable act, an act the proof of which every individual furnishes as he comes and goes, eats, drinks and clothes himself.

In history up to the present it is certainly an empirical fact that separate individuals have, with the broadening of their activity into world-historical activity, become more and more enslaved under a power alien to them (a pressure which they have conceived of as a dirty trick on the part of the so-called universal spirit, etc.), a power which has become more and more enormous and, in the last instance, turns out to be the world market. But it is just as empirically established that, by the overthrow of the existing state of society by the communist revolution (of which more below) and the abolition of private property which is identical with it, this power, which so battles the German theoreticians, will be dissolved; and that then the liberation of each single individual will be accomplished in the measure in which history becomes transformed into world history.* From the above it is clear that the real intellectual wealth of the indi-

* [Marginal note by Marx:] On the production of consciousness.
individual depends entirely on the wealth of his real connections. Only then will the separate individuals be liberated from the various national and local barriers, be brought into practical connection with the material and intellectual production of the whole world and be put in a position to acquire the capacity to enjoy this all-sided production of the whole earth (the creations of man.) All-round dependence, this natural form of the world-historical co-operation of individuals, will be transformed by this [22] communist revolution into the control and conscious mastery of these powers, which, born of the action of men on one another, have till now overawed and governed men as powers completely alien to them. Now this view can be expressed again in speculative-idealistic, i.e., fantastic, terms as “self-generation of the species” (“society as the subject”), and thereby the consecutive series of interrelated individuals connected with each other can be conceived as a single individual, which accomplishes the mystery of generating itself. It is clear here that individuals certainly make one another, physically and mentally, but do not make themselves either in the nonsense of Saint Bruno, or in the sense of the “Unique”, of the “made” man.

Finally, from the conception of history we have sketched we obtain these further conclusions: (1) In the development of productive forces there comes a stage when productive forces and means of intercourse are brought into being, which, under the existing relationships, only cause mischief, and are no longer productive but destructive forces (machinery and money); and connected with this a class is called forth, which has to bear all the burdens of society without enjoying its advantages, which, ousted from society, [23] is forced into the most decided antagonism to all other classes; a class which forms the majority of all members of society, and from which emanates the consciousness of the necessity of a fundamental revolution, the communist consciousness, which may, of course, arise among the other classes too through the contemplation of the situation of this class. (2) The conditions under which definite productive forces can be applied, are the conditions of the rule of a definite class of society, whose social power, deriving from its property, has its practical-idealistic expression in each case in the form of the State; and, therefore, every revolutionary struggle is directed against a class, which till then has been in power.* (3) In all revolutions up till now the mode of activity always remained unscathed and it was only a question of a different distribution

* [Marginal note by Marx:] The people are interested in maintaining the present state of production.
of this activity, a new distribution of labour to other persons, whilst the communist revolution is directed against the preceding mode of activity, does away with labour,* and abolishes the rule of all classes with the classes themselves, because it is carried through by the class which no longer counts as a class in society, is not recognised as a class, and is in itself the expression of the dissolution of all classes, nationalities, etc., within present society; and (4) Both for the production on a mass scale of this communist consciousness, and for the success of the cause itself, the alteration of men on a mass scale is necessary, an alteration which can only take place in a practical movement, a revolution; this revolution is necessary, therefore, not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way but also because the class overthrowing it can only in a revolution succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew.**

[7. Summary of the Materialistic Conception of History]

[24] This conception of history depends on our ability to expound the real process of production, starting out from the material production of life itself, and to comprehend the form of intercourse connected with this and created by this mode of pro-

* [The following words are crossed out in the manuscript:] ... the form of activity under which the rule of...

** [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] Whereas all communists in France as well as in England and Germany have long since agreed on the necessity of the revolution, Saint Bruno quietly continues to dream, and believes that "real humanism", i.e., communism, is to take "the place of spiritualism" (which has no place) only in order that it may gain respect. Then, he continues in his dream, no doubt "salvation will be attained, the earth becoming heaven, and heaven earth". (The theologian is still unable to forget heaven.) "Then joy and bliss will resound in celestial harmonies to all eternity." (P. 140.) The holy father of the church will be greatly surprised when judgement day overtakes him, the day when all this is to come to pass—a day when the reflection in the sky of burning cities will mark the dawn, when together with the "celestial harmonies" the tunes of the Marseillaise and Carmagnole will echo in his ears accompanied by the requisite roar of cannon, with the guillotine beating time; when the infamous "mass" will shout ça ira, ça ira and suspend "self-consciousness" by means of the lamp-post.15 Saint Bruno has no reason at all to draw an edifying picture "of joy and bliss to all eternity". We forego the pleasure of delineating a priori Saint Bruno's conduct on judgement day. It is moreover difficult to decide whether the prolétaires en révolution have to be conceived as "substance", as "mass", desiring to overthrow criticism, or as an "emanation" of the spirit which is, however, still lacking in the consistence necessary to digest Bauer's ideas.
duction (i.e., civil society in its various stages), as the basis of all history; and to show it in its action as State, to explain all the different theoretical products and forms of consciousness, religion, philosophy, ethics, etc., etc., and trace their origins and growth from that basis; by which means, of course, the whole thing can be depicted in its totality (and therefore, too, the reciprocal action of these various sides on one another). It has not, like the idealistic view of history, in every period to look for a category, but remains constantly on the real ground of history; it does not explain practice from the idea but explains the formation of ideas from material practice; and accordingly it comes to the conclusion that all forms and products of consciousness cannot be dissolved by mental criticism, by resolution into “self-consciousness” or transformation into “apparitions”, “spectres”, “fancies”, etc., but only by the practical overthrow of the actual social relations which gave rise to this idealistic humbug; that not criticism but revolution is the driving force of history, also of religion, of philosophy and all other types of theory. It shows that history does not end by being resolved into “self-consciousness” as “spirit of the spirit”, but that in it at each stage there is found a material result: a sum of productive forces, a historically created relation of individuals to nature and to one another, which is handed down to each generation from its predecessor; a mass of productive forces, capital funds and conditions, which, on the one hand, is indeed modified by the new generation, but also on the other prescribes for it its conditions of life and gives it a definite development, a special character. It shows that circumstances make men just as much as men make circumstances.

This sum of productive forces, capital funds and social forms of intercourse, which every individual and generation finds in existence as something given, is the real basis of what the philosophers have conceived as “substance” and “essence of man”, and what they have deified and attacked: a real basis which is not in the least disturbed, in its effect and influence on the development of men, by the fact that these philosophers revolt against it as “self-consciousness” and the “Unique”. These conditions of life, which different generations find in existence, decide also whether or not the periodically recurring revolutionary convulsion will be strong enough to overthrow the basis of the entire existing system. And if these material elements of a complete revolution are not present (namely, on the one hand the existing productive forces, on the other the formation of a revolution-

* Bruno Bauer’s expression.—Ed.
ary mass, which revolts not only against separate conditions of society up till then, but against the very "production of life" till then, the "total activity" on which it was based), then, as far as practical development is concerned, it is absolutely immaterial whether the idea of this revolution has been expressed a hundred times already, as the history of communism proves.

[8. Unfoundedness of the Former, Idealistic Conception of History, of German Post-Hegelian Philosophy in Particular]

In the whole conception of history up to the present this real basis of history has either been totally neglected or else considered as a minor matter quite irrelevant to the course of history. History must, therefore, always be written according to an extraneous standard; the real production of life seems to be primeval history, while the truly historical appears to be separated from ordinary life, something extra-superterrestrial. With this the relation of man to nature is excluded from history and hence the antithesis of nature and history is created. The exponents of this conception of history have consequently only been able to see in history the political actions of princes and States, religious and all sorts of theoretical struggles, and in particular in each historical epoch have had to share the illusion of that epoch. For instance, if an epoch imagines itself to be actuated by purely "political" or "religious" motives, although "religion" and "politics" are only forms of its true motives, the historian accepts this opinion. The "idea", the "conception" of the people in question about their real practice, is transformed into the sole determining, active force, which controls and determines their practice. When the crude form in which the division of labour appears with the Indians and Egyptians calls forth the caste-system in their State and religion, the historian believes that the caste-system [26] is the power which has produced this crude social form.

While the French and the English at least hold by the political illusion, which is moderately close to reality, the Germans move in the realm of the "pure spirit", and make religious illusion the driving force of history. The Hegelian philosophy of history is the last consequence, reduced to its "finest expression", of all this German historiography, for which it is not a question of real, nor even of political, interests, but of pure thoughts, which consequently must appear to Saint Bruno, as a series of "thoughts" that devour one another and are finally swallowed
up in "self-consciousness"*; and even more consistently the course of history appears to the Blessed Max Stirner, who knows not a thing about real history, as a mere tale of "knights", robbers and ghosts, from whose visions he can, of course, only save himself by "unholiness". This conception is truly religious: it postulates religious man as the primitive man, the starting-point of history; and in its imagination puts the religious production of fancies in the place of the real production of the means of subsistence and of life itself.

This whole conception of history, together with its dissolution and the scruples and qualms resulting from it, is a purely national affair of the Germans and has only local interest for the Germans, as for instance the important question treated several times of late: how really we "pass from the realm of God to the realm of Man"—as if this "realm of God" had ever existed anywhere save in the imagination, and the learned gentlemen, without being aware of it, were not constantly living in the "realm of Man" to which they are now seeking the way; and as if the learned pastime (for it is nothing more) of explaining the mystery of this theoretical bubble-blowing did not on the contrary lie in demonstrating its origin in actual earthly conditions. Always, for these Germans, it is simply a matter of resolving the nonsense of earlier writers [27] into some other freak, i.e., of presupposing that all this nonsense has a special sense which can be discovered; while really it is only a question of explaining this theoretical talk from the actual existing conditions. The real, practical dissolution of these phrases, the removal of these notions from the consciousness of men, will, as we have already said, be effected by altered circumstances, not by theoretical deductions. For the mass of men, i.e., the proletariat, these theoretical notions do not exist and hence do not require to be dissolved, and if this mass ever had any theoretical notions, e.g., religion, etc., these have now long been dissolved by circumstances.

The purely national character of these questions and solutions is shown again in the way these theorists believe in all seriousness that chimeras like "the God-Man", "Man", etc., have presided over individual epochs of history (Saint Bruno even goes so far as to assert that "only criticism and critics have made history"[17]), and when they themselves construct historical systems, they skip over all earlier periods in the greatest haste and

* [Marginal note by Marx:] So-called objective historiography just consists in treating the historical conditions independent of activity. Reactionary character.
pass immediately from "Mongolism" to history "with meaningful content", that is to say, to the history of the Hallische and Deutsche Jahrbücher and the dissolution of the Hegelian school into a general squabble. They forget all other nations, all real events, and the theatrum mundi is confined to the Leipzig Book Fair and the mutual quarrels of "Criticism", "Man", and "the Unique". If these theorists treat really historical subjects, as for instance the eighteenth century, they merely give a history of the ideas of the times, torn away from the facts and the practical development fundamental to them; and even that merely in order to represent that period as an imperfect preliminary stage, the as yet limited predecessor of the real historical age, i.e., the period of the German philosophic struggle from 1840 to 1844. As might be expected when the history of an earlier period is written with the aim of accentuating the brilliance of an unhistoric person and his fantasies, all the really historic events, even the really historic invasions of politics into history, receive no mention. Instead we get a narrative based not on research but on arbitrary constructions and literary gossip, such as Saint Bruno provided in his now forgotten history of the eighteenth century. These high-falutin and haughty hucksters of ideas, who imagine themselves infinitely exalted above all national prejudices, are thus in practice far more national than the beer-quaffing philistines who dream of a united Germany. They do not recognise the deeds of other nations as historical: they live in Germany, to Germany [28] and for Germany; they turn the Rhinesong into a religious hymn and conquer Alsace and Lorraine by robbing French philosophy instead of the French State, by Germanising French ideas instead of French provinces. Herr Venedey is a cosmopolitan compared with the Saints Bruno and Max, who, in the universal dominance of theory, proclaim the universal dominance of Germany.

[9. Additional Criticism of Feuerbach, of His Idealistic Conception of History]

It is also clear from these arguments how grossly Feuerbach is deceiving himself when (Wigand's Vierteljahrsschrift, 1845, Band 2) by virtue of the qualification "common man" he declares himself a communist, transforms the latter into a predicate of "man", and thereby thinks it possible to change the word "communist", which in the real world means the follower of a definite revolutionary party, into a mere category. Feuerbach's

---

* i.e., Bruno Bauer, Ludwig Feuerbach and Max Stirner.—Ed.
whole deduction with regard to the relation of men to one another goes only so far as to prove that men need and always have needed each other. He wants to establish consciousness of this fact, that is to say, like the other theorists, merely to produce a correct consciousness about an existing fact; whereas for the real communist it is a question of overthrowing the existing state of things. We thoroughly appreciate, moreover, that Feuerbach, in endeavouring to produce consciousness of just this fact, is going as far as a theorist possibly can, without ceasing to be a theorist and philosopher. It is characteristic, however, that Saint Bruno and Saint Max seize on Feuerbach’s conception of the communist and put it in place of the real communist—which occurs, partly, in order that they can combat communism too as “spirit of the spirit”, as a philosophical category, as an equal opponent and, in the case of Saint Bruno, partly also for pragmatic reason.

As an example of Feuerbach’s acceptance and at the same time misunderstanding of existing reality, which he still shares with our opponents, we recall the passage in the Philosophie der Zukunft where he develops the view that the existence of a thing or a man is at the same time its or his essence, that the conditions of existence, the mode of life and activity of an animal or human individual are those in which its “essence” feels itself satisfied. Here every exception is expressly conceived as an unhappy chance, as an abnormality which cannot be altered. Thus if millions of proletarians feel by no means contented with their living conditions, if their “existence” [29] does not in the least correspond to their “essence”, then, according to the passage quoted, this is an unavoidable misfortune, which must be borne quietly. The millions of proletarians and communists, however, think differently and will prove this in time, when they bring their “existence” into harmony with their “essence” in a practical way, by means of a revolution. Feuerbach, therefore, never speaks of the world of man in such cases, but always takes refuge in external nature, and moreover in nature which has not yet been subdued by men. But every new invention, every advance made by industry, detaches another piece from this domain, so that the ground which produces examples illustrating such Feuerbachian propositions is steadily shrinking. The “essence” of the fish is its “existence”, water—to go no further than this one proposition. The “essence” of the freshwater fish is the water of a river. But the latter ceases to be the “essence” of the fish and is no longer a suitable medium of existence as soon as the river is made to serve industry, as soon as it is polluted by dyes and other waste products and navigated by steamboats, or as
soon as its water is diverted into canals where simple drainage
can deprive the fish of its medium of existence. The explanation
that all such contradictions are inevitable abnormalities does
not essentially differ from the consolation which the Blessed
Max Stirner offers to the discontented, saying that this contra-
diction is their own contradiction and this predicament their own
predicament, whereupon they should either set their minds at
ease, keep their disgust to themselves, or revolt against it in
some fantastic way. It differs just as little from Saint Bruno's
allegation that these unfortunate circumstances are due to the
fact that those concerned are stuck in the muck of "substance",
have not advanced to "absolute self-consciousness", and do not
realise that these adverse conditions are spirit of their spirit.

[III]

[1. The Ruling Class and Ruling Consciousness.
  Formation of Hegel's Conception of the
  Domination of the Spirit in History]

[30] The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling
ideas: i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society,
is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which
has the means of material production at its disposal, has control
at the same time over the means of mental production, so that
thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the
means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas
are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant ma-
terial relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped
as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class
the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance. The individ-
uals composing the ruling class possess among other things con-
sciousness, and therefore think. Insofar, therefore, as they rule as
a class and determine the extent and compass of an epoch, it is
self-evident that they do this in its whole range, hence among
other things rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and
regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age:
thus their ideas are the ruling ideas of the epoch. For instance,
in an age and in a country where royal power, aristocracy and
bourgeoisie are contending for mastery and where, therefore,
mastery is shared, the doctrine of the separation of powers proves
to be the dominant idea and is expressed as an "eternal law".
The division of labour, which we already saw above (pp.
[15-18])\(^*\) as one of the chief forces of history up till now, mani-

\(^*\) See pp. 33-36 of this volume.—*Ed.
fests itself also in the ruling class as the division of mental and [31] material labour, so that inside this class one part appears as the thinkers of the class (its active, conceptive ideologists, who make the perfecting of the illusion of the class about itself their chief source of livelihood), while the others' attitude to these ideas and illusions is more passive and receptive, because they are in reality the active members of this class and have less time to make up illusions and ideas about themselves. Within this class this cleavage can even develop into a certain opposition and hostility between the two parts, which, however, in the case of a practical collision, in which the class itself is endangered, automatically comes to nothing, in which case there also vanishes the semblance that the ruling ideas were not the ideas of the ruling class and had a power distinct from the power of this class. The existence of revolutionary ideas in a particular period presupposes the existence of a revolutionary class; about the premises for the latter sufficient has already been said above (pp. [18-19, 22-23]).

If now in considering the course of history we detach the ideas of the ruling class from the ruling class itself and attribute to them an independent existence, if we confine ourselves to saying that these or those ideas were dominant at a given time, without bothering ourselves about the conditions of production and the producers of these ideas, if we thus ignore the individuals and world conditions which are the source of the ideas, we can say, for instance, that during the time that the aristocracy was dominant, the concepts honour, loyalty, etc., were dominant, during the dominance of the bourgeoisie the concepts freedom, equality, etc. The ruling class itself on the whole imagines this to be so. This conception of history, which is common to all historians, particularly since the eighteenth century, will necessarily come up against [32] the phenomenon that increasingly abstract ideas hold sway, i.e., ideas which increasingly take on the form of universality. For each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aim, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, that is, expressed in ideal form: it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones. The class making a revolution appears from the very start, if only because it is opposed to a class, not as a class but as the representative of the whole of society; it appears as the whole mass of society

* See pp. 37-38 and 40-41 of this volume.—Ed.
confronting the one ruling class. It can do this because, to start with, its interest really is more connected with the common interest of all other non-ruling classes, because under the pressure of hitherto existing conditions its interest has not yet been able to develop as the particular interest of a particular class. Its victory, therefore, benefits also many individuals of the other classes which are not winning a dominant position, but only insofar as it now puts these individuals in a position to raise themselves into the ruling class. When the French bourgeoisie overthrew the power of the aristocracy, it thereby made it possible for many proletarians to raise themselves above the proletariat, but only insofar as they became bourgeois. Every new class, therefore, achieves its hegemony only on a broader basis than that of the class ruling previously, whereas the opposition of the non-ruling class against the new ruling class later develops all the more sharply and profoundly. Both these things determine the fact that the struggle to be waged against this new ruling class, in its turn, aims at a more decided and radical negation of the previous conditions of society than [33] could all previous classes which sought to rule.

This whole semblance, that the rule of a certain class is only the rule of certain ideas, comes to a natural end, of course, as soon as class rule in general ceases to be the form in which society is organised, that is to say, as soon as it is no longer necessary to represent a particular interest as general or the "general interest" as ruling.

Once the ruling ideas have been separated from the ruling individuals and, above all, from the relationships which result from a given stage of the mode of production, and in this way the conclusion has been reached that history is always under the sway of ideas, it is very easy to abstract from these various ideas "the idea", the notion, etc., as the dominant force in history, and thus to understand all these separate ideas and concepts as "forms of self-determination" on the part of the concept developing in history. It follows then naturally, too, that all the relationships of men can be derived from the concept of man, man as conceived, the essence of man, Man. This has been done by the speculative philosophers. Hegel himself confesses at the end of the Geschichtsphilosophie that he "has considered the

* [Marginal note by Marx:] (Universality corresponds to (1) the class versus the estate, (2) the competition, world-wide intercourse, etc., (3) the great numerical strength of the ruling class, (4) the illusion of the common interests (in the beginning this illusion is true), (5) the delusion of the ideologists and the division of labour.)
progress of the concept only" and has represented in history the "true theology". (P. 446.) Now one can go back again to the producers of the "concept", to the theorists, ideologists and philosophers, and one comes then to the conclusion that the philosophers, the thinkers as such, have at all times been dominant in history: a conclusion, as we see, already expressed by Hegel.24

The whole trick of proving the hegemony of the spirit in history (hierarchy Stirner calls it) is thus confined to the following three efforts.

[34] No. 1. One must separate the ideas of those ruling for empirical reasons, under empirical conditions and as corporeal individuals, from these actual rulers, and thus recognise the rule of ideas or illusions in history.

No. 2. One must bring an order into this rule of ideas, prove a mystical connection among the successive ruling ideas, which is managed by understanding them as "acts of self-determination on the part of the concept" (this is possible because by virtue of their empirical basis these ideas are really connected with one another and because, conceived as mere ideas, they become self-distinctions, distinctions made by thought).

No. 3. To remove the mystical appearance of this "self-determining concept" it is changed into a person—"Self-Consciousness"—or, to appear thoroughly materialistic, into a series of persons, who represent the "concept" in history, into the "thinkers", the "philosophers", etc., who again are understood as the manufacturers of history, as the "council of guardians", as the rulers.3 Thus the whole body of materialistic elements has been removed from history and now full rein can be given to the speculative steed.

This historical method which reigned in Germany, and especially the reason why, must be understood from its connection with the illusion of ideologists in general, e.g., the illusions of the jurists, politicians (of the practical statesmen among them, too), from the dogmatic dreamings and distortions of these fellows; this is explained perfectly easily from their practical position in life, their job, and the division of labour.

[35] Whilst in ordinary life every shopkeeper is very well able to distinguish between what somebody professes to be and what he really is, our historians have not yet won even this trivial insight. They take every epoch at its word and believe that everything it says and imagines about itself is true.

* [Marginal note by Marx:] Man=the "rational human spirit".
[IV]

[1. Instruments of Production and Forms of Property]

[...]* [40] From the first, there follows the premise of a highly developed division of labour and an extensive commerce; from the second, the locality. In the first case the individuals must be brought together, in the second they find themselves alongside the given instrument of production as instruments of production themselves.

Here, therefore, arises the difference between natural instruments of production and those created by civilisation. The field (water, etc.) can be regarded as a natural instrument of production. In the first case, that of the natural instrument of production, individuals are subservient to nature; in the second, to a product of labour. In the first case, therefore, property (landed property) appears as direct natural domination, in the second, as domination of labour, particularly of accumulated labour, capital. The first case presupposes that the individuals are united by some bond: family, tribe, the land itself, etc.; the second, that they are independent of one another and are only held together by exchange. In the first case, what is involved is chiefly an exchange between men and nature in which the labour of the former is exchanged for the products of the latter; in the second, it is predominantly an exchange of men among themselves. In the first case, average, human common sense is adequate—physical activity is as yet not separated from mental activity; in the second, the division between physical and mental labour must already be practically completed. In the first case, the domination of the proprietor over the propertyless may be based on a personal relationship, on a kind of community; in the second, it must have taken on a material shape in a third party—money. In the first case, small industry exists, but determined by the utilisation of the natural instrument of production and therefore without the distribution of labour among various individuals; in the second, industry exists only in and through the division of labour.

[41] Our investigation hitherto started from the instruments of production, and it has already shown that private property was a necessity for certain industrial stages. In industrie extractive private property still coincides with labour; in small industry and all agriculture up till now property is the necessary consequence of the existing instruments of production; in big industry the contradiction between the instrument of production and pri-
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vate property appears for the first time and is the product of big industry; moreover, big industry must be highly developed to produce this contradiction. And thus only with big industry does the abolition of private property become possible.

**[2. The Division of Material and Mental Labour. Separation of Town and Country. The Guild-System]**

The greatest division of material and mental labour is the separation of town and country. The antagonism between town and country begins with the transition from barbarism to civilisation, from tribe to State, from locality to nation, and runs through the whole history of civilisation to the present day (the Anti-Corn Law League\textsuperscript{25}).

The existence of the town implies, at the same time, the necessity of administration, police, taxes, etc., in short, of the municipality, and thus of politics in general. Here first became manifest the division of the population into two great classes, which is directly based on the division of labour and on the instruments of production. The town already is in actual fact the concentration of the population, of the instruments of production, of capital, of pleasures, of needs, while the country demonstrates just the opposite fact, isolation and separation. The antagonism between town and country can only exist within the framework of private property. It is the most crass expression of the subjection of the individual under the division of labour, under a definite activity forced upon him—a subjection which makes one man into a restricted town-animal, the other into a restricted country-animal, and daily creates anew the conflict between their interests. Labour is here again the chief thing, power over individuals, and as long as the latter exists, private property must exist. The abolition of the antagonism between town and country is one of the first conditions [42] of communal life, a condition which again depends on a mass of material premises and which cannot be fulfilled by the mere will, as anyone can see at the first glance. (These conditions have still to be enumerated.)

The separation of town and country can also be understood as the separation of capital and landed property, as the beginning of the existence and development of capital independent of landed property—the beginning of property having its basis only in labour and exchange.

In the towns which, in the Middle Ages, did not derive ready-made from an earlier period but were formed anew by the serfs who had become free, each man's own particular labour was his only property apart from the small capital he brought with him,
consisting almost solely of the most necessary tools of his craft. The competition of serfs constantly escaping into the town, the constant war of the country against the towns and thus the necessity of an organised municipal military force, the bond of common ownership in a particular kind of labour, the necessity of common buildings for the sale of their wares at a time when craftsmen were also traders, and the consequent exclusion of the unauthorised from these buildings, the conflict among the interests of the various crafts, the necessity of protecting their laboriously acquired skill, and the feudal organisation of the whole of the country: these were the causes of the union of the workers of each craft in guilds. We have not at this point to go further into the manifold modifications of the guild-system, which arise through later historical developments. The flight of the serfs into the towns went on without interruption right through the Middle Ages. These serfs, persecuted by their lords in the country, came separately into the towns, where they found an organised community, against which they were powerless and in which they had to subject themselves to the station assigned to them by the demand for their labour and the interest of their organised urban competitors. These workers, entering separately, were never able to attain to any power, since, if their labour was of the guild type which had to be learned, the guild-masters bent them to their will and organised them according to their interest; or if their labour was not such as had to be learned, and therefore not of the guild type, they became day-labourers and never managed to organise, remaining an unorganised rabble. The need for day-labourers in the towns created the rabble.

These towns were true “associations”, called forth by the direct need, the care of providing for the protection of property, and of multiplying the means of production and defence of the separate members. The rabble of these towns was devoid of any power, composed as it was of individuals strange to one another who had entered separately, and who stood unorganised over against an organised power, armed for war, and jealously watching over them. The journeymen and apprentices were organised in each craft as it best suited the interest of the masters. The patriarchal relationship existing between them and their masters gave the latter a double power—on the one hand because of their influence on the whole life of the journeymen, and on the other because, for the journeymen who worked with the same master, it was a real bond which held them together against the journeymen of other masters and separated them from these. And finally, the journeymen were bound to the existing order by their simple interest in becoming masters themselves.
While, therefore, the rabble at least carried out revolts against the whole municipal order, revolts which remained completely ineffective because of their powerlessness, the journeymen never got further than small acts of insubordination within separate guilds, such as belong to the very nature of the guild-system. The great risings of the Middle Ages all radiated from the country, but equally remained totally ineffective because of the isolation and consequent crudity of the peasants.—

Capital in these towns was a naturally derived capital, consisting of a house, the tools of the craft, and the natural, hereditary customers; and not being realisable, on account of the backwardness of commerce and the lack of circulation, it descended from father to son. Unlike modern capital, which can be assessed in money and which may be indifferently invested in this thing or that, this capital was directly connected with the particular work of the owner, inseparable from it and to this extent *estate* capital.—

In the towns, the division of labour between [44] the individual guilds was as yet [quite naturally derived]* and, in the guilds themselves, not at all developed between the individual workers. Every workman had to be versed in a whole round of tasks, had to be able to make everything that was to be made with his tools. The limited commerce and the scanty communication between the individual towns, the lack of population and the narrow needs did not allow of a higher division of labour, and therefore every man who wished to become a master had to be proficient in the whole of his craft. Thus there is found with medieval craftsmen an interest in their special work and in proficiency in it, which was capable of rising to a narrow artistic sense. For this very reason, however, every medieval craftsman was completely absorbed in his work, to which he had a contented, slavish relationship, and to which he was subjected to a far greater extent than the modern worker, whose work is a matter of indifference to him.—

---


The next extension of the division of labour was the separation of production and commerce, the formation of a special class of merchants; a separation which, in the towns bequeathed by a former period, had been handed down (among other things with
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the Jews) and which very soon appeared in the newly formed ones. With this there was given the possibility of commercial communications transcending the immediate neighbourhood, a possibility, the realisation of which depended on the existing means of communication, the state of public safety in the countryside, which was determined by political conditions (during the whole of the Middle Ages, as is well known, the merchants travelled in armed caravans), and on the cruder or more advanced needs (determined by the stage of culture attained) of the region accessible to intercourse.

With commerce the prerogative of a particular class, with the extension of trade through the merchants beyond the immediate surroundings of the town, there immediately appears a reciprocal action between production and commerce. The towns enter into relations with one another, new tools are brought from one town into the other, and the separation between production and commerce soon calls forth a new division of production between [45] the individual towns, each of which is soon exploiting a predominant branch of industry. The local restrictions of earlier times begin gradually to be broken down.—

It depends purely on the extension of commerce whether the productive forces achieved in a locality, especially inventions, are lost for later development or not. As long as there exists no commerce transcending the immediate neighbourhood, every invention must be made separately in each locality, and mere chances such as irruptions of barbaric peoples, even ordinary wars, are sufficient to cause a country with advanced productive forces and needs to have to start right over again from the beginning. In primitive history every invention had to be made daily anew and in each locality independently. How little highly developed productive forces are safe from complete destruction, given even a relatively very extensive commerce, is proved by the Phoenicians, whose inventions were for the most part lost for a long time to come through the ousting of this nation from commerce, its conquest by Alexander and its consequent decline. Likewise, for instance, glass-painting in the Middle Ages. Only when commerce has become world commerce and has as its basis large-scale industry, when all nations are drawn into the competitive struggle, is the permanence of the acquired productive forces assured.—

The immediate consequence of the division of labour between

—

* [Marginal note by Marx:] and glass-painting in the Middle Ages.
the various towns was the rise of manufactures, branches of production which had outgrown the guild-system. Manufactures first flourished, in Italy and later in Flanders, under the historical premise of commerce with foreign nations. In other countries, England and France for example, manufactures were at first confined to the home market. Besides the premises already mentioned manufactures depend on an already advanced concentration of population, particularly in the countryside, and of capital, which began to accumulate in the hands of individuals, partly in the guilds in spite of the guild regulations, partly among the merchants.

[46] That labour which from the first presupposed a machine, even of the crudest sort, soon showed itself the most capable of development. Weaving, earlier carried on in the country by the peasants as a secondary occupation to procure their clothing, was the first labour to receive an impetus and a further development through the extension of commerce. Weaving was the first and remained the principal manufacture. The rising demand for clothing materials, consequent on the growth of population, the growing accumulation and mobilisation of natural capital through accelerated circulation, the demand for luxuries called forth by the latter and favoured generally by the gradual extension of commerce, gave weaving a quantitative and qualitative stimulus, which wrenched it out of the form of production hitherto existing. Alongside the peasants weaving for their own use, who continued, and still continue, with this sort of work, there emerged a new class of weavers in the towns, whose fabrics were destined for the whole home market and usually for foreign markets too.

Weaving, an occupation demanding in most cases little skill and soon splitting up into countless branches, by its whole nature resisted the trammels of the guild. Weaving was, therefore, carried on mostly in villages and market centres without guild organisation, which gradually became towns, and indeed the most flourishing towns in each land.

With guild-free manufacture, property relations also quickly changed. The first advance beyond naturally derived estate capital was provided by the rise of merchants whose capital was from the beginning movable, capital in the modern sense as far as one can speak of it, given the circumstances of those times. The second advance came with manufacture, which again made mobile a mass of natural capital, and altogether increased the mass of movable capital as against that of natural capital.

At the same time, manufacture became a refuge of the peasants from the guilds which excluded them or paid them badly, just
as earlier the guild-towns had [served] as a refuge [47] for the peasants from [the oppressive landed nobility].—

Simultaneously with the beginning of manufactures there was a period of vagabondage caused by the abolition of the feudal bodies of retainers, the disbanding of the swollen armies which had flocked to serve the kings against their vassals, the improvement of agriculture, and the transformation of great strips of tillage into pasture land. From this alone it is clear how this vagabondage is strictly connected with the disintegration of the feudal system. As early as the thirteenth century we find isolated epochs of this kind, but only at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth does this vagabondage make a general and permanent appearance. These vagabonds, who were so numerous that, for instance, Henry VIII of England had 72,000 of them hanged, were only prevailed upon to work with the greatest difficulty and through the most extreme necessity, and then only after long resistance. The rapid rise of manufactures, particularly in England, absorbed them gradually.—

With the advent of manufacture, the various nations entered into a competitive relationship, the struggle for trade, which was fought out in wars, protective duties and prohibitions, whereas earlier the nations, insofar as they were connected at all, had carried on an inoffensive exchange with each other. Trade had from now on a political significance.

With the advent of manufacture the relationship between worker and employer changed. In the guilds the patriarchal relationship between journeyman and master continued to exist; in manufacture its place was taken by the monetary relation between worker and capitalist—a relationship which in the countryside and in small towns retained a patriarchal tinge, but in the larger, the real manufacturing towns, quite early lost almost all patriarchal complexion.

Manufacture and the movement of production in general received an enormous impetus through the extension of commerce which came with the discovery of America and the sea-route to the East Indies. The new products imported thence, particularly the masses of gold and silver which came into circulation and totally changed the position of the classes towards one another, dealing a hard blow to feudal landed property and to the workers; the expeditions of adventurers, colonisation; and above all the extension of markets into a world market, which had now become possible and was daily becoming more and more a fact, called forth a new phase [48] of historical development, into
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which in general we cannot here enter further. Through the colonisation of the newly discovered countries the commercial struggle of the nations amongst one another was given new fuel and accordingly greater extension and animosity.

The expansion of trade and manufacture accelerated the accumulation of movable capital, while in the guilds, which were not stimulated to extend their production, natural capital remained stationary or even declined. Trade and manufacture created the big bourgeoisie; in the guilds was concentrated the petty bourgeoisie, which no longer was dominant in the towns as formerly, but had to bow to the might of the great merchants and manufacturers. Hence the decline of the guilds, as soon as they came into contact with manufacture.

The intercourse of nations took on, in the epoch of which we have been speaking, two different forms. At first the small quantity of gold and silver in circulation involved the ban on the export of these metals; and industry, for the most part imported from abroad and made necessary by the need for employing the growing urban population, could not do without those privileges which could be granted not only, of course, against home competition, but chiefly against foreign. The local guild privilege was in these original prohibitions extended over the whole nation. Customs duties originated from the tributes which the feudal lords exacted as protective levies against robbery from merchants passing through their territories, tributes later imposed likewise by the towns, and which, with the rise of the modern states, were the Treasury’s most obvious means of raising money.

The appearance of American gold and silver on the European markets, the gradual development of industry, the rapid expansion of trade and the consequent rise of the non-guild bourgeoisie and of money, gave these measures another significance. The State, which was daily less and less able to do without money, now retained the ban on the export of gold and silver out of fiscal considerations; the bourgeoisie, for whom these masses of money which were hurled on to the market became the chief object of speculative buying, were thoroughly content with this; privileges established earlier became a source of income for the government and were sold for money; in the customs legislation there appeared the export duty, which, since it only [placed] a hindrance in the way of industry, [49] had a purely fiscal aim.

* [Marginal note by Marx:] Petty bourgeoisie—Middle class—Big bourgeoisie.
The second period began in the middle of the seventeenth century and lasted almost to the end of the eighteenth. Commerce and navigation had expanded more rapidly than manufacture, which played a secondary role; the colonies were becoming considerable consumers; and after long struggles the separate nations shared out the opening world market among themselves. This period begins with the Navigation Laws and colonial monopolies. The competition of the nations among themselves was excluded as far as possible by tariffs, prohibitions and treaties; and in the last resort the competitive struggle was carried on and decided by wars (especially naval wars). The mightiest maritime nation, the English, retained preponderance in trade and manufacture. Here, already, we find concentration in one country.

Manufacture was all the time sheltered by protective duties in the home market, by monopolies in the colonial market, and abroad as much as possible by differential duties. The working-up of home-produced material was encouraged (wool and linen in England, silk in France), the export of home-produced raw material forbidden (wool in England), and the [working-up] of imported material neglected or suppressed (cotton in England). The nation dominant in sea trade and colonial power naturally secured for itself also the greatest quantitative and qualitative expansion of manufacture. Manufacture could not be carried on without protection, since, if the slightest change takes place in other countries, it can lose its market and be ruined; under reasonably favourable conditions it may easily be introduced into a country, but for this very reason can easily be destroyed. At the same time through the mode in which it is carried on, particularly in the eighteenth century, in the countryside, it is to such an extent interwoven with the vital relationships of a great mass of individuals, that no country dare jeopardise its existence by permitting free competition. Insofar as it manages to export, it therefore depends entirely on the extension or restriction of commerce, and exercises a relatively very small reaction [on the latter]. Hence its secondary [importance] and the influence of [the merchants] in the eighteenth century. [50]

It was the merchants and especially the shippers who more than anybody else pressed for State protection and monopolies; the manufacturers also demanded and indeed received protection, but all the time were inferior in political importance to the merchants. The commercial towns, particularly the maritime towns, became to some extent civilised and acquired the outlook of the big bourgeoisie, but in the factory towns an extreme petty-bourgeois outlook persisted. Cf. Aikin,27 etc. The eighteenth
century was the century of trade. Pinto says this expressly: "Le commerce fait la marotte du siècle"*; and: "Depuis quelque temps il n’est plus question que de commerce, de navigation et de marine."**28

The movement of capital, although considerably accelerated, still remained, however, relatively slow. The splitting-up of the world market into separate parts, each of which was exploited by a particular nation, the exclusion of competition among themselves on the part of the nations, the clumsiness of production itself and the fact that finance was only evolving from its early stages, greatly impeded circulation. The consequence of this was a haggling, mean and niggardly spirit which still clung to all merchants and to the whole mode of carrying on trade. Compared with the manufacturers, and above all with the craftsmen, they were certainly big bourgeois; compared with the merchants and industrialists of the next period they remain petty bourgeois. Cf. Adam Smith.29

This period is also characterised by the cessation of the bans on the export of gold and silver and the beginning of the trade in money; by banks, national debts, paper money; by speculation in stocks and shares and stockjobbing in all articles; by the development of finance in general. Again capital lost a great part of the natural character which had still clung to it.

[4. The Most Complex Division of Labour. Big Industry]

The concentration of trade and manufacture in one country, England, developing irresistibly in the seventeenth century, gradually created for this country a relative world market, and thus a demand for the manufactured products of this country, which could no longer be met by the industrial productive forces hitherto existing. This demand, outgrowing the productive forces, was the motive power which, by producing big industry—the application of elemental forces to industrial ends, machinery and the most complex division of labour—called into existence the third [51] period of private ownership since the Middle Ages. There already existed in England the other preconditions of this new phase: freedom of competition inside the nation, the development of theoretical mechanics, etc. (Indeed, the science of mechanics perfected by Newton was altogether the most popular

* "Commerce is the rage of the century."—Ed.
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science in France and England in the eighteenth century.) (Free competition inside the nation itself had everywhere to be conquered by a revolution—1640 and 1688 in England, 1789 in France.)

Competition soon compelled every country that wished to retain its historical role to protect its manufactures by renewed customs regulations (the old duties were no longer any good against big industry) and soon after to introduce big industry under protective duties. Big industry universalised competition in spite of these protective measures (it is practical free trade; the protective duty is only a palliative, a measure of defence within free trade), established means of communication and the modern world market, subordinated trade to itself, transformed all capital into industrial capital, and thus produced the rapid circulation (development of the financial system) and the centralisation of capital. By universal competition it forced all individuals to strain their energy to the utmost. It destroyed as far as possible ideology, religion, morality, etc., and where it could not do this, made them into a palpable lie. It produced world history for the first time, insofar as it made all civilised nations and every individual member of them dependent for the satisfaction of their wants on the whole world, thus destroying the former natural exclusiveness of separate nations. It made natural science subservient to capital and took from the division of labour the last semblance of its natural character. It destroyed natural growth in general, as far as this is possible while labour exists, and resolved all natural relationships into money relationships. In the place of naturally grown towns it created the modern, large industrial cities which have sprung up overnight. Wherever it penetrated, it destroyed the crafts and all earlier stages of industry. It completed the victory of the commercial town over the countryside. [Its first premise] was the automatic system. [Its development] produced a mass of productive forces, for which private [property]* became just as much a fetter [52] as the guild had been for manufacture and the small, rural workshop for the developing craft. These productive forces received under the system of private property a one-sided development only, and became for the majority destructive forces; moreover, a great multitude of such forces could find no application at all within this system. Generally speaking, big industry created everywhere the same relations between the classes of society, and thus destroyed the peculiar individuality of the various nationalities. And finally, while the bourgeoisie of each nation
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still retained separate national interests, big industry created a class, which in all nations has the same interest and with which nationality is already dead; a class which is really rid of all the old world and at the same time stands pitted against it. Big industry makes for the worker not only the relation to the capitalist, but labour itself, unbearable.

It is evident that big industry does not reach the same level of development in all districts of a country. This does not, however, retard the class movement of the proletariat, because the proletarians created by big industry assume leadership of this movement and carry the whole mass along with them, and because the workers excluded from big industry are placed by it in a still worse situation than the workers in big industry itself. The countries in which big industry is developed act in a similar manner upon the more or less non-industrial countries, insofar as the latter are swept by universal commerce into the universal competitive struggle.

* * *

These different forms [of production] are just so many forms of the organisation of labour, and hence of property. In each period a unification of the existing productive forces takes place, insofar as this has been rendered necessary to needs.

[5. The Contradiction Between the Productive Forces and the Form of Intercourse as the Basis of a Social Revolution]

The contradiction between the productive forces and the form of intercourse, which, as we saw, has occurred several times in past history, without, however, endangering the basis, necessarily on each occasion burst out in a revolution, taking on at the same time various subsidiary forms, such as all-embracing collisions, collisions of various classes, contradiction of consciousness, battle of ideas, etc., political conflict, etc. From a narrow point of view one may isolate one of these subsidiary forms and consider it as the basis of these revolutions; and this is all the more easy as the individuals who started the revolutions had illusions about their own activity according to their degree of culture and the stage of historical development.

Thus all collisions in history have their origin, according to our view, in the contradiction between the productive forces and the form [53] of intercourse. Incidentally, to lead to collisions in a country, this contradiction need not necessarily have reached
its extreme limit in this particular country. The competition with industrially more advanced countries, brought about by the expansion of international intercourse, is sufficient to produce a similar contradiction in countries with a backward industry (e.g., the latent proletariat in Germany brought into view by the competition of English industry).

[6. Competition of Individuals and the Formation of Classes. Development of Contradiction Between Individuals and the Conditions of Their Life. The Illusory Community of Individuals in Bourgeois Society and the Real Unity of Individuals under Communism. The Subjugation of Society's Conditions of Life to the Power of United Individuals]

Competition separates individuals from one another, not only the bourgeois but still more the workers, in spite of the fact that it brings them together. Hence it is a long time before these individuals can unite, apart from the fact that for the purpose of this union—if it is not to be merely local—the necessary means, the great industrial cities and cheap and quick communications, have first to be produced by big industry. Hence every organised power standing over against these isolated individuals, who live in relationships daily reproducing this isolation, can only be overcome after long struggles. To demand the opposite would be tantamount to demanding that competition should not exist in this definite epoch of history, or that the individuals should banish from their minds relationships over which in their isolation they have no control.

The building of houses. With savages each family has as a matter of course its own cave or hut like the separate family tent of the nomads. This separate domestic economy is made only the more necessary by the further development of private property. With the agricultural peoples a communal domestic economy is just as impossible as a communal cultivation of the soil. A great advance was the building of towns. In all previous periods, however, the abolition of individual economy, which is inseparable from the abolition of private property, was impossible for the simple reason that the material conditions governing it were not present. The setting-up of a communal domestic
economy presupposes the development of machinery, the use of natural forces and of many other productive forces—e.g., of water-supplies, [54] of gas-lighting, steam-heating, etc., the removal [of the antagonism] of town and country. Without these conditions a communal economy would not in itself form a new productive force; lacking any material basis and resting on a purely theoretical foundation, it would be a mere freak and would end in nothing more than a monastic economy.—What was possible can be seen in the towns brought about by condensation and the erection of communal buildings for various definite purposes (prisons, barracks, etc.). That the abolition of individual economy is inseparable from the abolition of the family is self-evident.

(The statement which frequently occurs with Saint Max that each is all that he is through the State is fundamentally the same as the statement that bourgeois is only a specimen of the bourgeois species; a statement which presupposes that the class of bourgeois existed before the individuals constituting it.*)

In the Middle Ages the citizens in each town were compelled to unite against the landed nobility to save their skins. The extension of trade, the establishment of communications, led the separate towns to get to know other towns, which had asserted the same interests in the struggle with the same antagonist. Out of the many local corporations of burghers there arose only gradually the burgher class. The conditions of life of the individual burghers became, on account of their contradiction to the existing relationships and of the mode of labour determined by these, conditions which were common to them all and independent of each individual. The burghers had created the conditions insofar as they had torn themselves free from feudal ties, and were created by them insofar as they were determined by their antagonism to the feudal system which they found in existence. When the individual towns began to enter into associations, these common conditions developed into class conditions. The same conditions, the same contradiction, the same interests necessarily called forth on the whole similar customs everywhere. The bourgeoisie itself, with its conditions, develops only gradually, splits according to the division of labour into various fractions and

* [Marginal note by Marx:] With the philosophers pre-existence of the class.
finally absorbs all propertied classes it finds in existence* (while it develops the majority of the earlier propertyless and a part of the hitherto propertied classes into a new class, the proletariat) in the measure to which all property found in existence is transformed into industrial or commercial capital.

The separate individuals form a class only insofar as [55] they have to carry on a common battle against another class; otherwise they are on hostile terms with each other as competitors. On the other hand, the class in its turn achieves an independent existence over against the individuals, so that the latter find their conditions of existence predestined, and hence have their position in life and their personal development assigned to them by their class, become subsumed under it. This is the same phenomenon as the subjection of the separate individuals to the division of labour and can only be removed by the abolition of private property and of labour** itself. We have already indicated several times how this subsuming of individuals under the class brings with it their subjection to all kinds of ideas, etc.—

If from a philosophical point of view one considers this evolution of individuals in the common conditions of existence of estates and classes, which followed on one another, and in the accompanying general conceptions forced upon them, it is certainly very easy to imagine that in these individuals the species, or Man, has evolved, or that they evolved Man—and in this way one can give history some hard clouts on the ear. One can conceive these various estates and classes to be specific terms of the general expression, subordinate varieties of the species, or evolutionary phases of Man.

This subsuming of individuals under definite classes cannot be abolished until a class has taken shape, which has no longer any particular class interest to assert against the ruling class.

The transformation, through the division of labour, of personal powers (relationships) into material powers, cannot be dispelled by dismissing the general idea of it from one’s mind, but can only be abolished by the individuals again subjecting these material powers to themselves and abolishing the division of labour.*** This is not possible without the community. Only.

* [Marginal note by Marx:] To begin with it absorbs the branches of labour directly belonging to the State and then all±[more or less] ideological estates.
** As to the meaning of the expression: “Abolition of labour” (Aufhebung der Arbeit) see pp. 40-41, 67, 73-76 of this volume.—Ed.
*** [Marginal note by Engels:] (Feuerbach: being and essence). (Cf. pp. 46-47 of this volume.—Ed.)
in community [with others has each] individual [56] the means of cultivating his gifts in all directions; only in the community, therefore, is personal freedom possible. In the previous substitutes for the community, in the State, etc., personal freedom has existed only for the individuals who developed within the relationships of the ruling class, and only insofar as they were individuals of this class. The illusory community, in which individuals have up till now combined, always took on an independent existence in relation to them, and was at the same time, since it was the combination of one class over against another, not only a completely illusory community, but a new fetter as well. In the real community the individuals obtain their freedom in and through their association.

Individuals have always built on themselves, but naturally on themselves within their given historical conditions and relationships, not on the “pure” individual in the sense of the ideologists. But in the course of historical evolution, and precisely through the inevitable fact that within the division of labour social relationships take on an independent existence, there appears a division within the life of each individual, insofar as it is personal and insofar as it is determined by some branch of labour and the conditions pertaining to it. (We do not mean it to be understood from this that, for example, the rentier, the capitalist, etc., cease to be persons; but their personality is conditioned and determined by quite definite class relationships, and the division appears only in their opposition to another class and, for themselves, only when they go bankrupt.) In the estate (and even more in the tribe) this is as yet concealed: for instance, a nobleman always remains a nobleman, a commoner always a commoner, apart from his other relationships, a quality inseparable from his individuality. The division between the personal and the class individual, the accidental nature of the conditions of life for the individual, appears only with the emergence of the class, which is itself a product of the bourgeoisie. This accidental character is only engendered and developed [57] by competition and the struggle of individuals among themselves. Thus, in imagination, individuals seem freer under the dominance of the bourgeoisie than before, because their conditions of life seem accidental; in reality, of course, they are less free, because they are more subjected to the violence of things. The difference from the estate comes out particularly in the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. When the estate of the urban burghers, the corporations, etc., emerged in opposition to the landed nobility, their condition of existence—movable property and craft labour, which had already existed latently before their
separation from the feudal ties—appeared as something positive, which was asserted against feudal landed property, and, therefore, in its own way at first took on a feudal form. Certainly the refugee serfs treated their previous servitude as something accidental to their personality. But here they only were doing what every class that is freeing itself from a fetter does; and they did not free themselves as a class but separately. Moreover, they did not rise above the system of estates, but only formed a new estate, retaining their previous mode of labour even in their new situation, and developing it further by freeing it from its earlier fetters, which no longer corresponded to the development already attained.

For the proletarians, on the other hand, the condition of their existence, labour, and with it all the conditions of existence governing modern society, have become something accidental, something over which they, as separate individuals, have no control, and over which no social organisation can give them control. The contradiction between the individuality of each separate proletarian and labour, the condition of life forced upon him, becomes evident to him himself, for he is sacrificed from youth upwards and, within his own class, has no chance of arriving at the conditions which would place him in the other class.—

[58] NB. It must not be forgotten that the serfs' very need of existing and the impossibility of a large-scale economy, which involved the distribution of the allotments among the serfs, very soon reduced the services of the serfs to their lord to an average of payments in kind and statute-labour. This made it possible for the serf to accumulate movable property and hence facilitated his escape out of possession of his lord and gave him the prospect of making his way as an urban citizen; it also created gradations among the serfs, so that the runaway serfs were already half burgheers. It is likewise obvious that the serfs who were masters of a craft had the best chance of acquiring movable property.—

Thus, while the refugee serfs only wished to be free to develop and assert those conditions of existence which were already there, and hence, in the end, only arrived at free labour, the proletariat, if they are to assert themselves as individuals, will have to abolish the very condition of their existence hitherto (which has, moreover, been that of all society up to the present), namely, labour. Thus they find themselves directly opposed to the form in which, hitherto, the individuals, of which society consists, have given themselves collective expression, that is, the State. In order, therefore, to assert themselves as individuals, they must overthrow the State.
It follows from all we have been saying up till now that the communal relationship into which the individuals of a class entered, and which was determined by their common interests over against a third party, was always a community to which these individuals belonged only as average individuals, only insofar as they lived within the conditions of existence of their class—a relationship in which they participated not as individuals but as members of a class. With the community of revolutionary proletarians, on the other hand, who take their conditions [59] of existence and those of all members of society under their control, it is just the reverse; it is as individuals that the individuals participate in it. It is just this combination of individuals (assuming the advanced stage of modern productive forces, of course) which puts the conditions of the free development and movement of individuals under their control—conditions which were previously abandoned to chance and had won an independent existence over against the separate individuals just because of their separation as individuals, and because of the necessity of their combination which had been determined by the division of labour, and through their separation had become a bond alien to them. Combination up till now (by no means an arbitrary one, such as is expounded for example in the *Contrat social*, but a necessary one) was an agreement upon these conditions, within which the individuals were free to enjoy the freaks of fortune (compare, e.g., the formation of the North American State and the South American republics). This right to the undisturbed enjoyment, within certain conditions, of fortuity and chance has up till now been called personal freedom. These conditions of existence are, of course, only the productive forces and forms of intercourse at any particular time.

Communism differs from all previous movements in that it overturns the basis of all earlier relations of production and intercourse, and for the first time consciously treats all natural premises as the creatures of hitherto existing men, strips them of their natural character and subjugates them to the power of the united individuals. Its organisation is, therefore, essentially economic, the material production of the conditions of this unity; it turns existing conditions into conditions of unity. The reality, which communism is creating, is precisely the true basis for rendering it impossible that anything should exist independently of individuals, insofar as reality is only a product of the preceding intercourse of individuals themselves. Thus the com-
munists in practice treat the conditions created up to now by production and intercourse as inorganic conditions, without, however, imagining that it was the plan or the destiny of previous generations to give them material, and without believing that these conditions were inorganic for the individuals creating them.

[7. Contradiction Between Individuals and the Conditions of Their Life as a Contradiction Between the Productive Forces and the Form of Intercourse. The Development of the Productive Forces and the Change of the Forms of Intercourse]

[60] The difference between the individual as a person and what is accidental to him is not a conceptual difference but a historical fact. This distinction has a different significance at different times—e.g., the estate as something accidental to the individual in the eighteenth century, the family more or less too. It is not a distinction that we have to make for each age, but one which each age makes itself from among the different elements which it finds in existence, and indeed not according to any theory, but compelled by material collisions in life.

What appears accidental to the later age as opposed to the earlier—and this applies also to the elements handed down by an earlier age—is a form of intercourse which corresponded to a definite stage of development of the productive forces. The relation of the productive forces to the form of intercourse, is the relation of the form of intercourse to the occupation or activity of the individuals. (The fundamental form of this activity is, of course, material, on which depend all other forms—mental, political, religious, etc. The various shaping of material life is, of course, in every case dependent on the needs which are already developed, and the production, as well as the satisfaction, of these needs is an historical process, which is not found in the case of a sheep or a dog (Stirner’s refractory principal argument adversus hominem), although sheep and dogs in their present form certainly, but malgré eux, are products of an historical process.) The conditions under which individuals have intercourse with each other, so long as the above-mentioned contradiction is absent, are conditions appertaining to their individuality, in no way external to them; conditions under which these definite individuals, living under definite relationships, can alone produce their material life and what is connected with it are thus the conditions of their self-activity and are produced
by this self-activity.* The definite condition under which they produce, thus corresponds, as long as [61] the contradiction has not yet appeared, to the reality of their conditioned nature, their one-sided existence, the one-sidedness of which only becomes evident when the contradiction enters on the scene and thus exists for the later individuals. Then this condition appears as an accidental fetter, and the consciousness that it is a fetter is imputed to the earlier age as well.

These various conditions, which appear first as conditions of self-activity, later as fetters upon it, form in the whole evolution of history a coherent series of forms of intercourse, the coherence of which consists in this: in the place of an earlier form of intercourse, which has become a fetter, a new one is put, corresponding to the more developed productive forces and, hence, to the advanced mode of the self-activity of individuals—a form which in its turn becomes a fetter and is then replaced by another. Since these conditions correspond at every stage to the simultaneous development of the productive forces, their history is at the same time the history of the evolving productive forces taken over by each new generation, and is, therefore, the history of the development of the forces of the individuals themselves.

Since this evolution takes place naturally, i.e., is not subordinated to a general plan of freely combined individuals, it proceeds from various localities, tribes, nations, branches of labour, etc., each of which to start with develops independently of the others and only gradually enters into relation with the others. Furthermore, it takes place only very slowly; the various stages and interests are never completely overcome, but only subordinated to the prevailing interest and trail along beside the latter for centuries afterwards. It follows from this that within a nation itself the individuals, even apart from their pecuniary circumstances, have quite different developments, and that an earlier interest, the form of intercourse of which has already been ousted by that belonging to a later interest, remains for a long time afterwards in possession of a traditional power in the community (State, law), which has won an existence independent of the individuals; a power which in the last resort can only be broken by a revolution. This explains why, with reference to individual points [62] which allow of a more general summing-up, consciousness can sometimes appear further advanced than the contemporary empirical relationships, so that

* [Marginal note by Marx:] Production of the form of intercourse itself.
in the struggles of a later epoch one can refer to earlier theoreticians as authorities.

On the other hand, in countries which, like North America, begin in an already advanced historical epoch, the development proceeds very rapidly. Such countries have no other natural premises than the individuals, who settled there and were led to do so because the forms of intercourse of the old countries did not correspond to their wants. Thus they begin with the most advanced individuals of the old countries, and, therefore, with the correspondingly most advanced form of intercourse, before this form of intercourse has been able to establish itself in the old countries. This is the case with all colonies, insofar as they are not mere military or trading stations. Carthage, the Greek colonies, and Iceland in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, provide examples of this. A similar relationship issues from conquest, when a form of intercourse which has evolved on another soil is brought over complete to the conquered country: whereas in its home it was still encumbered with interests and relationships left over from earlier periods, here it can and must be established completely and without hindrance, if only to assure the conquerors' lasting power. (England and Naples after the Norman conquest, when they received the most perfect form of feudal organisation.)

[8. The Role of Violence (Conquest) in History]

This whole interpretation of history appears to be contradicted by the fact of conquest. Up till now violence, war, pillage, murder and robbery, etc., have been accepted as the driving force of history. Here we must limit ourselves to the chief points and take, therefore, only the most striking example—the destruction of an old civilisation by a barbarous people and the resulting formation of an entirely new organisation of society. (Rome and the barbarians; feudalism and Gaul; the Byzantine Empire and the Turks.)

With the conquering barbarian people war itself is still, as indicated above, a regular form of intercourse, which is the more eagerly exploited as the increase in population together with the traditional and, for it, the only possible crude mode of production gives rise to the need for new means of production. In Italy, on the other hand, the concentration of landed property (caused not only by buying-up and indebtedness but also by inheritance, since loose living being rife and marriage rare, the old families gradually died out and their possessions fell into the hands of a few) and its conversion into grazing-land (caused
not only by the usual economic forces still operative today but by the importation of plundered and tribute-corn and the resultant lack of demand for Italian corn) brought about the almost total disappearance of the free population. The very slaves died out again and again, and had constantly to be replaced by new ones. Slavery remained the basis of the whole productive system. The plebeians, midway between freemen and slaves, never succeeded in becoming more than a proletarian rabble. Rome indeed never became more than a city; its connection with the provinces was almost exclusively political and could, therefore, easily be broken again by political events.

Nothing is more common than the notion that in history up till now it has only been a question of taking. The barbarians take the Roman Empire, and this fact of taking is made to explain the transition from the old world to the feudal system. In this taking by barbarians, however, the question is, whether the nation which is conquered has evolved industrial productive forces, as is the case with modern peoples, or whether their productive forces are based for the most part merely on their association and on the community. Taking is further determined by the object taken. A banker's fortune, consisting of paper, cannot be taken at all, without the taker's submitting to the conditions of production and intercourse of the country taken. Similarly the total industrial capital of a modern industrial country. And finally, everywhere there is very soon an end to taking, and when there is nothing more to take, you have to set about producing. From this necessity of producing, which very soon asserts itself, it follows [64] that the form of community adopted by the settling conquerors must correspond to the stage of development of the productive forces they find in existence; or, if this is not the case from the start, it must change according to the productive forces. By this, too, is explained the fact, which people profess to have noticed everywhere in the period following the migration of the peoples, namely, that the servant was master, and that the conquerors very soon took over language, culture and manners from the conquered. The feudal system was by no means brought complete from Germany, but had its origin, as far as the conquerors were concerned, in the martial organisation of the army during the actual conquest, and this only evolved after the conquest into the feudal system proper through the action of the productive forces found in the conquered countries. To what an extent this form was determined by the productive forces is shown by the abortive
attempts to realise other forms derived from reminiscences of ancient Rome (Charlemagne, etc.).
To be continued.

[9. The Development of Contradiction Between the Productive Forces and the Form of Intercourse in the Conditions of Big Industry and Free Competition. Antithesis Between Labour and Capital]

In big industry and competition the whole mass of conditions of existence, limitations, biases of individuals, are fused together into the two simplest forms: private property and labour. With money every form of intercourse, and intercourse itself, is considered fortuitous for the individuals. Thus money implies that all previous intercourse was only intercourse of individuals under particular conditions, not of individuals as individuals. These conditions are reduced to two: accumulated labour or private property, and actual labour. If both or one of these ceases, then intercourse comes to a standstill. The modern economists themselves, e.g., Sismondi, Cherbuliez, etc., oppose “association of individuals” to “association of capital”. On the other hand, the individuals themselves are entirely subordinated to the division of labour and hence are brought into the most complete dependence on one another. Private property, insofar as within labour itself it is opposed to labour, evolves out of the necessity of accumulation, and has still, to begin with, rather the form of the communality; but in its further development it approaches more and more the modern form of private property. The division of labour implies from the outset the division of the conditions of labour, of tools and materials, and thus the splitting-up of accumulated capital among different owners, and thus, also, the division between capital and labour, and the different forms of property itself. The more the division of labour develops [65] and accumulation grows, the sharper are the forms that this process of differentiation assumes. Labour itself can only exist on the premise of this fragmentation.

(Personal energy of the individuals of various nations—Germans and Americans—energy even through cross-breeding—hence the cretinism of the Germans; in France and England, etc., foreign peoples transplanted to an already developed soil, in America to an entirely new soil; in Germany the natural population quietly stayed where it was.)
Thus two facts are here revealed. First the productive forces appear as a world for themselves, quite independent of and divorced from the individuals, alongside the individuals: the reason for this is that the individuals, whose forces they are, exist split up and in opposition to one another, whilst, on the other hand, these forces are only real forces in the intercourse and association of these individuals. Thus, on the one hand, we have a totality of productive forces, which have, as it were, taken on a material form and are for the individuals no longer the forces of the individuals but of private property, and hence of the individuals only insofar as they are owners of private property themselves. Never, in any earlier period, have the productive forces taken on a form so indifferent to the intercourse of individuals as individuals, because their intercourse itself was formerly a restricted one. On the other hand, standing over against these productive forces, we have the majority of the individuals from whom these forces have been wrested away, and who, robbed thus of all real life-content, have become abstract individuals, but who are, however, only by this fact put into a position to enter into relation with one another as individuals.

The only connection which still links them with the productive forces and with their own existence—labour—has lost all semblance of self-activity and only sustains their [66] life by stunting it. While in the earlier periods self-activity and the production of material life were separated, in that they devolved on different persons, and while, on account of the narrowness of the individuals themselves, the production of material life was considered as a subordinate mode of self-activity, they now diverge to such an extent that altogether material life appears as the end, and what produces this material life, labour (which is now the only possible but, as we see, negative form of self-activity), as the means.

[10. The Necessity, Conditions and Consequences of the Abolition of Private Property]

Thus things have now come to such a pass, that the individuals must appropriate the existing totality of productive forces, not only to achieve self-activity, but, also, merely to safeguard their very existence.

This appropriation is first determined by the object to be appropriated, the productive forces, which have been developed to a totality and which only exist within a universal intercourse.

* [Marginal note by Engels:] Sismondi.
From this aspect alone, therefore, this appropriation must have a universal character corresponding to the productive forces and the intercourse. The appropriation of these forces is itself nothing more than the development of the individual capacities corresponding to the material instruments of production. The appropriation of a totality of instruments of production is, for this very reason, the development of a totality of capacities in the individuals themselves.

This appropriation is further determined by the persons appropriating. Only the proletarians of the present day, who are completely shut off from all self-activity, are in a position to achieve a complete and no longer restricted self-activity, which consists in the appropriation of a totality of productive forces and in the thus postulated development of a totality of capacities. All earlier revolutionary appropriations were restricted; individuals, whose self-activity was restricted by a crude instrument of production and a limited intercourse, appropriated this crude instrument [67] of production, and hence merely achieved a new state of limitation. Their instrument of production became their property, but they themselves remained subordinate to the division of labour and their own instrument of production. In all expropriations up to now, a mass of individuals remained subservient to a single instrument of production; in the appropriation by the proletarians, a mass of instruments of production must be made subject to each individual, and property to all. Modern universal intercourse can be controlled by individuals, therefore, only when controlled by all.

This appropriation is further determined by the manner in which it must be effected. It can only be effected through a union, which by the character of the proletariat itself can again only be a universal one, and through a revolution, in which, on the one hand, the power of the earlier mode of production and intercourse and social organisation is overthrown, and, on the other hand, there develops the universal character and the energy of the proletariat, without which the revolution cannot be accomplished; and in which, further, the proletariat rids itself of everything that still clings to it from its previous position in society.

Only at this stage does self-activity coincide with material life, which corresponds to the development of individuals into complete individuals and the casting-off of all natural limitations. The transformation of labour into self-activity corresponds to the transformation of the earlier limited intercourse into the intercourse of individuals as such. With the appropriation of the total productive forces through united individuals, private
properly comes to an end. Whilst previously in history a particular condition always appeared as accidental, now the isolation of individuals and the particular private gain of each man have themselves become accidental.

The individuals, who are no longer subject [68] to the division of labour, have been conceived by the philosophers as an ideal, under the name “Man”. They have conceived the whole process which we have outlined as the evolutionary process of “Man”, so that at every historical stage “Man” was substituted for the individuals and shown as the motive force of history. The whole process was thus conceived as a process of the self-estrangement of “Man”,* and this was essentially due to the fact that the average individual of the later stage was always foisted on to the earlier stage, and the consciousness of a later age on to the individuals of an earlier. Through this inversion, which from the first is an abstract image of the actual conditions, it was possible to transform the whole of history into an evolutionary process of consciousness.

* * *

Civil society embraces the whole material intercourse of individuals within a definite stage of the development of productive forces. It embraces the whole commercial and industrial life of a given stage and, insofar, transcends the State and the nation, though, on the other hand again, it must assert itself in its foreign relations as nationality and inwardly must organise itself as State. The term “civil society” [bürglerliche Gesellschaft]** emerged in the eighteenth century, when property relationships had already extricated themselves from the ancient and medieval communal society. Civil society as such only develops with the bourgeoisie; the social organisation evolving directly out of production and commerce, which in all ages forms the basis of the State and of the rest of the idealistic*** superstructure, has, however, always been designated by the same name.

[11.] The Relation of State and Law to Property

The first form of property, in the ancient world as in the Middle Ages, is tribal property, determined with the Romans chiefly by war, with [69] the Germans by the rearing of cattle.

* [Marginal note by Marx:] Self-estrangement.
** “Bürgerliche Gesellschaft” can mean either “bourgeois society” or “civil society”.—*Ed.
*** i.e., ideal, ideological.—*Ed.
In the case of the ancient peoples, since several tribes live together in one town, the tribal property appears as State property, and the right of the individual to it as mere “possession” which, however, like tribal property as a whole, is confined to landed property only. Real private property began with the ancients, as with modern nations, with movable property.—(Slavery and community) (dominium ex jure Quiritum*). In the case of the nations which grew out of the Middle Ages, tribal property evolved through various stages—feudal landed property, corporative movable property, capital invested in manufacture—to modern capital, determined by big industry and universal competition, i.e., pure private property, which has cast off all semblance of a communal institution and has shut out the State from any influence on the development of property. To this modern private property corresponds the modern State, which, purchased gradually by the owners of property by means of taxation, has fallen entirely into their hands through the national debt, and its existence has become wholly dependent on the commercial credit which the owners of property, the bourgeois, extend to it, as reflected in the rise and fall of State funds on the stock exchange. By the mere fact that it is a class and no longer an estate, the bourgeoisie is forced to organise itself no longer locally, but nationally, and to give a general form to its mean average interest. Through the emancipation of private property from the community, the State has become a separate entity, beside and outside civil society; but it is nothing more than the form of organisation which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests. The independence of the State is only found nowadays in those countries where the estates have not yet completely developed into classes, where the estates, done away with in more advanced countries, still have a part to play, and where there exists a mixture; countries, that is to say, in which no one section of the population can achieve dominance over the others. This is the case particularly in Germany. The most perfect example of the modern State is North [70] America. The modern French, English and American writers all express the opinion that the State exists only for the sake of private property, so that this fact has penetrated into the consciousness of the normal man.

Since the State is the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests, and in which the whole

* Ownership in accordance with the law applying to full Roman citizens.—Ed.
Civil society of an epoch is epitomised, it follows that the State mediates in the formation of all common institutions and that the institutions receive a political form. Hence the illusion that law is based on the will, and indeed on the will divorced from its real basis—on free will. Similarly, justice is in its turn reduced to the actual laws.

Civil law develops simultaneously with private property out of the disintegration of the natural community. With the Romans the development of private property and civil law had no further industrial and commercial consequences, because their whole mode of production did not alter.* With modern peoples, where the feudal community was disintegrated by industry and trade, there began with the rise of private property and civil law a new phase, which was capable of further development. The very first town which carried on an extensive maritime trade in the Middle Ages, Amalfi, also developed maritime law.\(^{34}\) As soon as industry and trade developed private property further, first in Italy and later in other countries, the highly developed Roman civil law was immediately adopted again and raised to authority. When later the bourgeoisie had acquired so much power that the princes took up its interests in order to overthrow the feudal nobility by means of the bourgeoisie, there began in all countries—in France in the sixteenth century—the real development of law, which in all countries except England proceeded \(^{71}\) on the basis of the Roman Codex. In England, too, Roman legal principles had to be introduced to further the development of civil law (especially in the case of movable property). (It must not be forgotten that law has just as little independent history as religion.)

In civil law the existing property relationships are declared to be the result of the general will. The \(jus utendi et abutendi\)** itself asserts on the one hand the fact that private property has become entirely independent of the community, and on the other the illusion that private property itself is based solely on the private will, the arbitrary disposal of the thing. In practice, the \(abuti\)** has very definite economic limitations for the owner of private property, if he does not wish to see his property and hence his \(jus abutendi\)** pass into other hands, since actually the thing, considered merely with reference to his will, is not

---

* [Marginal note by Engels:] (Usury!)
** The right of using and consuming (also: abusing), i.e., of disposing of a thing at will.—\(Ed.\)
*** Consuming or abusing.—\(Ed.\)
**** The right of abusing.—\(Ed.\)
a thing at all, but only becomes a thing, true property in intercourse, and independently of the law (a relationship, which the philosophers call an idea*). This juridical illusion, which reduces law to the mere will, necessarily leads, in the further development of property relationships, to the position that a man may have a legal title to a thing without really having the thing. If, for instance, the income from a piece of land is lost owing to competition, then the proprietor has certainly his legal title to it along with the *jus utendi et abutendi*. But he can do nothing with it: he owns nothing as a landed proprietor if in addition he has not enough capital to cultivate his land. This illusion of the jurists also explains the fact that for them, as for every code, it is altogether fortuitous that individuals enter into relationships among themselves (e.g., contracts); it explains why they consider that these relationships [can] be entered into or not at will, [72] and that their content rests purely on the individual [free] will of the contracting parties.

Whenever, through the development of industry and commerce, new forms of intercourse have been evolved (e.g., insurance companies, etc.), the law has always been compelled to admit them among the modes of acquiring property.**

[12. Forms of Social Consciousness]

The influence of the division of labour on science.

The role of repression with regard to the State, right, morality, etc.

[In the] law the bourgeois must give themselves a general expression precisely because they rule as a class.

Natural science and history.

There is no history of politics, law, science, etc., of art, religion, etc.***

Why the ideologists turn everything upside-down.

Religionists, jurists, politicians.

Jurists, politicians (statesmen in general), moralists, religionists.

---

* [Marginal note by Marx:] For the philosophers relationship = idea. They only know the relation of "Man" to himself and hence for them all real relations become ideas.

** Further, at the end of the manuscript, there are notes written in Marx's hand which were intended for his further elaboration.—Ed.

*** [Marginal note by Marx:] To the "community" as it appears in the ancient State, in feudalism and in the absolute monarchy, to this bond correspond especially the [Catholic] religious conceptions.
For this ideological subdivision within a class, 1. *The occupation assumes an independent existence owing to division of labour*; everyone believes his craft to be the true one. The very nature of their craft causes them to succumb the more easily to illusions regarding the connection between their craft and reality. In their consciousness, in jurisprudence, politics, etc., relationships become concepts; since they do not go beyond these relationships, the concepts of the relationships also become fixed concepts in their mind. The judge, for example, applies the code, he therefore regards legislation as the real, active driving force. Respect for their goods, because their craft deals with general matters.

Idea of justice. Idea of State. The matter is turned upside-down in *ordinary* consciousness.

Religion is from the outset consciousness of the *transcendental* arising from a *real* necessity.

This more popular.

Tradition, with regard to law, religion, etc.

* * *

[73]* Individuals always started, and always start, from themselves. Their relations are the relations of their real life. How does it happen that their relations assume an independent existence over against them? and that the forces of their own life overpower them?

In short: *the division of labour*, the level of which depends on the development of the productive power at any particular time.


Written by Marx and Engels in Brussels between November 1845 and August 1846

First published in Russian in the Marx-Engels Archives, Book I, 1924

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the German

* This last page is not numbered in the manuscript. It contains notes relating to the beginning of the authors' exposition of the materialistic conception of history. The ideas expressed here are developed in Part I of the chapter, in Section 3.—*Ed.*
Question 1: What is Communism?
Answer: Communism is the doctrine of the conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.

Question 2: What is the proletariat?
Answer: The proletariat is that class of society which procures its means of livelihood entirely and solely from the sale of its labour and not from the profit derived from some capital; whose weal and woe, whose life and death, whose whole existence depend on the demand for labour, hence, on the alternations of times of good business and times of bad business, on the fluctuations resulting from unbridled competition. The proletariat, or class of proletarians, is, in a word, the working class of the nineteenth century.

Question 3: Thus, have there not always been proletarians?
Answer: No. Poor folk and working classes have always existed, and the working classes have for the most part been poor. But such poor, such workers who lived under the just mentioned conditions, that is, proletarians, have not always existed, any more than competition has always been free and unbridled.

Question 4: How did the proletariat arise?
Answer: The proletariat arose as a result of the industrial revolution which unfolded in England in the latter half of the last century and which has repeated itself since then in all the civilised countries of the world. This industrial revolution was brought about by the invention of the steam-engine, of various spinning machines, of the power-loom, and of a great number of other mechanical devices. These machines which were very expensive and, consequently, could only be purchased by big capitalists altered the entire hitherto existing mode of production and ousted the hitherto existing workers because machines produced cheaper and better commodities than could the workers with their imperfect spinning-wheels and hand-looms. Thus, these machines handed over industry entirely to the big capitalists and rendered the workers' scanty property (tools, hand-looms, etc.) worthless, so that the capitalists soon owned every-
thing and nothing was left to the workers. In this way the factory system was introduced in the realm of textile production.—The impetus to the introduction of machinery and the factory system once having been given, the latter rapidly invaded all the other branches of industry, notably the textile- and book-printing trades, pottery, and hardware industry. More and more did labour come to be divided among many workers, so that the worker who formerly had made the entire article, now merely produced a part of the article. This division of labour made it possible to supply products more speedily and therefore cheaper. It reduced the labour of each worker to a very simple, constantly repeating mechanical operation, which could be performed by the machine not only equally well, but even a good deal better. In this way, all these branches of industry one after another fell under the dominion of steam-power, machinery, and the factory system, just like the spinning and weaving industries. But thereby all of them fell into the hands of the big capitalists, and here too the workers were deprived of the last shred of independence. Gradually, in addition to actual manufacture, the handicrafts likewise fell increasingly under the dominion of the factory system, because here too big capitalists pushed small masters more and more aside by erecting large workshops, in which much expense was spared and the labour could also be conveniently divided among the workers. In this way it has come about that in all civilised countries almost all branches of labour are carried on under the factory system, that in almost all these branches handicraft and manufacture have been ousted by large-scale industry.—As a result, the former middle classes, especially the smaller master handicraftsmen, have been increasingly driven to ruin, the former position of the workers has completely changed, and two new classes which are gradually absorbing all other classes have come into being, namely:

I. The class of big capitalists who, in all civilised countries, already now almost exclusively own all the means of subsistence and the raw materials and instruments (machinery, factories, etc.), needed for the production of these means of subsistence. This class is the bourgeois class or bourgeoisie.

II. The class of those who own absolutely nothing, who are compelled therefore to sell their labour to the bourgeois in order to obtain the necessary means of subsistence in exchange. This class is called the proletarian class or proletariat.

Q[uestion] 5: Under what conditions does this sale of the labour of proletarians to the bourgeois take place?

A[nswer]: Labour is a commodity like any other and its price is determined by the same laws as that of any other commodi-
ty. The price of a commodity under the dominion of large-scale industry or of free competition, which, as we shall see, means the same thing, is on the average always equal to the cost of production of that commodity. The price of labour is, therefore, likewise equal to the cost of production of labour. The latter cost consists precisely of that sum of the means of subsistence which is needed to make the worker fit to perform the labour and to prevent the working class from dying out. Thus, the worker will not receive more for his labour than is necessary for that purpose; the price of labour, or wages, will be the lowest, the minimum required to maintain a livelihood. Since business is now worse, now better, the worker receives now more, now less, just as the factory owner receives now more, now less for his commodity. But just as the factory owner receives on the average, be the times good or be they bad, neither more nor less for his commodity than the cost of its production, so will the worker, on the average, receive neither more nor less than that minimum. This economic law of wages will come to be more stringently applied the more all branches of labour are taken over by large-scale industry.

Q[uestion] 6: What working classes existed before the industrial revolution?

A[nsuwer]: Depending on the different stages of the development of society, the working classes lived in different conditions and stood in different relations to the possessing and ruling classes. In ancient times the working people were the slaves of their owners, just as they still are in many backward countries and even in the southern part of the United States. In the Middle Ages they were serfs belonging to the land-owning nobility, just as they still are in Hungary, Poland, and Russia. In the Middle Ages and up to the industrial revolution there were in the towns also handicraftsmen in the service of petty-bourgeois masters, and with the development of manufacture there gradually emerged manufactory workers, now employed by the more or less big capitalists.

Q[uestion] 7: In what way does the proletarian differ from the slave?

A[nsuwer]: The slave is sold outright, the proletarian has to sell himself by the day and by the hour. Each individual slave, the property of a single master, is guaranteed a subsistence even if only by the interests of his master, however wretched it may be; each individual proletarian, the property, as it were, of the whole bourgeois class, whose labour is bought only when it is needed by someone, has no guaranteed subsistence. This subsistence is merely guaranteed to the proletarian class as a whole.
The slave stands outside of competition, the proletarian stands in it and feels all its fluctuations. The slave is counted a thing and not a member of civil society; the proletarian is looked upon as a person, as a member of civil society. Thus, the slave may lead a better life than the proletarian, but the proletarian belongs to a higher stage of development of society and himself stands at a higher stage than the slave. The slave frees himself by rupturing of all private property relations only the relation of slavery, and thereby becomes himself a proletarian; the proletarian can free himself only by abolishing private property in general.

*Question* 8: In what way does the proletarian differ from the serf?

*Answer*: The serf has the possession and use of an instrument of production, a strip of land, in return for which he hands over a portion of the yield or performs work. The proletarian works with instruments of production belonging to another for this other in return for a portion of the yield. The serf gives, the proletarian is given. The serf has a guaranteed subsistence, the proletarian has not. The serf stands outside of competition, the proletarian stands in it. The serf frees himself either by running away to the town and there becoming a handicraftsman or by giving his landlord money instead of labour and products, thereby becoming a free leaseholder; or by driving his feudal lord away and himself becoming a proprietor, in short, by entering in one way or another the ranks of the possessing class and competition. The proletarian frees himself by abolishing competition, private property and all class distinctions.

*Question* 9: In what way does the proletarian differ from the handicraftsman?

*Question* 10: In what way does the proletarian differ from the manufactory worker?

*Answer*: The manufactory worker of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries almost everywhere still had the ownership of his instrument of production, his loom, the family spinning wheels, and a little plot of land which he cultivated in his leisure hours. The proletarian has none of these things. The manufactory worker lives almost exclusively in the country under more or less patriarchal relations with his landlord or his employer; the proletarian dwells mostly in large towns, and his relation to his employer is purely a money relation. The manufactory worker, wrested by large-scale industry from his patriarchal
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conditions, loses the property he still owns and thereby himself becomes a proletarian.

**Q[uestion] 11:** What were the immediate results of the industrial revolution and the division of society into bourgeois and proletarians?

**A[nswer]: In the first place,** since owing to machine labour the prices of industrial products constantly decreased, the old system of manufacture or industry founded upon manual labour was completely destroyed in all countries of the world. All semi-barbarian countries, which had hitherto been more or less cut off from historical development and whose industry had until now been based on manufacture, were thus forcibly dragged out of their isolation. They bought the cheaper commodities of the English and allowed their own manufactory workers to perish. Thus it was that countries which had stagnated for millennia, India for example, were revolutionised from top to base and even China is now marching towards a revolution. Thus, it has come about that a machine invented in England today, within a year robs millions of workers in China of their daily bread. In this way large-scale industry has brought all the peoples of the earth into relationships one with another, has lumped all the small local markets into one world market, has everywhere paved the way for civilisation and progress, and things have reached a point when everything that happens in the civilised countries has its repercussions in all other countries. Thus, if the workers of England or France free themselves now, this must induce revolutions in all other countries, which sooner or later will lead to the emancipation of the workers there too.

**Secondly,** wherever large-scale industry replaced manufacture, the industrial revolution developed the bourgeoisie, its wealth and its power to the highest degree and made it the first class in the country. The result was that wherever this happened, the bourgeoisie took political power in its hands and ousted the hitherto ruling classes,—the aristocracy, the guild-burghers and the absolute monarchy representing the two. The bourgeoisie annihilated the power of the aristocracy, the nobility, by abolishing entails or the prohibition of the sale of landed property, and the privileges of the nobility. The bourgeoisie destroyed the power of the guild-burghers by abolishing all guilds and craft privileges. It replaced the two by free competition, that is, by a system of society in which each has the right to engage in any branch of industry, and where nothing can hinder him in this but lack of the necessary capital. The introduction of free competition, therefore, constitutes a public declaration that henceforward members of society are only unequal in so far as their capital is
unequal, that capital is the decisive power, and that, hence, the capitalists, the bourgeois, have become the first class in society. But free competition is necessary in the beginning of large-scale industry for it is the only state of society in which large-scale industry can grow. As soon as the bourgeoisie had thus annihilated the social power of the nobility and the guild-burghers, it annihilated their political power as well. Having become the first class in society, the bourgeoisie proclaimed itself the first class also in the political field. It did this by establishing the representative system which rests upon bourgeois equality before the law and the legal recognition of free competition, and which in European countries was introduced in the form of constitutional monarchy. Under these constitutional monarchies those only are electors who possess a certain amount of capital, that is to say, the bourgeois; these bourgeois electors elect the deputies, and these bourgeois deputies, by way of the right to refuse supplies, elect a bourgeois government.

Thirdly, the industrial revolution built up the proletariat in the same measure in which it built up the bourgeoisie. In the same relation in which the bourgeois gained wealth, the proletarians gained in numbers. Since proletarians can only be employed by capital and since capital can only increase when it employs labour, the growth of the proletariat keeps exact pace with the growth of capital. Simultaneously, it assembles the bourgeois and the proletarians in large cities, in which industry can be carried on most profitably, and by this herding together of great masses in one spot makes the proletarians conscious of their power. Furthermore, the more it develops, the more machines are invented, which oust manual labour, the more large-scale industry depresses, as we already said, wages to the minimum, and thereby makes the proletariat's conditions more and more unbearable. Thus, by the growing discontent of the proletariat, on the one hand, and its growing power, on the other, the industrial revolution prepares the way for a social revolution by the proletariat.

Q[uestion] 12: What were the further results of the industrial revolution?

A[answer]: In the steam-engine and other machines large-scale industry created the means making it possible in a short period of time and at slight expense to increase industrial production to an unlimited extent. Free competition, the essential result of large-scale industry, soon assumed thanks to the facility of production an extremely intense nature; a great number of capitalists applied themselves to industry, and very soon more was produced than could be utilised. The result was that manufactured goods
could not be sold, and a so-called trade crisis ensued. Factories had to stand idle, factory owners went bankrupt, and the workers lost their bread. Abject misery set in. After a while the surplus products were sold, the factories were again set a-going, wages went up, and gradually business was more brisk than ever. But before long again too many commodities were produced, another crisis ensued, and ran the same course as the previous one. Thus since the beginning of this century the state of industry has constantly fluctuated between periods of prosperity and periods of crisis, and a similar crisis has recurred at almost regular intervals of five to seven years, bringing in its train ever more intolerable wretchedness for the workers, a general revolutionary ferment, and the greatest danger to the entire existing system.

Q[uestion] 13: What conclusions can be drawn from these regularly recurring trade crises?
A[nswe]r: First, that although in the initial stages of its development large-scale industry itself created free competition, it now has outgrown free competition; that competition and in general the carrying on of industrial production by individuals have become a fetter upon large-scale industry, which it must and will break; that large-scale industry, so long as it is conducted on its present basis, can only survive through a general confusion repeating every seven years, which every time threatens all of civilisation, not merely casting the proletarians into a well of misery but likewise causing the ruin of a great number of bourgeois; that, hence, either large-scale industry must be given up, which is quite impossible, or that it makes absolutely necessary a totally new organisation of society, in which no longer individual factory owners, competing one against the other, but the whole of society runs industrial production according to a fixed plan and according to the needs of all.

Secondly, that large-scale industry and the unlimited expansion of production made possible by it can bring into being a social order wherein so much of all necessities of life is produced that every member of society will be able to develop and to apply all his powers and abilities in the fullest freedom. Thus, precisely that quality of large-scale industry which in present-day society produces all misery and all trade crises is exactly the one which under a different social organisation will destroy that very misery and these disastrous fluctuations.

Thus it is clearly proved:
1. that from now on all these ills can be attributed exclusively to the social order which no longer corresponds to the existing conditions;
2. that the means are ready to hand for fully abolishing these ills through the establishment of a new social order.

*Question* 14: What kind of a new social order will this have to be?

*Answer*: First of all, the new social order will generally take the running of industry and all branches of production out of the hands of disjointed individuals competing among themselves and will instead run all these branches of production on behalf of society as a whole, i.e., according to a social plan and with the participation of all members of society. Thus it will do away with competition and replace it by association. Since the running of industry by individuals inevitably leads to private ownership and since competition is nothing but the manner in which industry is run by individual private owners, private ownership cannot be separated from the individual running of industry and competition. Hence, private ownership will also have to be abolished, and in its stead there will be common use of all the instruments of production and the distribution of all products by common agreement, or a so-called community of goods. The abolition of private ownership is even the most succinct and most characteristic summary expression of the transformation of the entire social system inevitably following from the development of industry, and it is therefore right that this is the main demand put forward by the Communists.

*Question* 15: Consequently, the abolition of private property was impossible earlier?

*Answer*: Right. Every change in the social order, every revolution in property relations is the essential result of the creation of new productive forces which no longer correspond to the old property relations. Private property itself arose in this way. For private property has not always existed, but when towards the end of the Middle Ages a new mode of production was introduced in the form of manufacture, which was incompatible with the then existing feudal and guild property, manufacture, which had outgrown the old property relations, created a new form of ownership—private ownership. No other property form than that of private ownership was possible during the period of manufacture and in the first stage of the development of large-scale industry, no other order of society than that founded upon private ownership. So long as there cannot be produced enough not only to supply all, but also to provide a surplus of products for the increase of social capital and for the further development of the productive forces, so long there must always be a dominant class, ruling over the productive forces of society, and a poor, oppressed class. The way in which these classes are
constituted will depend upon the stage of the development of production. In the Middle Ages, which were dependent upon agriculture, we find the lord and the serf; the towns of the later Middle Ages provide us with the master guildsman and his apprentices and day-labourers; the seventeenth century has manufacturers and manufactory workers; the nineteenth century—the big factory owner and the proletarian. It is obvious that hitherto the productive forces had not yet been developed widely enough to produce sufficiency for all, and to make private property a fetter, a barrier, to these productive forces. Now, however, when the development of large-scale industry has, firstly, created capital and productive forces on a scale hitherto unheard of and the means exist for multiplying these productive forces in a short span of time unendingly; when, secondly, these productive forces are concentrated in the hands of a few bourgeois whilst the great mass of the people are falling ever more into the ranks of the proletariat, and their condition is becoming more wretched and unendurable in the same measure in which the wealth of the bourgeois multiplies; when, thirdly, these mighty and easily multiplied productive forces have so greatly outgrown private property and the bourgeoisie that they constantly cause violent disturbances in the social order—only now has the abolition of private property become not only possible but even strictly essential.

Q[uestion] 16: Will it be possible to bring about the abolition of private property by peaceful methods?

A[nswe]: It is to be desired that this could happen, and Communists certainly would be the last to resist it. The Communists know only too well that all conspiracies are not only futile but even harmful. They know only too well that revolutions are not made deliberately and arbitrarily, but that everywhere and at all times they were the essential outcome of circumstances quite independent of the will and the leadership of particular parties and entire classes. But they likewise perceive that the development of the proletariat is in nearly every civilised country forcibly suppressed, and that thereby the opponents of the Communists are tending in every way to promote revolution. Should the oppressed proletariat in the end be goaded into a revolution, we Communists will then defend the cause of the proletarians by deed just as well as we do now by word.

Q[uestion] 17: Will it be possible to abolish private property at one blow?

A[nswe]: No, such a thing would be just as impossible as at one blow to multiply the existing productive forces to the degree necessary for the creation of the community. Hence, the proletar-
ian revolution, which in all likelihood is approaching, will only be able gradually to transform existing society, and will abolish private ownership only when the necessary quantity of means of production has been created.

Q[question] 18: What will be the course of this revolution?
A[nswer]: In the first place it will inaugurate a democratic constitution and thereby directly or indirectly the political rule of the proletariat. Directly in England, where the proletariat already constitutes the majority of the people. Indirectly in France and in Germany, where the majority of the people consists, in addition to proletarians, of petty peasants and bourgeois, who are now being proletarianised and in their political interests are becoming more and more dependent on the proletariat and therefore soon will have to submit to the demands of the proletariat. Perhaps this will involve a second fight, one that can end only in the victory of the proletariat.

Democracy would be quite useless to the proletariat if it were not immediately utilised as a means of accomplishing further measures directly attacking private ownership and securing the existence of the proletariat. Principal among these measures, already now consequent upon the existing relations, are the following:

1. Restriction of private ownership by means of progressive income taxes, high inheritance taxes, abolition of inheritance by collateral lines (brothers, nephews, etc.), compulsory loans, and so forth.

2. Gradual expropriation of landed proprietors, factory owners, railway and shipping magnates, partly through competition on the part of state industry and partly directly through the payment of compensation in currency notes.

3. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels against the majority of the people.

4. Organisation of the labour or occupation of the proletarians on national estates, in national factories and workshops, thereby putting an end to competition among the workers themselves and compelling the factory owners, as long as they still exist, to pay the same high wages as those paid by the State.

5. Equal liability to work for all members of society until the abolition of private ownership is completed. Formation of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

6. Centralisation of the credit and banking systems in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with state capital and the suppression of all private banks and bankers.

7. Increase of national factories, workshops, railways, and ships, cultivation of all uncultivated land and improvement of
the already cultivated land in the same proportion in which the capital and workers at the disposal of the nation are increasing.

8. Education of all children, as soon as they are old enough to dispense with maternal care, in national institutions and at the charge of the nation. Education combined with production.

9. The erection of large palaces on national estates as common dwellings for communities of citizens carrying on industry as well as agriculture, and combining the advantages of urban and rural life without the citizens having to suffer from the one-sidedness and the disadvantages of either.

10. The demolition of all insanitary and badly built houses and blocks of flats.

11. Equal right of inheritance to be enjoyed by illegitimate and legitimate children.

12. Concentration of all means of transport in the hands of the nation.

Of course, all these measures cannot be introduced at once. But one will always lead to the other. Once the first radical onslaught upon private ownership has been made, the proletariat will be compelled to go further, and more and more to concentrate in the hands of the State all capital, all agriculture, all industry, all transport, and all means of exchange. All these measures work towards such results; and they will become realisable and their centralising consequences will develop in the same proportion in which the productive forces of the country will multiply through the labour of the proletariat. Finally, when all capital, all production, and all exchange are concentrated in the hands of the nation, private ownership will automatically have ceased to exist, money will have become superfluous, and production will have so increased and men will have so changed that the last forms of the old social relations will also be able to fall away.

Q[uestion] 19: Will it be possible for this revolution to take place in one country alone?

A[nswer]: No. Large-scale industry, already by creating the world market, has so linked up all the peoples of the earth, and especially the civilised peoples, that each people is dependent on what happens to another. Further, large-scale industry has levelled the social development of all civilised countries so much that in all these countries the bourgeoisie and proletariat have become the decisive two classes of society, and the struggle between them has become the main struggle of the day. The communist revolution, therefore, will be not only a national one; it
will take place in all civilised countries, that is, at least simultaneously in England, America, France and Germany. In each of these countries it will take a longer or a shorter time to develop depending on which has a more developed industry, more wealth and a greater mass of the productive forces. It will therefore assume the slowest pace and be most difficult to achieve in Germany; it will be quickest and easiest to carry out in England. It will also exercise considerable influence upon other countries of the world, completely changing the hitherto existing mode of their development and accelerating it greatly. It is to be a world revolution, and will, therefore, have the whole world as its arena.

**Q[uestion]** 20: What will be the consequences of the final abolition of private ownership?

**A[nswer]:** The expropriation by society of the private capitalists of the use of all productive forces and means of communication, as well as of the exchange and distribution of products, and their management by society according to a plan based on the available means and the requirements of society as a whole, will eliminate first of all the bad consequences large-scale industry entails at present. Crises will cease to be; the extended production, which in the present system of society spells over-production and is such a mighty cause of misery, will then not even suffice and have to be further expanded. Instead of bringing misery in its wake, over-production exceeding the immediate needs of society, will satisfy the needs of all, will create new needs and simultaneously the means for their gratification. It will become the condition and stimulus of further progress, it will achieve progress, without, as heretofore, always involving the social order in confusion. Once liberated from the yoke of private ownership, large-scale industry will develop on a scale that will make its present level of development seem as paltry as seems the manufacturing system compared with large-scale industry of our time. This development of industry will provide society with a quantity of products sufficient to satisfy the needs of all. Agriculture, too, hindered by the pressure of private ownership and the parcellation of land from introducing available improvements and scientific achievements, will mark a new advance and place at the disposal of society an ample mass of products. Thus society will produce sufficient products to arrange a distribution that will satisfy the requirements of all its members. The division of society into various antagonistic classes will thereby become superfluous. Not only will it become superfluous, but it will even be incompatible with the new social order. Classes came into existence through the division of labour and the
division of labour in its hitherto existing form will entirely disappear. Mechanical and chemical auxiliaries do not alone suffice to develop industrial and agricultural production to the described heights, the abilities of the people setting these auxiliaries in motion must likewise be correspondingly developed. Just as in the last century, the peasants and the manufactory workers had to change their entire way of life, and themselves became totally different people, when they were drawn into large-scale industry, so also will the joint management of production by society as a whole and the resultant new development of production require quite different people and also mould them. The joint management of production cannot be carried on by people as they are today, when each individual is assigned to a single branch of production, is shackled to it, exploited by it, of whom each has developed only one of his abilities at the expense of all others, knows only one branch, or only a branch of a branch of production as a whole. Even contemporary industry finds less and less use for such people. Industry which is carried on jointly and according to plan by the whole of society wholly presupposes people whose abilities have been developed all-round, who are capable of surveying the entire system of production. Consequently, the division of labour already undermined by the machine system, which makes one man a peasant, another a shoemaker, a third a factory worker, a fourth a stockjobber, will thus completely disappear. Education will enable young people quickly to acquaint themselves with the whole system of production, it will enable them to pass in turn from one branch of industry to another according to social needs or the bidding of their own inclinations. It will therefore abolish the one-sidedness in development imposed on all by the present division of labour. Thus, a communistically organised society will be able to provide its members with the opportunity to utilise their comprehensively developed abilities in a comprehensive way. Concomitantly, the various classes will vanish of necessity. Thus, on the one hand, communistically organised society is incompatible with the existence of classes, on the other, the making of this society itself provides the means for removing these class distinctions.

It follows from all this that the antithesis between town and country will likewise disappear. The carrying on of agriculture and industrial production by the same people, instead of by two different classes, is, even for purely material reasons, an essential condition of communistic association. The scattering of the agricultural population throughout the country, alongside the crowding of the industrial population in the big towns, is a state adequate only to an undeveloped stage of agriculture and in-
industry, an obstacle to all further development, which is making itself very perceptible even now.

The general association of all members of society for the common and planned exploitation of the productive forces, the expansion of production to a degree where it suffices to provide for the needs of all, the cessation of the condition when the satisfaction of the needs of some is effected at the expense of others, the complete abolition of classes and their antitheses, the all-round development of the abilities of all the members of society through the abolition of the hitherto prevalent division of labour, through industrial education, through the change of activity, through the participation of all in the blessings produced by all, through the fusion of town and country—such are the main results to be expected from the abolition of private property.

Q[uestion] 21: What influence will the communistic order of society have upon the family?

A[nswer]: It will make the relations between the sexes a purely private affair which concerns only the persons involved, and calls for no interference by society. It is able to do this because it abolishes private property and educates children communally, destroying thereby the two foundation stones of hitherto existing marriage—the dependence of the wife upon her husband and of the children upon the parents conditioned by private property. This is an answer to the outcry raised by moralising philistines against the communistic community of wives. Community of wives is a relationship belonging entirely to bourgeois society and existing today in perfect form as prostitution. Prostitution, however, is rooted in private property and falls with it. Hence, the communistic organisation rather than establishing the community of women, puts an end to it.

Q[uestion] 22: What will be the attitude of the communistic organisation towards the existing nationalities?
— remains.36

Q[uestion] 23: What will be its attitude towards the existing religions?
— remains.

Q[uestion] 24: In what way do Communists differ from Socialists?
A[nswer]: So-called Socialists may be divided into three groups.

The first group consists of adherents of feudal and patriarchal society which has been or is still being daily destroyed by large-scale industry and world trade, and by bourgeois society which these two have brought into existence. From the ills of present-
day society this group draws the conclusion that feudal and patriarchal society should be re-established because it was free of these evils. All their proposals lead directly or indirectly to this goal. This group of reactionary Socialists, despite their alleged sympathy for and shedding of hot tears over the miseries of the proletariat, will be strongly opposed by the Communists, because

1. they are striving after something purely impossible;
2. they are endeavouring to re-establish the rule of the aristocracy, the guild-masters and the manufacturers, with their retinue of absolute or feudal monarchs, officials, soldiery and priests, a society which, although it was free from the drawbacks of present-day society, nevertheless had at least as many ills of its own and did not even have the prospect of an emancipation of the oppressed workers through a communistic organisation;
3. they always reveal their genuine intents whenever the proletariat turns revolutionary and communistic, in which case they immediately ally themselves with the bourgeoisie against the proletarians.

The second group is composed of adherents of the present-day society, in whom the ills which are its inevitable outcome have awakened anxiety for the existence of that society. They are, therefore, endeavouring to keep the present-day society intact while eliminating the ills linked with it. With this end in view, some of them propose various welfare measures, while others advocate magnificent reform systems which, under pretext of reorganising society, would retain the foundations of present-day society, and thereby present-day society itself. These bourgeois Socialists will have likewise to be persistently opposed by the Communists, for they are working for the foes of the Communists and are defending the society which the Communists are out to destroy.

Finally, the third group is made up of democratic Socialists, who in the same way as the Communists desire part of the measures in Question*, but not as means for a transition to communism but as measures sufficient for the abolition of the misery and ills of present-day society. These democratic Socialists are either proletarians who are not yet sufficiently enlightened regarding the conditions of the emancipation of their class, or they are members of the petty bourgeoisie, a class which, until the winning of democracy and the realisation of socialist measures

---
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which must follow it, has in many respects identical interests with the proletariat. At moments of action the Communists will, therefore, have to reach agreement with the democratic Socialists, and for the moment at least to generally pursue a common policy with them when this is possible, so far as these democratic Socialists do not enter the service of the ruling bourgeoisie and attack the Communists. It is obvious that this common action does not exclude the discussion of differences with them.

Q[uestion] 25: What is the attitude of the Communists towards the other political parties of our day?

A[nswer]: This attitude differs from country to country.—In England, France, and Belgium, where the bourgeoisie rules, the Communists have for the time being still interests in common with the various democratic parties, and this community of interests is the greater the closer the democrats in the socialist measures they are now advocating everywhere approximate the aims of the Communists, that is, the clearer and the more definitely they uphold the interests of the proletariat and the more they lean upon the proletariat. In England, for instance, the Chartists, 37 who are all workers, are incalculably nearer to the Communists than are the democratic petty bourgeois or so-called radicals.

In America, where a democratic constitution has been introduced, the Communists must make common cause with the party that will apply this constitution against the bourgeoisie and use it in the interests of the proletariat, that is, with the national agrarian reformers.

In Switzerland the radicals, although they still form a very mixed party, are yet the only people with whom the Communists can have anything to do, and among these radicals, those in the cantons of Vaud and of Geneva are again the most progressive.

Finally, in Germany the decisive struggle between the bourgeoisie and the absolute monarchy is still in the offing. Since, however, the Communists cannot count on waging the decisive struggle with the bourgeoisie until the latter rules, it is in the interests of the Communists to help the bourgeoisie to attain that rule as speedily as possible in order to overthrow it as soon as possible. Communists must, therefore, always take the side of the liberal bourgeoisie against governments but must be on their guard lest they should come to share the self-deception of the bourgeoisie or to believe the tempting declarations of the bourgeoisie that its victory will have beneficial results for the proletariat. The only advantages a victory of the bourgeoisie offers to the Communists would be: 1. various concessions which would make easier for the Communists the defence, discussion and
spread of their principles, and thereby the unification of the proletariat in a compact, combative and well-organised class, and 2. the certainty that, from the day on which the absolute governments are overthrown, the turn will come round for the struggle between bourgeois and proletarians. From that day onwards the Party policy of the Communists will be the same as that in the countries where the bourgeoisie already rules.

Written by Engels at the end of October-November 1847
First published as a separate edition in 1914

Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the German
PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1872

The Communist League, an international association of workers, which could of course be only a secret one under the conditions obtaining at the time, commissioned the undersigned, at the Congress held in London in November 1847, to draw up for publication a detailed theoretical and practical programme of the Party. Such was the origin of the following Manifesto, the manuscript of which travelled to London, to be printed, a few weeks before the February Revolution. First published in German, it has been republished in that language in at least twelve different editions in Germany, England and America. It was published in English for the first time in 1850 in the Red Republican, London, translated by Miss Helen Macfarlane, and in 1871 in at least three different translations in America. A French version first appeared in Paris shortly before the June insurrection of 1848 and recently in Le Socialiste of New York. A new translation is in the course of preparation. A Polish version appeared in London shortly after it was first published in German. A Russian translation was published in Geneva in the sixties. Into Danish, too, it was translated shortly after its first appearance.

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

But, then, the Manifesto has become a historical document which we have no longer any right to alter. A subsequent edition may perhaps appear with an introduction bridging the gap from 1847 to the present day; this reprint was too unexpected to leave us time for that.

Karl Marx    Frederick Engels

London, June 24, 1872

Written by Marx and Engels for the German edition which appeared in Leipzig in 1872

Printed according to the 1872 edition
Translated from the German

PREFACE TO THE RUSSIAN EDITION OF 1882

The first Russian edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, translated by Bakunin, was published early in the sixties by the printing office of the Kolokol. Then the West could see in it (the Russian edition of the Manifesto) only a literary curiosity. Such a view would be impossible today.

What a limited field the proletarian movement still occupied at that time (December 1847) is most clearly shown by the last section of the Manifesto: the position of the Communists in relation to the various opposition parties in the various countries.* Precisely Russia and the United States are missing here.

* See pp. 136-37 of this volume.—Ed.
It was the time when Russia constituted the last great reserve of all European reaction, when the United States absorbed the surplus proletarian forces of Europe through immigration. Both countries provided Europe with raw materials and were at the same time markets for the sale of its industrial products. At that time both were, therefore, in one way or another, pillars of the existing European order.

How very different today! Precisely European immigration fitted North America for a gigantic agricultural production, whose competition is shaking the very foundations of European landed property—large and small. In addition it enabled the United States to exploit its tremendous industrial resources with an energy and on a scale that must shortly break the industrial monopoly of Western Europe, and especially of England, existing up to now. Both circumstances react in revolutionary manner upon America itself. Step by step the small and middle landed ownership of the farmers, the basis of the whole political constitution, is succumbing to the competition of giant farms; simultaneously, a mass proletariat and a fabulous concentration of capitals are developing for the first time in the industrial regions.

And now Russia! During the Revolution of 1848-49 not only the European princes, but the European bourgeois as well, found their only salvation from the proletariat, just beginning to awaken, in Russian intervention. The tsar was proclaimed the chief of European reaction. Today he is a prisoner of war of the revolution, in Gatchina, and Russia forms the vanguard of revolutionary action in Europe.

The Communist Manifesto had as its object the proclamation of the inevitably impending dissolution of modern bourgeois property. But in Russia we find, face to face with the rapidly developing capitalist swindle and bourgeois landed property, just beginning to develop, more than half the land owned in common by the peasants. Now the question is: can the Russian obshchina,* though greatly undermined, yet a form of the primeval common ownership of land, pass directly to the higher form of communist common ownership? Or, on the contrary, must it first pass through the same process of dissolution as constitutes the historical evolution of the West?

The only answer to that possible today is this: If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that both complement each other, the present Rus-

---

* Obshchina: Village community.—Ed.
The preface to the present edition I must, alas, sign alone. Marx, the man to whom the whole working class of Europe and America owes more than to anyone else, rests at Highgate Cemetery and over his grave the first grass is already growing. Since his death, there can be even less thought of revising or supplementing the Manifesto. All the more do I consider it necessary again to state here the following expressly:

The basic thought running through the Manifesto—that economic production and the structure of society of every historical epoch necessarily arising therefrom constitute the foundation for the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently (ever since the dissolution of the primeval communal ownership of land) all history has been a history of class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social development; that this struggle, however, has now reached a stage where the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie), without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression and class struggles—this basic thought belongs solely and exclusively to Marx.*

* "This proposition," I wrote in the preface to the English translation, "which, in my opinion, is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology, we, both of us, had been gradually approaching for some years before 1845. How far I had independently progressed towards it, is best shown by my Condition of the Working Class in England. But when I again met Marx at Brussels, in spring, 1845, he had it ready worked out, and put it before me, in terms almost as clear as those in which I have stated it here." [Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.]
I have already stated this many times; but precisely now it is necessary that it also stand in front of the Manifesto itself.

London, June 28, 1883

Published in the German edition of the Manifesto which appeared in Hottingen-Zurich in 1883

Printed according to the 1890 edition, checked with the 1883 edition

Translated from the German

FROM THE PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1890

The Manifesto has had a history of its own. Greeted with enthusiasm, at the time of its appearance, by the then still not at all numerous vanguard of scientific socialism (as is proved by the translations mentioned in the first preface*), it was soon forced into the background by the reaction that began with the defeat of the Paris workers in June 1848,42 and was finally excommunicated "according to law" by the conviction of the Cologne Communists in November 1852.47 With the disappearance from the public scene of the workers' movement that had begun with the February Revolution, the Manifesto too passed into the background.

When the working class of Europe had again gathered sufficient strength for a new onslaught upon the power of the ruling classes, the International Working Men's Association came into being. Its aim was to weld together into one huge army the whole militant working class of Europe and America. Therefore it could not set out from the principles laid down in the Manifesto. It was bound to have a programme which would not shut the door on the English trade unions, the French, Belgian, Italian and Spanish Proudhonists and the German Lassalleans.** This programme—the preamble to the Rules of the International—was drawn up by Marx with a master hand acknowledged even by Bakunin and the Anarchists. For the ultimate triumph of the ideas set forth in the Manifesto Marx relied solely and

---

* See p. 98 of this volume. —Ed.
** Lassalle personally, to us, always acknowledged himself to be a "disciple" of Marx, and, as such, stood, of course, on the ground of the Manifesto. Matters were quite different with regard to those of his followers who did not go beyond his demand for producers' co-operatives supported by state credits and who divided the whole working class into supporters of state assistance and supporters of self-assistance. [Note by Engels.]
exclusively upon the intellectual development of the working class, as it necessarily had to ensue from united action and discussion. The events and vicissitudes in the struggle against capital, the defeats even more than the successes, could not but demonstrate to the fighters the inadequacy hitherto of their universal panaceas and make their minds more receptive to a thorough understanding of the true conditions for the emancipation of the workers. And Marx was right. The working class of 1874, at the dissolution of the International, was altogether different from that of 1864, at its foundation. Proudhonism in the Latin countries and the specific Lassalleanism in Germany were dying out, and even the then arch-conservative English trade unions were gradually approaching the point where in 1887 the chairman of their Swansea Congress* could say in their name: "Continental Socialism has lost its terrors for us." Yet by 1887 Continental Socialism was almost exclusively the theory heralded in the Manifesto. Thus, to a certain extent, the history of the Manifesto reflects the history of the modern working-class movement since 1848. At present it is doubtless the most widely circulated, the most international product of all socialist literature, the common programme of many millions of workers of all countries, from Siberia to California.

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

* W. Bevan.—Ed.
opposite. And since we were very decidedly of the opinion as early as then that "the emancipation of the workers must be the act of the working class itself,"48 we could have no hesitations as to which of the two names we should choose. Nor has it ever occurred to us since to repudiate it.

"Working men of all countries, unite!" But few voices responded when we proclaimed these words to the world forty-two years ago, on the eve of the first Paris Revolution in which the proletariat came out with demands of its own. On September 28, 1864, however, the proletarians of most of the Western European countries united to form the International Working Men’s Association of glorious memory. True, the International itself lived only nine years. But that the eternal union of the proletarians of all countries created by it is still alive and lives stronger than ever, there is no better witness than this day. Because today,49 as I write these lines, the European and American proletariat is reviewing its fighting forces, mobilised for the first time, mobilised as one army, under one flag, for one immediate aim: the standard eight-hour working day, to be established by legal enactment, as proclaimed by the Geneva Congress of the International in 1866, and again by the Paris Workers’ Congress in 1889. And today’s spectacle will open the eyes of the capitalists and landlords of all countries to the fact that today the working men of all countries are united indeed.

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

F. Engels

London, May 1, 1890

Published in the German edition of the Manifesto which appeared in London in 1890

Printed according to the 1890 edition

Translated from the German

PREFACE TO THE POLISH EDITION OF 1892

The fact that a new Polish edition of the Communist Manifesto has become necessary gives rise to various thoughts.

First of all, it is noteworthy that of late the Manifesto has become an index, as it were, of the development of large-scale industry on the European continent. In proportion as large-scale industry expands in a given country, the demand grows among the workers of that country for enlightenment regarding their position as the working class in relation to the possessing classes, the socialist movement spreads among them and the
demand for the Manifesto increases. Thus, not only the state of the labour movement but also the degree of development of large-scale industry can be measured with fair accuracy in every country by the number of copies of the Manifesto circulated in the language of that country.

Accordingly, the new Polish edition indicates a decided progress of Polish industry. And there can be no doubt whatever that this progress since the previous edition published ten years ago has actually taken place. Russian Poland, Congress Poland,\(^5\) has become the big industrial region of the Russian Empire. Whereas Russian large-scale industry is scattered sporadically—a part round the Gulf of Finland, another in the centre (Moscow and Vladimir), a third along the coasts of the Black and Azov seas, and still others elsewhere—Polish industry has been packed into a relatively small area and enjoys both the advantages and the disadvantages arising from such concentration. The competing Russian manufacturers acknowledged the advantages when they demanded protective tariffs against Poland, in spite of their ardent desire to transform the Poles into Russians. The disadvantages—for the Polish manufacturers and the Russian government—are manifest in the rapid spread of socialist ideas among the Polish workers and in the growing demand for the Manifesto.

But the rapid development of Polish industry, outstripping that of Russia, is in its turn a new proof of the inexhaustible vitality of the Polish people and a new guarantee of its impending national restoration. And the restoration of an independent strong Poland is a matter which concerns not only the Poles but all of us. A sincere international collaboration of the European nations is possible only if each of these nations is fully autonomous in its own house. The Revolution of 1848, which under the banner of the proletariat, after all, merely let the proletarian fighters do the work of the bourgeoisie, also secured the independence of Italy, Germany and Hungary through its testamentary executors, Louis Bonaparte and Bismarck; but Poland, which since 1792 had done more for the Revolution than all these three together, was left to its own resources when it succumbed in 1863 to a tenfold greater Russian force. The nobility could neither maintain nor regain Polish independence; today, to the bourgeoisie, this independence is, to say the least, immaterial. Nevertheless, it is a necessity for the harmonious collaboration of the European nations.\(^*\) It can be gained only

\(^*\) In the Polish edition this sentence is omitted.—Ed.
by the young Polish proletariat, and in its hands it is secure. For the workers of all the rest of Europe need the independence of Poland just as much as the Polish workers themselves.

London, February 10, 1892

Published in the journal
Preświt No. 35, February 27, 1892, and in the book:
K. Marx i F. Engels,
Manifest Komunistyczny,
Londyn, 1892

Printed according to the manuscript, checked with the Polish edition of 1892
Translated from the German

PREFACE TO THE ITALIAN EDITION OF 1893

To the Italian Reader

Publication of the Manifesto of the Communist Party coincided, one may say, with March 18, 1848, the day of the revolutions in Milan and Berlin, which were armed uprisings of the two nations situated in the centre, the one, of the continent of Europe, the other, of the Mediterranean; two nations until then enfeebled by division and internal strife, and thus fallen under foreign domination. While Italy was subject to the Emperor of Austria, Germany underwent the yoke, not less effective though more indirect, of the Tsar of all the Russias. The consequences of March 18, 1848, freed both Italy and Germany from this disgrace; if from 1848 to 1871 these two great nations were reconstituted and somehow again put on their own, it was, as Karl Marx used to say, because the men who suppressed the Revolution of 1848 were, nevertheless, its testamentary executors in spite of themselves.

Everywhere that revolution was the work of the working class; it was the latter that built the barricades and paid with its lifeblood. Only the Paris workers, in overthrowing the government, had the very definite intention of overthrowing the bourgeois regime. But conscious though they were of the fatal antagonism existing between their own class and the bourgeoisie, still, neither the economic progress of the country nor the intellectual development of the mass of French workers had as yet reached the stage which would have made a social reconstruction possible. In the final analysis, therefore, the fruits of the revolution were reaped by the capitalist class. In the other countries, in Italy, in Germany, in Austria, the workers, from the very outset, did nothing but raise the bourgeoisie to power.
But in any country the rule of the bourgeoisie is impossible without national independence. Therefore, the Revolution of 1848 had to bring in its train the unity and autonomy of the nations that had lacked them up to then: Italy, Germany, Hungary. Poland will follow in turn.

Thus, if the Revolution of 1848 was not a socialist revolution, it paved the way, prepared the ground for the latter. Through the impetus given to large-scale industry in all countries, the bourgeois regime during the last forty-five years has everywhere created a numerous, concentrated and powerful proletariat. It has thus raised, to use the language of the Manifesto, its own grave-diggers. Without restoring autonomy and unity to each nation, it will be impossible to achieve the international union of the proletariat, or the peaceful and intelligent co-operation of these nations toward common aims. Just imagine joint international action by the Italian, Hungarian, German, Polish and Russian workers under the political conditions preceding 1848!

The battles fought in 1848 were thus not fought in vain. Nor have the forty-five years separating us from that revolutionary epoch passed to no purpose. The fruits are ripening, and all I wish is that the publication of this Italian translation may augur as well for the victory of the Italian proletariat as the publication of the original did for the international revolution.

The Manifesto does full justice to the revolutionary part played by capitalism in the past. The first capitalist nation was Italy. The close of the feudal Middle Ages, and the opening of the modern capitalist era are marked by a colossal figure: an Italian, Dante, both the last poet of the Middle Ages and the first poet of modern times. Today, as in 1300, a new historical era is approaching. Will Italy give us the new Dante, who will mark the hour of birth of this new, proletarian era?

London, February 1, 1893

Frederick Engels

Published in the book: Karlo Marx e Federico Engels, Il Manifesto del Partito Comunista, Milano, 1893

Printed according to the text of the book, checked with the rough manuscript in French

Translated from the Italian
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.

I

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,

---

* 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
guild-master* and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppres-
sed, 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 gradation of society into various orders, a mani-
fold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patri-
cians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal
lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, 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 antag-
onisms. 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 [...].

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 com-
modities 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 produc-
tion was monopolised by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed

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 Commun-
istic 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 dif-
erentiated 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” [The Origin of the Family, Private Prop-
erty and the State. See present edition, Vol. 3.—Ed.], 2nd edition, Stutt-
gart 1886. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

* 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.]
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; 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.

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, corner-stone 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

* "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]
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 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, uninterruptedly 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 centrali-
sation. Independent, 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, canali-
sation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—
what earlier century had even a presentiment that such produc-
tive 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 or-
ganisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one 
word, the feudal relations of property became no longer com-
tible with the already developed productive forces; 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 econ-
omical 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 pro-
duction, 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 pro-
ductive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic 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; 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.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, 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 piece-meal, 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 appendage 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 la-
bour, 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 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. 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—the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly 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 produc-
tion 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 bourgeoisie, 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 bourgeoisie, 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 individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (Trades' Unions) against the bourgeoisie; 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 proletarians, 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.

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. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

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, 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 proletarian, 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, 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 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 interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interests 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 bourgeois, 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 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.

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 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 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.

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.

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.

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 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. 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 Communist 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 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, 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.

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 disappearance 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.

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 family ties 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 eighteenth 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.

"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 anta-
gonisms, 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.

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 equable distribution of the population over the
country.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. Aboli-
tion of children’s factory labour in its present form. Combi-
tnation of education with industrial production, &c., &c.

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 bour-
geoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise
itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the
ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old condi-
tions of production, then it will, along with these conditions,
have swept away the conditions for the existence of class an-
tagons 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 reform⁵³ agitation, these aristo-

* The 1848 edition has “antithesis between town and country”. In
the 1872 edition and those German editions that followed it the word
“antithesis” was replaced by the word “distinction”.—Ed.
cracies 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.

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 hindquarters the old feudal coats of arms, and deserted with loud and irreverent laughter.

One section of the French Legitimists54 and "Young England"55 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

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

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 bourgeoisie 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

* 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.]
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; overproduction 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 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.

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, 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. 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" 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 philo-
sophical conscience, or rather, in annexing the French ideas
without deserting their own philosophic point of view.

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 an-
cient 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.

The introduction of these philosophical phrases at the back
of the French historical criticisms 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 com-
pletely 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 seri-
ously 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 bour-
geoisie, 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 Social-
ist demands, of hurling the traditional anathemas against lib-
eralism, against representative government, against bourgeois
competition, bourgeois freedom of the press, bourgeois legisla-
tion, bourgeois liberty and equality, and of preaching to the
masses that they had nothing to gain, and everything to lose, by
this bourgeois movement. German Socialism forgot, in the nick
of time, that the French criticism, whose silly echo it was, pre-
supposed 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 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.*

* 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.]
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 bourgeois 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 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: 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, condi-
tions that had yet to be produced, and could be produced by
the impending bourgeois epoch alone. The revolutionary litera-
ture 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.
Bourgeoisie and Proletariat).
The founders of these systems see, indeed, the class antago-
isms, 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 proletar-
iat to an organisation of society specially contrived by these in-
ventors. 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 degrees they sink into the category of the reactionary 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.56

IV

POSITION OF THE COMMUNISTS IN RELATION TO THE VARIOUS EXISTING OPPOSITION PARTIES

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.

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 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.

56 Phalanstères were Socialist colonies on the plan of Charles Fourier; Icaria was the name given by Cabet 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.]

57 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.]
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 bourgeoisie.

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 1846.58

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.

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!

Written by Marx and Engels in December 1847-January 1848

Originally published in German in London in February 1848

Printed according to the 1888 English edition
When the March deluge—a deluge in miniature—had subsided it left no monsters, no revolutionary colossi, on the Berlin surface of the earth but creatures of the old style, squat bourgeois figures—the liberals of the “United Landtag”, the representatives of the conscious Prussian bourgeoisie. The provinces which have the most developed bourgeoisie, the Rhine Province and Silesia, supplied the chief contingent for the new ministries. Behind them a whole train of Rhenish jurists. To the same extent that the bourgeoisie was forced into the background by the feudal lords the Rhine Province and Silesia made room in the ministries for the arch-Prussian provinces. Only an Elberfeld Tory still connects the Brandenburg ministry with the Rhine Province. Hansemann and von der Heydt! These two names signify to the Prussian bourgeoisie the whole difference between March and December 1848.

The Prussian bourgeoisie was hurled to the height of state power, however not in the manner it had desired, by a peaceful bargain with the crown, but by a revolution. It was to defend not its own interests but the interests of the people, versus the crown, that is, against itself, for a popular movement had paved the way for the bourgeoisie. The crown, however, was in its eyes but a screen by the grace of God behind which its own worldly interests were to find concealment. The inviolability of its own interests and of the political forms that were in consonance with its interests was to read as follows when rendered into the language of constitutions: Inviolability of the Crown. Hence the ecstatic fondness of the German and especially the Prussian bourgeoisie for the constitutional monarchy. While therefore the February Revolution together with its German reverberations was welcomed by the Prussian bourgeoisie because it placed the helm of state in its hands, it at the same time upset its calculations because its rule was hedged about with conditions which it neither wanted to nor could fulfil.
The bourgeoisie had not lifted a hand. It had permitted the people to fight its battle for it. The rule that was transferred to it was, therefore, not the rule of a general who has defeated his adversary but the rule of a Committee of Public Safety to which the victorious people entrusts the protection of its own interests.

Camphausen still felt the utter discomfort of this situation and the whole weakness of his ministry can be traced to this feeling and the circumstances that engendered it. A blush tints, as it were, the most shameless acts of his government. Undisguised shamelessness and impudence were the privilege of Hansemann. The red colouring is the only difference between these two painters.

The Prussian March Revolution must not be confused with the English Revolution of 1648 or the French of 1789.

In 1648 the bourgeoisie was allied with the modern nobility against the monarchy, against the feudal nobility and against the established church.

In 1789 the bourgeoisie was allied with the people against the monarchy, the nobility and the established church.

The Revolution of 1789 had as its prototype (at least in Europe) only the Revolution of 1648, and the Revolution of 1648 only the insurrection of the Netherlands against Spain. Not only in time but also in content both revolutions were a century beyond their prototypes.

In both revolutions the bourgeoisie was the class that really formed the van of the movement. The proletariat and the strata of the burghers which did not belong to the bourgeoisie either had as yet no interests separate from those of the bourgeoisie or they did not yet constitute independently developed classes or subdivisions of classes. Hence where they came out in opposition to the bourgeoisie, as for instance in France in 1793 till 1794, they fought only for the realisation of the interests of the bourgeoisie, even if not in the fashion of the bourgeoisie. The whole French terrorism was nothing but a plebeian manner of settling accounts with the enemies of the bourgeoisie, with absolutism, feudalism and philistinism.

The Revolutions of 1648 and 1789 were not English and French revolutions; they were revolutions of a European pattern. They were not the victory of a definite class of society over the old political order; they were the proclamation of political order for the new European society. The bourgeoisie was victorious in these revolutions; but the victory of the bourgeoisie was at that time the victory of a new order of society, the victory of bourgeois property over feudal property, of nationality over provincialism, of competition over the guild, of partition over
primogeniture, of the owner of the land over the domination of the owner by the land, of enlightenment over superstition, of the family over the family name, of industry over heroic laziness, of civil law over medieval privilege. The Revolution of 1648 was the victory of the seventeenth century over the sixteenth century, the Revolution of 1789 the victory of the eighteenth century over the seventeenth century. These revolutions expressed still more the needs of the world of that day than of the sectors of the world in which they occurred, of England and France.

In the March Revolution in Prussia there was nothing of the kind.

The February Revolution had abolished the constitutional monarchy in reality and the rule of the bourgeoisie in the mind. The March Revolution in Prussia was to establish the constitutional monarchy in the mind and the rule of the bourgeoisie in reality. Far from being a European revolution it was but the stunted aftereffect of a European revolution in a backward country. Instead of being ahead of its age it trailed more than half a century behind it. It was secondary from the outset, but it is a known fact that secondary diseases are more difficult to cure and at the same time waste the body more than original diseases. It was not a question of the establishment of a new society but of the rebirth in Berlin of the society that had passed away in Paris. The March Revolution in Prussia was not even national, German; it was provincial-Prussian from its inception. The Vienna, Cassel, Munich and every other sort of provincial uprising swept on alongside of it and contested its lead.

While 1648 and 1789 had taken infinite pride in being the acme of creation it was the ambition of the Berlin of 1848 to form an anachronism. Their light was like the light of the stars which reaches us who dwell on earth only after the bodies which radiated it have been extinct for a hundred-thousand years. The March Revolution in Prussia was, in miniature—as it was everything in miniature—just such a star for Europe. Its light was the light of the corpse of a society that had long ago become putrified.

The German bourgeoisie had developed so slothfully, cravenly and slowly that at the moment when it menacingly faced feudalism and absolutism it saw itself menacingly faced by the proletariat and all factions of the burghers whose interests and ideas were akin to those of the proletariat. And it saw inimically arrayed not only a class behind it but all of Europe before it. The Prussian bourgeoisie was not, as the French of 1789 had
been, the class which represented the whole of modern society vis-à-vis the representatives of the old society, the monarchy and the nobility. It had sunk to the level of a sort of social estate, as distinctly opposed to the crown as to the people, eager to be in the opposition to both, irresolute against each of its opponents, taken severally, because it always saw both of them before or behind it; inclined from the very beginning to betray the people and compromise with the crowned representative of the old society because it itself already belonged to the old society; representing not the interests of a new society against an old but renewed interests within a superannuated society; at the steering wheel of the revolution not because the people stood behind it but because the people prodded it on before it; in the van not because it represented the initiative of a new but only the rancour of an old social epoch; a stratum of the old state that had not cropped out but been upheaved to the surface of the new state by an earthquake; without faith in itself, without faith in the people, grumbling at those above, trembling before those below, egoistic towards both sides and conscious of its egoism, revolutionary in relation to the conservatives and conservative in relation to the revolutionists, distrustful of its own mottoes, phrases instead of ideas, intimidated by the world storm, exploiting the world storm; no energy in any respect, plagiarism in every respect; common because it lacked originality, original in its commonness; dickering with its own desires, without initiative, without faith in itself, without faith in the people, without a world-historical calling; an execrable old man, who saw himself doomed to guide and deflect the first youthful impulses of a robust people in his own senile interests—sans eyes, sans ears, sans teeth, sans everything—such was the Prussian bourgeoisie that found itself at the helm of the Prussian state after the March Revolution.

Written by Marx on December 11, 1848
Published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 169, December 15, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper text
Translated from the German
INTRODUCTION BY FREDERICK ENGELS

The following work appeared as a series of leading articles in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* from April 4, 1849 onwards. It is based on the lectures delivered by Marx in 1847 at the German Workers' Society in Brussels. The work as printed remained a fragment; the words at the end of No. 269: "To be continued," remained unfulfilled in consequence of the events which just then came crowding one after another: the invasion of Hungary by the Russians, the insurrections in Dresden, Iserlohn, Elberfeld, the Palatinate and Baden, which led to the suppression of the newspaper itself (May 19, 1849). The manuscript of the continuation was not found among Marx's papers after his death.

*Wage Labour and Capital* has appeared in a number of editions as a separate publication in pamphlet form, the last being in 1884, by the Swiss Co-operative Press, Hottingen-Zurich. The editions hitherto published retained the exact wording of the original. The present new edition, however, is to be circulated in not less than 10,000 copies as a propaganda pamphlet, and so the question could not but force itself upon me whether under these circumstances Marx himself would have approved of an unaltered reproduction of the original.

In the forties, Marx had not yet finished his critique of political economy. This took place only towards the end of the fifties. Consequently, his works which appeared before the first part of *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859) differ in some points from those written after 1859, and contain expressions and whole sentences which, from the point of view of the later works, appear unfortunate and even incorrect. Now, it is self-evident that in ordinary editions intended for the general public this earlier point of view also has its place, as a part of the intellectual development of the author, and that both author and public have an indisputable right to the unaltered reproduction of these older works. And I should not have dreamed of altering a word of them.

It is another thing when the new edition is intended practic-
ally exclusively for propaganda among workers. In such a case Marx would certainly have brought the old presentation dating from 1849 into harmony with his new point of view. And I feel certain of acting as he would have done in undertaking for this edition the few alterations and additions which are required in order to attain this object in all essential points. I therefore tell the reader beforehand: this is not the pamphlet as Marx wrote it in 1849 but approximately as he would have written it in 1891. The actual text, moreover, is circulated in so many copies that this will suffice until I am able to reprint it again, unaltered, in a later complete edition.

My alterations all turn on one point. According to the original, the worker sells his labour to the capitalist for wages; according to the present text he sells his labour power. And for this alteration I owe an explanation. I owe it to the workers in order that they may see it is not a case here of mere juggling with words, but rather of one of the most important points in the whole of political economy. I owe it to the bourgeois, so that they can convince themselves how vastly superior the uneducated workers, for whom one can easily make comprehensible the most difficult economic analyses, are to our supercilious "educated people" to whom such intricate questions remain insoluble their whole life long.

Classical political economy took over from industrial practice the current conception of the manufacturer, that he buys and pays for the labour of his workers. This conception had been quite adequate for the business needs, the book-keeping and price calculations of the manufacturer. But, naively transferred to political economy, it produced there really wondrous errors and confusions.

Economics observes the fact that the prices of all commodities, among them also the price of the commodity that it calls "labour," are continually changing; that they rise and fall as the result of the most varied circumstances, which often bear no relation whatever to the production of the commodities themselves, so that prices seem, as a rule, to be determined by pure chance. As soon, then, as political economy made its appearance as a science, one of its first tasks was to seek the law which was concealed behind this chance apparently governing the prices of commodities, and which, in reality, governed this very chance. Within the prices of commodities, continually fluctuating and oscillating, now upwards and now downwards, political economy sought for the firm central point around which these fluctuations and oscillations turned. In a word, it started from the prices of commodities in order to look for the value
of the commodities as the law controlling prices, the value by
which all fluctuations in price are to be explained and to which
finally they are all to be ascribed.
Classical economics then found that the value of a commodity
is determined by the labour contained in it, requisite for its pro-
duction. With this explanation it contented itself. And we also
can pause here for the time being. I will only remind the reader,
in order to avoid misunderstandings, that this explanation has
nowadays become totally inadequate. Marx was the first
thoroughly to investigate the value-creating quality of labour
and he discovered in so doing that not all labour apparently, or
even really, necessary for the production of a commodity adds
to it under all circumstances a magnitude of value which cor-
responds to the quantity of labour expended. If therefore today
we say offhandedly with economists like Ricardo that the value
of a commodity is determined by the labour necessary for its
production, we always in so doing imply the reservations made
by Marx. This suffices here; more is to be found in Marx's A
Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, 1859, and the
first volume of Capital.
But as soon as the economists applied this determination of
value by labour to the commodity "labour", they fell into one
contradiction after another. How is the value of "labour" deter-
mined? By the necessary labour contained in it. But how much
labour is contained in the labour of a worker for a day, a week,
a month, a year? The labour of a day, a week, a month, a year.
If labour is the measure of all values, then indeed we can express
the "value of labour" only in labour. But we know absolutely
nothing about the value of an hour of labour, if we only know
that it is equal to an hour of labour. This brings us not a hair's
breadth nearer the goal; we keep on moving in a circle.
Classical economics, therefore, tried another tack. It said: The
value of a commodity is equal to its cost of production. But what
is the cost of production of labour? In order to answer this
question, the economists have to tamper a little with logic. In-
stead of investigating the cost of production of labour itself,
which unfortunately cannot be ascertained, they proceed to
investigate the cost of production of the worker. And this can
be ascertained. It varies with time and circumstance, but for a
given state of society, a given locality and a given branch of
production, it too is given, at least within fairly narrow limits.
We live today under the domination of capitalist production;
in which a large, ever-increasing class of the population can live
only if it works for the owners of the means of production—
the tools, machines, raw materials and means of subsistence—
in return for wages. On the basis of this mode of production, the cost of production of the worker consists of that quantity of the means of subsistence—or their price in money—which, on the average, is necessary to make him capable of working, keep him capable of working, and to replace him, after his departure by reason of old age, sickness or death, with a new worker—that is to say, to propagate the working class in the necessary numbers. Let us assume that the money price of these means of subsistence averages three marks a day.

Our worker, therefore, receives a wage of three marks a day from the capitalist who employs him. For this, the capitalist makes him work, say, twelve hours a day, calculating roughly as follows:

Let us assume that our worker—a machinist—has to make a part of a machine which he can complete in one day. The raw material—iron and brass in the necessary previously prepared form—costs twenty marks. The consumption of coal by the steam engine, and the wear and tear of this same engine, of the lathe and the other tools which our worker uses represent for one day, and reckoned by his share of their use, a value of one mark. The wage for one day, according to our assumption, is three marks. This makes twenty-four marks in all for our machine part. But the capitalist calculates that he will obtain, on an average, twenty-seven marks from his customers in return, or three marks more than his outlay.

Whence came the three marks pocketed by the capitalist? According to the assertion of classical economics, commodities are, on the average, sold at their values, that is, at prices corresponding to the amount of necessary labour contained in them. The average price of our machine part—twenty-seven marks—would thus be equal to its value, that is, equal to the labour embodied in it. But of these twenty-seven marks, twenty-one marks were values already present before our machinist began work. Twenty marks were contained in the raw materials, one mark in the coal consumed during the work, or in the machines and tools which were used in the process and which were diminished in their efficiency by the value of this sum. There remain six marks which have been added to the value of the raw material. But according to the assumption of our economists themselves, these six marks can only arise from the labour added to the raw material by our worker. His twelve hours' labour has thus created a new value of six marks. The value of his twelve hours' labour would, therefore, be equal to six marks. And thus we would at last have discovered what the "value of labour" is.
“Hold on there!” cries our machinist. “Six marks? But I have received only three marks! My capitalist swears by all that is holy that the value of my twelve hours’ labour is only three marks, and if I demand six he laughs at me. How do you make that out?”

If previously we got into a vicious circle with our value of labour, we are now properly caught in an insoluble contradiction. We looked for the value of labour and we have found more than we can use. For the worker, the value of the twelve hours’ labour is three marks, for the capitalist it is six marks, of which he pays three to the worker as wages and pockets three for himself. Thus labour would have not one but two values and very different values into the bargain!

The contradiction becomes still more absurd as soon as we reduce to labour time the values expressed in money. During the twelve hours’ labour a new value of six marks is created. Hence, in six hours three marks—the sum which the worker receives for twelve hours’ labour. For twelve hours’ labour the worker receives as an equivalent value the product of six hours’ labour. Either, therefore, labour has two values, of which one is double the size of the other, or twelve equals six! In both cases we get pure nonsense.

Turn and twist as we will, we cannot get out of this contradiction, as long as we speak of the purchase and sale of labour and of the value of labour. And this also happened to the economists. The last offshoot of classical economics, the Ricardian school, was wrecked mainly by the insolubility of this contradiction. Classical economics had got into a blind alley. The man who found the way out of this blind alley was Karl Marx.

What the economists had regarded as the cost of production of “labour” was the cost of production not of labour but of the living worker himself. And what this worker sold to the capitalist was not his labour. “As soon as his labour actually begins,” says Marx, “it has already ceased to belong to him; it can therefore no longer be sold by him.”\(^6\) At the most, he might sell his \textit{future} labour, that is, undertake to perform a certain amount of work in a definite time. In so doing, however, he does not sell labour (which would first have to be performed) but puts his labour power at the disposal of the capitalist for a definite time (in the case of time-work) or for the purpose of a definite output (in the case of piece-work) in return for a definite payment: he hires out, or sells, his \textit{labour power}. But this labour power is intergrown with his person and inseparable from it.

Its cost of production, therefore, coincides with his cost of production; what the economists called the cost of production of labour is really the cost of production of the worker and therewith of his labour power. And so we can go back from the cost of production of labour power to the value of labour power and determine the amount of socially necessary labour requisite for the production of labour power of a particular quality, as Marx has done in the chapter on the buying and selling of labour power (Kapital, Band IV, 3).

Now what happens after the worker has sold his labour power to the capitalist, that is, placed it at the disposal of the latter in return for a wage—day wage or piece wage—agreed upon beforehand? The capitalist takes the worker into his workshop or factory, where all the things necessary for work—raw materials, auxiliary materials (coal, dyes, etc.), tools, machines—are already to be found. Here the worker begins to drudge. His daily wage may be, as above, three marks—and in this connection it does not make any difference whether he earns it as day wage or piece wage. Here also we again assume that in twelve hours the worker by his labour adds a new value of six marks to the raw materials used up, which new value the capitalist realises on the sale of the finished piece of work. Out of this he pays the worker his three marks; the other three marks he keeps for himself. If, now, the worker creates a value of six marks in twelve hours, then in six hours he creates a value of three marks. He has, therefore, already repaid the capitalist the counter-value of the three marks contained in his wages when he has worked six hours for him. After six hours' labour they are both quits, neither owes the other a pfennig.

"Hold on there!" the capitalist now cries. "I have hired the worker for a whole day, for twelve hours. Six hours, however, are only half a day. So go right on working until the other six hours are up—only then shall we be quits!" And, in fact, the worker has to comply with his contract "voluntarily" entered into, according to which he has pledged himself to work twelve whole hours for a labour product which costs six hours of labour.

It is just the same with piece wages. Let us assume that our worker makes twelve items of a commodity in twelve hours. Each of these costs two marks in raw materials and depreciation and is sold at two and a half marks. Then the capitalist, on the same assumptions as before, will give the worker twenty-five pfennigs per item; that makes three marks for twelve items, to earn which the worker needs twelve hours. The capitalist receives thirty marks for the twelve items; deduct twenty-four
marks for raw materials and depreciation and there remain six marks, of which he pays three marks to the worker in wages and pockets three marks. It is just as above. Here, too, the worker works six hours for himself, that is, for replacement of his wages (half an hour in each of the twelve hours), and six hours for the capitalist.

The difficulty over which the best economists came to grief, so long as they started out from the value of “labour,” vanishes as soon as we start out from the value of “labour power” instead. In our present-day capitalist society, labour power is a commodity, a commodity like any other, and yet quite a peculiar commodity. It has, namely, the peculiar property of being a value-creating power, a source of value, and, indeed, with suitable treatment, a source of more value than it itself possesses. With the present state of production, human labour power not only produces in one day a greater value than it itself possesses and costs; with every new scientific discovery, with every new technical invention, this surplus of its daily product over its daily cost increases, and therefore that portion of the labour day in which the worker works to produce the replacement of his day’s wage decreases; consequently, on the other hand, that portion of the labour day in which he has to make a present of his labour to the capitalist without being paid for it increases.

And this is the economic constitution of the whole of our present-day society: it is the working class alone which produces all values. For value is only another expression for labour, that expression whereby in our present-day capitalist society is designated the amount of socially necessary labour contained in a particular commodity. These values produced by the workers do not, however, belong to the workers. They belong to the owners of the raw materials, machines, tools and the reserve funds which allow these owners to buy the labour power of the working class. From the whole mass of products produced by it, the working class, therefore, receives back only a part for itself. And as we have just seen, the other part, which the capitalist class keeps for itself and at most has to divide with the class of landowners, becomes larger with every new discovery and invention, while the part falling to the share of the working class (reckoned per head) either increases only very slowly and inconsiderably or not at all, and under certain circumstances may even fall.

But these discoveries and inventions which supersede each other at an ever-increasing rate, this productivity of human labour which rises day by day to an extent previously unheard of, finally give rise to a conflict in which the present-day capi-
talist economy must perish. On the one hand are immeasurable riches and a superfluity of products which the purchasers cannot cope with; on the other hand, the great mass of society proletarianised, turned into wage-workers, and precisely for that reason made incapable of appropriating for themselves this superfluity of products. The division of society into a small, excessively rich class and a large, propertyless class of wage-workers results in a society suffocating from its own superfluity, while the great majority of its members is scarcely, or even not at all, protected from extreme want. This state of affairs becomes daily more absurd and—more unnecessary. It must be abolished, it can be abolished. A new social order is possible in which the present class differences will have disappeared and in which—perhaps after a short transitional period involving some privation, but at any rate of great value morally—through the planned utilisation and extension of the already existing enormous productive forces of all members of society, and with uniform obligation to work, the means for existence, for enjoying life, for the development and employment of all bodily and mental faculties will be available in an equal measure and in ever-increasing fulness. And that the workers are becoming more and more determined to win this new social order will be demonstrated on both sides of the ocean by May the First, tomorrow, and by Sunday, May 3.70
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From various quarters we have been reproached with not having presented the economic relations which constitute the material foundation of the present class struggles and national struggles. We have designedly touched upon these relations only where they directly forced themselves to the front in political conflicts.

The point was, above all, to trace the class struggle in current history, and to prove empirically by means of the historical material already at hand and which is being newly created daily, that, with the subjugation of the working class that February and March had wrought, its opponents were simultaneously defeated—the bourgeois republicans in France and the bourgeois and peasant classes which were fighting feudal absolutism throughout the continent of Europe; that the victory of the "honest republic" in France was at the same time the downfall of the nations that had responded to the February Revolution by heroic wars of independence; finally, that Europe, with the defeat of the revolutionary workers, had relapsed into its old double slavery, the Anglo-Russian slavery. The June struggle in Paris, the fall of Vienna, the tragicomedy of Berlin's November 1848, the desperate exertions of Poland, Italy and Hungary, the starving of Ireland into submission—these were the chief factors which characterised the European class struggle between bourgeoisie and working class and by means of which we proved that every revolutionary upheaval, however remote from the class struggle its goal may appear to be, must fail until the revolutionary working class is victorious, that every social reform remains a utopia until the proletarian revolution and the feudalistic counter-revolution measure swords in a world war. In our presentation, as in reality, Belgium and Switzerland were tragi-comic genre-pictures akin to caricature in the great historical tableau, the one being the model state of the bourgeois monarchy, the other the model state of the bourgeois republic, both of them states which imagine themselves to be as independent of the class struggle as of the European revolution.
Now, after our readers have seen the class struggle develop in colossal political forms in 1848, the time has come to deal more closely with the economic relations themselves on which the existence of the bourgeoisie and its class rule, as well as the slavery of the workers, are founded.

We shall present in three large sections: 1) the relation of wage labour to capital, the slavery of the worker, the domination of the capitalist; 2) the inevitable destruction of the middle bourgeois classes and of the so-called peasant estate under the present system; 3) the commercial subjugation and exploitation of the bourgeois classes of the various European nations by the despot of the world market—England.

We shall try to make our presentation as simple and popular as possible and shall not presuppose even the most elementary notions of political economy. We wish to be understood by the workers. Moreover, the most remarkable ignorance and confusion of ideas prevails in Germany in regard to the simplest economic relations, from the accredited defenders of the existing state of things down to the socialist miracle workers and the unrecognised political geniuses in which fragmented Germany is even richer than in sovereign princes.

Now, therefore, for the first question:

**What Are Wages?**

**How Are They Determined?**

If workers were asked: "How much are your wages?" one would reply: "I get a mark a day from my employer"; another, "I get two marks," and so on. According to the different trades to which they belong, they would mention different sums of money which they receive from their respective employers for the performance of a particular piece of work, for example, weaving a yard of linen or type-setting a printed sheet. In spite of the variety of their statements, they would all agree on one point: wages are the sum of money paid by the capitalist for a particular labour time or for a particular output of labour.

The capitalist, it seems, therefore, buys their labour with money. They sell him their labour for money. But this is merely the appearance. In reality what they sell to the capitalist for money is their labour power. The capitalist buys this labour power for a day, a week, a month, etc. And after he has bought it, he uses it by having the workers work for the stipulated time. For the same sum with which the capitalist has bought their labour power, for example, two marks, he could have bought two pounds of sugar or a definite amount of any other com-
modity. The two marks, with which he bought two pounds of sugar, are the price of the two pounds of sugar. The two marks, with which he bought twelve hours' use of labour power, are the price of twelve hours' labour. Labour power, therefore, is a commodity, neither more nor less than sugar. The former is measured by the clock, the latter by the scales.

The workers exchange their commodity, labour power, for the commodity of the capitalist, for money, and this exchange takes place in a definite ratio. So much money for so long a use of labour power. For twelve hours' weaving, two marks. And do not the two marks represent all the other commodities which I can buy for two marks? In fact, therefore, the worker has exchanged his commodity, labour power, for other commodities of all kinds and that in a definite ratio. By giving him two marks, the capitalist has given him so much meat, so much clothing, so much fuel, light, etc., in exchange for his day's labour. Accordingly, the two marks express the ratio in which labour power is exchanged for other commodities, the exchange value of his labour power. The exchange value of a commodity, reckoned in money, is what is called its price. Wages are only a special name for the price of labour power, commonly called the price of labour, for the price of this peculiar commodity which has no other repository than human flesh and blood.

Let us take any worker, say, a weaver. The capitalist supplies him with the loom and yarn. The weaver sets to work and the yarn is converted into linen. The capitalist takes possession of the linen and sells it, say, for twenty marks. Now are the wages of the weaver a share in the linen, in the twenty marks, in the product of his labour? By no means. Long before the linen is sold, perhaps long before its weaving is finished, the weaver has received his wages. The capitalist, therefore, does not pay these wages with the money which he will obtain from the linen, but with money already in reserve. Just as the loom and the yarn are not the product of the weaver to whom they are supplied by his employer, so likewise with the commodities which the weaver receives in exchange for his commodity, labour power. It was possible that his employer found no purchaser at all for his linen. It was possible that he did not get even the amount of the wages by its sale. It is possible that he sells it very profitably in comparison with the weaver's wages. All that has nothing to do with the weaver. The capitalist buys the labour power of the weaver with a part of his available wealth, of his capital, just as he has bought the raw material—the yarn—and the instrument of labour—the loom—with another part of his wealth. After he has made these purchases, and these purchases
include the labour power necessary for the production of linen, he produces only with the raw materials and instruments of labour belonging to him. For the latter include now, true enough, our good weaver as well, who has as little share in the product or the price of the product as the loom has.

Wages are, therefore, not the worker's share in the commodity produced by him. Wages are the part of already existing commodities with which the capitalist buys for himself a definite amount of productive labour power.

Labour power is, therefore, a commodity which its possessor, the wage-worker, sells to capital. Why does he sell it? In order to live.

But the exercise of labour power, labour, is the worker's own life-activity, the manifestation of his own life. And this life-activity he sells to another person in order to secure the necessary means of subsistence. Thus his life-activity is for him only a means to enable him to exist. He works in order to live. He does not even reckon labour as part of his life, it is rather a sacrifice of his life. It is a commodity which he has made over to another. Hence, also, the product of his activity is not the object of his activity. What he produces for himself is not the silk that he weaves, not the gold that he draws from the mine, not the palace that he builds. What he produces for himself is wages, and silk, gold, palace resolve themselves for him into a definite quantity of the means of subsistence, perhaps into a cotton jacket, some copper coins and a lodging in a cellar. And the worker, who for twelve hours weaves, spins, drills, turns, builds, shovels, breaks stones, carries loads, etc.—does he consider this twelve hours' weaving, spinning, drilling, turning, building, shovelling, stone breaking as a manifestation of his life, as life? On the contrary, life begins for him where this activity ceases, at table, in the public house, in bed. The twelve hours' labour, on the other hand, has no meaning for him as weaving, spinning, drilling, etc., but as earnings, which bring him to the table, to the public house, into bed. If the silk worm were to spin in order to continue its existence as a caterpillar, it would be a complete wage-worker. Labour power was not always a commodity. Labour was not always wage labour, that is, free labour. The slave did not sell his labour power to the slave owner, any more than the ox sells its services to the peasant. The slave, together with his labour power, is sold once and for all to his owner. He is a commodity which can pass from the hand of one owner to that of another. He is himself a commodity, but the labour power is not his commodity. The serf sells only a part of his labour power. He does not receive a wage
from the owner of the land; rather the owner of the land receives a tribute from him.

The serf belongs to the land and turns over to the owner of the land the fruits thereof. The free labourer, on the other hand, sells himself and, indeed, sells himself piecemeal. He sells at auction eight, ten, twelve, fifteen hours of his life, day after day, to the highest bidder, to the owner of the raw materials, instruments of labour and means of subsistence, that is, to the capitalist. The worker belongs neither to an owner nor to the land, but eight, ten, twelve, fifteen hours of his daily life belong to him who buys them. The worker leaves the capitalist to whom he hires himself whenever he likes, and the capitalist discharges him whenever he thinks fit, as soon as he no longer gets any profit out of him, or not the anticipated profit. But the worker, whose sole source of livelihood is the sale of his labour power, cannot leave the whole class of purchasers, that is, the capitalist class, without renouncing his existence. He belongs not to this or that capitalist but to the capitalist class, and, moreover, it is his business to dispose of himself, that is, to find a purchaser within this capitalist class.

Now, before going more closely into the relation between capital and wage labour, we shall present briefly the most general relations which come into consideration in the determination of wages.

Wages, as we have seen, are the price of a definite commodity, of labour power. Wages are, therefore, determined by the same laws that determine the price of every other commodity. The question, therefore, is, how is the price of a commodity determined?

**By What Is the Price of a Commodity Determined?**

By competition between buyers and sellers, by the relation of inquiry to delivery, of demand to supply. Competition, by which the price of a commodity is determined, is three-sided.

The same commodity is offered by various sellers. With goods of the same quality, the one who sells most cheaply is certain of driving the others out of the field and securing the greatest sale for himself. Thus, the sellers mutually contend among themselves for sales, for the market. Each of them desires to sell, to sell as much as possible and, if possible, to sell alone, to the exclusion of the other sellers. Hence, one sells cheaper than another. Consequently, competition takes place among the sellers, which depresses the price of the commodities offered by them.
But competition also takes place among the buyers, which in its turn causes the commodities offered to rise in price.

Finally competition occurs between buyers and sellers; the former desire to buy as cheaply as possible, the latter to sell as dearly as possible. The result of this competition between buyers and sellers will depend upon how the two above-mentioned sides of the competition are related, that is, whether the competition is stronger in the army of buyers or in the army of sellers. Industry leads two armies into the field against each other, each of which again carries on a battle within its own ranks, among its own troops. The army whose troops beat each other up the least gains the victory over the opposing host.

Let us suppose there are 100 bales of cotton on the market and at the same time buyers for 1,000 bales of cotton. In this case, therefore, the demand is ten times as great as the supply. Competition will be very strong among the buyers, each of whom desires to get one, and if possible all, of the hundred bales for himself. This example is no arbitrary assumption. We have experienced periods of cotton crop failure in the history of the trade when a few capitalists in alliance have tried to buy, not one hundred bales, but all the cotton stocks of the world. Hence, in the example mentioned, one buyer will seek to drive the other from the field by offering a relatively higher price per bale of cotton. The cotton sellers, who see that the troops of the enemy army are engaged in the most violent struggle among themselves and that the sale of all their hundred bales is absolutely certain, will take good care not to fall out among themselves and depress the price of cotton at the moment when their adversaries are competing with one another to force it up. Thus, peace suddenly descends on the army of the sellers. They stand facing the buyers as one man, fold their arms philosophically, and there would be no bounds to their demands were it not that the offers of even the most persistent and eager buyers have very definite limits.

If, therefore, the supply of a commodity is lower than the demand for it, then only slight competition, or none at all, takes place among the sellers. In the same proportion as this competition decreases, competition increases among the buyers. The result is a more or less considerable rise in commodity prices.

It is well known that the reverse case with a reverse result occurs more frequently. Considerable surplus of supply over demand; desperate competition among the sellers; lack of buyers; disposal of goods at ridiculously low prices.

But what is the meaning of a rise, a fall in prices; what is the meaning of high price, low price? A grain of sand is high when
examined through a microscope, and a tower is low when compared with a mountain. And if price is determined by the relation between supply and demand, what determines the relation between supply and demand?

Let us turn to the first bourgeois we meet. He will not reflect for an instant but, like another Alexander the Great, will cut this metaphysical knot with the multiplication table. If the production of the goods which I sell has cost me 100 marks, he will tell us, and if I get 110 marks from the sale of these goods, within the year of course—then that is sound, honest, legitimate profit. But if I get in exchange 120 or 130 marks, that is a high profit; and if I get as much as 200 marks, that would be an extraordinary, an enormous profit. What, therefore, serves the bourgeois as his measure of profit? The cost of production of his commodity. If he receives in exchange for this commodity an amount of other commodities which it has cost less to produce, he has lost. If he receives in exchange for his commodity an amount of other commodities the production of which has cost more, he has gained. And he calculates the rise or fall of the profit according to the degree in which the exchange value of his commodity stands above or below zero—the cost of production.

We have thus seen how the changing relation of supply and demand causes now a rise and now a fall of prices, now high, now low prices. If the price of a commodity rises considerably because of inadequate supply or disproportionate increase of the demand, the price of some other commodity must necessarily have fallen proportionately, for the price of a commodity only expresses in money the ratio in which other commodities are given in exchange for it. If, for example, the price of a yard of silk material rises from five marks to six marks, the price of silver in relation to silk material has fallen and likewise the prices of all other commodities that have remained at their old prices have fallen in relation to the silk. One has to give a larger amount of them in exchange to get the same amount of silks. What will be the consequence of the rising price of a commodity? A mass of capital will be thrown into that flourishing branch of industry and this influx of capital into the domain of the favoured industry will continue until it yields the ordinary profits or, rather, until the price of its products, through overproduction, sinks below the cost of production.

Conversely, if the price of a commodity falls below its cost of production, capital will be withdrawn from the production of this commodity. Except in the case of a branch of industry which has become obsolete and must, therefore, perish, the
production of such a commodity, that is, its supply, will go on decreasing owing to this flight of capital until it corresponds to the demand, and consequently its price is again on a level with its cost of production or, rather, until the supply has sunk below the demand, that is, until its price rises again above its cost of production, for the current price of a commodity is always either above or below its cost of production.

We see how capital continually migrates in and out, out of the domain of one industry into that of another. High prices bring too great an immigration and low prices too great an emigration.

We could show from another point of view how not only supply but also demand is determined by the cost of production. But this would take us too far away from our subject.

We have just seen how the fluctuations of supply and demand continually bring the price of a commodity back to the cost of production. The real price of a commodity, it is true, is always above or below its cost of production; but rise and fall reciprocally balance each other, so that within a certain period of time, taking the ebb and flow of the industry together, commodities are exchanged for one another in accordance with their cost of production, their price, therefore, being determined by their cost of production.

This determination of price by cost of production is not to be understood in the sense of the economists. The economists say that the average price of commodities is equal to the cost of production; that this is a law. The anarchical movement, in which rise is compensated by fall and fall by rise, is regarded by them as chance. With just as much right one could regard the fluctuations as the law and the determination by the cost of production as chance, as has actually been done by other economists. But it is solely these fluctuations, which, looked at more closely, bring with them the most fearful devastations and, like earthquakes, cause bourgeois society to tremble to its foundations—it is solely in the course of these fluctuations that prices are determined by the cost of production. The total movement of this disorder is its order. In the course of this industrial anarchy, in this movement in a circle, competition compensates, so to speak, for one excess by means of another.

We see, therefore, that the price of a commodity is determined by its cost of production in such manner that the periods in which the price of this commodity rises above its cost of production are compensated by the periods in which it sinks below the cost of production, and vice versa. This does not hold good, of course, for separate, particular industrial products but only
for the whole branch of industry. Consequently, it also does not hold good for the individual industrialist but only for the whole class of industrialists.

The determination of price by the cost of production is equivalent to the determination of price by the labour time necessary for the manufacture of a commodity, for the cost of production consists of 1) raw materials and depreciation of instruments, that is, of industrial products the production of which has cost a certain amount of labour days and which, therefore, represent a certain amount of labour time, and, 2) of direct labour, the measure of which is, precisely, time.

Now, the same general laws that regulate the price of commodities in general of course also regulate wages, the price of labour.

Wages will rise and fall according to the relation of supply and demand, according to the turn taken by the competition between the buyers of labour power, the capitalists, and the sellers of labour power, the workers. The fluctuations in wages correspond in general to the fluctuations in prices of commodities. Within these fluctuations, however, the price of labour will be determined by the cost of production, by the labour time necessary to produce this commodity—labour power.

What, then, is the cost of production of labour power?

It is the cost required for maintaining the worker as a worker and of developing him into a worker.

The less the period of training, therefore, that any work requires the smaller is the cost of production of the worker and the lower is the price of his labour, his wages. In those branches of industry in which hardly any period of apprenticeship is required and where the mere bodily existence of the worker suffices, the cost necessary for his production is almost confined to the commodities necessary for keeping him alive and capable of working. The price of his labour will, therefore, be determined by the price of the necessary means of subsistence.

Another consideration, however, also comes in. The manufacturer in calculating his cost of production and, accordingly, the price of the products takes into account the wear and tear of the instruments of labour. If, for example, a machine costs him 1,000 marks and wears out in ten years, he adds 100 marks annually to the price of the commodities so as to be able to replace the worn-out machine by a new one at the end of ten years. In the same way, in calculating the cost of production of simple labour power, there must be included the cost of reproduction, whereby the race of workers is enabled to multiply and to replace worn-out workers by new ones. Thus the depre-
ciation of the worker is taken into account in the same way as the depreciation of the machine.

The cost of production of simple labour power, therefore, amounts to the cost of existence and reproduction of the worker. The price of this cost of existence and reproduction constitutes wages. Wages so determined are called the wage minimum. This wage minimum, like the determination of the price of commodities by the cost of production in general, does not hold good for the single individual but for the species. Individual workers, millions of workers, do not get enough to be able to exist and reproduce themselves; but the wages of the whole working class level down, within their fluctuations, to this minimum.

Now that we have arrived at an understanding of the most general laws which regulate wages like the price of any other commodity, we can go into our subject more specifically.

Capital consists of raw materials, instruments of labour and means of subsistence of all kinds, which are utilised in order to produce new raw materials, new instruments of labour and new means of subsistence. All these component parts of capital are creations of labour, products of labour, accumulated labour. Accumulated labour which serves as a means of new production is capital.

So say the economists.

What is a Negro slave? A man of the black race. The one explanation is as good as the other.

A Negro is a Negro. He only becomes a slave in certain relations. A cotton-spinning jenny is a machine for spinning cotton. It becomes capital only in certain relations. Torn from these relationships it is no more capital than gold in itself is money or sugar the price of sugar.

In production, men not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by co-operating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their action on nature, does production, take place.

These social relations into which the producers enter with one another, the conditions under which they exchange their activities and participate in the whole act of production, will naturally vary according to the character of the means of production. With the invention of a new instrument of warfare, firearms, the whole internal organisation of the army necessarily changed; the relationships within which individuals can constitute an army and act as an army were transformed and the relations of different armies to one another also changed.
Thus the social relations within which individuals produce, the social relations of production, change, are transformed, with the change and development of the material means of production, the productive forces. The relations of production in their totality constitute what are called the social relations, society, and, specifically, a society at a definite stage of historical development, a society with a peculiar, distinctive character. Ancient society, feudal society, bourgeois society are such totalities of production relations, each of which at the same time denotes a special stage of development in the history of mankind.

Capital, also, is a social relation of production. It is a bourgeois production relation, a production relation of bourgeois society. Are not the means of subsistence, the instruments of labour, the raw materials of which capital consists, produced and accumulated under given social conditions, in definite social relations? Are they not utilised for new production under given social conditions, in definite social relations? And is it not just this definite social character which turns the products serving for new production into capital?

Capital consists not only of means of subsistence, instruments of labour and raw materials, not only of material products; it consists just as much of exchange values. All the products of which it consists are commodities. Capital is, therefore, not only a sum of material products; it is a sum of commodities, of exchange values, of social magnitudes.

Capital remains the same, whether we put cotton in place of wool, rice in place of wheat or steamships in place of railways, provided only that the cotton, the rice, the steamships—the body of capital—have the same exchange value, the same price as the wool, the wheat, the railways in which it was previously incorporated. The body of capital can change continually without the capital suffering the slightest alteration.

But while all capital is a sum of commodities, that is, of exchange values, not every sum of commodities, of exchange values, is capital.

Every sum of exchange values is an exchange value. Every separate exchange value is a sum of exchange values. For instance, a house that is worth 1,000 marks is an exchange value of 1,000 marks. A piece of paper worth a pfennig is a sum of exchange values of one-hundred hundredths of a pfennig. Products which are exchangeable for others are commodities. The particular ratio in which they are exchangeable constitutes their exchange value or, expressed in money, their price. The quantity of these products can change nothing in their quality of being
commodities or representing an exchange value or having a definite price. Whether a tree is large or small it is a tree. Whether we exchange iron for other products in ounces or in hundredweights, does this make any difference in its character as commodity, as exchange value? It is a commodity of greater or lesser value, of higher or lower price, depending upon the quantity.

How, then, does any amount of commodities, of exchange value, become capital?

By maintaining and multiplying itself as an independent social power, that is, as the power of a portion of society, by means of its exchange for direct, living labour power. The existence of a class which possesses nothing but its capacity to labour is a necessary prerequisite of capital.

It is only the domination of accumulated, past, materialised labour over direct, living labour that turns accumulated labour into capital.

Capital does not consist in accumulated labour serving living labour as a means for new production. It consists in living labour serving accumulated labour as a means for maintaining and multiplying the exchange value of the latter.

What takes place in the exchange between capitalist and wage-worker?

The worker receives means of subsistence in exchange for his labour power, but the capitalist receives in exchange for his means of subsistence labour, the productive activity of the worker, the creative power whereby the worker not only replaces what he consumes but gives to the accumulated labour a greater value than it previously possessed. The worker receives a part of the available means of subsistence from the capitalist. For what purpose do these means of subsistence serve him? For immediate consumption. As soon, however, as I consume the means of subsistence, they are irretrievably lost to me unless I use the time during which I am kept alive by them in order to produce new means of subsistence, in order during consumption to create by my labour new values in place of the values which perish in being consumed. But it is just this noble reproductive power that the worker surrenders to the capitalist in exchange for means of subsistence received. He has, therefore, lost it for himself.

Let us take an example: a tenant farmer gives his day labourer five silver groschen a day. For these five silver groschen the labourer works all day on the farmer's field and thus secures him a return of ten silver groschen. The farmer not only gets the value replaced that he has to give the day labourer; he doubles it. He has therefore employed, consumed, the five silver
groschen that he gave to the labourer in a fruitful, productive manner. He has bought with the five silver groschen just that labour and power of the labourer which produces agricultural products of double value and makes ten silver groschen out of five. The day labourer, on the other hand, receives in place of his productive power, the effect of which he has bargained away to the farmer, five silver groschen, which he exchanges for means of subsistence, and these he consumes with greater or less rapidity. The five silver groschen have, therefore, been consumed in a double way, *reproductively* for capital, for they have been exchanged for labour power* which produced ten silver groschen, *unproductively* for the worker, for they have been exchanged for means of subsistence which have disappeared forever and the value of which he can only recover by repeating the same exchange with the farmer. *Thus capital presupposes wage labour; wage labour presupposes capital. They reciprocally condition the existence of each other; they reciprocally bring forth each other.*

Does a worker in a cotton factory produce merely cotton textiles? No, he produces capital. He produces values which serve afresh to command his labour and by means of it to create new values.

Capital can only increase by exchanging itself for labour power, by calling wage labour to life. The labour power of the wage-worker can only be exchanged for capital by increasing capital, by strengthening the power whose slave it is. Hence, *increase of capital is increase of the proletariat, that is, of the working class.*

The interests of the capitalist and those of the worker are, therefore, *one and the same,* assert the bourgeois and their economists. Indeed! The worker perishes if capital does not employ him. Capital perishes if it does not exploit labour power, and in order to exploit it, it must buy it. The faster capital intended for production, productive capital, increases, the more, therefore, industry prospers, the more the bourgeoisie enriches itself and the better business is, the more workers does the capitalist need, the more dearly does the worker sell himself.

The indispensable condition for a tolerable situation of the worker is, therefore, *the fastest possible growth of productive capital.*

But what is the growth of productive capital? Growth of the power of accumulated labour over living labour. Growth of the

---

* The term “labour power” was not added here by Engels but had already been in the text Marx published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung.*
—*Ed.*
domination of the bourgeoisie over the working class. If wage labour produces the wealth of others that rules over it, the power that is hostile to it, capital, then the means of employment, that is, the means of subsistence, flow back to it from this hostile power, on condition that it makes itself afresh into a part of capital, into the lever which hurls capital anew into an accelerated movement of growth.

To say that the interests of capital and those of the workers are one and the same is only to say that capital and wage labour are two sides of one and the same relation. The one conditions the other, just as usurer and squanderer condition each other.

As long as the wage-worker is a wage-worker his lot depends upon capital. That is the much-vaunted community of interests between worker and capitalist.

If capital grows, the mass of wage labour grows, the number of wage-workers grows; in a word, the domination of capital extends over a greater number of individuals. Let us assume the most favourable case: when productive capital grows, the demand for labour grows; consequently, the price of labour, wages, goes up.

A house may be large or small; as long as the surrounding houses are equally small it satisfies all social demands for a dwelling. But let a palace arise beside the little house, and it shrinks from a little house to a hut. The little house shows now that its owner has only very slight or no demands to make; and however high it may shoot up in the course of civilisation, if the neighbouring palace grows to an equal or even greater extent, the occupant of the relatively small house will feel more and more uncomfortable, dissatisfied and cramped within its four walls.

A noticeable increase in wages presupposes a rapid growth of productive capital. The rapid growth of productive capital brings about an equally rapid growth of wealth, luxury, social wants, social enjoyments. Thus, although the enjoyments of the worker have risen, the social satisfaction that they give has fallen in comparison with the increased enjoyments of the capitalist, which are inaccessible to the worker, in comparison with the state of development of society in general. Our desires and pleasures spring from society; we measure them, therefore, by society and not by the objects which serve for their satisfaction. Because they are of a social nature, they are of a relative nature.

In general, wages are determined not only by the amount of commodities for which I can exchange them. They embody various relations.
What the workers receive for their labour power is, in the first place, a definite sum of money. Are wages determined only by this money price?

In the sixteenth century, the gold and silver circulating in Europe increased as a result of the discovery of richer and more easily worked mines in America. Hence, the value of gold and silver fell in relation to other commodities. The workers received the same amount of coined silver for their labour power as before. The money price of their labour remained the same, and yet their wages had fallen, for in exchange for the same quantity of silver they received a smaller amount of other commodities. This was one of the circumstances which furthered the growth of capital and the rise of the bourgeoisie in the sixteenth century.

Let us take another case. In the winter of 1847, as a result of a crop failure, the most indispensable means of subsistence, cereals, meat, butter, cheese, etc., rose considerably in price. Assume that the workers received the same sum of money for their labour power as before. Had not their wages fallen? Of course. For the same money they received less bread, meat, etc., in exchange. Their wages had fallen, not because the value of silver had diminished, but because the value of the means of subsistence had increased.

Assume, finally, that the money price of labour remains the same while all agricultural and manufactured goods have fallen in price owing to the employment of new machinery, a favourable season, etc. For the same money the workers can now buy more commodities of all kinds. Their wages, therefore, have risen, just because the money value of their wages has not changed.

Thus, the money price of labour, nominal wages, do not coincide with real wages, that is, with the sum of commodities which is actually given in exchange for the wages. If, therefore, we speak of a rise or fall of wages, we must keep in mind not only the money price of labour, the nominal wages.

But neither nominal wages, that is, the sum of money for which the worker sells himself to the capitalist, nor real wages, that is, the sum of commodities which he can buy for this money, exhaust the relations contained in wages.

Wages are, above all, also determined by their relation to the gain, to the profit of the capitalist—comparative, relative wages.

Real wages express the price of labour in relation to the price of other commodities; relative wages, on the other hand, express the share of direct labour in the new value it has created in
relation to the share which falls to accumulated labour, to capital.

We said above, page 14*: "Wages are not the worker's share in the commodity produced by him. Wages are the part of already existing commodities with which the capitalist buys for himself a definite amount of productive labour power." But the capitalist must replace these wages out of the price at which he sells the product produced by the worker; he must replace it in such a way that there remains to him, as a rule, a surplus over the cost of production expended by him, a profit. For the capitalist, the selling price of the commodities produced by the worker is divided into three parts: first, replacement of the price of the raw materials advanced by him together with replacement of the depreciation of the tools, machinery and other means of labour also advanced by him; secondly, the replacement of the wages advanced by him, and thirdly, the surplus left over, the capitalist's profit. While the first part only replaces previously existing values, it is clear that both the replacement of the wages and also the surplus profit of the capitalist are, on the whole, taken from the new value created by the worker's labour and added to the raw materials. And in this sense, in order to compare them with one another, we can regard both wages and profit as shares in the product of the worker.

Real wages may remain the same, they may even rise, and yet relative wages may fall. Let us suppose, for example, that all means of subsistence have gone down in price by two-thirds while wages per day have only fallen by one-third, that is to say, for example, from three marks to two marks. Although the worker can command a greater amount of commodities with these two marks than he previously could with three marks, yet his wages have gone down in relation to the profit of the capitalist. The profit of the capitalist (for example, the manufacturer) has increased by one mark; that is, for a smaller sum of exchange values which he pays to the worker, the latter must produce a greater amount of exchange values than before. The share of capital relative to the share of labour has risen. The division of social wealth between capital and labour has become still more unequal. With the same capital, the capitalist commands a greater quantity of labour. The power of the capitalist class over the working class has grown, the social position of the worker has deteriorated, has been depressed one step further below that of the capitalist.

* See p. 153 of this volume.—Ed.
What, then, is the general law which determines the rise and fall of wages and profit in their reciprocal relation?

They stand in inverse ratio to each other. Capital’s share of profit, rises in the same proportion as labour’s share, wages, fall, and vice versa. Profit rises to the extent that wages fall; it falls to the extent that wages rise.

The objection will, perhaps, be made that the capitalist can profit by a favourable exchange of his products with other capitalists, by increase of the demand for his commodities, whether as a result of the opening of new markets, or as a result of a momentarily increased demand in the old markets, etc.; that the capitalist’s profit can, therefore, increase by overreaching other capitalists, independently of the rise and fall of wages, of the exchange value of labour power; or that the capitalist’s profit may also rise owing to the improvement of the instruments of labour, a new application of natural forces, etc.

First of all, it will have to be admitted that the result remains the same, although it is brought about in reverse fashion. True, the profit has not risen because wages have fallen, but wages have fallen because the profit has risen. With the same amount of other people’s labour, the capitalist has acquired a greater amount of exchange values, without having paid more for the labour on that account; that is, therefore, labour is paid less in proportion to the net profit which it yields the capitalist.

In addition, we recall that, in spite of the fluctuations in prices of commodities, the average price of every commodity, the ratio in which it is exchanged for other commodities, is determined by its cost of production. Hence the overreaching within the capitalist class necessarily balance one another. The improvement of machinery, new application of natural forces in the service of production, enable a larger amount of products to be created in a given period of time with the same amount of labour and capital, but not by any means a larger amount of exchange values. If, by the use of the spinning jenny, I can turn out twice as much yarn in an hour as before its invention, say, one hundred pounds instead of fifty, then in the long run I will receive for these hundred pounds no more commodities in exchange than formerly for the fifty pounds, because the cost of production has fallen by one-half, or because I can deliver double the product at the same cost.

Finally, in whatever proportion the capitalist class, the bourgeoisie, whether of one country or of the whole world market, shares the net profit of production within itself, the total amount of this net profit always consists only of the amount by which, on the whole, accumulated labour has been increased by direct
labour. This total amount grows, therefore, in the proportion in which labour augments capital, that is, in the proportion in which profit rises in comparison with wages.

We see, therefore, that even if we remain within the relation of capital and wage labour, the interests of capital and the interests of wage labour are diametrically opposed.

A rapid increase of capital is equivalent to a rapid increase of profit. Profit can only increase rapidly if the price of labour, if relative wages, decrease just as rapidly. Relative wages can fall although real wages rise simultaneously with nominal wages, with the money value of labour, if they do not rise, however, in the same proportion as profit. If, for instance, in times when business is good, wages rise by five per cent, profit on the other hand by thirty per cent, then the comparative, the relative wages, have not increased but decreased.

Thus if the income of the worker increases with the rapid growth of capital, the social gulf that separates the worker from the capitalist increases at the same time, and the power of capital over labour, the dependence of labour on capital, likewise increases at the same time.

To say that the worker has an interest in the rapid growth of capital is only to say that the more rapidly the worker increases the wealth of others, the richer will be the crumbs that fall to him, the greater is the number of workers that can be employed and called into existence, the more can the mass of slaves dependent on capital be increased.

We have thus seen that:

Even the most favourable situation for the working class, the most rapid possible growth of capital, however much it may improve the material existence of the worker, does not remove the antagonism between his interests and the interests of the bourgeoisie, the interests of the capitalists. Profit and wages remain as before in inverse proportion.

If capital is growing rapidly, wages may rise; the profit of capital rises incomparably more rapidly. The material position of the worker has improved, but at the cost of his social position. The social gulf that divides him from the capitalist has widened.

Finally:

To say that the most favourable condition for wage labour is the most rapid possible growth of productive capital is only to say that the more rapidly the working class increases and enlarges the power that is hostile to it, the wealth that does not belong to it and that rules over it, the more favourable will be the conditions under which it is allowed to labour anew at
increasing bourgeois wealth, at enlarging the power of capital, content with forging for itself the golden chains by which the bourgeoisie drags it in its train.

Are growth of productive capital and rise of wages really so inseparably connected as the bourgeois economists maintain? We must not take their word for it. We must not even believe them when they say that the fatter capital is, the better will its slave be fed. The bourgeoisie is too enlightened, it calculates too well, to share the prejudices of the feudal lord who makes a display by the brilliance of his retinue. The conditions of existence of the bourgeoisie compel it to calculate.

We must, therefore, examine more closely:

How does the growth of productive capital affect wages?

If, on the whole, the productive capital of bourgeois society grows, a more manifold accumulation of labour takes place. The capitals increase in number and extent. The numerical increase of the capitals increases the competition between the capitalists. The increasing extent of the capitals provides the means for bringing more powerful labour armies with more gigantic instruments of war into the industrial battlefield.

One capitalist can drive another from the field and capture his capital only by selling more cheaply. In order to be able to sell more cheaply without ruining himself, he must produce more cheaply, that is, raise the productive power of labour as much as possible. But the productive power of labour is raised, above all, by a greater division of labour, by a more universal introduction and continual improvement of machinery. The greater the labour army among whom labour is divided, the more gigantic the scale on which machinery is introduced, the more does the cost of production proportionately decrease, the more fruitful is labour. Hence, a general rivalry arises among the capitalists to increase the division of labour and machinery and to exploit them on the greatest possible scale.

If, now, by a greater division of labour, by the utilisation of new machines and their improvement, by more profitable and extensive exploitation of natural forces, one capitalist has found the means of producing with the same amount of labour or of accumulated labour a greater amount of products, of commodities, than his competitors, if he can, for example, produce a whole yard of linen in the same labour time in which his competitors weave half a yard, how will this capitalist operate?

He could continue to sell half a yard of linen at the old market price; this would, however, be no means of driving his opponents from the field and of enlarging his own sales. But in
the same measure in which his production has expanded, his need to sell has also increased. The more powerful and costly means of production that he has called into life enable him, indeed, to sell his commodities more cheaply, they compel him, however, at the same time to sell more commodities, to conquer a much larger market for his commodities; consequently, our capitalist will sell his half yard of linen more cheaply than his competitors.

The capitalist will not, however, sell a whole yard as cheaply as his competitors sell half a yard, although the production of the whole yard does not cost him more than the half yard costs the others. Otherwise he would not gain anything extra but only get back the cost of production by the exchange. His possibly greater income would be derived from the fact of having set a larger capital into motion, but not from having made more of his capital than the others. Moreover, he attains the object he wishes to attain, if he puts the price of his goods only a small percentage lower than that of his competitors. He drives them from the field, he wrests from them at least a part of their sales, by underselling them. And, finally, it will be remembered that the current price always stands above or below the cost of production, according to whether the sale of the commodity occurs in a favourable or unfavourable industrial season. The percentage at which the capitalist who has employed new and more fruitful means of production sells above his real cost of production will vary, depending upon whether the market price of a yard of linen stands below or above its hitherto customary cost of production.

However, the privileged position of our capitalist is not of long duration; other competing capitalists introduce the same machines, the same division of labour, introduce them on the same or on a larger scale, and this introduction will become so general that the price of linen is reduced not only below its old, but below its new cost of production.

The capitalists find themselves, therefore, in the same position relative to one another as before the introduction of the new means of production, and if they are able to supply by these means double the production at the same price, they are now forced to supply the double product below the old price. On the basis of this new cost of production, the same game begins again. More division of labour, more machinery, enlarged scale of exploitation of machinery and division of labour. And again competition brings the same counteraction against this result.

We see how in this way the mode of production and the means of production are continually transformed, revolutionised,
how the division of labour is necessarily followed by greater
division of labour, the application of machinery by still greater
application of machinery, work on a large scale by work on a
still larger scale.

That is the law which again and again throws bourgeois pro-
duction out of its old course and which compels capital to inten-
sify the productive forces of labour, because it has intensified
them, it, the law which gives capital no rest and continually
whispers in its ear: “Go on! Go on!”

This law is none other than that which, within the fluctua-
tions of trade periods, necessarily levels out the price of a com-
modity to its cost of production.

However powerful the means of production which a capitalist
brings into the field, competition will make these means of pro-
duction universal and from the moment when it has made them
universal, the only result of the greater fruitfulness of his capital
is that he must now supply for the same price ten, twenty, a
hundred times as much as before. But, as he must sell perhaps
a thousand times as much as before in order to outweigh the
lower selling price by the greater amount of the product sold,
because a more extensive sale is now necessary, not only in order
to make more profit but in order to replace the cost of produc-
tion—the instrument of production itself, as we have seen, be-
comes more and more expensive—and because this mass sale
becomes a question of life and death not only for him but also
for his rivals, the old struggle begins again all the more violently
the more fruitful the already discovered means of production
are. The division of labour and the application of machinery,
therefore, will go on anew on an incomparably greater scale.

Whatever the power of the means of production employed
may be, competition seeks to rob capital of the golden fruits of
this power by bringing the price of the commodities back to the
cost of production, by thus making cheaper production—the
supply of ever greater amounts of products for the same total
price—an imperative law to the same extent as production can
be cheapened, that is, as more can be produced with the same
amount of labour. Thus the capitalist would have won nothing
by his own exertions but the obligation to supply more in the
same labour time, in a word, more difficult conditions for the
augmentation of the value of his capital. While, therefore, com-
petition continually pursues him with its law of the cost of pro-
duction and every weapon that he forges against his rivals re-
coils against himself, the capitalist continually tries to get the
better of competition by incessantly introducing new machines,
more expensive, it is true, but producing more cheaply, and new
division of labour in place of the old, and by not waiting until
competition has rendered the new ones obsolete.

If now we picture to ourselves this feverish simultaneous agi-
tation on the whole world market, it will be comprehensible how
the growth, accumulation and concentration of capital results in
an uninterrupted division of labour, and in the application of
new and the perfecting of old machinery precipitately and on
an ever more gigantic scale.

But how do these circumstances, which are inseparable from
the growth of productive capital, affect the determination of
wages?

The greater division of labour enables one worker to do the
work of five, ten or twenty; it therefore multiplies competition
among the workers fivefold, tenfold and twentyfold. The workers
do not only compete by one selling himself cheaper than another;
they compete by one doing the work of five, ten, twenty; and
the division of labour, introduced by capital and continually
increased, compels the workers to compete among themselves
in this way.

Further, as the division of labour increases, labour is simpli-
\textit{fied}. The special skill of the worker becomes worthless. He be-
comes transformed into a simple, monotonous productive force
that does not have to use intense bodily or intellectual faculties.
His labour becomes a labour that anyone can perform. Hence,
competitors crowd upon him on all sides, and besides we re-
mind the reader that the more simple and easily learned the
labour is, the lower the cost of production needed to master it,
the lower do wages sink, for, like the price of every other com-
modity, they are determined by the cost of production.

\textit{Therefore, as labour becomes more unsatisfying, more repul-
sive, competition increases and wages decrease}. The worker tries
to keep up the amount of his wages by working more, whether
by working longer hours or by producing more in one hour. Driv-
en by want, therefore, he still further increases the evil effects
of the division of labour. The result is that \textit{the more he works
the less wages he receives}, and for the simple reason that he
competes to that extent with his fellow workers, hence makes
them into so many competitors who offer themselves on just
the same bad terms as he does himself, and that, therefore, in
the last resort he \textit{competes with himself, with himself as a
member of the working class}.

\textit{Machinery} brings about the same results on a much greater
scale, by replacing skilled workers by unskilled, men by women,
adults by children. It brings about the same results, where it is
newly introduced, by throwing the hand workers on to the
streets in masses, and, where it is developed, improved and replaced by more productive machinery, by discharging workers in smaller batches. We have portrayed above, in a hasty sketch, the industrial war of the capitalists among themselves; this war has the peculiarity that its battles are won less by recruiting than by discharging the army of labour. The generals, the capitalists, compete with one another as to who can discharge most soldiers of industry.

The economists tell us, it is true, that the workers rendered superfluous by machinery find new branches of employment. They dare not assert directly that the same workers who are discharged find places in the new branches of labour. The facts cry out too loudly against this lie. They really only assert that new means of employment will open up for other component sections of the working class, for instance, for the portion of the young generation of workers that was ready to enter the branch of industry which has gone under. That is, of course, a great consolation for the disinherited workers. The worshipful capitalists will never want for fresh exploitable flesh and blood, and will let the dead bury their dead. This is a consolation which the bourgeois give themselves rather than one which they give the workers. If the whole class of wage-workers were to be abolished owing to machinery, how dreadful that would be for capital which, without wage labour, ceases to be capital!

Let us suppose, however, that those directly driven out of their jobs by machinery, and the entire section of the new generation that was already on the watch for this employment, find a new occupation. Does any one imagine that it will be as highly paid as that which has been lost? That would contradict all the laws of economics. We have seen how modern industry always brings with it the substitution of a more simple, subordinate occupation for the more complex and higher one.

How, then, could a mass of workers who have been thrown out of one branch of industry owing to machinery find refuge in another, unless the latter is lower, worse paid?

The workers who work in the manufacture of machinery itself have been cited as an exception. As soon as more machinery is demanded and used in industry, it is said, there must necessarily be an increase of machines, consequently of the manufacture of machines, and consequently of the employment of workers in the manufacture of machines; and the workers engaged in this branch of industry are claimed to be skilled, even educated workers.

Since the year 1840 this assertion, which even before was only half true, has lost all semblance of truth because ever more ver-
satile machines have been employed in the manufacture of machinery, no more and no less than in the manufacture of cotton yarn, and the workers employed in the machine factories, confronted by highly elaborate machines, can only play the part of highly unelaborate machines.

But in place of the man who has been discharged owing to the machine, the factory employs maybe three children and one woman. And did not the man's wages have to suffice for the three children and a woman? Did not the minimum of wages have to suffice to maintain and to propagate the race? What, then, does this favourite bourgeois phrase prove? Nothing more than that now four times as many workers' lives are used up in order to gain a livelihood for one worker's family.

Let us sum up: The more productive capital grows, the more the division of labour and the application of machinery expands. The more the division of labour and the application of machinery expands, the more competition among the workers expands and the more their wages contract.

In addition, the working class gains recruits from the higher strata of society also; a mass of petty industrialists and small rentiers are hurled down into its ranks and have nothing better to do than urgently stretch out their arms alongside those of the workers. Thus the forest of uplifted arms demanding work becomes ever thicker, while the arms themselves become ever thinner.

That the small industrialist cannot survive in a contest one of the first conditions of which is to produce on an ever greater scale, that is, precisely to be a large and not a small industrialist, is self-evident.

That the interest on capital decreases in the same measure as the mass and number of capitals increase, as capital grows; that, therefore, the small rentier can no longer live on his interest but must throw himself into industry, and, consequently, help to swell the ranks of the small industrialists and thereby of candidates for the proletariat—all this surely requires no further explanation.

Finally, as the capitalists are compelled, by the movement described above, to exploit the already existing gigantic means of production on a larger scale and to set in motion all the mainsprings of credit to this end, there is a corresponding increase in industrial earthquakes, in which the trading world can only maintain itself by sacrificing a part of wealth, of products and even of productive forces to the gods of the nether world—in a word, crises increase. They become more frequent and more violent, if only because, as the mass of production, and conse-
quently the need for extended markets, grows, the world market becomes more and more contracted, fewer and fewer new markets remain available for exploitation, since every preceding crisis has subjected to world trade a market hitherto unconquered or only superficially exploited. But capital does not live only on labour. A lord, at once aristocratic and barbarous, it drags with it into the grave the corpses of its slaves, whole hecatombs of workers who perish in the crises. Thus we see: if capital grows rapidly, competition among the workers grows incomparably more rapidly, that is, the means of employment, the means of subsistence, of the working class decrease proportionately so much the more, and, nevertheless, the rapid growth of capital is the most favourable condition for wage labour.71
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Brothers! In the two revolutionary years 1848-49 the League proved itself in double fashion: first, in that its members energetically took part in the movement in all places, that in the press, on the barricades and on the battlefields, they stood in the front ranks of the only decidedly revolutionary class, the proletariat. The League further proved itself in that its conception of the movement as laid down in the circulars of the congresses and of the Central Committee of 1847 as well as in the Communist Manifesto turned out to be the only correct one, that the expectations expressed in those documents were completely fulfilled and the conception of present-day social conditions, previously propagated only in secret by the League, is now on everyone's lips and is openly preached in the market places. At the same time the former firm organisation of the League was considerably slackened. A large part of the members who directly participated in the revolutionary movement believed the time for secret societies to have gone by and public activities alone sufficient. The individual circles and communities allowed their connections with the Central Committee to become loose and gradually dormant. Consequently, while the democratic party, the party of the petty bourgeoisie, organised itself more and more in Germany, the workers' party lost its only firm foothold, remained organised at the most in separate localities for local purposes and in the general movement thus came completely under the domination and leadership of the petty-bourgeois democrats. An end must be put to this state of affairs, the independence of the workers must be restored. The Central Committee realised this necessity and therefore already in the winter of 1848-49 it sent an emissary, Josef Moll, to Germany for the reorganisation of the League. Moll's mission, however, was without lasting effect, partly because the German workers at that time had not acquired sufficient experience and partly because it was interrupted by the insurrection of the previous May. Moll himself took up the musket, entered the
Baden-Palatinate army and fell on July 19* in the encounter at
the Murg. The League lost in him one of its oldest, most active
and most trustworthy members, one who had been active in all
the congresses and Central Committees and even prior to this
had carried out a series of missions with great success. After
the defeat of the revolutionary parties of Germany and France
in July 1849, almost all the members of the Central Committee
came together again in London, replenished their numbers with
new revolutionary forces and set about the reorganisation of
the League with renewed zeal.

Reorganisation can only be carried out by an emissary, and
the Central Committee considers it extremely important that
the emissary should leave precisely at this moment when a new
revolution is impending, when the workers’ party, therefore,
must act in the most organised, most unanimous and most
independent fashion possible if it is not to be exploited and
taken in tow again by the bourgeoisie as in 1848.

Brothers! We told you as early as 1848 that the German lib-
eral bourgeoisie would soon come to power and would immediately
turn their newly acquired power against the workers. You have
seen how this has been fulfilled. In fact it was the bourgeoisie
who, immediately after the March movement of 1848, took pos-
session of the state power and used this power to force back at
once the workers, their allies in the struggle, into their former
oppressed position. Though the bourgeoisie was not able to
accomplish this without uniting with the feudal party, which
had been disposed of in March, without finally even surrend-
ering power once again to this feudal absolutist party, still it has
secured conditions for itself which, in the long run, owing to
the financial embarrassment of the government, would place
power in its hands and would safeguard all its interests, if it
were possible for the revolutionary movement to assume already
now a so-called peaceful development. The bourgeoisie, in order
to safeguard its rule, would not even need to make itself obno-
xious by violent measures against the people, since all such
violent steps have already been taken by the feudal counter-
revolution. Developments, however, will not take this peaceful
course. On the contrary, the revolution, which will accelerate
this development, is near at hand, whether it will be called
forth by an independent uprising of the French proletariat or
by an invasion of the Holy Alliance73 against the revolutionary
Babylon.74

* A mistake; should read “June 29”.—Ed.
And the role, this so treacherous role which the German liberal bourgeois played in 1848 against the people, will in the impending revolution be taken over by the democratic petty bourgeois, who at present occupy the same position in the opposition as the liberal bourgeois before 1848. This party, the democratic party, which is far more dangerous to the workers than the previous liberal one, consists of three elements:

I. Of the most advanced sections of the big bourgeoisie, which pursue the aim of the immediate complete overthrow of feudalism and absolutism. This faction is represented by the one-time Berlin compromisers, by the tax resisters.

II. Of the democratic-constitutional petty bourgeoisie, whose main aim during the previous movement was the establishment of a more or less democratic federal state as striven for by their representatives, the Lefts in the Frankfort Assembly, and later by the Stuttgart parliament, and by themselves in the campaign for the Reich Constitution.75

III. Of the republican petty bourgeois, whose ideal is a German federative republic after the manner of Switzerland, and who now call themselves Red and Social-Democratic because they cherish the pious wish of abolishing the pressure of big capital on small capital, of the big bourgeois on the small bourgeois. The representatives of this faction were the members of the democratic congresses and committees, the leaders of the democratic associations, the editors of the democratic newspapers.

Now, after their defeat, all these factions call themselves Republicans or Reds, just as the republican petty bourgeois in France now call themselves Socialists. Where, as in Württemberg, Bavaria, etc., they still find opportunity to pursue their aims constitutionally, they seize the occasion to retain their old phrases and to prove by deeds that they have not changed in the least. It is evident, moreover, that the altered name of this party does not make the slightest difference in its attitude to the workers, but merely proves that they are now obliged to turn against the bourgeoisie, which is united with absolutism, and to seek support in the proletariat.

The petty-bourgeois democratic party in Germany is very powerful; it comprises not only the great majority of the bourgeois inhabitants of the towns, the small people in industry and trade and the guild masters; it numbers among its followers also the peasants and the rural proletariat, in so far as the latter has not yet found a support in the independent urban proletariat.

The relation of the revolutionary workers' party to the petty-bourgeois democrats is this: it marches together with them
against the faction which it aims at overthrowing, it opposes them in everything whereby they seek to consolidate their position in their own interests.

Far from desiring to revolutionise all society for the revolutionary proletarians, the democratic petty bourgeois strive for a change in social conditions by means of which existing society will be made as tolerable and comfortable as possible for them. Hence they demand above all diminution of state expenditure by a curtailment of the bureaucracy and shifting the chief taxes on to the big landowners and bourgeois. Further, they demand the abolition of the pressure of big capital on small, through public credit institutions and laws against usury, by which means it will be possible for them and the peasants to obtain advances, on favourable conditions, from the state instead of from the capitalists; they also demand the establishment of bourgeois property relations in the countryside by the complete abolition of feudalism. To accomplish all this they need a democratic state structure, either constitutional or republican, that will give them and their allies, the peasants, a majority; also a democratic communal structure that will give them direct control over communal property and over a series of functions now performed by the bureaucrats.

The domination and speedy increase of capital is further to be counteracted partly by restricting the right of inheritance and partly by transferring as many jobs of work as possible to the state. As far as the workers are concerned, it remains certain above all that they are to remain wage-workers as before; the democratic petty bourgeois only desire better wages and a more secure existence for the workers and hope to achieve this through partial employment by the state and through charity measures; in short, they hope to bribe the workers by more or less concealed alms and to break their revolutionary potency by making their position tolerable for the moment. The demands of the petty-bourgeois democracy here summarised are not put forward by all of its factions at the same time and only a very few members of them consider that these demands constitute definite aims in their entirety. The further separate individuals or factions among them go, the more of these demands will they make their own, and those few who see their own programme in what has been outlined above might believe that thereby they have put forward the utmost that can be demanded from the revolution. But these demands can in no wise suffice for the party of the proletariat. While the democratic petty bourgeois wish to bring the revolution to a conclusion as quickly as possible, and with the achievement, at most, of the above demands,
it is our interest and our task to make the revolution permanent, until all more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance, until the proletariat has conquered state power, and the association of proletarians, not only in one country but in all the dominant countries of the world, has advanced so far that competition among the proletarians of these countries has ceased and that at least the decisive productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians. For us the issue cannot be the alteration of private property but only its annihilation, not the smoothing over of class antagonisms but the abolition of classes, not the improvement of existing society but the foundation of a new one. That, during the further development of the revolution, the petty-bourgeois democracy will for a moment obtain predominating influence in Germany is not open to doubt. The question, therefore, arises as to what the attitude of the proletariat and in particular of the League will be in relation to it:

1. During the continuance of the present conditions where the petty-bourgeois democrats are likewise oppressed;
2. In the next revolutionary struggle, which will give them the upper hand;
3. After this struggle, during the period of preponderance over the overthrown classes and the proletariat.

1. At the present moment, when the democratic petty bourgeois are everywhere oppressed, they preach in general unity and reconciliation to the proletariat, they offer it their hand and strive for the establishment of a large opposition party which will embrace all shades of opinion in the democratic party, that is, they strive to entangle the workers in a party organisation in which general social-democratic phrases predominate, behind which their special interests are concealed and in which the particular demands of the proletariat may not be brought forward for the sake of beloved peace. Such a union would turn out solely to their advantage and altogether to the disadvantage of the proletariat. The proletariat would lose its whole independent, laboriously achieved position and once more sink down to being an appendage of official bourgeois democracy. This union must, therefore, be most decisively rejected. Instead of once again stooping to serve as the applauding chorus of the bourgeois democrats, the workers, and above all the League, must exert themselves to establish an independent, secret and public organisation of the workers' party alongside of the official democrats and make each section the central point and nucleus of workers' societies in which the attitude and interests of the proletariat will be discussed independently of bourgeois influ-
ences. How far the bourgeois democrats are from seriously considering an alliance in which the proletarians would stand side by side with them with equal power and equal rights is shown, for example, by the Breslau democrats who, in their organ, the Neue Oder-Zeitung, most furiously attack the independently organised workers, whom they style Socialists. In the case of a struggle against a common adversary no special union is required. As soon as such an adversary has to be fought directly, the interests of both parties, for the moment, coincide, and, as previously, so also in the future, this connection, calculated to last only for the moment, will arise of itself. It is self-evident that in the impending bloody conflicts, as in all earlier ones, it is the workers who, in the main, will have to win the victory by their courage, determination and self-sacrifice. As previously, so also in this struggle, the mass of the petty bourgeois will as long as possible remain hesitant, undecided and inactive, and then, as soon as the issue has been decided, will seize the victory for themselves, will call upon the workers to maintain tranquillity and return to their work, will guard against so-called excesses and bar the proletariat from the fruits of victory. It is not in the power of the workers to prevent the petty-bourgeois democrats from doing this, but it is in their power to make it difficult for them to gain the upper hand as against the armed proletariat, and to dictate such conditions to them that the rule of the bourgeois democrats will from the outset bear within it the seeds of their downfall, and that their subsequent extrusion by the rule of the proletariat will be considerably facilitated. Above all things, the workers must counteract, as much as is at all possible, during the conflict and immediately after the struggle, the bourgeois endeavours to allay the storm, and must compel the democrats to carry out their present terrorist phrases. Their actions must be so aimed as to prevent the direct revolutionary excitement from being suppressed again immediately after the victory. On the contrary, they must keep it alive as long as possible. Far from opposing so-called excesses, instances of popular revenge against hated individuals or public buildings that are associated only with hateful recollections, such instances must not only be tolerated but the leadership of them taken in hand. During the struggle and after the struggle, the workers must, at every opportunity, put forward their own demands alongside of the demands of the bourgeois democrats. They must demand guarantees for the workers as soon as the democratic bourgeois set about taking over the government. If necessary they must obtain these guarantees by force and in general they must see to it that the new rulers
pledge themselves to all possible concessions and promises—the surest way to compromise them. In general, they must in every way restrain as far as possible the intoxication of victory and the enthusiasm for the new state of things, which make their appearance after every victorious street battle, by a calm and dispassionate estimate of the situation and by unconcealed mistrust in the new government. Alongside of the new official governments they must establish simultaneously their own revolutionary workers' governments, whether in the form of municipal committees and municipal councils or in the form of workers' clubs or workers' committees, so that the bourgeois-democratic governments not only immediately lose the support of the workers but from the outset see themselves supervised and threatened by authorities which are backed by the whole mass of the workers. In a word, from the first moment of victory, mistrust must be directed no longer against the conquered reactionary party, but against the workers' previous allies, against the party that wishes to exploit the common victory for itself alone.

2. But in order to be able energetically and threateningly to oppose this party, whose treachery to the workers will begin from the first hour of victory, the workers must be armed and organised. The arming of the whole proletariat with rifles, muskets, cannon and munitions must be put through at once, the revival of the old Citizens' Guard directed against the workers must be resisted. However, where the latter is not feasible the workers must attempt to organise themselves independently as a proletarian guard with commanders elected by themselves and with a general staff of their own choosing, and to put themselves at the command not of the state authority but of the revolutionary community councils which the workers will have managed to get adopted. Where workers are employed at the expense of the state they must see that they are armed and organised in a separate corps with commanders of their own choosing or as part of the proletarian guard. Arms and ammunition must not be surrendered on any pretext; any attempt at disarming must be frustrated, if necessary by force. Destruction of the influence of the bourgeois democrats upon the workers, immediate independent and armed organisation of the workers and the enforcement of conditions as difficult and compromising as possible upon the inevitable momentary rule of the bourgeois democracy—these are the main points which the proletariat and hence the League must keep in view during and after the impending insurrection.

3. As soon as the new governments have consolidated their
positions to some extent, their struggle against the workers will begin. Here, in order to be able to offer energetic opposition to the democratic petty bourgeois, it is above all necessary that the workers shall be independently organised and centralised in clubs. After the overthrow of the existing governments, the Central Committee will, as soon as it is at all possible, betake itself to Germany, immediately convene a congress and put before the latter the necessary proposals for the centralisation of the workers’ clubs under a leadership established in the chief seat of the movement. The speedy organisation of at least a provincial interlinking of the workers’ clubs is one of the most important points for the strengthening and development of the workers’ party; the immediate consequence of the overthrow of the existing governments will be the election of a national representative assembly. Here the proletariat must see to it:

I. That no groups of workers are barred on any pretext or by any kind of trickery on the part of local authorities or government commissioners.

II. That everywhere workers’ candidates are put up alongside of the bourgeois-democratic candidates, that they should consist as far as possible of members of the League, and that their election is promoted by all possible means. Even where there is no prospect whatsoever of their being elected, the workers must put up their own candidates in order to preserve their independence, to count their forces and to bring before the public their revolutionary attitude and party standpoint. In this connection they must not allow themselves to be seduced by such arguments of the democrats as, for example, that by so doing they are splitting the democratic party and making it possible for the reactionaries to win. The ultimate intention of all such phrases is to dupe the proletariat. The advance which the proletarian party is bound to make by such independent action is infinitely more important than the disadvantage that might be incurred by the presence of a few reactionaries in the representative body. If the democracy from the outset comes out resolutely and terroristically against the reaction, the influence of the latter in the elections will be destroyed in advance.

The first point on which the bourgeois democrats will come into conflict with the workers will be the abolition of feudalism. As in the first French Revolution, the petty bourgeois will give the feudal lands to the peasants as free property, that is to say, try to leave the rural proletariat in existence and form a petty-bourgeois peasant class which will go through the same cycle of impoverishment and indebtedness which the French peasant is now still going through.
The workers must oppose this plan in the interest of the rural proletariat and in their own interest. They must demand that the confiscated feudal property remain state property and be converted into workers' colonies cultivated by the associated rural proletariat with all the advantages of large-scale agriculture, through which the principle of common property immediately obtains a firm basis in the midst of the tottering bourgeois property relations. Just as the democrats combine with the peasants so much the workers combine with the rural proletariat. Further, the democrats will work either directly for a federative republic or, if they cannot avoid a single and indivisible republic, they will at least attempt to cripple the central government by the utmost possible autonomy and independence for the communities* and provinces. The workers, in opposition to this plan, must not only strive for a single and indivisible German republic, but also within this republic for the most determined centralisation of power in the hands of the state authority. They must not allow themselves to be misguided by the democratic talk of freedom for the communities, of self-government, etc. In a country like Germany where there are still so many relics of the Middle Ages to be abolished, where there is so much local and provincial obstinacy to be broken, it must under no circumstances be permitted that every village, every town and every province should put a new obstacle in the path of revolutionary activity, which can proceed with full force only from the centre. It is not to be tolerated that the present state of affairs should be renewed, that Germans must fight separately in every town and in every province for one and the same advance. Least of all is it to be tolerated that a form of property, namely, communal property, which still lags behind modern private property and which everywhere is necessarily passing into the latter, together with the quarrels resulting from it between poor and rich communities, as well as communal civil law, with its trickery against the workers, that exists alongside of state civil law, should be perpetuated by a so-called free communal constitution. As in France in 1793 so today in Germany it is the task of the really revolutionary party to carry through the strictest centralisation.**

* Community [Gemeinde]: This term is employed here in a wide sense to embrace both urban municipalities and rural communities.—Ed.
** It must be recalled today that this passage is based on a misunderstanding. At that time—thanks to the Bonapartist and liberal falsifiers of history—it was considered as established that the French centralised machine of administration had been introduced by the Great Revolution and in particular that it had been operated by the Convention as an indispens-
We have seen how the democrats will come to power with the next movement, how they will be compelled to propose more or less socialistic measures. It will be asked what measures the workers ought to propose in reply. At the beginning of the movement, of course, the workers cannot yet propose any directly communistic measures. But they can:

1. Compel the democrats to interfere in as many spheres as possible of the hitherto existing social order, to disturb its regular course and to compromise themselves as well as to concentrate the utmost possible productive forces, means of transport, factories, railways, etc., in the hands of the state;

2. They must drive the proposals of the democrats, who in any case will not act in a revolutionary but in a merely reformist manner, to the extreme and transform them into direct attacks upon private property; thus, for example, if the petty bourgeois propose purchase of the railways and factories, the workers must demand that these railways and factories shall be simply confiscated by the state without compensation as being the property of reactionaries. If the democrats propose proportional taxes, the workers must demand progressive taxes; if the democrats themselves put forward a moderately progressive tax, the workers must insist on a tax with rates that rise so steeply that big capital will be ruined by it; if the democrats demand the regulation of state debts, the workers must demand state bankruptcy. Thus, the demands of the workers must everywhere be governed by the concessions and measures of the democrats.

If the German workers are not able to attain power and achieve their own class interests without completely going

able and decisive weapon for defeating the royalist and federalist reaction and the external enemy. It is now, however, a well-known fact that throughout the whole revolution up to the eighteenth Brumaire the whole administration of the departments, arrondissements and communes consisted of authorities elected by the respective constituents themselves, and that these authorities acted with complete freedom within the general state laws; that precisely this provincial and local self-government, similar to the American, became the most powerful lever of the revolution and indeed to such an extent that Napoleon, immediately after his coup d'état of the eighteenth Brumaire, hastened to replace it by an administration by prefects, which still exists and which, therefore, was a pure instrument of reaction from the beginning. But just as little as local and provincial self-government is in contradiction to political, national centralisation, so is it to an equally small extent necessarily bound up with that narrow-minded, cantonal or communal self-seeking which strikes us as so repulsive in Switzerland, and which all the South German federal republicans wanted to make the rule in Germany in 1849. [Note by Engels to the 1885 edition.]
through a lengthy revolutionary development, they at least know for a certainty this time that the first act of this approaching revolutionary drama will coincide with the direct victory of their own class in France and will be very much accelerated by it.

But they themselves must do the utmost for their final victory by clarifying their minds as to what their class interests are, by taking up their position as an independent party as soon as possible and by not allowing themselves to be seduced for a single moment by the hypocritical phrases of the democratic petty bourgeois into refraining from the independent organisation of the party of the proletariat. Their battle cry must be: The Revolution in Permanence.

London, March 1850
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INTRODUCTION BY FREDERICK ENGELS

The work here republished was Marx's first attempt to explain a section of contemporary history by means of his materialist conception, on the basis of the given economic situation. In the Communist Manifesto, the theory was applied in broad outline to the whole of modern history; in the articles by Marx and myself in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, it was constantly used to interpret political events of the day. Here, on the other hand, the question was to demonstrate the inner causal connection in the course of a development which extended over some years, a development as critical, for the whole of Europe, as it was typical; hence, in accordance with the conception of the author, to trace political events back to effects of what were, in the final analysis, economic causes.

If events and series of events are judged by current history, it will never be possible to go back to the ultimate economic causes. Even today, when the specialised press concerned provides such rich material, it still remains impossible even in England to follow day by day the movement of industry and trade in the world market and the changes which take place in the methods of production in such a way as to be able to draw a general conclusion, for any point of time, from these manifold, complicated and ever-changing factors, the most important of which, into the bargain, generally operate a long time in secret before they suddenly make themselves violently felt on the surface. A clear survey of the economic history of a given period can never be obtained contemporaneously, but only subsequently, after a collecting and sifting of the material has taken place. Statistics are a necessary auxiliary means here, and they always lag behind. For this reason, it is only too often necessary, in current history, to treat this, the most decisive, factor as constant, and the economic situation existing at the beginning of the period concerned as given and unalterable for the whole period, or else to take notice of only such changes in this situation as arise out of the patently manifest events themselves, and are, therefore, likewise patently manifest. Hence, the materialist method
has here quite often to limit itself to tracing political conflicts
back to the struggles between the interests of the existing social
classes and fractions of classes created by the economic de-
velopment, and to prove the particular political parties to be the
more or less adequate political expression of these same classes
and fractions of classes.

It is self-evident that this unavoidable neglect of contempora-
neous changes in the economic situation, the very basis of all the
processes to be examined, must be a source of error. But all the
conditions of a comprehensive presentation of current history
unavoidably include sources of error—which, however, keeps
nobody from writing current history.

When Marx undertook this work, the source of error men-
tioned was even more unavoidable. It was simply impossible dur-
ing the period of the Revolution of 1848-49 to follow up the
economic transformations taking place at the same time or even
to keep them in view. It was the same during the first months
of exile in London, in the autumn and winter of 1849-50. But
that was just the time when Marx began this work. And in spite
of these unfavourable circumstances, his exact knowledge both
of the economic situation in France before, and of the political
history of that country after the February Revolution made it
possible for him to give a picture of events which laid bare their
inner connections in a way never attained ever since, and which
later brilliantly stood the double test applied by Marx himself.

The first test resulted from the fact that after the spring of
1850 Marx once again found leisure for economic studies, and
first of all took up the economic history of the last ten years.
Thereby what he had hitherto deduced, half a priori, from gappy
material, became absolutely clear to him from the facts them-
selves, namely, that the world trade crisis of 1847 had been the
true mother of the February and March Revolutions, and that
the industrial prosperity, which had been returning gradually
since the middle of 1848 and attained full bloom in 1849 and
1850, was the revitalising force of the newly strengthened Euro-
pean reaction. That was decisive. Whereas in the first three
articles* (which appeared in the January, February and March
issues of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische
Revue,80 Hamburg, 1850) there was still the expectation of an
early new upsurge of revolutionary energy, the historical review
written by Marx and myself for the last issue, a double issue
(May to October), which was published in the autumn of 1850,
breaks once and for all with these illusions: "A new revolution

* See pp. 205-86 of this volume.—Ed.
is possible only in consequence of a new crisis. It is, however, just as certain as this crisis."* But that was the only essential change which had to be made. There was absolutely nothing to alter in the interpretation of events given in the earlier chapters, or in the causal connections established therein, as the continuation of the narrative from March 10 up to the autumn of 1850 in the review in question proves. I have, therefore, included this continuation as the fourth article in the present new edition.

The second test was even more severe. Immediately after Louis Bonaparte's *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851, Marx worked out anew the history of France from February 1848 up to this event, which concluded the revolutionary period for the time being. (*The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. Third edition, Hamburg, Meissner, 1885.*)** In this pamphlet the period depicted in our present publication is again dealt with, although more briefly. Compare this second presentation, written in the light of the decisive event which happened over a year later, with ours and it will be found that the author had very little to change.

What, besides, gives our work quite special significance is the circumstance that it was the first to express the formula in which, by common agreement, the workers' parties of all countries in the world briefly summarise their demand for economic transformation: the appropriation of the means of production by society. In the second chapter, in connection with the "right to work," which is characterised as "the first clumsy formula wherein the revolutionary demands of the proletariat are summarised," it is said: "But behind the right to work stands the power over capital; behind the power over capital, the *appropriation of the means of production*, their subjection to the associated working class and, therefore, the abolition of wage labour as well as of capital and of their mutual relations."*** Thus, here, for the first time, the proposition is formulated by which modern workers' socialism is equally sharply differentiated both from all the different shades of feudal, bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, etc., socialism and also from the confused community of goods of *utopian* and of spontaneous workers' communism. If, later, Marx extended the formula to include appropriation of the means of exchange, this extension, which in any case was self-evident after the *Communist Manifesto*, only expressed a corollary to the main
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* See p. 289 of this volume.—Ed.
** See pp. 398-487 of this volume.—Ed.
*** See p. 234 of this volume.—Ed.
prophecy. A few wiseacres in England have of late added that the “means of distribution” should also be handed over to society. It would be difficult for these gentlemen to say what these economic means of distribution are, as distinct from the means of production and exchange; unless political means of distribution are meant, taxes, poor relief, including the Sachsenwald and other endowments. But, first, these are already now means of distribution in possession of society in the aggregate, either of the state or of the community, and secondly, it is precisely the abolition of these that we desire.

* * *

When the February Revolution broke out, all of us, as far as our conceptions of the conditions and the course of revolutionary movements were concerned, were under the spell of previous historical experience, particularly that of France. It was, indeed, the latter which had dominated the whole of European history since 1789, and from which now once again the signal had gone forth for general revolutionary change. It was, therefore, natural and unavoidable that our conceptions of the nature and the course of the “social” revolution proclaimed in Paris in February 1848, of the revolution of the proletariat, should be strongly coloured by memories of the prototypes of 1789 and 1830. Moreover, when the Paris uprising found its echo in the victorious insurrections in Vienna, Milan and Berlin; when the whole of Europe right up to the Russian frontier was swept into the movement; when thereupon in Paris, in June, the first great battle for power between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was fought; when the very victory of its class so shook the bourgeoisie of all countries that it fled back into the arms of the monarchist-feudal reaction which had just been overthrown—there could be no doubt for us, under the circumstances then obtaining, that the great decisive combat had commenced, that it would have to be fought out in a single, long and vicissitudinous period of revolution, but that it could only end in the final victory of the proletariat.

After the defeats of 1849 we in no way shared the illusions of the vulgar democracy grouped around the future provisional governments in partibus. This vulgar democracy reckoned on a speedy and finally decisive victory of the “people” over the “tyrants”; we looked to a long struggle, after the removal of the “tyrants,” among the antagonistic elements concealed within this “people” itself. Vulgar democracy expected a renewed outbreak any day; we declared as early as autumn 1850 that at least the
first chapter of the revolutionary period was closed and that nothing was to be expected until the outbreak of a new world economic crisis. For which reason we were excommunicated, as traitors to the revolution, by the very people who later, almost without exception, made their peace with Bismarck—so far as Bismarck found them worth the trouble. But history has shown us too to have been wrong, has revealed our point of view of that time to have been an illusion. It has done even more: it has not merely dispelled the erroneous notions we then held; it has also completely transformed the conditions under which the proletariat has to fight. The mode of struggle of 1848 is today obsolete in every respect, and this is a point which deserves closer examination on the present occasion.

All revolutions up to the present day have resulted in the displacement of one definite class rule by another; but all ruling classes up to now have been only small minorities in relation to the ruled mass of the people. One ruling minority was thus overthrown; another minority seized the helm of state in its stead and refashioned the state institutions to suit its own interests. This was on every occasion the minority group qualified and called to rule by the given degree of economic development; and just for that reason, and only for that reason, it happened that the ruled majority either participated in the revolution for the benefit of the former or else calmly acquiesced in it. But if we disregard the concrete content in each case, the common form of all these revolutions was that they were minority revolutions. Even when the majority took part, it did so—whether wittingly or not—only in the service of a minority; but because of this, or even simply because of the passive, unresisting attitude of the majority, this minority acquired the appearance of being the representative of the whole people.

As a rule, after the first great success, the victorious minority divided; one half was satisfied with what had been gained, the other wanted to go still further, and put forward new demands, which, partly at least, were also in the real or apparent interest of the great mass of the people. In individual cases these more radical demands were actually forced through, but often only for the moment; the more moderate party would regain the upper hand, and what had last been won would wholly or partly be lost again; the vanquished would then shriek of treachery or ascribe their defeat to accident. In reality, however, the truth of the matter was largely this: the achievements of the first victory were only safeguarded by the second victory of the more radical party; this having been attained, and, with it, what was neces-
sary for the moment, the radicals and their achievements vanished once more from the stage.

All revolutions of modern times, beginning with the great English Revolution of the seventeenth century, showed these features, which appeared inseparable from every revolutionary struggle. They appeared applicable, also, to the struggle of the proletariat for its emancipation; all the more applicable, since precisely in 1848 there were but a very few people who had any idea at all of the direction in which this emancipation was to be sought. The proletarian masses themselves, even in Paris, after the victory, were still absolutely in the dark as to the path to be taken. And yet the movement was there, instinctive, spontaneous, irrepressible. Was not this just the situation in which a revolution had to succeed, led, true, by a minority, but this time not in the interest of the minority, but in the veriest interest of the majority? If, in all the longer revolutionary periods, it was so easy to win the great masses of the people by the merely plausible false representations of the forward-thrusting minorities, why should they be less susceptible to ideas which were the truest reflection of their economic condition, which were nothing but the clear, rational expression of their needs, of needs not yet understood but merely vaguely felt by them? To be sure, this revolutionary mood of the masses had almost always, and usually very speedily, given way to lassitude or even to a revulsion of feeling as soon as illusion evaporated and disappointment set in. But here it was not a question of false representations, but of giving effect to the highest special interests of the great majority itself, interests which, true, were at that time by no means clear to this great majority, but which soon enough had to become clear to it in the course of giving practical effect to them, by their convincing obviousness. And when, as Marx showed in his third article, in the spring of 1850, the development of the bourgeois republic that arose out of the "social" Revolution of 1848 had even concentrated real power in the hands of the big bourgeoisie—monarchistically inclined as it was into the bargain—and, on the other hand, had grouped all the other social classes, peasantry as well as petty bourgeoisie, round the proletariat, so that, during and after the common victory, not they but the proletariat grown wise by experience had to become the decisive factor—was there not every prospect then of turning the revolution of the minority into a revolution of the majority?

History has proved us, and all who thought like us, wrong. It has made it clear that the state of economic development on the Continent at that time was not, by a long way, ripe for the
elimination of capitalist production; it has proved this by the economic revolution which, since 1848, has seized the whole of the Continent, and has caused big industry to take real root in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland and, recently, in Russia, while it has made Germany positively an industrial country of the first rank—all on a capitalist basis, which in the year 1848, therefore, still had great capacity for expansion. But it is just this industrial revolution which has everywhere produced clarity in class relations, has removed a number of intermediate forms handed down from the period of manufacture and in Eastern Europe even from guild handicraft, has created a genuine bourgeoisie and a genuine large-scale industrial proletariat and has pushed them into the foreground of social development. However, owing to this, the struggle between these two great classes, a struggle which, apart from England, existed in 1848 only in Paris and, at the most, in a few big industrial centres, has spread over the whole of Europe and reached an intensity still inconceivable in 1848. At that time the many obscure evangels of the sects, with their panaceas; today the one generally recognised, crystal-clear theory of Marx, sharply formulating the ultimate aims of the struggle. At that time the masses, sundered and differing according to locality and nationality, linked only by the feeling of common suffering, undeveloped, helplessly tossed to and fro from enthusiasm to despair; today the one great international army of Socialists, marching irresistibly on and growing daily in number, organisation, discipline, insight and certainty of victory. If even this mighty army of the proletariat has still not reached its goal, if, far from winning victory by one mighty stroke, it has slowly to press forward from position to position in a hard, tenacious struggle, this only proves, once and for all, how impossible it was in 1848 to win social transformation by a simple surprise attack.

A bourgeoisie split into two dynastic-monarchist sections, a bourgeoisie, however, which demanded, above all, peace and security for its financial operations, faced by a proletariat vanquished, indeed, but still always a menace, a proletariat round which petty bourgeois and peasants grouped themselves more and more—the continual threat of a violent outbreak, which, nevertheless, offered absolutely no prospect of a final solution—such was the situation, as if specially created for the coup d'état of the third, the pseudo-democratic pretender, Louis Bonaparte. On December 2, 1851, by means of the army, he put an end to the tense situation and secured Europe domestic tranquillity in order to confer upon it the blessing of a new era of wars. The period of revolutions from below was concluded for the
time being; there followed a period of revolutions from above.

The reversion to the empire in 1851 gave new proof of the unripeness of the proletarian aspirations of that time. But it was itself to create the conditions under which they were bound to ripen. Internal tranquillity ensured the full development of the new industrial boom; the necessity of keeping the army occupied and of diverting the revolutionary currents outwards produced the wars in which Bonaparte, under the pretext of asserting "the principle of nationality,"85 sought to hook annexations for France. His imitator, Bismarck, adopted the same policy for Prussia; he made his coup d’état, his revolution from above, in 1866, against the German Confederation86 and Austria, and no less against the Prussian Konfliktskammer.* But Europe was too small for two Bonapartes and the irony of history so willed it that Bismarck overthrew Bonaparte, and King William of Prussia not only established the little German empire,87 but also the French republic. The general result, however, was that in Europe the independence and internal unity of the great nations, with the exception of Poland, had become a fact. Within relatively modest limits, it is true, but, for all that, on a scale large enough to allow the development of the working class to proceed without finding national complications any longer a serious obstacle. The grave-diggers of the Revolution of 1848 had become the executors of its will. And alongside of them already rose threateningly the heir of 1848, the proletariat, in the shape of the International.

After the war of 1870-71, Bonaparte vanishes from the stage and Bismarck’s mission is fulfilled, so that he can now sink back again into the ordinary Junker. The period, however, is brought to a close by the Paris Commune. An underhand attempt by Thiers to steal the cannon of the Paris National Guard88 called forth a victorious rising. It was shown once more that in Paris none but a proletarian revolution is any longer possible. After the victory power fell, quite of itself and quite undisputed, into the hands of the working class. And once again it was proved how impossible even then, twenty years after the time described in our work, this rule of the working class still was. On the one hand, France left Paris in the lurch, looked on while it bled profusely from the bullets of MacMahon; on the other hand, the Commune was consumed in unfruitful strife between the two parties which split it, the Blanquists (the majority) and the

* Konfliktskammer, that is, the Prussian Chamber then in conflict with the government.—Ed.
Proudhonists (the minority), neither of which knew what was to be done. The victory which came as a gift in 1871 remained just as unfruitful as the surprise attack of 1848.

It was believed that the militant proletariat had been finally buried with the Paris Commune. But, completely to the contrary, it dates its most powerful resurgence from the Commune and the Franco-Prussian War. The recruitment of the whole of the population able to bear arms into armies that henceforth could be counted only in millions, and the introduction of firearms, projectiles and explosives of hitherto undreamt-of efficacy, created a complete revolution in all warfare. This revolution, on the one hand, put a sudden end to the Bonapartist war period and ensured peaceful industrial development by making any war other than a world war of unheard-of cruelty and absolutely incalculable outcome an impossibility. On the other hand, it caused military expenditure to rise in geometrical progression and thereby forced up taxes to exorbitant levels and so drove the poorer classes of people into the arms of socialism. The annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, the immediate cause of the mad competition in armaments, was able to set the French and German bourgeoisie chauvinistically at each other’s throats; for the workers of the two countries it became a new bond of unity. And the anniversary of the Paris Commune became the first universal day of celebration of the whole proletariat.

The war of 1870-71 and the defeat of the Commune transferred the centre of gravity of the European workers’ movement for the time being from France to Germany, as Marx had foretold. In France it naturally took years to recover from the blood-letting of May 1871. In Germany, on the other hand, where industry—fostered, in addition, in positively hothouse fashion by the blessing of the French milliards—developed more and more rapidly, Social-Democracy experienced a still more rapid and enduring growth. Thanks to the intelligent use which the German workers made of the universal suffrage introduced in 1866, the astonishing growth of the party is made plain to all the world by incontestable figures: 1871, 102,000; 1874, 352,000; 1877, 493,000 Social-Democratic votes. Then came recognition of this advance by high authority in the shape of the Anti-Socialist Law; the party was temporarily broken up, the number of votes dropped to 312,000 in 1881. But that was quickly overcome, and then, under the pressure of the Exceptional Law, without a press, without a legal organisation and without the right of combination and assembly, rapid expansion really began: 1884, 550,000; 1887, 763,000; 1890, 1,427,000 votes. Thereupon the hand of the state was paralysed. The Anti-Socialist Law disappeared; socialist votes rose to
1,787,000, over a quarter of all the votes cast. The government and the ruling classes had exhausted all their expedients—uselessly, purposelessly, unsuccessfully. The tangible proofs of their impotence, which the authorities, from night watchman to the imperial chancellor, had had to accept—and that from the despised workers!—these proofs were counted in millions. The state was at the end of its tether, the workers only at the beginning of theirs.

But, besides, the German workers rendered a second great service to their cause in addition to the first, a service performed by their mere existence as the strongest, best disciplined and most rapidly growing Socialist Party. They supplied their comrades in all countries with a new weapon, and one of the sharpest, when they showed them how to make use of universal suffrage.

There had long been universal suffrage in France, but it had fallen into disrepute through the misuse to which the Bonapartist government had put it. After the Commune there was no workers' party to make use of it. It also existed in Spain since the republic, but in Spain boycott of elections was ever the rule of all serious opposition parties. The experience of the Swiss with universal suffrage was also anything but encouraging for a workers' party. The revolutionary workers of the Latin countries had been wont to regard the suffrage as a snare, as an instrument of government trickery. It was otherwise in Germany. The Communist Manifesto had already proclaimed the winning of universal suffrage, of democracy, as one of the first and most important tasks of the militant proletariat, and Lassalle had again taken up this point. Now, when Bismarck found himself compelled to introduce this franchise as the only means of interesting the mass of the people in his plans, our workers immediately took it in earnest and sent August Bebel to the first, constituent Reichstag. And from that day on, they have used the franchise in a way which has paid them a thousandfold and has served as a model to the workers of all countries. The franchise has been, in the words of the French Marxist programme, transformé, de moyen de duperie qu'il a été jusqu'ici, en instrument d'émancipation—transformed by them from a means of deception, which it was before, into an instrument of emancipation. And if universal suffrage had offered no other advantage than that it allowed us to count our numbers every three years; that by the regularly established, unexpectedly rapid rise in the number of our votes it increased in equal measure the workers' certainty of victory and the dismay of their opponents, and so became our best means of propaganda; that it accurately informed
us concerning our own strength and that of all hostile parties. and thereby provided us with a measure of proportion for our actions second to none, safeguarding us from untimely timidity as much as from untimely foolhardiness—if this had been the only advantage we gained from the suffrage, it would still have been much more than enough. But it did more than this by far. In election agitation it provided us with a means, second to none, of getting in touch with the mass of the people where they still stand aloof from us; of forcing all parties to defend their views and actions against our attacks before all the people; and, further, it provided our representatives in the Reichstag with a platform from which they could speak to their opponents in parliament, and to the masses without, with quite other authority and freedom than in the press or at meetings. Of what avail was their Anti-Socialist Law to the government and the bourgeoisie when election campaigning and socialist speeches in the Reichstag continually broke through it?

With this successful utilisation of universal suffrage, however, an entirely new method of proletarian struggle came into operation, and this method quickly developed further. It was found that the state institutions, in which the rule of the bourgeoisie is organised, offer the working class still further opportunities to fight these very state institutions. The workers took part in elections to particular Diets, to municipal councils and to trades courts; they contested with the bourgeoisie every post in the occupation of which a sufficient part of the proletariat had a say. And so it happened that the bourgeoisie and the government came to be much more afraid of the legal than of the illegal action of the workers’ party, of the results of elections than of those of rebellion.

For here, too, the conditions of the struggle had essentially changed. Rebellion in the old style; street fighting with barricades, which decided the issue everywhere up to 1848, was to a considerable extent obsolete.

Let us have no illusions about it: a real victory of an insurrection over the military in street fighting, a victory as between two armies, is one of the rarest exceptions. And the insurgents counted on it just as rarely. For them it was solely a question of making the troops yield to moral influences which, in a fight between the armies of two warring countries, do not come into play at all or do so to a much smaller extent. If they succeed in this, the troops fail to respond, or the commanding officers lose their heads, and the insurrection wins. If they do not succeed in this, then, even where the military are in the minority, the superiority of better equipment and training, of single lead-
ership, of the planned employment of the military forces and of discipline makes itself felt. The most that an insurrection can achieve in the way of actual tactical operations is the proper construction and defence of a single barricade. Mutual support, the disposition and employment of reserves—in short, concerted and co-ordinated action of the individual detachments, indispensable even for the defence of one section of a town, not to speak of the whole of a large town, will be attainable only to a very limited extent, and most of the time not at all. Concentration of the military forces at a decisive point is, of course, out of question here. Hence passive defence is the prevailing form of fighting; the attack will rise here and there, but only by way of exception, to occasional thrusts and flank assaults; as a rule, however, it will be limited to occupation of positions abandoned by retreating troops. In addition, the military have at their disposal artillery and fully equipped corps of trained engineers, resources of war which, in nearly every case, the insurgents entirely lack. No wonder, then, that even the barricade fighting conducted with the greatest heroism—Paris, June 1848; Vienna, October 1848; Dresden, May 1849—ended in the defeat of the insurrection as soon as the leaders of the attack, unhampered by political considerations, acted from the purely military standpoint, and their soldiers remained reliable.

The numerous successes of the insurgents up to 1848 were due to a great variety of causes. In Paris, in July 1830 and February 1848, as in most of the Spanish street fighting, a citizens' guard stood between the insurgents and the military. This guard either sided directly with the insurrection, or else by its lukewarm, indecisive attitude caused the troops likewise to vacillate, and supplied the insurrection with arms into the bargain. Where this citizens' guard opposed the insurrection from the outset, as in June 1848 in Paris, the insurrection was vanquished. In Berlin in 1848, the people were victorious partly through a considerable accession of new fighting forces during the night and the morning of [March] the 19th, partly as a result of the exhaustion and bad victualling of the troops, and, finally, partly as a result of the paralysis that was seizing the command. But in all cases the fight was won because the troops failed to respond, because the commanding officers lost the faculty to decide or because their hands were tied.

Even in the classic time of street fighting, therefore, the barricade produced more of a moral than a material effect. It was a means of shaking the steadfastness of the military. If it held out until this was attained, victory was won; if not, there was defeat. This is the main point, which must be kept in view, like-
wise, when the chances of possible future street fighting are examined.*

Already in 1849, these chances were pretty poor. Everywhere the bourgeoisie had thrown in its lot with the governments, “culture and property” had halled and feasted the military moving against insurrection. The spell of the barricade was broken; the soldier no longer saw behind it “the people,” but rebels, agitators, plunderers, levellers, the scum of society; the officer had in the course of time become versed in the tactical forms of street fighting, he no longer marched straight ahead and without cover against the improvised breastwork, but went round it through gardens, yards and houses. And this was now successful, with a little skill, in nine cases out of ten.

But since then there have been very many more changes, and all in favour of the military. If the big towns have become considerably bigger, the armies have become bigger still. Paris and Berlin have, since 1848, grown less than fourfold, but their garrisons have grown more than that. By means of the railways, these garrisons can, in twenty-four hours, be more than doubled, and in forty-eight hours they can be increased to huge armies. The arming of this enormously increased number of troops has become incomparably more effective. In 1848 the smooth-bore, muzzle-loading percussion gun, today the small-calibre, breech-loading magazine rifle, which shoots four times as far, ten times as accurately and ten times as fast as the former. At that time the relatively ineffective round shot and grape-shot of the artillery; today the percussion shells, of which one is sufficient to demolish the best barricade. At that time the pick-axe of the sapper for breaking through firewalls; today the dynamite cartridge.

On the other hand, all the conditions of the insurgents’ side have grown worse. An insurrection with which all sections of the people sympathise will hardly recur; in the class struggle all the middle strata will probably never group themselves round the proletariat so exclusively that in comparison the party of reaction gathered round the bourgeoisie will well-nigh disappear. The “people,” therefore, will always appear divided, and thus a most powerful lever, so extraordinarily effective in 1848, is gone. If more soldiers who have seen service came over to the insurrectionists, the arming of them would become so much the more difficult. The hunting and fancy guns of the munitions shops—even if not previously made unusable by removal of part

* In *Die Neue Zeit* and in the 1895 edition of *The Class Struggles in France*, this sentence is omitted.—*Ed.*
of the lock by order of the police—are far from being a match for the magazine rifle of the soldier, even in close fighting. Up to 1848 it was possible to make the necessary ammunition oneself out of powder and lead; today the cartridges differ for each gun, and are everywhere alike only in one point, namely, that they are a complicated product of big industry, and therefore not to be manufactured *ex tempore*, with the result that most guns are useless as long as one does not possess the ammunition specially suited to them. And, finally, since 1848 the newly built quarters of the big cities have been laid out in long, straight, broad streets, as though made to give full effect to the new cannon and rifles. The revolutionist would have to be mad who himself chose the new working-class districts in the North or East of Berlin for a barricade fight.

Does that mean that in the future street fighting will no longer play any role? Certainly not. It only means that the conditions since 1848 have become far more unfavourable for civilian fighters and far more favourable for the military. In future, street fighting can, therefore, be victorious only if this disadvantageous situation is compensated by other factors. Accordingly, it will occur more seldom in the beginning of a great revolution than in its further progress, and will have to be undertaken with greater forces. These, however, may then well prefer, as in the whole great French Revolution or on September 4 and October 31, 1870, in Paris, the open attack to the passive barricade tactics.*

Does the reader now understand why the powers that be positively want to get us to go where the guns shoot and the sabres slash? Why they accuse us today of cowardice, because we do not betake ourselves without more ado into the street, where we are certain of defeat in advance? Why they so earnestly implore us to play for once the part of cannon fodder?

The gentlemen pour out their prayers and their challenges for nothing, for absolutely nothing. We are not so stupid. They might just as well demand from their enemy in the next war that he should accept battle in the line formation of old Fritz,** or in the columns of whole divisions *à la* Wagram and Waterloo, and with the flint-lock in his hands at that. If conditions have changed in the case of war between nations, this is no less true in the case of the class struggle. The time of surprise attacks, of revolutions carried through by small conscious minorities at

---
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the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where it is a question of a complete transformation of the social organisation, the masses themselves must also be in it, must themselves already have grasped what is at stake, what they are going in for, body and soul.* The history of the last fifty years has taught us that. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, long, persistent work is required, and it is just this work that we are now pursuing, and with a success which drives the enemy to despair.

In the Latin countries, also, it is being realised more and more that the old tactics must be revised. Everywhere the German example of utilising the suffrage, of winning all posts accessible to us, has been imitated; everywhere the unprepared launching of an attack has been relegated to the background.** In France, where for more than a hundred years the ground has been undermined by revolution after revolution, where there is not a single party which has not done its share in conspiracies, insurrections and all other revolutionary actions; in France, where, as a result, the government is by no means sure of the army and where, in general, the conditions for an insurrectionary coup de main are far more favourable than in Germany—even in France the Socialists are realising more and more that no lasting victory is possible for them, unless they first win the great mass of the people, that is, in this case, the peasants. Slow propaganda work and parliamentary activity are recognised here, too, as the immediate tasks of the party. Successes were not lacking. Not only have a whole series of municipal councils been won; fifty Socialists have seats in the Chambers, and they have already overthrown three ministries and a president of the republic. In Belgium last year the workers forced the adoption of the franchise, and have been victorious in a quarter of the constituencies. In Switzerland, in Italy, in Denmark, yes, even in Bulgaria and Rumania the Socialists are represented in the parliaments. In Austria all parties agree that our admission to the Reichsrat can no longer be withheld. We will get in, that is certain; the only question still in dispute is: by which door? And even in Russia, when the famous Zemsky Sobor meets—that National Assembly to which young Nicholas offers such vain resistance—even there we can reckon with certainty on being represented in it.

* In Die Neue Zeit and in the 1895 edition of The Class Struggles in France, the words "what they should fight for" are given instead of "what they are going in for, body and soul".—Ed.
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Of course, our foreign comrades do not thereby in the least renounce their right to revolution. The right to revolution is, after all, the only really "historical right," the only right on which all modern states without exception rest, Mecklenburg included, whose aristocratic revolution was ended in 1755 by the "hereditary settlement" ["Erbvergleich"], the glorious charter of feudalism still valid today.\textsuperscript{95} The right to revolution is so incontestably recognised in the general consciousness that even General von Boguslawski derives the right to a coup d'\textsuperscript{état}, which he vindicates for his Kaiser, solely from this popular right.

But whatever may happen in other countries, the German Social-Democracy occupies a special position and therewith, at least in the immediate future, has a special task. The two million voters whom it sends to the ballot box, together with the young men and women who stand behind them as non-voters, form the most numerous, most compact mass, the decisive "shock force" of the international proletarian army. This mass already supplies over a fourth of the votes cast; and as the by-elections to the Reichstag, the Diet elections in individual states, the municipal council and trades court elections demonstrate, it increases incessantly. Its growth proceeds as spontaneously, as steadily, as irresistibly, and at the same time as tranquilly as a natural process. All government intervention has proved powerless against it. We can count even today on two and a quarter million voters. If it continues in this fashion, by the end of the century we shall conquer the greater part of the middle strata of society, petty bourgeois and small peasants, and grow into the decisive power in the land, before which all other powers will have to bow, whether they like it or not. To keep this growth going without interruption until it of itself gets beyond the control of the prevailing governmental system, not to fritter away this daily increasing shock force in vanguard skirmishes, but to keep it intact until the decisive day,\textsuperscript{*} that is our main task. And there is only one means by which the steady rise of the socialist fighting forces in Germany could be temporarily halted, and even thrown back for some time: a clash on a big scale with the military, a blood-letting like that of 1871 in Paris. In the long run that would also be overcome. To shoot a party which numbers millions out of existence is too much even for all the magazine rifles of Europe and America. But the normal development would be impeded, the shock force would, perhaps, not be

\textsuperscript{*} In Die Neue Zeit and the 1895 edition of The Class Struggles in France, the words "not to fritter away this daily increasing shock force in vanguard skirmishes, but to keep it intact until the decisive day" are omitted.—\textit{Ed.}
available at the critical moment, the decisive combat* would be
delayed, protracted and attended by heavier sacrifices.

The irony of world history turns everything upside down. We,
the “revolutionists,” the “overthrowers”—we are thriving far
better on legal methods than on illegal methods and overthrow.
The parties of Order, as they call themselves, are perishing under
the legal conditions created by themselves. They cry despairingly
with Odilon Barrot: la légalité nous tue, legality is the death of
us; whereas we, under this legality, get firm muscles and rosy
cheeks and look like life eternal. And if we are not so crazy as
to let ourselves be driven to street fighting in order to please
them, then in the end there is nothing left for them to do but
themselves break through this fatal legality.

Meanwhile they make new laws against overthrows. Again
everything is turned upside down. These anti-overthrow fanatics
of today, are they not themselves the overthrowers of yester-
day? Have we perchance evoked the civil war of 1866? Have
we driven the King of Hanover, the Elector of Hesse, and the
Duke of Nassau from their hereditary lawful domains and an-
nexed these hereditary domains? And these overthrowers of the
German Confederation and three crowns by the grace of God
complain of overthrow! Quis tulerit Grachos de seditione que-
rentes?** Who could allow the Bismarck worshippers to rail at
overthrow?

Let them, nevertheless, put through their anti-overthrow bills,
make them still worse, transform the whole penal law into in-
dia-rubber, they will gain nothing but new proof of their im-
potence. If they want to deal Social-Democracy a serious blow
they will have to resort to quite other measures, in addition. They
can cope with the Social-Democratic overthrow, which just now
is doing so well by keeping the law, only by an overthrow on
the part of the parties of Order, an overthrow which cannot live
without breaking the law. Herr Rössler, the Prussian bureaucrat,
and Herr von Boguslawski, the Prussian general, have shown
them the only way perhaps still possible of getting at the work-
ers, who simply refuse to let themselves be lured into street fight-
ing. Breach of the constitution, dictatorship, return to absolut-
ism, regis voluntas suprema lex!*** Therefore, take courage, gen-

* In Die Neue Zeit and the 1895 edition of The Class Struggles in France,
the words “the shock force would, perhaps, not be available at the critical
moment” are omitted, and the word “decision” is given instead of “the decisive
combat”.—Ed.

** Who would suffer the Gracchi to complain of sedition? (Juvenal, Satire
II.)—Ed.

*** The King’s will is the supreme law!—Ed.
tlemen; here half measures will not do; here you must go the whole hog!

But do not forget that the German empire, like all small states and generally all modern states, is a product of contract; of the contract, first, of the princes with one another and, second, of the princes with the people. If one side breaks the contract, the whole contract falls to the ground; the other side is then also no longer bound, as Bismarck demonstrated to us so beautifully in 1866. If, therefore, you break the constitution of the Reich, the Social-Democracy is free, and can do as it pleases with regard to you. But it will hardly blurt out to you today what it is going to do then.  

It is now, almost to the year, sixteen centuries since a dangerous party of overthrow was likewise active in the Roman empire. It undermined religion and all the foundations of the state; it flatly denied that Caesar's will was the supreme law; it was without a fatherland, was international; it spread over all countries of the empire, from Gaul to Asia, and beyond the frontiers of the empire. It had long carried on seditious activities in secret, underground; for a considerable time, however, it had felt itself strong enough to come out into the open. This party of overthrow, which was known by the name of Christians, was also strongly represented in the army; whole legions were Christian. When they were ordered to attend the sacrificial ceremonies of the pagan established church, in order to do the honours there, the subversive soldiers had the audacity to stick peculiar emblems—crosses—on their helmets in protest. Even the wonted barrack bullying of their superior officers was fruitless. The Emperor Diocletian could no longer quietly look on while order, obedience and discipline in his army were being undermined. He interfered energetically, while there was still time. He promul-gated an anti-Socialist—beg pardon, I meant to say anti-Christian—law. The meetings of the overthrowers were forbidden, their meeting halls were closed or even pulled down, the Christian emblems, crosses, etc., were, like the red handkerchiefs in Saxony, prohibited. Christians were declared incapable of holding public office; they were not to be allowed to become even corporals. Since there were not available at that time judges so well trained in "respect of persons" as Herr von Köller's anti-overthrow bill assumes, Christians were forbidden out of hand to seek justice before a court. This exceptional law was also

* In Die Neue Zeit and the 1895 edition of The Class Struggles in France, the words beginning with "as Bismarck demonstrated..." and to the end of the paragraph are omitted.—Ed.
without effect. The Christians tore it down from the walls with scorn; they are even supposed to have burnt the Emperor's palace in Nicomedia over his head. Then the latter revenged himself by the great persecution of Christians in the year 303 of our era. It was the last of its kind. And it was so effective that seventeen years later the army consisted overwhelmingly of Christians, and the succeeding autocrat of the whole Roman empire, Constantine, called the Great by the priests, proclaimed Christianity the state religion.

London, March 6, 1895

Published in abridged form in the journal Die Neue Zeit, Bd. 2, Nos. 27 and 28, 1894-95, and in the book: Karl Marx. Die Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich 1848 bis 1850. Berlin, 1895

Printed according to the galleys of the book, checked with the manuscript Translated from the German
With the exception of only a few chapters, every more important part of the annals of the revolution from 1848 to 1849 carries the heading: *Defeat of the revolution!*

What succumbed in these defeats was not the revolution. It was the pre-revolutionary traditional appendages, results of social relationships which had not yet come to the point of sharp class antagonisms—persons, illusions, conceptions, projects from which the revolutionary party before the February Revolution was not free, from which it could be freed not by the *victory of February*, but only by a series of *defeats*.

In a word: the revolution made progress, forged ahead, not by its immediate tragicomic achievements, but on the contrary by the creation of a powerful, united counter-revolution, by the creation of an opponent in combat with whom, only, the party of overthrow ripened into a really revolutionary party.

To prove this is the task of the following pages.
I

THE DEFEAT OF JUNE 1848

After the July Revolution, when the liberal banker Laffitte led his companion, the Duke of Orleans, in triumph to the Hôtel de Ville, he let fall the words: “From now on the bankers will rule.” Laffitte had betrayed the secret of the revolution.

It was not the French bourgeoisie that ruled under Louis Philippe, but one faction of it: bankers, stock-exchange kings, railway kings, owners of coal and iron mines and forests, a part of the landed proprietors associated with them—the so-called finance aristocracy. It sat on the throne, it dictated laws in the Chambers, it distributed public offices, from cabinet portfolios to tobacco bureau posts.

The industrial bourgeoisie proper formed part of the official opposition, that is, it was represented only as a minority in the Chambers. Its opposition was expressed all the more resolutely, the more unalloyed the autocracy of the finance aristocracy became, and the more it itself imagined that its domination over the working class was ensured after the mutinies of 1832, 1834 and 1839, which had been drowned in blood. Grandin, Rouen manufacturer and the most fanatical instrument of bourgeois reaction in the Constituent as well as in the Legislative National Assembly, was the most violent opponent of Guizot in the Chamber of Deputies. Léon Faucher, later known for his impotent efforts to climb into prominence as the Guizot of the French counter-revolution, in the last days of Louis Philippe waged a war of the pen for industry against speculation and its train bearer, the government. Bastiat agitated in the name of Bordeaux and the whole of wine-producing France against the ruling system.

The petty bourgeoisie of all gradations, and the peasantry also, were completely excluded from political power. Finally, in the official opposition or entirely outside the pays légal,* there were the ideological representatives and spokesmen of the above classes, their savants, lawyers, doctors, etc., in a word: their so-called men of talent.

Owing to its financial straits, the July monarchy was dependent from the beginning on the big bourgeoisie, and its dependence on the big bourgeoisie was the inexhaustible source of increasing financial straits. It was impossible to subordinate the administration of the state to the interests of national production without balancing the budget, without establishing a balance.

---

*Outside the circle of persons enjoying the right to vote.—Ed.
between state expenditures and revenues. And how was this balance to be established without limiting state expenditures, that is, without encroaching on interests which were so many props of the ruling system, and without redistributing taxes, that is, without shifting a considerable share of the burden of taxation onto the shoulders of the big bourgeoisie itself?

On the contrary, the faction of the bourgeoisie that ruled and legislated through the Chambers had a direct interest in the indebtedness of the state. The state deficit was really the main object of its speculation and the chief source of its enrichment. At the end of each year a new deficit. After the lapse of four or five years a new loan. And every new loan offered new opportunities to the finance aristocracy for defrauding the state, which was kept artificially on the verge of bankruptcy—it had to negotiate with the bankers under the most unfavourable conditions. Each new loan gave a further opportunity, that of plundering the public which invested its capital in state bonds by means of stock-exchange manipulations, into the secrets of which the government and the majority in the Chambers were initiated. In general, the instability of state credit and the possession of state secrets gave the bankers and their associates in the Chambers and on the throne the possibility of evoking sudden, extraordinary fluctuations in the quotations of government securities, the result of which was always bound to be the ruin of a mass of smaller capitalists and the fabulously rapid enrichment of the big gamblers. As the state deficit was in the direct interest of the ruling faction of the bourgeoisie, it is clear why the extraordinary state expenditure in the last years of Louis Philippe's reign was far more than double the extraordinary state expenditure under Napoleon, indeed reached a yearly sum of nearly 400,000,000 francs, whereas the whole average annual export of France seldom attained a volume amounting to 750,000,000 francs. The enormous sums which, in this way, flowed through the hands of the state facilitated, moreover, swindling contracts for deliveries, bribery, defalcations and all kinds of roguery. The defrauding of the state, practised wholesale in connection with loans, was repeated retail in public works. What occurred in the relations between Chamber and Government became multiplied in the relations between individual departments and individual entrepreneurs.

The ruling class exploited the building of railways in the same way as it exploited state expenditures in general and state loans. The Chambers piled the main burdens on the state, and secured the golden fruits to the speculating finance aristocracy. One recalls the scandals in the Chamber of Deputies, when by,
chance it leaked out that all the members of the majority, including a number of ministers, had been interested as shareholders in the very railway constructions which as legislators they caused to be carried out afterwards at the cost of the state.

On the other hand, the smallest financial reform was wrecked due to the influence of the bankers. For example, the postal reform. Rothschild protested. Was it permissible for the state to curtail sources of revenue out of which interest was to be paid on its ever-increasing debt?

The July monarchy was nothing other than a joint-stock company for the exploitation of France’s national wealth, the dividends of which were divided among ministers, Chambers, 240,000 voters and their adherents. Louis Philippe was the director of this company—Robert Macaire on the throne. Trade, industry, agriculture, shipping, the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie, were bound to be continually endangered and prejudiced under this system. Cheap government, gouvernement à bon marché, was what it had inscribed in the July days on its banner.

Since the finance aristocracy made the laws, was at the head of the administration of the state, had command of all the organised public authorities, dominated public opinion through the actual state of affairs and through the press, the same prostitution, the same shameless cheating, the same mania to get rich was repeated in every sphere, from the Court to the Café Borgne,* to get rich not by production, but by pocketing the already available wealth of others. Clashing every moment with the bourgeois laws themselves, an unbridled assertion of unhealthy and dissolute appetites manifested itself, particularly at the top of bourgeois society—lusts wherein wealth derived from gambling naturally seeks its satisfaction, where pleasure becomes debauched, where money, filth and blood commingle. The finance aristocracy, in its mode of acquisition as well as in its pleasures, is nothing but the rebirth of the lumpenproletariat on the heights of bourgeois society.

And the non-ruling factions of the French bourgeoisie cried: corruption! The people cried: à bas les grands voleurs! à bas les assassins!* when in 1847, on the most prominent stages of bourgeois society, the same scenes were publicly enacted that regularly lead the lumpenproletariat to brothels, to workhouses and lunatic asylums, to the bar of justice, to the dungeon and to the scaffold. The industrial bourgeoisie saw its interests en-

* Café Borgne: This term was applied in France to cafés of dubious character.—Ed.
** Down with the big thieves, down with the assassins!—Ed.
dangered, the petty bourgeoisie was filled with moral indignation, the imagination of the people was offended, Paris was flooded with pamphlets—"The Rothschild Dynasty," "Usuers Kings of the Epoch," etc.—in which the rule of the finance aristocracy was denounced and stigmatised with greater or less wit.

*Rien pour la gloire!* Glory brings no profit! *La paix partout et toujours!* War depresses the quotations of the three and four per cents! the France of the Bourse jobbers had inscribed on her banner. Her foreign policy was therefore lost in a series of mortifications to French national sentiment, which reacted all the more vigorously when the rape of Poland was brought to its conclusion with the incorporation of Cracow by Austria,58 and when Guizot came out actively on the side of the Holy Alliance73 in the Swiss Sonderbund war.100 The victory of the Swiss liberals in this mimic war raised the self-respect of the bourgeois opposition in France; the bloody uprising of the people in Palermo worked like an electric shock on the paralysed masses of the people and awoke their great revolutionary memories and passions.**

The eruption of the general discontent was finally accelerated and the mood for revolt ripened by *two economic world events.*

The *potato blight* and the *crop failures* of 1845 and 1846 increased the general ferment among the people. The dearth of 1847 called forth bloody conflicts in France as well as on the rest of the Continent. As against the shameless orgies of the finance aristocracy, the struggle of the people for the prime necessities of life! At Buzançais, hunger rioters executed101; in Paris, oversatiated *escrocs*** snatched from the courts by the royal family!

The second great economic event which hastened the outbreak of the revolution was a *general commercial and industrial crisis* in England. Already heralded in the autumn of 1845 by the wholesale reverses of the speculators in railway shares, staved off during 1846 by a number of incidents such as the impending abolition of the corn duties, the crisis finally burst in the autumn of 1847 with the bankruptcy of the London wholesale grocers, on the heels of which followed the insolvencies of the land banks and the closing of the factories in the English industrial districts.

---

* Nothing for glory!—Ed.
** Peace everywhere and always!—Ed.
*** Annexation of Cracow by Austria agreement with Russia and Prussia on November 11, 1846.—Swiss Sonderbund war: November 4 to 28, 1847.—Rising in Palermo January 12, 1848; at the end of January, nine days' bombardment of the town by the Neapolitans. [Note by Engels to the edition of 1895.]
**** Escrocs: Swindlers.—Ed.
The after-effect of this crisis on the Continent had not yet spent itself when the February Revolution broke out.

The devastation of trade and industry caused by the economic epidemic made the autocracy of the finance aristocracy still more unbearable. Throughout the whole of France the bourgeois opposition agitated at banquets for an electoral reform which should win for it the majority in the Chambers and overthrow the Ministry of the Bourse. In Paris the industrial crisis had, moreover, the particular result of throwing a multitude of manufacturers and big traders, who under the existing circumstances could no longer do any business in the foreign market, onto the home market. They set up large establishments, the competition of which ruined the small épiciers* and boutiquiers** en masse. Hence the innumerable bankruptcies among this section of the Paris bourgeoisie, and hence their revolutionary action in February. It is well known how Guizot and the Chambers answered the reform proposals with an unambiguous challenge, how Louis Philippe too late resolved on a Ministry led by Barrot, how things went as far as hand-to-hand fighting between the people and the army, how the army was disarmed by the passive conduct of the National Guard, how the July monarchy had to give way to a Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government which emerged from the February barricades necessarily mirrored in its composition the different parties which shared in the victory. It could not be anything but a compromise between the different classes which together had overthrown the July throne, but whose interests were mutually antagonistic. The great majority of its members consisted of representatives of the bourgeoisie. The republican petty bourgeoisie was represented by Ledru-Rollin and Flocon, the republican bourgeoisie by the people from the National, the dynastic opposition by Crémieux, Dupont de l'Eure, etc. The working class had only two representatives, Louis Blanc and Albert. Finally, Lamartine in the Provisional Government, this was at first no real interest, no definite class; this was the February Revolution itself, the common uprising with its illusions, its poetry, its visionary content and its phrases. For the rest, the spokesman of the February Revolution, by his position and his views, belonged to the bourgeoisie.

If Paris, as a result of political centralisation, rules France, the workers, in moments of revolutionary earthquakes, rule Paris. The first act in the life of the Provisional Government was

---

* Épiciers: Storekeepers.—Ed.
** Boutiquiers: Shopkeepers.—Ed.
an attempt to escape from this overpowering influence by an appeal from intoxicated Paris to sober France. Lamartine disputed the right of the barricade fighters to proclaim a republic on the ground that only the majority of Frenchmen had that right; they must await their votes, the Paris proletariat must not besmirch its victory by a usurpation. The bourgeoisie allows the proletariat only one usurpation—that of fighting.

Up to noon of February 25 the republic had not yet been proclaimed; on the other hand, all the ministries had already been divided among the bourgeois elements of the Provisional Government and among the generals, bankers and lawyers of the National. But the workers were determined this time not to put up with any bamboozlement like that of July 1830. They were ready to take up the fight anew and to get a republic by force of arms. With this message, Raspail betook himself to the Hôtel de Ville. In the name of the Paris proletariat he commanded the Provisional Government to proclaim a republic; if this order of the people were not fulfilled within two hours, he would return at the head of 200,000 men. The bodies of the fallen were scarcely cold, the barricades were not yet cleared away, the workers not yet disarmed, and the only force which could be opposed to them was the National Guard. Under these circumstances the doubts born of considerations of state policy and the juristic scruples of conscience entertained by the Provisional Government suddenly vanished. The time limit of two hours had not yet expired when all the walls of Paris were resplendent with the gigantesque historical words:

République française!
Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité!

Even the memory of the limited aims and motives which drove the bourgeoisie into the February Revolution was extinguished by the proclamation of the republic on the basis of universal suffrage. Instead of only a few factions of the bourgeoisie, all classes of French society were suddenly hurled into the orbit of political power, forced to leave the boxes, the stalls and the gallery and to act in person upon the revolutionary stage! With the constitutional monarchy vanished also the semblance of a state power independently confronting bourgeois society as well as the whole series of subordinate struggles which this semblance of power called forth!

By dictating the republic to the Provisional Government and through the Provisional Government to the whole of France, the proletariat stepped into the foreground forthwith as an independent party, but at the same time challenged the whole of
bourgeois France to enter the lists against it. What it won was the terrain for the fight for its revolutionary emancipation, but by no means this emancipation itself.

The first thing that the February republic had to do was, rather, to complete the rule of the bourgeoisie by allowing, beside the finance aristocracy, all the propertied classes to enter the orbit of political power. The majority of the great landowners, the Legitimists, were emancipated from the political nullity to which they had been condemned by the July monarchy. Not for nothing had the Gazette de France agitated in common with the opposition papers; not for nothing had La Rochejaquelein taken the side of the revolution in the session of the Chamber of Deputies on February 24. The nominal proprietors, who form the great majority of the French people, the peasants, were put by universal suffrage in the position of arbiters of the fate of France. The February republic finally brought the rule of the bourgeoisie clearly into view, since it struck off the crown behind which capital kept itself concealed.

Just as the workers in the July days had fought for and won the bourgeois monarchy, so in the February days they fought for and won the bourgeois republic. Just as the July monarchy had to proclaim itself a monarchy surrounded by republican institutions, so the February republic was forced to proclaim itself a republic surrounded by social institutions. The Paris proletariat compelled this concession, too.

Marche, a worker, dictated the decree by which the newly formed Provisional Government pledged itself to guarantee the workers a livelihood by means of labour, to provide work for all citizens, etc. And when, a few days later, it forgot its promises and seemed to have lost sight of the proletariat, a mass of 20,000 workers marched on the Hôtel de Ville with the cry: Organise labour! Form a special Ministry of Labour! Reluctantly and after long debate, the Provisional Government nominated a permanent special commission charged with finding means of improving the lot of the working classes! This commission consisted of delegates from the corporations of Paris artisans and was presided over by Louis Blanc and Albert. The Luxembourg palace was assigned to it as its meeting place. In this way the representatives of the working class were banished from the seat of the Provisional Government, the bourgeoisie part of which retained the real state power and the reins of administration exclusively in its hands; and side by side with the ministries of Finance, Trade and Public Works, side by side with the Bank and the Bourse, there arose a socialist synagogue whose high priests, Louis Blanc and Albert, had the task of discovering the
promised land, of preaching the new gospel and of providing work for the Paris proletariat. Unlike any profane state power, they had no budget, no executive authority at their disposal. They were supposed to break the pillars of bourgeois society by dashing their heads against them. While the Luxembourg sought the philosopher’s stone, in the Hôtel de Ville they minted the current coinage.

And yet the claims of the Paris proletariat, so far as they went beyond the bourgeois republic, could win no other existence than the nebulous one of the Luxembourg.

In common with the bourgeoisie the workers had made the February Revolution, and alongside the bourgeoisie they sought to secure the advancement of their interests, just as they had installed a worker in the Provisional Government itself alongside the bourgeois majority. Organise labour! But wage labour, that is the existing, the bourgeois organisation of labour. Without it there is no capital, no bourgeoisie, no bourgeois society. A special Ministry of Labour! But the ministries of Finance, of Trade, of Public Works—are not these the bourgeois ministries of labour? And alongside these a proletarian Ministry of Labour had to be a ministry of impotence, a ministry of pious wishes, a Luxembourg Commission. Just as the workers thought they would be able to emancipate themselves side by side with the bourgeoisie, so they thought they would be able to consummate a proletarian revolution within the national walls of France, side by side with the remaining bourgeois nations. But French relations of production are conditioned by the foreign trade of France, by her position on the world market and the laws thereof; how was France to break them without a European revolutionary war, which would strike back at the despot of the world market, England?

As soon as it has risen up, a class in which the revolutionary interests of society are concentrated finds the content and the material for its revolutionary activity directly in its own situation: foes to be laid low, measures dictated by the needs of the struggle to be taken; the consequences of its own deeds drive it on. It makes no theoretical inquiries into its own task. The French working class had not attained this level; it was still incapable of accomplishing its own revolution.

The development of the industrial proletariat is, in general, conditioned by the development of the industrial bourgeoisie. Only under its rule does the proletariat gain that extensive national existence which can raise its revolution to a national one, and does it itself create the modern means of production, which become just so many means of its revolutionary emancipation.
Only its rule tears up the material roots of feudal society and levels the ground on which alone a proletarian revolution is possible. French industry is more developed and the French bourgeoisie more revolutionary than that of the rest of the Continent. But was not the February Revolution levelled directly against the finance aristocracy? This fact proved that the industrial bourgeoisie did not rule France. The industrial bourgeoisie can rule only where modern industry shapes all property relations to suit itself, and industry can win this power only where it has conquered the world market, for national bounds are inadequate for its development. But French industry, to a great extent, maintains its command even of the national market only through a more or less modified system of prohibitive duties. While, therefore, the French proletariat, at the moment of a revolution, possesses in Paris actual power and influence which spur it on to a drive beyond its means, in the rest of France it is crowded into separate, scattered industrial centres, being almost lost in the superior numbers of peasants and petty bourgeois. The struggle against capital in its developed, modern form, in its decisive aspect, the struggle of the industrial wage-worker against the industrial bourgeoisie, is in France a partial phenomenon, which after the February days could so much the less supply the national content of the revolution, since the struggle against capital's secondary modes of exploitation, that of the peasant against usury and mortgages or of the petty bourgeoisie against the wholesale dealer, banker and manufacturer, in a word, against bankruptcy, was still hidden in the general uprising against the finance aristocracy. Nothing is more understandable, then, than that the Paris proletariat sought to secure the advancement of its own interests side by side with those of the bourgeoisie, instead of enforcing them as the revolutionary interests of society itself, that it let the red flag be lowered to the tricolour. The French workers could not take a step forward, could not touch a hair of the bourgeois order, until the course of the revolution had aroused the mass of the nation, peasants and petty bourgeois, standing between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, against this order, against the rule of capital, and had forced it to attach itself to the proletarians as their protagonists. The workers could buy this victory only through the tremendous defeat in June.

The Luxembourg Commission, this creation of the Paris workers, must be given the credit of having disclosed, from a Europe-wide tribune, the secret of the revolution of the nineteenth century: the emancipation of the proletariat. The Moniteur redened when it had to propagate officially the "wild ravings"
which up to that time lay buried in the apocryphal writings of the Socialists and reached the ear of the bourgeoisie only from time to time as remote, half terrifying, half ludicrous legends. Europe awoke astonished from its bourgeois doze. Therefore, in the minds of the proletarians, who confused the finance aristocracy with the bourgeoisie in general; in the imagination of the good old republicans who denied the very existence of classes or, at most, admitted them as a result of the constitutional monarchy; in the hypocritical phrases of the factions of the bourgeoisie which up to now had been excluded from power, the rule of the bourgeoisie was abolished with the introduction of the republic. At that time all the royalists were transformed into republicans and all the millionaires of Paris into workers. The phrase which corresponded to this imaginary abolition of class relations was fraternité, universal fraternisation and brotherhood. This pleasant abstraction from class antagonisms, this sentimental reconciliation of contradictory class interests, this visionary elevation above the class struggle, this fraternité was the real catchword of the February Revolution. The classes were divided by a mere misunderstanding and Lamartine baptised the Provisional Government on February 24 “un gouvernement qui suspende ce malentendu terrible qui existe entre les différentes classes.” The Paris proletariat revelled in this magnificent intoxication of fraternity.

The Provisional Government, on its part, once it was compelled to proclaim the republic, did everything to make it acceptable to the bourgeoisie and to the provinces. The bloody terror of the first French republic was disavowed by the abolition of the death penalty for political offences; the press was opened to all opinions; the army, the courts, the administration remained with a few exceptions in the hands of their old dignitaries; none of the July monarchy’s great offenders was brought to book. The bourgeois republicans of the National amused themselves by exchanging monarchist names and costumes for old republican ones. To them the republic was only a new ball dress for the old bourgeois society. The young republic sought its chief merit not in frightening, but rather in constantly taking fright itself, and in winning existence and disarming resistance by the soft compliance and non-resistance of its existence. At home to the privileged classes, abroad to the despotic powers, it was loudly announced that the republic was of a peaceful nature. Live and let live was its professed motto. In addition thereto, shortly after the February Revolution the

* “A government that removes this terrible misunderstanding which exists between the different classes.”—Ed.
Germans, Poles, Austrians, Hungarians and Italians revolted, each people in accordance with its immediate situation. Russia and England—the latter itself agitated, the former cowed—were not prepared. The republic, therefore, had no national enemy to face. Consequently, there were no great foreign complications which could fire the energies, hasten the revolutionary process, drive the Provisional Government forward or throw it overboard. The Paris proletariat, which looked upon the republic as its own creation, naturally acclaimed each act of the Provisional Government which facilitated the firm emplacement of the latter in bourgeois society. It willingly allowed itself to be employed on police service by Caussidière in order to protect property in Paris, just as it allowed Louis Blanc to arbitrate wage disputes between workers and masters. It made it a point d'honneur to preserve the bourgeois honour of the republic unblemished in the eyes of Europe.

The republic encountered no resistance either abroad or at home. This disarmed it. Its task was no longer the revolutionary transformation of the world, but consisted only in adapting itself to the relations of bourgeois society. Concerning the fanaticism with which the Provisional Government undertook this task there is no more eloquent testimony than its financial measures.

Public credit and private credit were naturally shaken. Public credit rests on confidence that the state will allow itself to be exploited by the wolves of finance. But the old state had vanished and the revolution was directed above all against the finance aristocracy. The vibrations of the last European commercial crisis had not yet ceased. Bankruptcy still followed bankruptcy.

Private credit was therefore paralysed, circulation restricted, production at a standstill before the February Revolution broke out. The revolutionary crisis increased the commercial crisis. And if private credit rests on confidence that bourgeois production in the entire scope of its relations, that the bourgeois order, will not be touched, will remain inviolate, what effect must a revolution have had which questioned the basis of bourgeois production, the economic slavery of the proletariat, which set up against the Bourse the sphinx of the Luxembourg? The uprising of the proletariat is the abolition of bourgeois credit; for it is the abolition of bourgeois production and its order. Public credit and private credit are the economic thermometer by which the intensity of a revolution can be measured. The more they fall, the more the fervour and generative power of the revolution rises.

The Provisional Government wanted to strip the republic of its anti-bourgeois appearance. And so it had, above all, to try to peg the exchange value of this new form of state, its quotation
on the Bourse. Private credit necessarily rose again, together with the current Bourse quotation of the republic.

In order to allay the very suspicion that it would not or could not honour the obligations assumed by the monarchy, in order to build up confidence in the republic’s bourgeois morality and capacity to pay, the Provisional Government took refuge in bragadocio as undignified as it was childish. In advance of the legal date of payment it paid out the interest on the 5 per cent, 4½ per cent and 4 per cent bonds to the state creditors. The bourgeois aplomb, the self-assurance of the capitalists, suddenly awoke when they saw the anxious haste with which it was sought to buy their confidence.

The financial embarrassment of the Provisional Government was naturally not lessened by a theatrical stroke which robbed it of its stock of ready cash. The financial pinch could no longer be concealed and petty bourgeois, domestic servants and workers had to pay for the pleasant surprise which had been prepared for the state creditors.

It was announced that no more money could be drawn on savings bank books for an amount of over one hundred francs. The sums deposited in the savings banks were confiscated and by decree transformed into an irredeemable state debt. This embittered the already hard pressed petty bourgeois against the republic. Since he received state debt certificates in place of his savings bank books, he was forced to go to the Bourse in order to sell them and thus deliver himself directly into the hands of the Bourse jobbers, against whom he had made the February Revolution.

The finance aristocracy, which ruled under the July monarchy, had its high church in the Bank. Just as the Bourse governs state credit, the Bank governs commercial credit.

Directly threatened not only in its rule but in its very existence by the February Revolution, the Bank tried from the outset to discredit the republic by making the lack of credit general. It suddenly stopped the credits of the bankers, the manufacturers and the merchants. As it did not immediately call forth a counter-revolution, this manoeuvre necessarily reacted on the Bank itself. The capitalists drew out the money which they had deposited in the vaults of the Bank. The possessors of bank notes rushed to the pay office in order to exchange them for gold and silver.

The Provisional Government could have forced the Bank into bankruptcy without forcible interference, in a legal manner; it would only have had to remain passive and leave the Bank to its fate. The bankruptcy of the Bank would have been the deluge
which in a trice would have swept from French soil the finance aristocracy, the most powerful and dangerous enemy of the republic, the golden pedestal of the July monarchy. And once the Bank was bankrupt, the bourgeoisie itself would have had to regard it as a last desperate attempt at rescue, if the government had formed a national bank and subjected national credit to the control of the nation.

The Provisional Government, on the contrary, fixed a compulsory quotation for the notes of the Bank. It did more. It transformed all provincial banks into branches of the Banque de France and allowed it to cast its net over the whole of France. Later it pledged the state forests to the Bank as a guarantee for a loan that it contracted from it. In this way the February Revolution directly strengthened and enlarged the bankocracy which it should have overthrown.

Meanwhile the Provisional Government was writhing under the incubus of a growing deficit. In vain it begged for patriotic sacrifices. Only the workers threw it their alms. Recourse had to be had to a heroic measure, to the imposition of a new tax. But who was to be taxed? The Bourse wolves, the bank kings, the state creditors, the rentiers, the industrialists? That was not the way to ingratiate the republic with the bourgeoisie. That would have meant, on the one hand, to endanger state credit and commercial credit, while, on the other, attempts were made to purchase them with such great sacrifices and humiliations. But someone had to fork out the cash. Who was sacrificed to bourgeois credit? Jacques le bonhomme,* the peasant.

The Provisional Government imposed an additional tax of 45 centimes in the franc on the four direct taxes. The government press cajoled the Paris proletariat into believing that this tax would fall chiefly on the big landed proprietors, on the possessors of the milliard granted by the Restoration.106 But in truth it hit the peasant class above all, that is, the large majority of the French people. They had to pay the costs of the February Revolution; in them the counter-revolution gained its main material. The 45 centimes tax was a question of life and death for the French peasant; he made it a life-and-death question for the republic. From that moment the republic meant to the French peasant the 45 centimes tax, and he saw in the Paris proletariat the spendthrift who did himself well at his expense.

Whereas the Revolution of 1789 began by shaking the feudal burdens off the peasants, the Revolution of 1848 announced
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* Jacques le bonhomme: A contemptuous nickname applied by the French landowners to the peasants.—Ed.
itself to the rural population by the imposition of a new tax, in order not to endanger capital and to keep its state machine going.

There was only one means by which the Provisional Government could set aside all these inconveniences and jerk the state out of its old rut—a declaration of state bankruptcy. Everyone recalls how Ledru-Rollin in the National Assembly subsequently recited the virtuous indignation with which he repudiated this presumptuous proposal of the Bourse wolf Fould, now French Finance Minister. Fould had handed him the apple from the tree of knowledge.

By honouring the bills drawn on the state by the old bourgeois society, the Provisional Government succumbed to the latter. It had become the hard pressed debtor of bourgeois society instead of confronting it as the pressing creditor that had to collect the revolutionary debts of many years. It had to consolidate the shaky bourgeois relationships in order to fulfil obligations which are only to be fulfilled within these relationships. Credit became a condition of life for it, and the concessions to the proletariat, the promises made to it, became so many fetters which had to be struck off. The emancipation of the workers—even as a phrase—became an unbearable danger to the new republic, for it was a standing protest against the restoration of credit, which rests on undisturbed and untroubled recognition of the existing economic class relations. Therefore, it was necessary to have done with the workers.

The February Revolution had cast the army out of Paris. The National Guard, that is, the bourgeoisie in its different gradations, constituted the sole power. Alone, however, it did not feel itself a match for the proletariat. Moreover, it was forced gradually and piecemeal to open its ranks and admit armed proletarians, albeit after the most tenacious resistance and after setting up hundred different obstacles. There consequently remained but one way out: to play off one part of the proletariat against the other.

For this purpose the Provisional Government formed 24 battalions of Mobile Guards, each a thousand strong, composed of young men from 15 to 20 years. They belonged for the most part to the lumpenproletariat, which in all big towns forms a mass sharply differentiated from the industrial proletariat, a recruiting ground for thieves and criminals of all kinds, living on the crumbs of society, people without a definite trade, vagabonds, gens sans feu et sans aveu,* varying according to the

* Folk without hearth or home.—Ed.
degree of civilisation of the nation to which they belong, but never renouncing their *lazzaroni* character; at the youthful age at which the Provisional Government recruited them, thoroughly malleable, as capable of the most heroic deeds and the most exalted sacrifices as of the basest banditry and the foulest corruption. The Provisional Government paid them 1 franc 50 centimes a day, that is, it bought them. It gave them their own uniform, that is, it made them outwardly distinct from the blouse-wearing workers. In part it had assigned them officers from the standing army as leaders; in part they themselves elected young sons of the bourgeoisie whose rodomontades about death for the fatherland and devotion to the republic captivated them.

And so the Paris proletariat was confronted with an army, drawn from its own midst, of 24,000 young, strong, foolhardy men. It gave cheers for the Mobile Guard on its marches through Paris. It acknowledged it to be its foremost fighters on the barricades. It regarded it as the *proletarian* guard in contradistinction to the bourgeois National Guard. Its error was pardonable.

Besides the Mobile Guard, the government decided to rally round itself an army of industrial workers. A hundred thousand workers, thrown on the streets by the crisis and the revolution, were enrolled by the Minister Marie in so-called national *ateliers.* Under this grandiose name was hidden nothing else than the employment of the workers on tedious, monotonous, unproductive *earthworks* at a wage of 23 sous. *English workhouses* in the open—that is what these national *ateliers* were. The Provisional Government believed that it had formed, in them, a second proletarian army against the workers themselves. This time the bourgeoisie was mistaken in the national *ateliers,* just as the workers were mistaken in the Mobile Guard. It had created an army for mutiny.

But one purpose was achieved.

National *ateliers* was the name of the people's workshops, which Louis Blanc preached in the Luxembourg palace. Marie's *ateliers,* devised in direct *antagonism* to the Luxembourg, offered occasion, thanks to the common label, for a plot of errors worthy of the Spanish comedy of servants. The Provisional Government itself surreptitiously spread the report that these national *ateliers* were the discovery of Louis Blanc, and this seemed the more plausible because Louis Blanc, the prophet of the national *ateliers,* was a member of the Provisional Government. And in the half naive, half intentional confusion of the Paris
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* Ateliers: Workshops.—Ed.
bourgeoisie, in the artificially moulded opinion of France, of Europe, these workhouses were the first realisation of Socialism, which was put in the pillory with them.

In their appellation, though not in their content, the *national ateliers* were the embodied protest of the proletariat against bourgeois industry, bourgeois credit and the bourgeois republic. The whole hate of the bourgeoisie was, therefore, turned upon them. It had found in them, simultaneously, the point against which it could direct the attack, as soon as it was strong enough to break openly with the February illusions. All the discontent, all the ill humour of the *petty bourgeoisie* too was directed against these national ateliers, the common target. With real fury they reckoned up the sums that the proletarian loafers swallowed up, while their own situation was becoming daily more unbearable. A state pension for sham labour, so that's Socialism! they grumbled to themselves. They sought the reason for their misery in the national ateliers, the declamations of the Luxembourg, the processions of the workers through Paris. And no one was more fanatic about the alleged machinations of the Communists than the petty bourgeoisie, who hovered hopelessly on the brink of bankruptcy.

Thus in the approaching *mélée* between bourgeoisie and proletariat, all the advantages, all the decisive posts, all the middle strata of society were in the hands of the bourgeoisie, at the same time as the waves of the February Revolution rose high over the whole Continent, and each new post brought a new bulletin of revolution, now from Italy, now from Germany, now from the remotest parts of Southeastern Europe, and maintained the general ecstasy of the people, giving it constant testimony of a victory that it had already forfeited.

*March 17* and *April 16* were the first skirmishes in the big class struggle, which the bourgeois republic hid under its wings.

*March 17* revealed the ambiguous situation of the proletariat, which permitted of no decisive act. Its demonstration originally pursued the purpose of pushing the Provisional Government back onto the path of revolution, of effecting the exclusion of its bourgeois members, according to circumstances, and of compelling the postponement of the election days for the National Assembly and the National Guard. But on March 16 the bourgeoisie represented in the National Guard staged a hostile demonstration against the Provisional Government. With the cry: *à bas Ledru-Rollin!* it surged to the *Hôtel de Ville*. And the people were forced, on March 17, to shout: Long live Ledru-
Rollin! Long live the Provisional Government! They were forced
to take sides against the bourgeoisie in support of the bourgeois
republic, which seemed to them to be in danger. They strengthens
the Provisional Government, instead of subordinating it
to themselves. March 17 went off in a melodramatic scene, and
whereas the Paris proletariat on this day once more displayed
its giant body, the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Pro-
visional Government was all the more determined to smash it.

April 16 was a misunderstanding engineered by the Provision-
al Government in alliance with the bourgeoisie. The workers
had gathered in great numbers in the Field of Mars and in the
Hippodrome to prepare their elections to the general staff of
the National Guard. Suddenly throughout Paris, from one end
to the other, a rumour spread as quick as lightning, to the effect,
that the workers had met armed in the Field of Mars, under
the leadership of Louis Blanc, Blanqui, Cabot and Raspail, in
order to march thence on the Hôtel de Ville, overthrow the Pro-
visional Government and proclaim a communist government.
The general alarm is sounded—Ledru-Rollin, Marrast and La-
martine later contended for the honour of having initiated this
—and in an hour 100,000 men are under arms; the Hôtel de Ville
is occupied at all points by the National Guard; the cry:
Down with the Communists! Down with Louis Blanc, with
Blanqui, with Raspail, with Cabot! thunders throughout Paris.
Innumerable deputations pay homage to the Provisional Govern-
ment, all ready to save the fatherland and society. When the
workers finally appear before the Hôtel de Ville, in order to hand
over to the Provisional Government a patriotic collection which
they had made in the Field of Mars, they learn to their amazement
that bourgeois Paris had defeated their shadow in a very care-
fully calculated sham battle. The terrible attempt of April 16
furnished the excuse for recalling the army to Paris—the real
purpose of the clumsily staged comedy—and for the reactionary
federalist demonstrations in the provinces.

On May 4 the National Assembly,* the result of the direct
general elections, convened. Universal suffrage did not possess
the magic power which republicans of the old school had as-
cribed to it. They saw in the whole of France, at least in the
majority of Frenchmen, citoyens** with the same interests, the
same understanding, etc. This was their cult of the people.

* Here and below, up to page 251, by the National Assembly is meant
the Constituent National Assembly in power from May 4, 1848 to May
1849 (Constituanta).—Ed.
** Citoyens: Citizens.—Ed.
Instead of their imaginary people, the elections brought the real people to the light of day, that is, representatives of the different classes into which it falls. We have seen why peasants and petty bourgeois had to vote under the leadership of a bourgeoisie spoiling for a fight and of big landowners frantic for restoration. But if universal suffrage was not the miracle-working magic wand for which the republican worthies had taken it, it possessed the incomparably higher merit of unchaining the class struggle, of letting the various middle strata of bourgeois society rapidly get over their illusions and disappointments, of tossing all the sections of the exploiting class at one throw to the apex of the state, and thus tearing from them their deceptive mask, whereas the monarchy with its property qualifications only let certain factions of the bourgeoisie compromise themselves, allowing the others to lie hidden behind the scenes and surrounding them with the halo of a common opposition.

In the Constituent National Assembly, which met on May 4, the bourgeois republicans, the republicans of the National, had the upper hand. Even Legitimists and Orleanists at first dared to show themselves only under the mask of bourgeois republicanism. The fight against the proletariat could be undertaken only in the name of the republic.

The republic dates from May 4, not from February 25, that is, the republic recognised by the French people; it is not the republic which the Paris proletariat thrust upon the Provisional Government, not the republic with social institutions, not the vision which hovered before the fighters on the barricades. The republic proclaimed by the National Assembly, the sole legitimate republic, is a republic which is no revolutionary weapon against the bourgeois order, but rather its political reconstitution, the political reconsolidation of bourgeois society, in a word, a bourgeois republic. This contention resounded from the tribune of the National Assembly, and in the entire republican and anti-republican bourgeois press it found its echo.

And we have seen how the February republic in reality was not and could not be other than a bourgeois republic; how the Provisional Government, nevertheless, was forced by the immediate pressure of the proletariat to announce it as a republic with social institutions; how the Paris proletariat was still incapable of going beyond the bourgeois republic otherwise than in its fancy, in imagination; how everywhere it acted in its service when it really came to action; how the promises made to it became an unbearable danger for the new republic; how the whole life process of the Provisional Government was comprised in a continuous fight against the demands of the proletariat.
In the National Assembly all France sat in judgment upon the Paris proletariat. The Assembly broke immediately with the social illusions of the February Revolution; it roundly proclaimed the bourgeois republic, nothing but the bourgeois republic. It at once excluded the representatives of the proletariat. Louis Blanc and Albert, from the Executive Commission appointed by it; it threw out the proposal of a special Labour Ministry, and received with acclamation the statement of the Minister Trélat: "The question now is merely one of bringing labour back to its old conditions."

But all this was not enough. The February republic was won by the workers with the passive support of the bourgeoisie. The proletarians rightly regarded themselves as the victors of February, and they made the arrogant claims of victors. They had to be vanquished in the streets, they had to be shown that they were worsted as soon as they did not fight with the bourgeoisie, but against the bourgeoisie. Just as the February republic, with its socialist concessions, required a battle of the proletariat, united with the bourgeoisie, against the monarchy, so a second battle was necessary in order to sever the republic from the socialist concessions, in order to officially work out the bourgeois republic as dominant. The bourgeoisie had to refute, arms in hand, the demands of the proletariat. And the real birth-place of the bourgeois republic is not the February victory; it is the June defeat.

The proletariat hastened the decision when, on the 15th of May, it pushed its way into the National Assembly, sought in vain to recapture its revolutionary influence and only delivered its energetic leaders to the jailers of the bourgeoisie. It faut en finir! This situation must end! With this cry the National Assembly gave vent to its determination to force the proletariat into a decisive struggle. The Executive Commission issued a series of provocative decrees, such as that prohibiting congregations of people, etc. The workers were directly provoked, insulted and derided from the tribune of the Constituent National Assembly. But the real point of the attack was, as we have seen, the national ateliers. The Constituent Assembly imperiously pointed these out to the Executive Commission, which only waited to hear its own plan proclaimed the command of the National Assembly.

The Executive Commission began by making admission to the national ateliers more difficult, by turning the day wage into a piece wage, by banishing workers not born in Paris to the Sologne, ostensibly for the construction of earthworks. These earthworks were only a rhetorical formula with which to em-
bellish their exile, as the workers, returning disillusioned, announced to their comrades. Finally, on June 21, a decree appeared in the Moniteur which ordered the forcible expulsion of all unmarried workers from the national ateliers or their enrolment in the army.

The workers were left no choice; they had to starve or let fly. They answered on June 22 with the tremendous insurrection in which the first great battle was fought between the two classes that split modern society. It was a fight for the preservation or annihilation of the bourgeois order. The veil that shrouded the republic was torn asunder.

It is well known how the workers, with unexampled bravery and ingenuity, without leaders, without a common plan, without means and, for the most part, lacking weapons, held in check for five days the army, the Mobile Guard, the Paris National Guard, and the National Guard that streamed in from the provinces. It is well known how the bourgeoisie compensated itself for the mortal anguish it suffered by unheard-of brutality, massacring over 3,000 prisoners.

The official representatives of French democracy were steeped in republican ideology to such an extent that it was only some weeks later that they began to have an inkling of the significance of the June fight. They were stupefied by the gunpowder smoke in which their fantastic republic dissolved.

The immediate impression which the news of the June defeat made on us, the reader will allow us to describe in the words of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung:

"The last official remnant of the February Revolution, the Executive Commission, has melted away, like an apparition, before the seriousness of events. The fireworks of Lamartine have turned into the war rockets of Cavaignac. Fraternité, the fraternity of antagonistic classes, of which one exploits the other, this fraternité, proclaimed in February, written in capital letters on the brow of Paris, on every prison, on every barracks —its true, unadulterated, its prosaic expression is civil war, civil war in its most frightful form, the war of labour and capital. This fraternity flamed in front of all the windows of Paris on the evening of June 25, when the Paris of the bourgeoisie was illuminated, whilst the Paris of the proletariat burnt, bled, moaned unto death. Fraternity endured just as long as the interests of the bourgeoisie were in fraternity with the interests of the proletariat.

"Pedants of the old revolutionary traditions of 1793; socialist systematisers who begged at the doors of the bourgeoisie on behalf of the people and were allowed to preach long sermons
and to compromise themselves as long as the proletarian lion had to be lulled to sleep; republicans who demanded the old bourgeois order in its entirety, with the exception of the crowned head; adherents of the dynasty among the opposition upon whom accident foisted the overthrow of the dynasty instead of a change of ministers; Legitimists who did not want to cast aside the livery but to change its cut—these were the allies with whom the people made its February.—The February Revolution was the beautiful revolution, the revolution of universal sympathy, because the antagonisms which had flared up in it against the monarchy slumbered undeveloped, harmoniously side by side, because the social struggle which formed their background had won only an airy existence, an existence of phrases, of words. The June Revolution is the ugly revolution, the repulsive revolution, because deeds have taken the place of phrases, because the republic uncovered the head of the monster itself by striking off the crown that shielded and concealed it.—Order! was the battle cry of Guizot. Order! cried Sébastiani, the follower of Guizot, when Warsaw became Russian. Order! shouts Cavaignac, the brutal echo of the French National Assembly and of the republican bourgeoisie. Order! thundered its grapeshot, as it ripped up the body of the proletariat. None of the numerous revolutions of the French bourgeoisie since 1789 was an attack on order; for they allowed the rule of the class, they allowed the slavery of the workers, they allowed the bourgeois order to endure, no matter how often the political form of this rule and this slavery changed. June has violated this order. Woe to June!” (N. Rh. Z., June 29, 1848.)

Woe to June! re-echoes Europe.

The Paris proletariat was forced into the June insurrection by the bourgeoisie. This sufficed to mark its doom. Its immediate avowed needs did not drive it to engage in a fight for the forcible overthrow of the bourgeoisie, nor was it equal to this task. The Moniteur had to inform it officially that the time was past when the republic saw any occasion to bow and scrape to its illusions, and only its defeat convinced it of the truth that the slightest improvement in its position remains a utopia within the bourgeois republic, a utopia that becomes a crime as soon as it wants to become a reality. In place of its demands exuberant in form, but petty and even bourgeois still in content, the concession of which it wanted to wring from the February republic, there appeared the bold slogan of revolutionary struggle: Overthrow of the bourgeoisie! Dictatorship of the working class!

By making its burial place the birthplace of the bourgeois re-
public, the proletariat compelled the latter to come out forthwith in its pure form as the state whose admitted object it is to perpetuate the rule of capital, the slavery of labour. Having constantly before its eyes the scarred, irreconcilable, invincible enemy—invincible because his existence is the condition of its own life—bourgeois rule, freed from all fetters, was bound to turn immediately into bourgeois terrorism. With the proletariat removed for the time being from the stage and bourgeois dictatorship recognised officially, the middle strata of bourgeois society, the petty bourgeoisie and the peasant class, had to adhere more and more closely to the proletariat as their position became more unbearable and their antagonism to the bourgeoisie more acute. Just as earlier they had to find the cause of their distress in its upsurge, so now in its defeat.

If the June insurrection raised the self-assurance of the bourgeoisie all over the Continent, and caused it to league itself openly with the feudal monarchy against the people, who was the first victim of this alliance? The Continental bourgeoisie itself. The June defeat prevented it from consolidating its rule and from bringing the people, half satisfied and half out of humour, to a standstill at the lowest stage of the bourgeois revolution.

Finally, the defeat of June divulged to the despotic powers of Europe the secret that France must maintain peace abroad at any price in order to be able to wage civil war at home. Thus the peoples who had begun the fight for their national independence were abandoned to the superior power of Russia, Austria and Prussia, but, at the same time, the fate of these national revolutions was made subject to the fate of the proletarian revolution, and they were robbed of their apparent autonomy, their independence of the great social revolution. The Hungarian shall not be free, nor the Pole, nor the Italian, as long as the worker remains a slave!

Finally, with the victories of the Holy Alliance, Europe has taken on a form that makes every fresh proletarian upheaval in France directly coincide with a world war. The new French revolution is forced to leave its national soil forthwith and conquer the European terrain, on which alone the social revolution of the nineteenth century can be accomplished.

Thus only the June defeat has created all the conditions under which France can seize the initiative of the European revolution. Only after being dipped in the blood of the June insurgents did the tricolour become the flag of the European revolution—the red flag!

And we exclaim: The revolution is dead!—Long live the revolution!
February 25, 1848, had granted the republic to France, June 25 thrust the revolution upon her. And revolution, after June, meant: overthrow of bourgeois society, whereas before February it had meant: overthrow of the form of government.

The June fight had been led by the republican faction of the bourgeoisie; with victory political power necessarily fell to its share. The state of siege laid gagged Paris unresisting at its feet, and in the provinces there prevailed a moral state of siege, the threatening, brutal arrogance of victory of the bourgeoisie and the unleashed property fanaticism of the peasants. No danger, therefore, from below!

The crash of the revolutionary might of the workers was simultaneously a crash of the political influence of the democratic republicans, that is, of the republicans in the sense of the petty bourgeoisie, represented in the Executive Commission by Ledru-Rollin, in the Constituent National Assembly by the party of the Montagne and in the press by the Réforme. Together with the bourgeois republicans they had conspired on April 16 against the proletarian, together with them they had warred against it in the June days. Thus they themselves blasted the background against which their party stood out as a power, for the petty bourgeoisie can preserve a revolutionary attitude toward the bourgeoisie only as long as the proletariat stands behind it. They were dismissed. The sham alliance concluded with them reluctantly and with mental reservations during the epoch of the Provisional Government and the Executive Commission was openly broken by the bourgeois republicans. Spurned and repulsed as allies, they sank down to subordinate henchmen of the tricolour-men, from whom they could not wring any concessions, but whose domination they had to support whenever it, and with it the republic, seemed to be put in jeopardy by the anti-republican bourgeois factions. Lastly, these factions, the Orleanists and the Legitimists, were from the very beginning in a minority in the Constituent National Assembly. Before the June days, they dared to react only under the mask of bourgeois republicanism; the June victory allowed for a moment the whole of bourgeois France to greet its saviour in Cavaignac, and when, shortly after the June days, the anti-republican party regained independence, the military dictatorship and the state of siege in Paris permitted it to put out its antennae only very timidly and cautiously.
Since 1830, the bourgeois republican faction, in the person of its writers, its spokesmen, its men of talent and ambition, its deputies, generals, bankers and lawyers, had grouped itself round a Parisian journal, the National. In the provinces this journal had its branch newspapers. The coterie of the National was the dynasty of the tricolour republic. It immediately took possession of all state dignities, of the ministries, the prefecture of police, the post-office directorship, the positions of prefect, the higher army officers’ posts now become vacant. At the head of the executive power stood its general, Cavaignac; its editor-in-chief, Marrast, became permanent president of the Constituent National Assembly. As master of ceremonies he at the same time did the honours, in his salons, of the respectable republic.

Even revolutionary French writers, awed, as it were, by the republican tradition, have strengthened the mistaken belief that the royalists dominated the Constituent National Assembly. On the contrary, after the June days, the Constituent Assembly remained the exclusive representative of bourgeois republicanism, and it emphasised this aspect all the more resolutely, the more the influence of the tricolour republicans collapsed outside the Assembly. If the question was one of maintaining the form of the bourgeois republic, then the Assembly had the votes of the democratic republicans at its disposal; if one of maintaining the content, then even its mode of speech no longer separated it from the royalist bourgeois factions, for it is the interests of the bourgeoisie, the material conditions of its class rule and class exploitation, that form the content of the bourgeois republic.

Thus it was not royalism but bourgeois republicanism that was realised in the life and work of this Constituent Assembly, which in the end did not die, nor was killed, but decayed.

For the entire duration of its rule, as long as it gave its grand performance of state on the proscenium, an unbroken sacrificial feast was being staged in the background—the continual sentencing by courts-martial of the captured June insurgents or their deportation without trial. The Constituent Assembly had the tact to admit that in the June insurgents it was not judging criminals but wiping out enemies.

The first act of the Constituent National Assembly was the setting up of a commission of enquiry into the events of June and of May 15, and into the part played by the socialist and democratic party leaders during these days. The enquiry was directly aimed at Louis Blanc, Ledru-Rollin and Caussidière. The bourgeois republicans burned with impatience to rid themselves of these rivals. They could have entrusted the venting of their spleen to no more suitable subject than M. Odilon Barrot,
the former chief of the dynastic opposition, the incarnation of liberalism, the nullité grave, the thoroughly shallow person who not only had a dynasty to revenge, but even had to settle accounts with the revolutionists for thwarting his premiership. A sure guarantee of his relentlessness. This Barrot was, therefore, appointed chairman of the commission of enquiry, and he constructed a complete legal process against the February Revolution, which process may be summarised thus: March 17, demonstration; April 16, conspiracy; May 15, attempt; June 23, civil war! Why did he not stretch his erudite criminologist’s researches as far back as February 24? The Journal des Débats answered: February 24—that is the foundation of Rome. The origin of states gets lost in a myth, in which one may believe, but which one may not discuss. Louis Blanc and Caussidière were handed over to the courts. The National Assembly completed the work of purging itself which it had begun on May 15.

The plan formed by the Provisional Government, and again taken up by Goudchaux, of taxing capital—in the form of a mortgage tax—was rejected by the Constituent Assembly; the law that limited the working day to ten hours was repealed; imprisonment for debt was once more introduced; the large section of the French population that can neither read nor write was excluded from jury service. Why not from the franchise also? Journals again had to deposit caution-money; the right of association was restricted.

But in their haste to give back to the old bourgeois relationships their old guarantees, and to wipe out every trace left behind by the waves of the revolution, the bourgeois republicans encountered a resistance which threatened them with unexpected danger.

No one had fought more fanatically in the June days for the salvation of property and the restoration of credit than the Parisian petty bourgeois—keepers of cafés and restaurants, marchands de vins, small traders, shopkeepers, handicraftsmen, etc. The shopkeeper had pulled himself together and marched against the barricades in order to restore the traffic which leads from the streets into the shop. But behind the barricade stood the customers and the debtors; before it the creditors of the shop. And when the barricades were thrown down and the workers were crushed and the shopkeepers, drunk with victory, rushed back to their shops, they found the entrance barred by a saviour of property, an official agent of credit, who presented them with threatening notices: Overdue promissory note! Overdue house rent! Overdue bond! Doomed shop! Doomed shopkeeper!

Salvation of property! But the house in which they lived was
not their property; the shop which they kept was not their property; the commodities in which they dealt were not their property. Neither their business, nor the plate from which they ate, nor the bed on which they slept belonged to them any longer. It was precisely from them that this property had to be saved— for the houseowner who let the house, for the banker who discounted the promissory note, for the capitalist who made the advances in cash, for the manufacturer who entrusted the sale of his commodities to these retailers, for the wholesale dealer who had credited the raw materials to these handicraftsmen: Restoration of credit! But credit, having regained strength, proved itself a vigorous and jealous god, for it turned the debtor who could not pay out of his four walls, together with wife and child, surrendered his sham property to capital, and threw the man himself into the debtors' prison, which had once more reared its head threateningly over the corpses of the June insurgents.

The petty bourgeois saw with horror that by striking down the workers they had delivered themselves without resistance into the hands of their creditors. Their bankruptcy, which since February had been dragging on in chronic fashion and had been apparently ignored, was openly declared after June.

Their nominal property had been left unassailed as long as it was of consequence to drive them to the battlefield in the name of property. Now that the great issue with the proletariat had been settled, the small matter of the épicer could in turn be settled. In Paris the mass of overdue paper amounted to over 21,000,000 francs; in the provinces to over 11,000,000. The proprietors of more than 7,000 Paris firms had not paid their rent since February.

While the National Assembly had instituted an enquête* into the political guilt, going as far back as the end of February, the petty bourgeois, on their part, now demanded an enquête into the civil debts up to February 24. They assembled en masse in the Bourse hall and threateningly demanded, on behalf of every businessman who could prove that his insolvency was due solely to the stagnation caused by the revolution and that his business had been in good condition on February 24, an extension of the term of payment by order of a commerce court and the compulsory liquidation of creditors' claims in consideration of a moderate percentage payment. As a legislative proposal, this question was dealt with in the National Assembly in the form of concordats à l'amiable.** The Assembly vacillated; then it sud-

* Enquête: Enquiry.—Ed.
** Concordats à l'amiable: Amicable agreements.—Ed.
denly learnt that, at the same time, at the Porte St. Denis, thousands of wives and children of the insurgents had prepared an amnesty petition.

In the presence of the resurrected spectre of June, the petty bourgeoisie trembled and the National Assembly retrieved its implacability. The concordats à l'amicable, the amicable settlement between debtor and creditor, were rejected in their most essential points.

Thus, long after the democratic representatives of the petty bourgeoisie had been repulsed within the National Assembly by the republican representatives of the bourgeoisie, this parliamentary breach received its bourgeois, its real economic meaning by the petty bourgeoisie as debtors being handed over to the bourgeoisie as creditors. A large part of the former were completely ruined and the remainder were allowed to continue their businesses only under conditions which made them absolute serfs of capital. On August 22, 1848, the National Assembly rejected the concordats à l'amicable; on September 19, 1848, in the midst of the state of siege, Prince Louis Bonaparte and the prisoner of Vincennes, the Communist Raspail, were elected representatives of Paris. The bourgeoisie, however, elected the usurious money-changer and Orleanist Fould. From all sides at once, therefore, open declaration of war against the Constituent National Assembly, against bourgeois republicanism, against Cavaignac.

It needs no argument to show how the mass bankruptcy of the Paris petty bourgeoisie was bound to produce aftereffects far transcending the circle of its immediate victims, and to convulse bourgeois commerce once more, while the state deficit was swollen anew by the costs of the June insurrection, and state revenues sank continuously through the hold-up of production, the restricted consumption and the decreasing imports. Cavaignac and the National Assembly could have recourse to no other expedient than a new loan, which forced them still further under the yoke of the finance aristocracy.

While the petty bourgeoisie had harvested bankruptcy and liquidation by order of court as the fruit of the June victory, Cavaignac's Janissaries, the Mobile Guards, found their reward in the soft arms of the courtesans, and as "the youthful saviours of society" they received all kinds of homage in the salons of Marrast, the gentilhomme* of the tricolour, who at the same time served as the Amphitryon and the troubadour of the respectable republic. Meanwhile, this social favouritism and the

---

* Gentilhomme: Knight.—*Ed.
disproportionately higher pay of the Mobile Guard embittered the army, while at the same time vanished all those national illusions with which bourgeois republicanism, through its journal, the National, had been able to attach to itself a part of the army and peasant class under Louis Philippe. The role of mediator, which Cavaignac and the National Assembly played in North Italy in order, together with England, to betray it to Austria—this one day of rule destroyed eighteen years of opposition on the part of the National. No government was less national than that of the National, none more dependent on England, and, under Louis Philippe, the National lived by paraphrasing daily Cato’s dictum: Carthaginem esse delendam*; none was more servile towards the Holy Alliance, and from a Guizot the National had demanded the tearing up of the Treaties of Vienna. The irony of history made Bastide, the ex-editor for foreign affairs of the National, Minister of Foreign Affairs of France, so that he might refute every one of his articles in every one of his despatches.

For a moment, the army and the peasant class had believed that, simultaneously with the military dictatorship, war abroad and gloire had been placed on the order of the day in France. But Cavaignac was not the dictatorship of the sabre over bourgeois society; he was the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the sabre. And of the soldier they now required only the gendarme. Under the stern features of antique-republican resignation Cavaignac concealed humdrum submission to the humiliating conditions of his bourgeois office. L’argent n’a pas de maître! Money has no master! He, as well as the Constituent Assembly in general, idealised this old election cry of the tiers état** by translating it into political speech: The bourgeoisie has no king; the true form of its rule is the republic.

And the “great organic work” of the Constituent National Assembly consisted in working out this form, in producing a republican constitution. The re-christening of the Christian calendar as a republican one, of the saintly Bartholomew as the saintly Robespierre, made no more change in the wind and weather than this constitution made or was supposed to make in bourgeois society. Where it went beyond a change of costume, it put on record the existing facts. Thus it solemnly registered the fact of the republic, the fact of universal suffrage, the fact of a single sovereign National Assembly in place of two limited constitutional chambers. Thus it registered and regulated the

---

* Carthage must be destroyed.—Ed.
** Tiers état: Third estate.—Ed.
fact of the dictatorship of Cavaignac by replacing the stationary, irresponsible hereditary monarchy with an ambulatory, responsible, elective monarchy, with a quadrennial presidency. Thus it elevated no less to an organic law the fact of the extraordinary powers with which the National Assembly, after the horrors of May 15 and June 25, had providently invested its president in the interest of its own security. The remainder of the constitution was a work of terminology. The royalist labels were torn off the mechanism of the old monarchy and republican labels stuck on. Marrast, former editor-in-chief of the National, now editor-in-chief of the constitution, acquitted himself of this academic task not without talent.

The Constituent Assembly resembled that Chilean official who wanted to regulate property relations in land more firmly by a cadastral survey just at the moment when subterranean rumblings already announced the volcanic eruption that was to hurl away the land from under his very feet. While in theory it accurately marked off the forms in which the rule of the bourgeoisie found republican expression, in reality it held its own only by the abolition of all formulas, by force sans phrase,* by the state of siege. Two days before it began its work on the constitution, it proclaimed a prolongation of the state of siege. Formerly, constitutions had been made and adopted as soon as the social process of revolution had reached a point of rest, the newly formed class relationships had established themselves and the contending factions of the ruling class had had recourse to a compromise which allowed them to continue the struggle among themselves and at the same time to keep the exhausted masses of the people out of it. This constitution, on the contrary, did not sanction any social revolution; it sanctioned the momentary victory of the old society over the revolution.

The first draft of the constitution,112 made before the June days, still contained the droit au travail, the right to work, the first clumsy formula wherein the revolutionary demands of the proletariat are summarised. It was transformed into the droit à l'assistance, the right to public relief, and what modern state does not feed its paupers in some form or other? The right to work is, in the bourgeois sense, an absurdity, a miserable, pious wish. But behind the right to work stands the power over capital; behind the power over capital, the appropriation of the means of production, their subjection to the associated working class and, therefore, the abolition of wage labour, of capital and of their mutual relations. Behind the "right to work" stood the

---

* Sans phrase: Without circumlocution.—Ed.
June insurrection. The Constituent Assembly, which in fact put the revolutionary proletariat hors la loi, outside the law, had on principle to throw the proletariat's formula out of the constitution, the law of laws, had to pronounce its anathema upon the "right to work." But it did not stop there. As Plato banned the poets from his republic, so it banished forever from its republic—the progressive tax. And the progressive tax is not only a bourgeois measure, which can be carried out within the existing relations of production to a greater or less degree; it was the only means of binding the middle strata of bourgeois society to the "respectable" republic, of reducing the state debt, of holding the anti-republican majority of the bourgeoisie in check.

In the matter of the concordats à l'amiable, the tricolour republicans had actually sacrificed the petty bourgeoisie to the big bourgeoisie. They elevated this isolated fact to a principle by the legal prohibition of a progressive tax. They put bourgeois reform on the same level as proletarian revolution. But what class then remained as the mainstay of their republic? The big bourgeoisie. And its mass was anti-republican. While it exploited the republicans of the National in order to consolidate again the old relations of economic life, it thought, on the other hand, of exploiting the once more consolidated social relations in order to restore the political forms that corresponded to them. Already at the beginning of October, Cavaignac felt compelled to make Dufaure and Vivien, previously ministers of Louis Philippe, ministers of the republic, however much the brainless puritans of his own party growled and blistered.

While the tricolour constitution rejected every compromise with the petty bourgeoisie and was unable to win the attachment of any new social element to the new form of government, it hastened, on the other hand, to restore its traditional inviolability to a body that constituted the most hard-bitten and fanatical defender of the old state. It raised the irremovability of judges, which had been questioned by the Provisional Government, to an organic law. The one king whom it had removed rose again, by the score, in these irremovable inquisitors of legality.

The French press has analysed from numerous aspects the contradictions of M. Marrast's constitution; for example, the coexistence of two sovereigns, the National Assembly and the President, etc., etc.

The comprehensive contradiction of this constitution, however, consists in the following: The classes whose social slavery the constitution is to perpetuate, proletariat, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, it puts in possession of political power through universal suffrage. And from the class whose old social power it
sanctions, the bourgeoisie, it withdraws the political guarantees of this power. It forces the political rule of the bourgeoisie into democratic conditions, which at every moment help the hostile classes to victory and jeopardise the very foundations of bourgeois society. From the ones it demands that they should not go forward from political to social emancipation; from the others that they should not go back from social to political restoration.

These contradictions perturbed the bourgeois republicans little. To the extent that they ceased to be indispensable—and they were indispensable only as the protagonists of the old society against the revolutionary proletariat—they fell, a few weeks after their victory, from the position of a party to that of a coterie. And they treated the constitution as a big intrigue. What was to be constituted in it was, above all, the rule of the coterie, The President was to be a protracted Cavaignac; the Legislative Assembly a protracted Constituent Assembly. They hoped to reduce the political power of the masses of the people to a semblance of power, and to be able to make sufficient play with this sham power itself to keep continually hanging over the majority of the bourgeoisie the dilemma of the June days: realm of the National or realm of anarchy.

The work on the constitution, which was begun on September 4, was finished on October 23. On September 2 the Constituent Assembly had decided not to dissolve until the organic laws supplementing the constitution were enacted. Nonetheless, it now decided to bring to life the creation that was most peculiarly its own, the President, already on December 10, long before the circle of its own activity was closed. So sure was it of hailing, in the homunculus of the constitution, the son of his mother. As a precaution it was provided that if none of the candidates received two million votes, the election should pass over from the nation to the Constituent Assembly.

Futile provisions! The first day of the realisation of the constitution was the last day of the rule of the Constituent Assembly. In the abyss of the ballot box lay its sentence of death. It sought the “son of his mother” and found the “nephew of his uncle”. Saul Cavaignac slew one million votes, but David Napoleon slew six million. Saul Cavaignac was beaten six times over.¹¹³

December 10, 1848, was the day of the peasant insurrection. Only from this day does the February of the French peasants date. The symbol that expressed their entry into the revolutionary movement, clumsily cunning, knavishly naive, doltishly sublime, a calculated superstition, a pathetic burlesque, a cleverly stupid anachronism, a world-historic piece of buffoonery and an undecipherable hieroglyphic for the understanding of
the civilised—this symbol bore the unmistakable physiognomy of the class that represents barbarism within civilisation. The republic had announced itself to this class with the tax collector; it announced itself to the republic with the emperor. Napoleon was the only man who had exhaustively represented the interests and the imagination of the peasant class, newly created in 1789. By writing his name on the frontispiece of the republic, it declared war abroad and the enforcing of its class interests at home. Napoleon was to the peasants not a person but a programme. With banners, with beat of drums and blare of trumpets, they marched to the polling booths shouting: *plus d’impôts, à bas les riches, à bas la république, vive l’Empereur!* No more taxes, down with the rich, down with the republic, long live the emperor! Behind the emperor was hidden the peasant war. The republic that they voted down was the republic of the rich.

December 10 was the *coup d’état* of the peasants, which overthrew the existing government. And from that day on, when they had taken a government from France and given a government to her, their eyes were fixed steadily on Paris. For a moment active heroes of the revolutionary drama, they could no longer be forced back into the inactive and spineless role of the chorus.

The other classes helped to complete the election victory of the peasants. To the *proletariat*, the election of Napoleon meant the deposition of Cavaignac, the overthrow of the Constituent Assembly, the dismissal of bourgeois republicanism, the cassation of the June victory. To the *petty bourgeoisie*, Napoleon meant the rule of the debtor over the creditor. For the majority of the *big bourgeoisie*, the election of Napoleon meant an open breach with the faction of which it had had to make use, for a moment, against the revolution, but which became intolerable to it as soon as this faction sought to consolidate the position of the moment into a constitutional position. Napoleon in place of Cavaignac meant to this majority the monarchy in place of the republic, the beginning of the royalist restoration, a shy hint at Orleans, the lily hidden beneath the violet. Lastly, the army voted for Napoleon against the Mobile Guard, against the peace idyll, for war.

Thus it happened, as the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* stated, that the most simple-minded man in France acquired the most multifarious significance. Just because he was nothing, he could signify everything save himself. Meanwhile, different as the meaning of the name Napoleon might be in the mouths of the different classes, with this name each wrote on its ballot:
Down with the party of the National, down with Cavaignac, down with the Constituent Assembly, down with the bourgeois republic. Minister Dufaure publicly declared in the Constituent Assembly: December 10 is a second February 24.

Petty bourgeoisie and proletariat had voted en bloc* for Napoleon, in order to vote against Cavaignac and, by pooling their votes, to wrest the final decision from the Constituent Assembly. The more advanced sections of the two classes, however, put forward their own candidates. Napoleon was the collective name of all parties in coalition against the bourgeois republic; Ledru-Rollin and Raspail were the proper names, the former of the democratic petty bourgeoisie, the latter of the revolutionary proletariat. The votes for Raspail—the proletarians and their socialist spokesmen declared it loudly—were to be merely a demonstration, so many protests against any presidency, that is, against the constitution itself, so many votes against Ledru-Rollin, the first act by which the proletariat, as an independent political party, declared its separation from the democratic party. This party, on the other hand—the democratic petty bourgeoisie and its parliamentary representative, the Montagne—treated the candidature of Ledru-Rollin with all the seriousness with which it is in the habit of solemnly duping itself. For the rest, this was its last attempt to set itself up as an independent party, as against the proletariat. Not only the republican bourgeoisie party, but also the democratic petty bourgeoisie and its Montagne were beaten on December 10.

France now possessed a Napoleon side by side with a Montagne, proof that both were only the lifeless caricatures of the great realities whose names they bore. Louis Napoleon, with the emperor's hat and the eagle, parodied the old Napoleon no more miserably than the Montagne, with its phrases borrowed from 1793 and its demagogic poses, parodied the old Montagne. Thus the traditional 1793 superstition was stripped off at the same time as the traditional Napoleon superstition. The revolution had come into its own only when it had won its own, its original name, and it could do that only when the modern revolutionary class, the industrial proletariat, came dominoingly into its foreground. One can say that December 10 dumbfounded the Montagne and caused it to grow confused in its own mind, if for no other reason than because that day laughingly cut short with a contemptuous peasant jest the classical analogy to the old revolution.

* As a bloc.—Ed.
On December 20, Cavaignac laid down his office and the Constituent Assembly proclaimed Louis Napoleon president of the republic. On December 19, the last day of its sole rule, it rejected the proposal of amnesty for the June insurgents. Would revoking the decree of June 27, under which it had condemned 15,000 insurgents to deportation without judicial sentence, not have meant revoking the June battle itself?

Odilon Barrot, the last minister of Louis Philippe, became the first minister of Louis Napoleon. Just as Louis Napoleon dated his rule, not from December 10, but from a decree of the Senate of 1804, so he found a prime minister who did not date his ministry from December 20, but from a royal decree of February 24. As the legitimate heir of Louis Philippe, Louis Napoleon mollified the change of government by retaining the old ministry, which, moreover, had not had time to be worn off, since it had not found time to embark upon life.

The leaders of the royalist bourgeois factions advised him in this choice. The head of the old dynastic opposition, who had unconsciously constituted the transition to the republicans of the National, was still more fitted to constitute with full consciousness the transition from the bourgeois republic to the monarchy.

Odilon Barrot was the leader of the one old opposition party which, always fruitlessly struggling for ministerial portfolios, had not yet been used up. In rapid succession the revolution hurled all the old opposition parties to the top of the state, so that they would have to deny, to repudiate their old phrases not only in deeds but even in words, and might finally be flung all together, combined in a repulsive commixture, on the dung heap of history by the people. And no apostasy was spared this Barrot, this incarnation of bourgeois liberalism, who for eighteen years had hidden the rascally vacuity of his mind behind the serious demeanour of his body. If, at certain moments, the far too striking contrast between the thistles of the present and the laurels of the past startled the man himself, one glance in the mirror gave him back his ministerial composure and human self-admiration. What beamed at him from the mirror was Guizot, whom he had always envied, who had always mastered him, Guizot himself, but Guizot with the Olympian forehead of Odilon. What he overlooked were the ears of Midas.

The Barrot of February 24 first became manifest in the Barrot of December 20. Associated with him, the Orleanist and Voltairean, was the Legitimist and Jesuit Falloux, as Minister of Public Worship.

A few days later, the Ministry of Home Affairs was given to
Léon Faucher, the Malthusian. Law, religion and political economy! The ministry of Barrot contained all this and, in addition, a combination of Legitimists and Orleanists. Only the Bonapartist was lacking. Bonaparte still hid his longing to signify Napoleon, for Soulouque did not yet play Toussaint Louverture.

The party of the National was immediately relieved of all the higher posts, where it had entrenched itself. The Prefecture of Police, the office of the Director of the Post, the Procuratorship General, the Mairie* of Paris, were all filled with old creatures of the monarchy. Changarnier, the Legitimist, received the unified supreme command of the National Guard of the Department of the Seine, of the Mobile Guard and the troops of the line of the first military division; Bugeaud, the Orleanist, was appointed commander-in-chief of the Alpine army. This change of officials continued uninterruptedly under the Barrot government. The first act of his ministry was the restoration of the old royalist administration. The official scene was transformed in a trice—scenery, costumes, speech, actors, supers, mutes, prompters, the position of the parties, the theme of the drama, the content of the conflict, the whole situation. Only the premundane Constituent Assembly still remained in its place. But from the hour when the National Assembly had installed Bonaparte, Bonaparte Barrot and Barrot Changarnier, France stepped out of the period of republican constitution into the period of the constituted republic. And what place was there for a Constituent Assembly in a constituted republic? After the earth had been created, there was nothing else for its creator to do but to flee to heaven. The Constituent Assembly was determined not to follow his example; the National Assembly was the last asylum of the party of the bourgeois republicans. If all levers of executive power had been wrested from it, was there not left to it constituent omnipotence? Its first thought was to hold under all circumstances the position of sovereignty that it occupied, and thence to reconquer the lost ground. Once the Barrot ministry was displaced by a ministry of the National, the royalist personnel would have to vacate the palaces of the administration forthwith and the tricolour personnel would move in again triumphantly. The National Assembly resolved on the overthrow of the ministry and the ministry itself offered an opportunity for the attack, than which the Constituent Assembly could not have invented a better.

It will be remembered that for the peasants Louis Bonaparte signified: No more taxes! Six days he sat in the President's

* Mairie: The office of the Mayor.—Ed.
chair, and on the seventh, on December 27, his ministry proposed the retention of the salt tax, the abolition of which the Provisional Government had decreed. The salt tax shares with the wine tax the privilege of being the scapegoat of the old French financial system, particularly in the eyes of the country folk. The Barrot ministry could not have put into the mouth of the choice of the peasants a more mordant epigram on his electors than the words: Restoration of the salt tax! With the salt tax, Bonaparte lost his revolutionary salt—the Napoleon of the peasant insurrection dissolved like an apparition, and nothing remained but the great unknown of royalist bourgeois intrigue. And not without intention did the Barrot ministry make this act of tactlessly rude disillusionment the first governmental act of the President.

The Constituent Assembly, on its part, seized eagerly on the double opportunity of overthrowing the ministry, and, as against the elect of the peasantry, of setting itself up as the representative of peasant interests. It rejected the proposal of the finance minister, reduced the salt tax to a third of its former amount, thus increasing by sixty millions a state deficit of five hundred and sixty millions, and, after this vote of no confidence, calmly awaited the resignation of the ministry. So little did it comprehend the new world that surrounded it and its own changed position. Behind the ministry stood the President and behind the President stood six millions, who had placed in the ballot box as many votes of no confidence in the Constituent Assembly. The Constituent Assembly gave the nation back its no confidence vote. Absurd exchange! It forgot that its votes were no longer legal tender. The rejection of the salt tax only matured the decision of Bonaparte and his ministry "to end" the Constituent Assembly. There began that long duel which lasted the entire latter half of the life of the Constituent Assembly. January 29, March 21 and May 8 are the journées, the great days of this crisis, just so many forerunners of June 13.

Frenchmen, for example Louis Blanc, have construed January 29 as the date of the emergence of a constitutional contradiction, the contradiction between a sovereign, indissoluble National Assembly born of universal suffrage, and a President who, to go by the wording, was responsible to the Assembly, but who, to go by reality, was not only similarly sanctioned by universal suffrage and, in addition, united in his own person all the votes that were split up a hundred times and distributed among the individual members of the National Assembly, but who was also in full possession of the whole executive power, above which the National Assembly hovered as a merely moral force. This inter-
pretation of January 29 confuses the language of the struggle on the platform, through the press and in the clubs with its real content. Louis Bonaparte as against the Constituent National Assembly—that was not one unilateral constitutional power as against another; that was not the executive power as against the legislative; that was the constituted bourgeois republic itself as against the instruments of its constitution, as against the ambitious intrigues and ideological demands of the revolutionary faction of the bourgeoisie that had founded it and was now amazed to find that its constituted republic looked like a restored monarchy, and now desired forcibly to prolong the constituent period with its conditions, its illusions, its language and its personages and to prevent the mature bourgeois republic from emerging in its complete and peculiar form. As the Constituent National Assembly represented Cavaignac who had fallen back into its midst, so Bonaparte represented the Legislative National Assembly that had not yet been divorced from him, that is, the National Assembly of the constituted bourgeois republic.

The election of Bonaparte could only become explicable by putting in the place of the one name its manifold meanings, by repeating itself in the election of the new National Assembly. The mandate of the old was annulled by December 10. Thus on January 29, it was not the President and the National Assembly of the same republic that were face to face; it was the National Assembly of the republic that was coming into being and the President of the republic that had come into being, two powers that embodied quite different periods in the life process of the republic; the one, the small republican faction of the bourgeoisie that alone could proclaim the republic, wrest it from the revolutionary proletariat by street fighting and a reign of terror, and draft its ideal basic features in the constitution; and the other, the whole royalist mass of the bourgeoisie that alone could rule in this constituted bourgeois republic, strip the constitution of its ideological trimmings, and realise by its legislation and administration the indispensable conditions for the subjugation of the proletariat.

The storm which broke on January 29 gathered its elements during the whole month of January. The Constituent Assembly wanted to drive the Barrot ministry to resign by its no confidence vote. The Barrot ministry, on the other hand, proposed to the Constituent Assembly that it should give itself a definitive no confidence vote, decide on suicide and decree its own dissolution. On January 6 Rateau, one of the most obscure deputies, brought this motion at the order of the ministry before the Constituent Assembly, the same Constituent Assembly that already
in August had resolved not to dissolve until a whole series of organic laws supplementing the constitution had been enacted by it. Fould, the ministerialist, bluntly declared to it that its dissolution was necessary "for the restoration of the deranged credit." And did it not derange credit when it prolonged the provisional stage and, with Barrot, again called Bonaparte in question, and, with Bonaparte, the constituted republic? Barrot the Olympian became a raving Roland on the prospect of seeing the finally pocketed premiership, which the republicans had already withheld from him once for a decennium, that is, for ten months, again torn from him after scarcely two weeks' enjoyment of it—Barrot, confronting this wretched Assembly, out-tyrannised the tyrant. His mildest words were "no future is possible with it." And actually it did only represent the past. "It is incapable," he added ironically, "of providing the republic with the institutions which are necessary for its consolidation." Incapable indeed! Its bourgeois energy was broken simultaneously with its exceptional antagonism to the proletariat, and with its antagonism to the royalists its republican exuberance lived anew. Thus it was doubly incapable of consolidating the bourgeois republic, which it no longer comprehended, by means of the corresponding institutions.

Simultaneously with Rateau's motion the ministry evoked a storm of petitions throughout the land, and from all corners of France came flying daily at the head of the Constituent Assembly bundles of billets doux in which it was more or less categorically requested to dissolve and make its will. The Constituent Assembly, on its side, called forth counterpetitions, in which it caused itself to be requested to remain alive. The election struggle between Bonaparte and Cavaignac was renewed as a petition struggle for and against the dissolution of the National Assembly. The petitions were to be belated commentaries on December 10. This agitation continued during the whole of January.

In the conflict between the Constituent Assembly and the President, the former could not refer back to the general election as its origin, for the appeal was from the Assembly to universal suffrage. It could base itself on no regularly constituted power, for the issue was the struggle against the legal power. It could not overthrow the ministry by no confidence votes, as it again essayed to do on January 6 and 26, for the ministry did not ask for its confidence. Only one possibility was left to it, that of insurrection. The fighting forces of the insurrection were the Republican part of the National Guard, the Mobile Guard, and the

* See pp. 219-20 of this volume.—Ed.
centres of the revolutionary proletariat, the clubs. The Mobile Guard, those heroes of the June days, in December formed the organised fighting force of the republican faction of the bourgeoisie, just as before June the national ateliers* had formed the organised fighting force of the revolutionary proletariat. As the Executive Commission of the Constituent Assembly directed its brutal attack on the national ateliers, when it had to put an end to the pretensions, become unbearable, of the proletariat, so the ministry of Bonaparte directed its attack on the Mobile Guard, when it had to put an end to the pretensions, become unbearable, of the republican faction of the bourgeoisie. It ordered the disbandment of the Mobile Guard. One half of it was dismissed and thrown on the street, the other was organised on monarchist instead of democratic lines, and its pay was reduced to the usual pay of troops of the line. The Mobile Guard found itself in the position of the June insurgents and every day the press carried public confessions in which it admitted its blame for June and implored the proletariat to forgive it.

And the clubs? From the moment when the Constituent Assembly in the person of Barrot called in question the President, and in the person of the President the constituted bourgeois republic, and in the person of the constituted bourgeois republic the bourgeois republic in general, all the constituent elements of the February republic necessarily ranged themselves around it—all the parties that wished to overthrow the existing republic and by a violent retrograde process to transform it into a republic of their class interests and principles. The scrambled eggs were unscrambled, the crystallisations of the revolutionary movement had again become fluid, the republic that was being fought for was again the indefinite republic of the February days, the defining of which each party reserved to itself. For a moment the parties again took up their old February positions, without sharing the illusions of February. The tricolour republicans of the National again leant on the democratic republicans of the Réforme and pushed them as protagonists into the foreground of the parliamentary struggle. The democratic republicans again leant on the socialist republicans—on January 27 a public manifesto announced their reconciliation and union—and prepared their insurrectional background in the clubs. The ministerial press rightly treated the tricolour republicans of the National as the resurrected insurgents of June. In order to maintain themselves at the head of the bourgeois republic, they called in question the bourgeois republic itself. On January 26 Minister Fau-

* See pp. 220-21 of this volume.—Ed.
cher proposed a law on the right of association, the first para-
graph of which read: "Clubs are forbidden." He moved that this
bill should immediately be discussed as urgent. The Constituent
Assembly rejected the motion of urgency, and on January 27
Ledru-Rollin put forward a proposition, with 230 signatures ap-
pended to it, to impeach the ministry for violation of the consti-
tution. The impeachment of the ministry at times when such an
act was a tactless disclosure of the impotence of the judge, to
wit, the majority of the Chamber, or an impotent protest of the
accuser against this majority itself—that was the great revolu-
tionary trump that the latter-day Montagne played from now on
at each high spot of the crisis. Poor Montagnel crushed by the
weight of its own name!

On May 15, Blanqui, Barbès, Raspail, etc., had attempted to
break up the Constituent Assembly by forcing an entrance into
its hall of session at the head of the Paris proletariat. Barrot
prepared a moral May 15 for the same Assembly when he want-
ed to dictate its self-dissolution and close the hall. The same
Assembly had commissioned Barrot to make the enquête against
the May accused, and now, at the moment when he appeared be-
fore it like a royalist Blanqui, when it sought for allies against
him in the clubs, among the revolutionary proletarians, in the
party of Blanqui—at this moment the relentless Barrot torment-
ed it with the proposal to withdraw the May prisoners from the
Court of Assizes with its jury and hand them over to the High
Court, to the haute cour devised by the party of the National.
Remarkable how panic fear for a ministerial portfolio could
pound out of the head of a Barrot points worthy of a Beau-
marchais! After much vacillation the National Assembly accepted
his proposal. As against the makers of the May attempt, it re-
verted to its normal character.

If the Constituent Assembly, as against the President and the
ministers, was driven to insurrection, the President and the min-
isters, as against the Constituent Assembly, were driven to a coup
d'état for they had no legal means of dissolving it. But the Con-
stituent Assembly was the mother of the constitution and the
constitution was the mother of the President. With the coup
d'état the President tore up the constitution and extinguished his
republican legal title. He was then forced to pull out his impe-
rial legal title, but the imperial legal title woke up the Orleanist
legal title and both paled before the Legitimist legal title. The
downfall of the legal republic could shoot to the top only its
extreme antipode, the Legitimist monarchy, at a moment when
the Orleanist party was still only the vanquished of February
and Bonaparte was still only the victor of December 10, when
both could oppose to republican usurpation only their likewise usurped monarchist titles. The Legitimists were aware of the propitiousness of the moment; they conspired openly. They could hope to find their Monk in General Changarnier. The imminence of the White monarchy was as openly announced in their clubs as was that of the Red republic in the proletarian clubs.

The ministry would have escaped all difficulties by a happily suppressed rising. “Legality is the death of us,” cried Odilon Barrot. A rising would have allowed it, under the pretext of the salut public,* to dissolve the Constituent Assembly, to violate the constitution in the interests of the constitution itself. The brutal behaviour of Odilon Barrot in the National Assembly, the motion for the dissolution of the clubs, the tumultuous removal of 50 tricolour prefects and their replacement by royalists, the dissolution of the Mobile Guard, the ill-treatment of their chiefs by Changarnier, the reinstatement of Lerminier, the professor who was impossible even under Guizot, the toleration of the Legitimist braggadocio—all these were just so many provocations to mutiny. But the mutiny remained mute. It expected its signal from the Constituent Assembly and not from the ministry.

Finally came January 29, the day on with the decision was to be taken on the motion of Mathieu (de la Drôme) for unconditional rejection of Rateau’s motion. Legitimists, Orleanists, Bonapartists, Mobile Guard, Montagne, clubs—all conspired on this day, each just as much against the ostensible enemy as against the ostensible ally. Bonaparte, mounted on horseback, mustered a part of the troops on the Place de la Concorde; Changarnier play-acted with a display of strategic manoeuvres; the Constituent Assembly found its building occupied by the military. This Assembly, the centre of all the conflicting hopes, fears, expectations, ferments, tensions and conspiracies, this lionhearted Assembly did not falter for a moment when it came nearer to the world spirit [Weltgeist] than ever. It was like that fighter who not only feared to make use of his own weapons, but also felt himself obliged to maintain the weapons of his opponent unimpaired. Scorning death, it signed its own death warrant, and rejected the unconditional rejection of the Rateau motion. Itself in a state of siege, it set limits to a constituent activity whose necessary frame had been the state of siege of Paris. It revenged itself worthily when, on the following day, it instituted an enquiry into the fright that the ministry had given it on January 29. The Montagne showed its lack of revolutionary energy and political understanding by allowing itself to be used by the party of the

* Salut public: Public Welfare.—Ed.
National in this great comedy of intrigues as the crier in the contest. The party of the National had made its last attempt to continue to maintain, in the constituted republic, the monopoly of rule that it had possessed during the inchoative period of the bourgeois republic. It was shipwrecked.

While in the January crisis it was a question of the existence of the Constituent Assembly, in the crisis of March 21 it was a question of the existence of the constitution—there of the personnel of the National party, here of its ideal. There is no need to point out that the respectable republicans surrendered the exaltation of their ideology more cheaply than the worldly enjoyment of governmental power.

On March 21 Faucher’s bill against the right of association: the suppression of the clubs, was on the order of the day in the National Assembly. Article 8 of the constitution guarantees to all Frenchmen the right to associate. The prohibition of the clubs was, therefore, an unequivocal violation of the constitution, and the Constituent Assembly itself was to canonise the profanation of its holies. But the clubs—these were the gathering points, the conspiratorial seats of the revolutionary proletariat. The National Assembly had itself forbidden the coalition of the workers against their bourgeois. And the clubs—what were they but a coalition of the whole working class against the whole bourgeois class, the formation of a workers’ state against the bourgeois state? Were they not just so many constituent assemblies of the proletariat and just so many military detachments of revolt in fighting trim? What the constitution was to constitute above all else was the rule of the bourgeoisie. By the right of association the constitution, therefore, could manifestly mean only associations that harmonised with the rule of the bourgeoisie, that is, with bourgeois order. If, for reasons of theoretical propriety, it expressed itself in general terms, was not the government and the National Assembly there to interpret and apply it in a special case? And if in the primeval epoch of the republic, the clubs actually were forbidden by the state of siege, had they not to be forbidden in the ordered, constituted republic by the law? The tricolour republicans had nothing to oppose to this prosaic interpretation of the constitution but the high-flown phraseology of the constitution. A section of them, Pagnerre, Duclerc, etc., voted for the ministry and thereby gave it a majority. The others, with the archangel Cavaignac and the father of the church Marrast at their head, retired, after the article on the prohibition of the clubs had gone through, to a special committee room, jointly with Ledru-Rollin and the Montagne—“and held a council.” The National Assem-
bly was paralysed; it no longer had a quorum. At the right time, M. Crémieux remembered in the committee room that the way from here led directly to the street and that it was no longer February 1848, but March 1849. The party of the National, suddenly enlightened, returned to the National Assembly’s hall of session, behind it the Montagne, duped once more. The latter, constantly tormented by revolutionary longings, just as constantly clutched at constitutional possibilities, and still felt itself more in place behind the bourgeois republicans than in front of the revolutionary proletariat. Thus the comedy was played. And the Constituent Assembly itself had decreed that the violation of the letter of the constitution was the only appropriate realisation of its spirit.

There was only one point left to settle, the relation of the constituted republic to the European revolution, its foreign policy. On May 8, 1849, unwonted excitement prevailed in the Constituent Assembly, whose term of life was due to end in a few days. The attack of the French army on Rome, its repulse by the Romans, its political infamy and military disgrace, the foul assassination of the Roman republic by the French republic, the first Italian campaign of the second Bonaparte was on the order of the day. The Montagne had once more played its great trump; Ledru-Rollin had laid on the President’s table the inevitable bill of impeachment against the ministry, and this time also against Bonaparte, for violation of the constitution.

The motive of May 8 was repeated later as the motive of June 13. Let us get clear about the expedition to Rome.

Already in the middle of November 1848, Cavaignac had sent a battle fleet to Civitavecchia in order to protect the Pope, to take him on board and to ship him over to France. The Pope* was to consecrate the respectable republic, and to ensure the election of Cavaignac as president. With the Pope, Cavaignac wanted to angle for the priests, with the priests for the peasants, and with the peasants for the presidency. The expedition of Cavaignac, an election advertisement in its immediate purpose, was at the same time a protest and a threat against the Roman revolution. It contained in embryo France’s intervention in favour of the Pope.

This intervention on behalf of the Pope in association with Austria and Naples against the Roman republic was decided on at the first meeting of Bonaparte’s ministerial council on December 23. Falloux in the ministry, that meant the Pope in Rome and ... in the Rome of the Pope. Bonaparte did not need the Pope any longer in order to become the President of the peas-

* Pius IX.—Ed.
ants; but he needed the conservation of the Pope in order to conserve the peasants of the President. Their credulity had made him President. With faith they would lose credulity, and with the Pope, faith. And the Orleanists and Legitimists in coalition, who ruled in Bonaparte’s name! Before the king was restored, the power that consecrates kings had to be restored. Apart from their royalism: without the old Rome, subject to his temporal rule, no Pope; without the Pope, no catholicism; without catholicism, no French religion; and without religion, what would become of the old French society? The mortgage that the peasant has on heavenly possessions guarantees the mortgage that the bourgeois has on peasant possessions. The Roman revolution was, therefore, an attack on property, on the bourgeois order, dreadful as the June Revolution. Re-established bourgeois rule in France required the restoration of papal rule in Rome. Finally, to smite the Roman revolutionists was to smite the allies of the French revolutionists; the alliance of the counter-revolutionary classes in the constituted French republic was necessarily supplemented by the alliance of the French republic with the Holy Alliance, with Naples and Austria. The decision of the ministerial council of December 23 was no secret for the Constituent Assembly. On January 8, Ledru-Rollin had already interpellated the ministry concerning it; the ministry had denied it and the National Assembly had proceeded to the order of the day. Did it trust the word of the ministry? We know that it spent the whole month of January in giving the ministry no confidence votes. But if it was part of the ministry’s role to lie, it was part of the National Assembly’s role to feign belief in its lie and thereby save the republican déhors.*

Meanwhile Piedmont was beaten, Charles-Albert had abdicated and the Austrian army knocked at the gates of France. Ledru-Rollin vehemently interpellated. The ministry proved that it had only continued in North Italy the policy of Cavaignac, and Cavaignac only the policy of the Provisional Government, that is, of Ledru-Rollin. This time it even reaped a vote of confidence from the National Assembly and was authorised to occupy temporarily a suitable point in Upper Italy in order to give support to peaceful negotiations with Austria concerning the integrity of Sardinian territory and the question of Rome. It is known that the fate of Italy is decided on the battlefields of North Italy. Hence Rome would fall with Lombardy and Piedmont, or France would have to declare war on Austria and thereby on the European counter-revolution. Did the National Assembly sud-

* Déhors: Appearances.—Ed.
ddenly take the Barrot ministry for the old Committee of Public Safety? Or itself for the Convention? Why, then, the military occupation of a point in Upper Italy? This transparent veil covered the expedition against Rome.

On April 14, 14,000 men sailed under Oudinot for Civitavecchia; on April 16, the National Assembly voted the ministry a credit of 1,200,000 francs for the maintenance of a fleet of intervention in the Mediterranean Sea for three months. Thus it gave the ministry every means of intervening against Rome, while it adopted the pose of letting it intervene against Austria. It did not see what the ministry did; it only heard what it said. Such faith was not found in Israel; the Constituent Assembly had fallen into the position of not daring to know what the constituted republic had to do.

Finally, on May 8, the last scene of the comedy was played; the Constituent Assembly urged the ministry to take swift measures to bring the Italian expedition back to the aim set for it. Bonaparte that same evening inserted a letter in the Moniteur, in which he lavished the greatest appreciation on Oudinot. On May 11, the National Assembly rejected the bill of impeachment against this same Bonaparte and his ministry. And the Montagne, which, instead of tearing this web of deceit to pieces, took the parliamentary comedy tragically in order itself to play in it the role of Fouquier-Tinville, did it not betray its natural petty-bourgeois calf’s hide under the borrowed lion’s skin of the Convention!

The latter half of the life of the Constituent Assembly is summarised thus: On January 29 it admits that the royalist bourgeois factions are the natural superiors of the republic constituted by it; an March 21, that the violation of the constitution is its realisation; and on May 11, that the bombastically proclaimed passive alliance of the French republic with the struggling peoples means its active alliance with the European counter-revolution.

This miserable Assembly left the stage after it had given itself the satisfaction, two days before the anniversary of its birthday, May 4, of rejecting the motion of amnesty for the June insurgents. Its power shattered, held in deadly hatred by the people, repulsed, maltreated, contemptuously thrown aside by the bourgeoisie, whose tool it was, forced in the second half of its life to disavow the first, robbed of its republican illusions, without having created anything great in the past, without hope in the future and with its living body dying bit by bit, it was able to galvanise its own corpse into life only by continually recalling and living through the June victory over and over again, affirm-
ing itself by constantly repeated damnation of the damned. Vampire that lived on the blood of the June insurgents!

It left behind a state deficit increased by the costs of the June insurrection, by the loss of the salt tax, by the compensation it paid the plantation owners for abolishing Negro slavery, by the costs of the Roman expedition, by the loss of the wine tax, the abolition of which it resolved upon when already at its last gasp, a malicious old man, happy to impose on his laughing heir a compromising debt of honour.

With the beginning of March the agitation for the election of the Legislative National Assembly had commenced. Two main groups opposed each other, the party of Order and the democratic-socialist, or Red, party; between the two stood the Friends of the Constitution, under which name the tricolour republicans, of the National sought to put forward a party. The party of Order was formed directly after the June days; only after December 10 had allowed it to cast off the coterie of the National, of the bourgeois republicans, was the secret of its existence, the coalition of Orleanists and Legitimists into one party, disclosed. The bourgeois class fell apart into two big factions, which, alternately, the big landed proprietors under the restored monarchy and the finance aristocracy and the industrial bourgeoisie under the July monarchy, had maintained a monopoly of power. Bourbon was the royal name for the predominant influence of the interests of the one faction. Orleans the royal name for the predominant influence of the interests of the other faction—the nameless realm of the republic was the only one in which both factions could maintain with equal power the common class interest without giving up their mutual rivalry. If the bourgeois republic could not be anything but the perfected and clearly expressed rule of the whole bourgeois class, could it be anything but the rule of the Orleanists supplemented by the Legitimists, and of the Legitimists supplemented by the Orleanists, the synthesis of the restoration and the July monarchy? The bourgeois republicans of the National did not represent any large faction of their class resting on economic foundations. They possessed only the importance and the historical claim of having asserted, under the monarchy, as against the two bourgeois factions that only understood their particular régime, the general régime of the bourgeois class, the nameless realm of the republic, which they idealised and embellished with antique arabesques, but in which, above all, they hailed the rule of their coterie. If the party of the National grew confused in its own mind when it described the royalists in coalition at the top of the republic founded by it, these royalists deceived themselves no less
concerning the fact of their united rule. They did not comprehend that if each of their factions, regarded separately, by itself, was royalist, the product of their chemical combination had necessarily to be republican, that the white and the blue monarchy had to neutralise each other in the tricolour republic. Forced, by antagonism to the revolutionary proletariat and the transition classes thronging more and more round it as their centre, to summon their united strength and to conserve the organisation of this united strength, each faction of the party of Order had to assert, as against the desire for restoration and the overweening presumption of the other, their joint rule, that is, the republican form of bourgeois rule. Thus we find these royalists in the beginning believing in an immediate restoration, later preserving the republican form with foaming rage and deadly invective against it on their lips, and finally confessing that they can endure each other only in the republic and postponing the restoration indefinitely. The enjoyment of the united rule itself strengthened each of the two factions, and made each of them still more unable and unwilling to subordinate itself to the other, that is, to restore the monarchy.

The party of Order directly proclaimed in its election programme the rule of the bourgeois class, that is, the preservation of the life conditions of its rule: property, family, religion, order! Naturally it represented its class rule and the conditions of its class rule as the rule of civilisation and as the necessary conditions of material production as well as of the relations of social intercourse arising from it. The party of Order had enormous money resources at its command; it organised its branches throughout France; it had all the ideologists of the old society in its pay; it had the influence of the existing governmental power at its disposal; it possessed an army of unpaid vassals in the whole mass of petty bourgeois and peasants, who, still removed from the revolutionary movement, found in the high dignitaries of property the natural representatives of their petty property and its petty prejudices. This party, represented throughout the country by countless petty kings, could punish the rejection of their candidates as insurrection, dismiss the rebellious workers, the recalcitrant farm hands, domestic servants, clerks, railway officials, penmen, all the functionaries civilly subordinate to it. Finally, here and there, it could maintain the delusion that the republican Constituent Assembly had prevented the Bonaparte of December 10 from manifesting his wonder-working powers. We have not mentioned the Bonapartists in connection with the party of Order. They were not a serious faction of the bourgeois class, but a collection of old, superstitious invalids and of
young, unbelieving soldiers of fortune. The party of Order was victorious in the elections; it sent a large majority into the Legislative Assembly.

As against the coalesced counter-revolutionary bourgeois class, the sections of the petty bourgeoisie and peasant class already revolutionised had naturally to ally themselves with the high dignitary of revolutionary interests, the revolutionary proletariat. We have seen how the democratic spokesmen of the petty bourgeoisie in parliament, that is, the Montagne, were driven by parliamentary defeats to the socialist spokesmen of the proletariat, and how the actual petty bourgeoisie, outside of parliament, was driven by the concordats à l'amiable, by the brutal enforcement of bourgeois interests and by bankruptcy, to the actual proletarians. On January 27, Montagne and Socialists had celebrated their reconciliation; at the great banquet of February 1849, they repeated their act of union. The social and the democratic party, the party of the workers and that of the petty bourgeois, united to form the social-democratic party, that is, the Red party.

Paralysed for a moment by the agony that followed the June days, the French republic had lived through a continuous series of feverish excitements since the raising of the state of siege, since October 19. First the struggle for the presidency, then the struggle between the President and the Constituent Assembly; the struggle for the clubs; the trial in Bourges,¹¹⁸ which, in contrast with the petty figures of the President, the coalesced royalists, the respectable republicans, the democratic Montagne and the socialist doctrinaires of the proletariat, caused the proletariat's real revolutionists to appear as primordial monsters, such as only a deluge leaves behind on the surface of society, or such as could only precede a social deluge; the election agitation; the execution of the Bréa murderers¹¹⁹; the continual proceedings against the press; the violent interference of the government with the banquets by police action; the insolent royalist provocations; the exhibition of the portraits of Louis Blanc and Causidière on the pillory; the unbroken struggle between the constituted republic and the Constituent Assembly, which each moment drove the revolution back to its starting point, which each moment made the victors the vanquished and the vanquished the victors and, in a trice, changed around the positions of the parties and the classes, their separations and connections; the rapid march of the European counter-revolution; the glorious Hungarian fight; the armed uprisings in Germany; the Roman expedition; the ignominious defeat of the French army before Rome—in this vortex of the movement, in this torment of historical
unrest, in this dramatic ebb and flow of revolutionary passions, hopes and disappointments, the different classes of French society had to count their epochs of development in weeks where they had previously counted them in half centuries. A considerable part of the peasants and of the provinces was revolutionised. Not only were they disappointed in Napoleon, but the Red party offered them, instead of the name, the content, instead of illusory freedom from taxation, repayment of the milliard paid to the Legitimists, the adjustment of mortgages and the abolition of usury.

The army itself was infected with the revolutionary fever. In voting for Bonaparte it had voted for victory, and he gave it defeat. In him it had voted for the Little Corporal, behind whom the great revolutionary general is concealed, and he once more gave it the great generals, behind whom the pipe-clay corporal shelters himself. There was no doubt that the Red party, that is, the coalesced democratic party, was bound to celebrate, if not victory, still, great triumphs; that Paris, the army and a great part of the provinces would vote for it. Ledru-Rollin, the leader of the Montagne, was elected by five departments; no leader of the party of Order carried off such a victory, no candidate belonging to the proletarian party proper. This election reveals to us the secret of the democratic-socialist party. If, on the one hand, the Montagne, the parliamentary champion of the democratic petty bourgeoisie, was forced to unite with the socialist doctrinaires of the proletariat—the proletariat, forced by the terrible material defeat of June to raise itself up again through intellectual victories and not yet enabled through the development of the remaining classes to seize the revolutionary dictatorship, had to throw itself into the arms of the doctrinaires of its emancipation, the founders of socialist sects—the revolutionary peasants, the army and the provinces, on the other hand, ranged themselves behind the Montagne, which thus became the lord and master in the revolutionary army camp and through the understanding with the Socialists had eliminated every antagonism in the revolutionary party. In the latter half of the life of the Constituent Assembly it represented the republican fervour of the same and caused to be buried in oblivion its sins during the Provisional Government, during the Executive Commission, during the June days. In the same measure as the party of the National, in accordance with its half-and-half nature, had allowed itself to be put down by the royalist ministry, the party of the Mountain, which had been brushed aside during the omnipotence of the National, rose and asserted itself as the parliamentary representative of the revolution. In fact, the party of the National
had nothing to oppose to the other, royalist factions but ambitious personalities and idealistic humbug. The party of the Mountain, on the contrary, represented a mass hovering between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, a mass whose material interests demanded democratic institutions. In comparison with the Cavaignacs and the Marrasts, Ledru-Rollin and the Montagne, therefore, represented the true revolution, and from the consciousness of this important situation they drew the greater courage the more the expression of revolutionary energy limited itself to parliamentary attacks, bringing in bills of impeachment, threats, raised voices, thundering speeches, and extremes which were only pushed as far as phrases. The peasants were in about the same position as the petty bourgeoisie; they had more or less the same social demands to put forward. All the middle strata of society, so far as they were driven into the revolutionary movement, were therefore bound to find their hero in Ledru-Rollin. Ledru-Rollin was the personage of the democratic petty bourgeoisie. As against the party of Order, the half conservative, half revolutionary and wholly utopian reformers of this order had first to be pushed to the forefront.

The party of the National, "the Friends of the Constitution quand même," the républicains purs et simples, were completely defeated in the elections. A tiny minority of them was sent into the Legislative Chamber, their most noted leaders vanished from the stage, even Marrast, the editor-in-chief and the Orpheus of the respectable republic.

On May 28, the Legislative Assembly convened; on June 11, the collision of May 8 was renewed and, in the name of the Montagne, Ledru-Rollin brought in a bill of impeachment against the President and the ministry for violation of the constitution, for the bombardment of Rome. On June 12, the Legislative Assembly rejected the bill of impeachment, just as the Constituent Assembly had rejected it on May 11, but the proletariat this time drove the Montagne onto the streets, not to a street battle, however, but only to a street procession. It is enough to say that the Montagne was at the head of this movement to know that the movement was defeated, and that June 1849 was a caricature, as ridiculous as it was vile, of June 1848. The great retreat of June 13 was only eclipsed by the still greater battle report of Changarnier, the great man that the party of Order improvised. Every social epoch needs its great men, and when it does not find them, it invents them, as Helvétius says.

On December 20 only one half of the constituted bourgeois republic was in existence, the President; on May 28 it was completed by the other half, the Legislative Assembly. In June 1848,
the constituent bourgeois republic, by an unspeakable battle against the proletariat, and in June 1849, the constituted bourgeois republic, by an unutterable comedy with the petty bourgeoisie, had engraved their names in the birth register of history. June 1849 was the Nemesis of June 1848. In June 1849, it was not the workers that were vanquished; it was the petty bourgeoisie, who stood between them and the revolution, that were felled. June 1849 was not a bloody tragedy between wage labour and capital, but a prison-filling and lamentable play of debtors and creditors. The party of Order had won, it was all-powerful; it had now to show what it was.

III

CONSEQUENCES OF JUNE 13, 1849

On December 20, the Janus head of the constitutional republic had still shown only one face, the executive face with the indistinct, plain features of L. Bonaparte; on May 28, 1849, it showed its second face, the legislative, pitted with the scars that the orgies of the Restoration and the July monarchy had left behind. With the Legislative National Assembly the phenomenon of the constitutional republic was completed, that is, the republican form of government in which the rule of the bourgeois class is constituted, the common rule, therefore, of the two great royalist factions that form the French bourgeoisie, the coalesced Legitimists and Orleanists, the party of Order. While the French republic thus became the property of the coalition of the royalist parties, the European coalition of the counter-revolutionary powers embarked, simultaneously, upon a general crusade against the last places of refuge of the March revolutions. Russia invaded Hungary; Prussia marched against the army defending the Reich constitution, and Oudinot bombarded Rome. The European crisis was evidently approaching a decisive turning point; the eyes of all Europe were turned on Paris, and the eyes of all Paris on the Legislative Assembly.

On June 11 Ledru-Rollin mounted its tribune. He made no speech; he formulated a requisitory against the ministers, naked, unadorned, factual, concentrated, forceful.

The attack on Rome is an attack on the constitution; the attack on the Roman republic is an attack on the French republic. Article V of the constitution reads: “The French republic never employs its forces against the liberty of any people whatsoever” —and the President employs the French army against Roman liberty. Article 54 of the constitution forbids the executive power
to declare any war whatsoever without the consent of the National Assembly. The Constituent Assembly's resolution of May 8 expressly commands the ministers to make the Rome expedition conform with the utmost speed to its original mission; it therefore just as expressly prohibits war on Rome—and Oudinot bombards Rome. Thus Ledru-Rollin called the constitution itself as a witness for the prosecution against Bonaparte and his ministers. At the royalist majority of the National Assembly, he, the tribune of the constitution, hurled the threatening declaration: "The republicans will know how to command respect for the constitution by every means, be it even by force of arms!" "By force of arms!" repeated the hundredfold echo of the Montagne. The majority answered with a terrible tumult; the President of the National Assembly called Ledru-Rollin to order; Ledru-Rollin repeated the challenging declaration, and finally laid on the President's table a motion for the impeachment of Bonaparte and his ministers. By 361 votes to 203, the National Assembly resolved to pass on from the bombardment of Rome to the next item on the agenda.

Did Ledru-Rollin believe that he could beat the National Assembly by means of the constitution, and the President by means of the National Assembly?

To be sure, the constitution forbade any attack on the liberty of foreign peoples, but what the French army attacked in Rome was, according to the ministry, not "liberty" but the "despotism of anarchy." Had the Montagne still not comprehended, all experiences in the Constituent Assembly notwithstanding, that the interpretation of the constitution did not belong to those who had made it, but only to those who had accepted it? That its wording must be construed in its viable meaning and that the bourgeois meaning was its only viable meaning? That Bonaparte and the royalist majority of the National Assembly were the authentic interpreters of the constitution, as the priest is the authentic interpreter of the Bible, and the judge the authentic interpreter of the law? Should the National Assembly, freshly emerged from the general elections, feel itself bound by the testamentary provisions of the dead Constituent Assembly, whose will while living an Odilon Barrot had broken? When Ledru-Rollin cited the Constituent Assembly's resolution of May 8, had he forgotten that the same Constituent Assembly on May 11 had rejected his first motion for the impeachment of Bonaparte and the ministers; that it had acquitted the President and the

* Here et seq. by the National Assembly is meant the Legislative National Assembly in power from May 28, 1849 to December 1851 (Legislativa). —Ed.
ministers; that it had thus sanctioned the attack on Rome as "constitutional"; that he only lodged an appeal against a judgment already delivered; that he, lastly, appealed from the republican Constituent Assembly to the royalist Legislative Assembly? The constitution itself calls insurrection to its aid by summoning, in a special article, every citizen to protect it. Ledru-Rollin based himself on this article. But, at the same time, are not the public authorities organised for the defence of the constitution, and does not the violation of the constitution begin only from the moment when one of the constitutional public authorities rebels against the other? And the President of the republic, the ministers of the republic and the National Assembly of the republic were in the most harmonious agreement.

What the Montagne attempted on June 11 was "an insurrection within the limits of pure reason," that is, a purely parliamentary insurrection. The majority of the Assembly, intimidated by the prospect of an armed rising of the popular masses, was, in Bonaparte and the ministers, to destroy its own power and the significance of its own election. Had not the Constituent Assembly similarly attempted to annul the election of Bonaparte, when it insisted so obstinately on the dismissal of the Barrot-Falloux ministry?

Neither were there lacking from the time of the Convention models for parliamentary insurrections which had suddenly transformed completely the relation between the majority and the minority—and should the young Montagne not succeed where the old had succeeded?—nor did the relations at the moment seem unfavourable for such an undertaking. Popular unrest in Paris had reached an alarmingly high point; the army, according to its vote at the election, did not seem favourably inclined towards the government; the legislative majority itself was still too young to have become consolidated and, in addition, it consisted of old gentlemen. If the Montagne were successful in a parliamentary insurrection, the helm of state would fall directly into its hands. The democratic petty bourgeoisie, for its part, wished, as always, for nothing more fervently than to see the battle fought out in the clouds over its head between the departed spirits of parliament. Finally, both of them, the democratic petty bourgeoisie and its representatives, the Montagne, would, through a parliamentary insurrection, achieve their great purpose, that of breaking the power of the bourgeoisie without unleashing the proletariat or letting it appear otherwise than in perspective; the proletariat would have been used without becoming dangerous.

After the vote of the National Assembly on June 11, a con-
ference took place between some members of the Montagne and delegates of the secret workers' societies. The latter urged that the attack be started the same evening. The Montagne decisively rejected this plan. On no account did it want to let the leadership slip out of its hands; its allies were as suspect to it as its antagonists, and rightly so. The memory of June 1848 surged through the ranks of the Paris proletariat more vigorously than ever. Nevertheless it was chained to the alliance with the Montagne. The latter represented the largest part of the departments; it exaggerated its influence in the army; it had at its disposal the democratic section of the National Guard; it had the moral power of the shopkeepers behind it. To begin the revolution at this moment against the will of the Montagne would have meant for the proletariat, decimated moreover by cholera and driven out of Paris in considerable numbers by unemployment, to repeat uselessly the June days of 1848, without the situation which had forced this desperate struggle. The proletarian delegates did the only rational thing. They obligated the Montagne to compromise itself, that is, to come out beyond the confines of the parliamentary struggle in the event of its bill of impeachment being rejected. During the whole of June 13, the proletariat maintained this same sceptically watchful attitude, and awaited a seriously engaged irrevocable mêlée between the democratic National Guard and the army, in order then to plunge into the fight and push the revolution forward beyond the petty-bourgeois aim set for it. In the event of victory a proletarian commune was already formed which would take its place beside the official government. The Parisian workers had learned in the bloody school of June 1848.

On June 12 Minister Lacrosse himself brought forward in the Legislative Assembly the motion to proceed at once to the discussion of the bill of impeachment. During the night the government had made every provision for defence and attack; the majority of the National Assembly was determined to drive the rebellious minority out into the streets; the minority itself could no longer retreat; the die was cast; the bill of impeachment was rejected by 377 votes to 8. The Mountain, which had abstained from voting, rushed resentfully into the propaganda halls of the "pacific democracy," into the newspaper offices of the Démocratie pacifique.120

Its withdrawal from the parliament building broke its strength as withdrawal from the earth broke the strength of Antaeus, her giant son. Samsons in the precincts of the Legislative Assembly, they were only Philistines in the precincts of the "pacific democracy." A long, noisy, rambling debate ensued. The Montagne
was determined to compel respect for the constitution by every means, "only not by force of arms." In this decision it was supported by a manifesto and by a deputation of the "Friends of the Constitution." "Friends of the Constitution" was what the wreckage of the coterie of the National, of the bourgeois-republican party, called itself. While six of its remaining parliamentary representatives had voted against, the others in a body voting for, the rejection of the bill of impeachment, while Cavaignac placed his sabre at the disposal of the party of Order, the larger, extra-parliamentary part of the coterie greedily seized the opportunity to emerge from its position of a political pariah, and to press into the ranks of the democratic party. Did they not appear as the natural shield bearers of this party, which hid itself behind their shield, behind their principles, behind the constitution? 

Till break of day the "Mountain" was in labour. It gave birth to "a proclamation to the people," which, on the morning of June 13, occupied a more or less shamefaced place in two socialist journals. It declared the President, the ministers and the majority of the Legislative Assembly "outside the constitution" (hors la Constitution) and summoned the National Guard, the army and finally also the people "to arise." "Long live the Constitution!" was the slogan that it put forward, a slogan that signified nothing other than "Down with the revolution!"

In conformity with the constitutional proclamation of the Mountain, there was a so-called peaceful demonstration of the petty bourgeois on June 13, that is, a street procession from the Château d'Eau through the boulevards, 30,000 strong, mainly National Guards, unarmed, with an admixture of members of the secret workers' sections, moving along with the cry: "Long live the Constitution!" which was uttered mechanically, icily, and with a bad conscience by the members of the procession itself, and thrown back ironically by the echo of the people that surged along the sidewalks, instead of swelling up like thunder. From the many-voiced song the chest notes were missing. And when the procession swung by the meeting hall of the "Friends of the Constitution" and a hired herald of the constitution appeared on the housetop, violently cleaving the air with his claqueur hat and from tremendous lungs letting the catchcry "Long live the Constitution!" fall like hail on the heads of the pilgrims, they themselves seemed overcome for a moment by the comedy of the situation. It is known how the procession, having arrived at the termination of the rue de la Paix, was received in the boulevards by the dragoons and chasseurs of Changarnier in an altogether unparliamentary way, how in a trice it scattered in all directions
and how it threw behind it a few shouts of "to arms" only in order that the parliamentary call to arms of June 11 might be fulfilled.

The majority of the Montagne assembled in the rue du Hasard scattered when this violent dispersion of the peaceful procession, the muffled rumours of murder of unarmed citizens on the boulevards and the growing tumult in the streets seemed to herald the approach of a rising. Ledru-Rollin at the head of a small band of deputies saved the honour of the Mountain. Under the protection of the Paris Artillery, which had assembled in the Palais National, they betook themselves to the Conservatoire des arts et métiers,* where the fifth and sixth legions of the National Guard were to arrive. But the Montagnards waited in vain for the fifth and sixth legions; these discreet National Guards left their representatives in the lurch; the Paris Artillery itself prevented the people from throwing up barricades; chaotic disorder made any decision impossible; the troops of the line advanced with fixed bayonets; some of the representatives were taken prisoner, while others escaped. Thus ended June 13.

If June 23, 1848, was the insurrection of the revolutionary proletariat, June 13, 1849, was the insurrection of the democratic petty bourgeoisie, each of these two insurrections being the classically pure expression of the class which had been its vehicle.

Only in Lyons did it come to an obstinate, bloody conflict. Here, where the industrial bourgeoisie and the industrial proletariat stand directly opposed to one another, where the workers' movement is not, as in Paris, included in and determined by the general movement, June 13, in its repercussion, lost its original character. Wherever else it broke out in the provinces it did not kindle fire—a cold lightning flash.

June 13 closes the first period in the life of the constitutional republic, which had attained its normal existence on May 28, 1849, with the meeting of the Legislative Assembly. The whole period of this prologue is filled with vociferous struggle between the party of Order and the Montagne, between the big bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, which strove in vain against the consolidation of the bourgeois republic, for which it had itself continuously conspired in the Provisional Government and in the Executive Commission, and for which, during the June days, it had fought fanatically against the proletariat. The 13th of June breaks its resistance and makes the legislative dictatorship of the united royalists a fait accompli. From this moment

* Museum of Arts and Trades.—Ed.
the National Assembly is only a Committee of Public Safety of the party of Order.

Paris had put the President, the ministers and the majority of the National Assembly in a "state of impeachment"; they put Paris in a "state of siege." The Mountain had declared the majority of the Legislative Assembly "outside the constitution"; for violation of the constitution the majority handed over the Mountain to the haute cour* and proscribed everything in it that still had vital force. It was decimated to a rump without head or heart. The minority had gone as far as to attempt a parliamentary insurrection; the majority elevated its parliamentary despotism to law. It decreed new standing orders, which annihilate the freedom of the tribune and authorise the President of the National Assembly to punish representatives for violation of the standing orders with censure, with fines, with stoppage of their salaries, with suspension of membership, with incarceration. Over the rump of the Mountain it hung the rod instead of the sword. The remainder of the deputies of the Mountain owed it to their honour to make a mass exit. By such an act the dissolution of the party of Order would have been hastened. It would have had to break up into its original component parts the moment when not even the semblance of an opposition would hold it together any longer.

Simultaneously with their parliamentary power, the democratic petty bourgeois were robbed of their armed power through the dissolution of the Paris Artillery and the 8th, 9th and 12th legions of the National Guard. On the other hand, the legion of high finance, which on June 13 had raided the print shops of Boulé and Roux, demolished the presses, played havoc with the offices of the republican journals and arbitrarily arrested editors, compositors, printers, shipping clerks and errand boys, received encouraging approval from the tribune of the National Assembly. All over France the disbandment of National Guards suspected of republicanism was repeated.

A new press law, a new law of association, a new law on the state of siege, the prisons of Paris overflowing, the political refugees driven out, all the journals that go beyond the limits of the National suspended, Lyons and the five departments surrounding it abandoned to the brutal persecution of military despotism, the courts ubiquitous and the army of officials, so often purged, purged once more—these were the inevitable, the constantly recurring commonplaces of victorious reaction, worth

* Haute cour: High Court.—Ed.
mentioning after the massacres and the deportations of June only because this time they were directed not only against Paris, but also against the departments, not only against the proletariat, but, above all, against the middle classes.

The repressive laws, by which the declaration of a state of siege was left to the discretion of the government, the press still more firmly muzzled and the right of association annihilated, absorbed the whole of the legislative activity of the National Assembly during the months of June, July and August.

However, this epoch is characterised not by the exploitation of victory in fact, but in principle; not by the resolutions of the National Assembly, but by the grounds advanced for these resolutions; not by the thing, but by the phrase; not by the phrase but by the accent and the gesture which enliven the phrase. The brazen, unreserved expression of royalist sentiments, the contemptuously aristocratic insults to the republic, the coquettishly frivolous babbling of the restoration aims, in a word, the boastful violation of republican decorum give its peculiar tone and colour to this period. Long live the Constitution! was the battle cry of the vanquished of June 13. The victors were therefore absolved from the hypocrisy of constitutional, that is, republican, speech. The counter-revolution subjugated Hungary, Italy and Germany, and they believed that the restoration was already at the gates of France. Among the masters of ceremonies of the factions of Order there ensued a real competition to document their royalism in the Moniteur, and to confess, repent and crave pardon before God and man for liberal sins perchance committed by them under the monarchy. No day passed without the February Revolution being declared a national calamity from the tribune of the National Assembly, without some Legitimist provincial cabbage-Junker solemnly stating that he had never recognised the republic, without one of the cowardly deserters of and traitors to the July monarchy relating the belated deeds of heroism in the performance of which only the philanthropy of Louis Philippe or other misunderstandings had hindered him. What was admirable in the February days was not the magnanimity of the victorious people, but the self-sacrifice and moderation of the royalists, who had allowed it to be victorious. One Representative of the People proposed to divert part of the money destined for the relief of those wounded in February to the Municipal Guards, who alone in those days had deserved well of the fatherland. Another wanted to have an equestrian statue decreed to the Duke of Orleans in the Place du Carrousel. Thiers called the constitution a dirty piece of paper. There appeared in succession on the tribune Orleanists, to repent of their conspiracy
against the legitimate monarchy; Legitimists, who reproached themselves with having hastened the overthrow of monarchy in general by resisting the illegitimate monarchy; Thiers, who repented of having intrigued against Molé; Molé, who repented of having intrigued against Guizot; Barrot, who repented of having intrigued against all three. The cry "Long live the Social-Democratic Republic!" was declared unconstitutional; the cry "Long live the Republic!" was prosecuted as social-democratic. On the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo, a Representative declared: "I fear an invasion of the Prussians less than the entry of the revolutionary refugees into France." To the complaints about the terrorism which was organised in Lyons and in the neighbouring departments, Baraguey d'Hilliers answered: "I prefer the White terror to the Red terror." (Je préfère la terreur blanche que la terreur rouge.) And the Assembly applauded frantically every time that an epigram against the republic, against the revolution, against the constitution, for the monarchy or for the Holy Alliance fell from the lips of its orators. Every infringement of the minutest republican formality, for example, addressing the Representatives as citoyens, filled the knights of order with enthusiasm.

The by-elections in Paris on July 8, held under the influence of the state of siege and of the abstention of a great part of the proletariat from the ballot box, the taking of Rome by the French army, the entry into Rome of the red eminences and, in their train, of the inquisition and monkish terrorism, added fresh victories to the victory of June and increased the intoxication of the party of Order.

Finally, in the middle of August, half with the intention of attending the Department Councils just assembled, half through exhaustion from the tendentious orgy of many months, the royalists decreed the prorogation of the National Assembly for two months. With transparent irony they left behind a commission of twenty-five Representatives, the cream of the Legitimists and the Orleanists, a Molé and a Changarnier, as proxies for the National Assembly and as guardians of the republic. The irony was more profound than they suspected. They, condemned by history to help to overthrow the monarchy they loved, were destined by it to conserve the republic they hated.

The second period in the life of the constitutional republic, its royalist period of sowing wild oats, closes with the proroguing of the Legislative Assembly.

The state of siege in Paris had again been raised, the activities of the press had again begun. During the suspension of the social-democratic papers, during the period of repressive legis-
lation and royalist bluster, the Siècle, the old literary representative of the monarchist-constitutional petty bourgeois, republicanised itself; the Presse, the old literary exponent of the bourgeois reformers, democratised itself; while the National, the old classic organ of the republican bourgeois, socialised itself.

The secret societies grew in extent and intensity in the same degree that the public clubs became impossible. The workers’ industrial co-operatives, tolerated as purely commercial societies, while of no account economically, became politically so many means of cementing the proletariat. June 13 had struck off the official heads of the various semi-revolutionary parties; the masses that remained won a head of their own. The knights of order had practised intimidation by prophecies of the terror of the Red republic; the base excesses, the hyperborean atrocities of the victorious counter-revolution in Hungary, in Baden and in Rome washed the “Red republic” white. And the malcontent intermediate classes of French society began to prefer the promises of the Red republic with its problematic terrors to the terrors of the Red monarchy with its actual hopelessness. No Socialist in France spread more revolutionary propaganda than Haynau. A chaque capacité selon ses œuvres!

In the meantime Louis Bonaparte exploited the recess of the National Assembly to make princely tours of the provinces, the most hot-blooded Legitimists made pilgrimages to Ems, to the grandchild of the saintly Louis, and the mass of the popular representatives on the side of order intrigued in the Department Councils, which had just met. It was necessary to make them pronounce what the majority of the National Assembly did not yet dare to pronounce, an urgent motion for immediate revision of the constitution. According to the constitution, it could not be revised before 1852, and then only by a National Assembly called together expressly for this purpose. If, however, the majority of the Department Councils expressed themselves to this effect, was not the National Assembly bound to sacrifice the virginity of the constitution to the voice of France? The National Assembly entertained the same hopes in regard to these provincial assemblies as the nuns in Voltaire’s Henriade entertained in regard to the pandours. But, some exceptions apart, the Potiphars of the National Assembly had to deal with just so many Josephs of the provinces. The vast majority did not want to understand the importunate insinuation. The revi-

* To each man of talent according to his work! (Paraphrase of Saint-Simon’s well-known formula.)—Ed.
sion of the constitution was frustrated by the very instruments by which it was to have been called into being, by the votes of the Department Councils. The voice of France, and indeed of bourgeois France, had spoken and had spoken against revision.

At the beginning of October the Legislative National Assembly met once more—*tantum mutatus ab illo*! Its physiognomy was completely changed. The unexpected rejection of revision on the part of the Department Councils had put it back within the limits of the constitution and indicated the limits of its term of life. The Orleanists had become mistrustful because of the pilgrimages of the Legitimists to Ems; the Legitimists had grown suspicious on account of the negotiations of the Orleanists with London; the journals of the two factions had fanned the fire and weighed the reciprocal claims of their pretenders. Orleanists and Legitimists grumbled in unison at the machinations of the Bonapartists, which showed themselves in the princely tours, in the more or less transparent emancipatory attempts of the President, in the presumptuous language of the Bonapartist newspapers; Louis Bonaparte grumbled at a National Assembly which found only the Legitimist-Orleanist conspiracy legitimate, at a ministry which betrayed him continually to this National Assembly. Finally, the ministry was itself divided on the Roman policy and on the *income tax* proposed by Minister Passy, and decreed as socialistic by the conservatives.

One of the first bills of the Barrot ministry in the re-assembled Legislative Assembly was a demand for a credit of 300,000 francs for the payment of a widow’s pension to the *Duchess of Orleans*. The National Assembly granted it and added to the list of debts of the French nation a sum of seven million francs. Thus, while Louis Philippe continued to play with success the role of the *pauvre honteux*, of the shamefaced beggar, the ministry neither dared to move an increase of salary for Bonaparte nor did the Assembly appear inclined to grant it. And Louis Bonaparte, as ever, vacillated in the dilemma: *Aut Caesar aut Clichy!*

The minister’s second demand for a credit, one of nine million francs for the *costs of the Rome expedition*, increased the tension between Bonaparte, on the one hand, and the ministers and the National Assembly, on the other. Louis Bonaparte had inserted a letter to his military aide, Edgar Ney, in the *Moni-

---

* How great was the change since then (Virgil, *Aeneid*).—Ed.

** Either Caesar or Clichy. (Clichy: Paris prison for insolvent debtors.) (Paraphrase of the well-known saying, “Aut Caesar aut nihil”—“Either Caesar or nothing.”)—Ed.
teur, in which he bound the papal government to constitutional guarantees. The Pope, on his part, had published an address, *motu proprio,* in which he rejected any limitation of his restored rule. Bonaparte's letter, with studied indiscretion, raised the curtain of his cabinet, in order to expose himself to the eyes of the gallery as a benevolent genius who was, however, misunderstood and shackled in his own house. It was not the first time that he had coquetted with the "furtive flights of a free soul."* Thiers, the reporter of the commission, completely ignored Bonaparte's flight and contented himself with translating the papal allocution into French. It was not the ministry, but Victor Hugo that sought to save the President through an order of the day in which the National Assembly was to express its agreement with Napoleon's letter. *Allons donc! Allons donc!* With this disrespectful, frivolous interjection the majority buried Hugo's motion. The policy of the President? The letter of the President? The President himself? *Allons donc! Allons donc!* Who the devil takes Monsieur Bonaparte *au sérieux?* Do you believe, Monsieur Victor Hugo, that we believe you that you believe in the President? *Allons donc! Allons donc!*

Finally, the breach between Bonaparte and the National Assembly was hastened by the discussion on the *recall of the Orleans and the Bourbons.* In default of the ministry, the cousin of the President, the son of the ex-king of Westphalia, had put forward this motion, which had no other purpose than to push the Legitimist and the Orleanist pretenders down to the same level, or rather a *lower* level than the Bonapartist pretender, who at least stood in fact at the pinnacle of the state.

Napoleon Bonaparte was disrespectful enough to make the *recall of the expelled royal families* and the *amnesty of the June insurgents* parts of one and the same motion. The indignation of the majority compelled him immediately to apologise for this sacrilegious concatenation of the holy and the impious, of the royal races and the proletarian brood, of the fixed stars of society and of its swamp lights, and to assign to each of the two motions its proper place. The majority energetically rejected the recall of the royal family, and *Berryer,* the Demosthenes of the Legitimists, left no doubt about the meaning of the vote. The civic degradation of the pretenders, that is what is intended! It

* Georg Herwegh, "Aus den Bergen" ("From the Mountains").—Ed.
** Get along with you!—Ed.
*** *Au sérieux:* Seriously.—Ed.
**** Napoleon Joseph Bonaparte, son of Jerome Bonaparte.—Ed.
is desired to rob them of their halo, of the last majesty that is left to them, the majesty of exile! What, cried Berryer, would be thought of him among the pretenders who, forgetting his august origin, came here to live as a simple private individual? It could not have been more clearly intimated to Louis Bonaparte that he had not gained the day by his presence, that whereas the royalists in coalition needed him here in France as a neutral man in the presidential chair, the serious pretenders to the throne had to be kept out of profane sight by the fog of exile.

On November 1, Louis Bonaparte answered the Legislative Assembly with a message which in pretty brusque words announced the dismissal of the Barrot ministry and the formation of a new ministry. The Barrot-Falloux ministry was the ministry of the royalist coalition, the d'Hautpoul ministry was the ministry of Bonaparte, the organ of the President as against the Legislative Assembly, the ministry of the clerks.

Bonaparte was no longer the merely neutral man of December 10, 1848. Possession of the executive power had grouped a number of interests around him, the struggle with anarchy forced the party of Order itself to increase his influence, and if he was no longer popular, the party of Order was unpopular. Could he not hope to compel the Orleanists and the Legitimists, through their rivalry as well as through the necessity of some sort of monarchist restoration, to recognise the neutral pretender?

From November 1, 1849, dates the third period in the life of the constitutional republic, a period which closes with March 10, 1850. The regular game, so much admired by Guizot, of the constitutional institutions, the wrangling between executive and legislative power, now begins. More, as against the hankering for restoration on the part of the united Orleanists and Legitimists, Bonaparte defends his title to his actual power, the republic; as against the hankering for restoration on the part of Bonaparte, the party of Order defends its title to its common rule, the republic; as against the Orleanists, the Legitimists, and as against the Legitimists, the Orleanists, defend the status quo, the republic. All these factions of the party of Order, each of which has its own king and its own restoration in petto,* mutually enforce, as against their rivals’ hankering for usurpation and revolt, the common rule of the bourgeoisie, the form in which the special claims remain neutralised and reserved—the republic.

* In petto: In its bosom, that is, secretly.—Ed.
Just as Kant makes the republic, so these royalists make the monarchy, the only rational form of state, a postulate of practical reason whose realisation is never attained, but whose attainment must always be striven for and mentally adhered to as the goal.

Thus the constitutional republic had gone forth from the hands of the bourgeois republicans as a hollow ideological formula to become a form full of content and life in the hands of the royalists in coalition. And Thiers spoke more truly than he suspects when he said: “We, the royalists, are the true pillars of the constitutional republic.”

The overthrow of the ministry of the coalition and the appearance of the ministry of the clerks has a second significance. Its Finance Minister was Fould. Fould as Finance Minister signifies the official surrender of France’s national wealth to the Bourse, the management of the state’s property by the Bourse and in the interests of the Bourse. With the nomination of Fould, the finance aristocracy announced its restoration in the Moniteur. This restoration necessarily supplemented the other restorations, which form just so many links in the chain of the constitutional republic.

Louis Philippe had never dared to make a genuine loup-cervier (stock-exchange shark) finance minister. Just as his monarchy was the ideal name for the rule of the big bourgeoisie, so in his ministries the privileged interests had to bear ideologically disinterested names. The bourgeois republic everywhere pushed into the forefront what the different monarchies, Legitimist as well as Orleanist, kept concealed in the background. It made earthly what they had made heavenly. In place of the names of the saints it put the bourgeois proper names of the dominant class interests.

Our whole exposition has shown how the republic, from the first day of its existence, did not overthrow but consolidated the finance aristocracy. But the concessions that were made to it were a fate to which submission was made without the desire to bring it about. With Fould, the initiative in the government returned to the finance aristocracy.

The question will be asked, how the coalesced bourgeoisie could bear and suffer the rule of finance, which under Louis Philippe depended on the exclusion or subordination of the remaining bourgeois factions.

The answer is simple.

First of all, the finance aristocracy itself forms a weighty, authoritative part of the royalist coalition, whose common governmental power is denominated republic. Are not the spokes-
men and leading lights among the Orleanists the old confederates and accomplices of the finance aristocracy? Is it not itself the golden phalanx of Orleanism? As far as the Legitimists are concerned, they had participated in practice already under Louis Philippe in all the orgies of the Bourse, mine and railway speculations. In general, the combination of large landed property with high finance is a normal fact. Proof: England; proof: even Austria.

In a country like France, where the volume of national production stands at a disproportionately lower level than the amount of the national debt, where government bonds form the most important subject of speculation and the Bourse the chief market for the investment of capital that wants to turn itself to account in an unproductive way—in such a country a countless number of people from all bourgeois or semi-bourgeois classes must have an interest in the state debt, in the Bourse gamblings, in finance. Do not all these interested subalterns find their natural mainstays and commanders in the faction which represents this interest in its vastest outlines, which represents it as a whole?

By what is the accrual of state property to high finance conditioned? By the constantly growing indebtedness of the state. And the indebtedness of the state? By the constant excess of its expenditure over its income, a disproportion which is simultaneously the cause and effect of the system of state loans.

In order to escape from this indebtedness, the state must either restrict its expenditure, that is, simplify and curtail the government organism, govern as little as possible, employ as small a personnel as possible, enter as little as possible into relations with bourgeois society. This path was impossible for the party of Order, whose means of repression, whose official interference in the name of the state and whose ubiquity through organs of state were bound to increase in the same measure as the number of quarters increased from which its rule and the conditions for the existence of its class were threatened. The gendarmerie cannot be reduced in the same measure as attacks on persons and property increase.

Or the state must seek to evade the debts and produce an immediate but transitory balance in its budget by putting extraordinary taxes on the shoulders of the wealthiest classes. But was the party of Order to sacrifice its own wealth on the altar of the fatherland in order to stop the national wealth from being exploited by the Bourse? *Pas si bête!*—Ed.
Therefore, without a complete revolution in the French state, no revolution in the French state budget. Along with this state budget necessarily goes state indebtedness, and with state indebtedness necessarily goes the lordship of the trade in state debts, of the state creditors, the bankers, the money dealers and the wolves of the Bourse. Only one faction of the party of Order was directly concerned in the overthrow of the finance aristocracy—the manufacturers. We are not speaking of the middle, of the smaller people engaged in industry; we are speaking of the reigning princes of the manufacturing interests, who had formed the broad basis of the dynastic opposition under Louis Philippe. Their interest is indubitably reduction of the costs of production and hence reduction of the taxes, which enter into production, and hence reduction of the state debts, the interest on which enters into the taxes, hence the overthrow of the finance aristocracy.

In England—and the largest French manufacturers are petty bourgeois compared with their English rivals—we really find the manufacturers, a Cobden, a Bright, at the head of the crusade against the bank and the stock-exchange aristocracy. Why not in France? In England industry predominates; in France, agriculture. In England industry requires free trade; in France, protective tariffs, national monopoly alongside of the other monopolies. French industry does not dominate French production, the French industrialists, therefore, do not dominate the French bourgeoisie. In order to secure the advancement of their interests as against the remaining factions of the bourgeoisie, they cannot, like the English, take the lead of the movement and simultaneously push their class interests to the fore; they must follow in the train of the revolution, and serve interests which are opposed to the collective interests of their class. In February they had misunderstood their position; February sharpened their wits. And who is more directly threatened by the workers than the employer, the industrial capitalist? The manufacturer, therefore, of necessity became in France the most fanatical member of the party of Order. The reduction of his profit by finance, what is that compared with the abolition of profit by the proletariat?

In France, the petty bourgeois does what normally the industrial bourgeois would have to do; the worker does what normally would be the task of the petty bourgeois; and the task of the worker, who accomplishes that? No one. In France it is not accomplished; in France it is proclaimed. It is not accomplished anywhere within the national walls; the class war within French society turns into a world war, in which the
nations confront one another. Accomplishment begins only at the moment when, through the world war, the proletariat is pushed to the van of the people that dominates the world market, to the van of England. The revolution, which finds here not its end, but its organisational beginning, is no short-lived revolution. The present generation is like the Jews whom Moses led through the wilderness. It has not only a new world to conquer, it must go under in order to make room for the men who are able to cope with a new world.

Let us return to Fould.

On November 14, 1849, Fould mounted the tribune of the National Assembly and expounded his system of finance: an apology for the old system of taxes! Retention of the wine tax! Abandonment of Passy's income tax!

Passy, too, was no revolutionist; he was an old minister of Louis Philippe's. He belonged to the puritans of the Dufaure brand and to the most intimate confidants of Teste,* the scapegoat of the July monarchy. Passy, too, had praised the old tax system and recommended the retention of the wine tax; but he had, at the same time, torn the veil from the state deficit. He had declared the necessity for a new tax, the income tax, if the bankruptcy of the state was to be avoided. Fould, who had recommended state bankruptcy to Ledru-Rollin, recommended the state deficit to the Legislative Assembly. He promised economies, the secret of which later revealed itself in that, for example, expenditures diminished by sixty millions while the floating debt increased by two hundred millions—conjurers' tricks in the grouping of figures, in the drawing up of accounts, which all finally amounted to new loans.

Alongside the other jealous bourgeois factions, the finance aristocracy naturally did not act in so shamelessly corrupt a manner under Fould as under Louis Philippe. But, once it existed, the system remained the same: constant increase in the debts, masking of the deficit. And, in time, the old Bourse swindling came out more openly. Proof: the law concerning the Avignon Railway; the mysterious fluctuations in government securities, for a brief space the topic of the day throughout Paris;

---

* On July 8, 1847, before the Chamber of Peers in Paris, began the trial of Parmentier and General Cubières for bribery of officials with a view to obtaining a salt works concession, and of the then Minister of Public Works, Teste, for accepting such money bribes. The latter, during the trial, attempted to commit suicide. All were sentenced to pay heavy fines, Teste, in addition, to serve three years' imprisonment. [Note by Engels to the 1895 edition.]
finally, the ill-starred speculations of Fould and Bonaparte on
the elections of March 10.
With the official restoration of the finance aristocracy, the
French people had soon again to stand before a February 24.
The Constituent Assembly, in an attack of misanthropy against
its heir, had abolished the wine tax for the year of our
Lord 1850. New debts could not be paid with the abolition of
old taxes. Creton, a cretin of the party of Order, had moved the
retention of the wine tax even before the prorogation of the
Legislative Assembly. Fould took up this motion in the name of
the Bonapartist ministry and on December 20, 1849, the anni-
versary of the day when Bonaparte was proclaimed President,
the National Assembly decreed the restoration of the wine
tax.
The sponsor of this restoration was not a financier; it was
the Jesuit chief Montalembert. His argument was strikingly
simple: Taxation is the maternal breast on which the government
is suckled. The government is the instruments of repression; it
is the organs of authority; it is the army; it is the police; it is
the officials, the judges, the ministers; it is the priests. An at-
tack on taxation is an attack by the anarchists on the sentinels
of order, who safeguard the material and spiritual production
of bourgeois society from the inroads of the proletarian vandals.
Taxation is the fifth god, side by side with property, the family,
order and religion. And the wine tax is incontestably taxation
and, moreover, not ordinary, but traditional, monarchical dis-
posed, respectable taxation. Vive l'impôt des boissons!² Three
cheers and one cheer more!
When the French peasant paints the devil, he paints him in
the guise of a tax collector. From the moment when Montalem-
bert elevated taxation to a god, the peasant became godless,
atheist, and threw himself into the arms of the devil, of Social-
ism. The religion of order had forfeited him; the Jesuits had
forfeited him; Bonaparte had forfeited him. December 20, 1849,
had irrevocably compromised December 20, 1848. The "nephew
of his uncle" was not the first of his family whom the wine tax
defeated, this tax which, in the expression of Montalembert,
heralds the revolutionary storm. The real, the great Napoleon
declared on St. Helena that the reintroduction of the wine tax
had contributed more to his downfall than all else, since it had
alienated from him the peasants of Southern France. Already
under Louis XIV the favourite object of the hatred of the peo-

² Long live the tax on drinks!—Ed.
ple (see the writings of Boisguillebert and Vauban), abolished by the first revolution. It was reintroduced by Napoleon in a modified form in 1808. When the restoration entered France, there trotted before it not only the Cossacks, but also the promises to abolish the wine tax. The gentilhommerie* naturally did not need to keep its word to the gens taillables à merci et miséricorde.** The year 1830 promised the abolition of the wine tax. It was not its way to do what it said or say what it did. The year 1848 promised the abolition of the wine tax, just as it promised everything. Finally, the Constituent Assembly, which promised nothing, made, as already mentioned, a testamentary provision whereby the wine tax was to disappear on January 1, 1850. And just ten days before January 1, 1850, the Legislative Assembly introduced it once more, so that the French people perpetually pursued it, and when it had thrown it out the door saw it come in again through the window.

The popular hatred of the wine tax is explained by the fact that it unites in itself all the odiousness of the French system of taxation. The mode of its collection is odious, the mode of its distribution aristocratic, for the rates of taxation are the same for the commonest as for the costliest wines; it increases, therefore, in geometrical progression as the wealth of the consumers decreases, an inverted progressive tax. It accordingly directly provokes the poisoning of the labouring classes by putting a premium on adulterated and imitation wines. It lessens consumption, since it sets up octrois*** before the gates of all towns of over 4,000 inhabitants and transforms each such town into a foreign country with a protective tariff against French wine. The big wine merchants, but still more the small ones, the marchands de vins, the keepers of wine saloons, whose livelihood directly depends on the consumption of wine, are so many avowed enemies of the wine tax. And, finally, by lessening consumption the wine tax curtails the producers' market. While it renders the urban workers incapable of paying for wine, it renders the wine growers incapable of selling it. And France has a wine-growing population of about twelve million. One can, therefore, understand the hatred of the people in general; one can, in particular, understand the fanaticism of the peasants against the wine tax. And, in addition, they saw in its restoration no isolated, more or less accidental, event. The peasants have a kind of historical tradition of their own, which is handed

* Gentilhommerie: Nobility.—Ed.
** People taxable at arbitrary discretion.—Ed.
*** Octrois: Local customs offices at the gates of towns.—Ed.
down from father to son, and in this historical school it is muttered that whenever any government wants to dupe the peasants, it promises the abolition of the wine tax, and as soon as it has duped the peasants, retains or reintroduces the wine tax. In the wine tax the peasant tests the bouquet of the government, its tendency. The restoration of the wine tax on December 20 meant: Louis Bonaparte is like the rest. But he was not like the rest; he was a peasant discovery, and in the petitions carrying millions of signatures against the wine tax they took back the votes that they had given a year before to the “nephew of his uncle.”

The country folk—over two-thirds of the total French population—consist for the most part of so-called free landowners. The first generation, gratuitously freed by the revolution of 1789 from its feudal burdens, had paid no price for the soil. But the following generations paid, under the form of the price of land, what their semi-serf forefathers had paid in the form of rent, tithes, corvée, etc. The more, on the one hand, the population grew and the more, on the other hand, the partition of the soil increased, the higher became the price of the parcels, for the demand for them increased with their smallness. But in proportion as the price which the peasant paid for his parcel rose, whether he bought it directly or whether he had it accounted as capital by his coheirs, necessarily also rose the indebtedness of the peasant, that is, the mortgage. The claim to a debt encumbering the land is termed a mortgage, a pawn-ticket in respect of the land. Just as privileges accumulated on the medieval estate, mortgages accumulate on the modern small allotment. On the other hand: under the system of parcellation the soil is purely an instrument of production for its proprietor. Now the fruitfulness of land diminishes in the same measure as land is divided. The application of machinery to the land, the division of labour, major soil improvement measures, such as cutting drainage and irrigation canals and the like, become more and more impossible, while the unproductive costs of cultivation increase in the same proportion as the division of the instrument of production itself. All this, regardless of whether the possessor of the small allotment possesses capital or not. But the more the division increases, the more does the parcel of land with its utterly wretched inventory form the entire capital of the small allotment peasant, the more does investment of capital in the land diminish, the more does the cotter lack land, money and education for making use of the progress in agronomy, and the more does the cultivation of the soil retrogress. Finally, the net proceeds diminish in the same proportion as the gross consump-
tion increases, as the whole family of the peasant is kept back from other occupations through its holding and yet is not enabled to live by it.

In the measure, therefore, that the population and, with it, the division of the land increases, does the instrument of production, the soil, become dearer and its fertility decrease, does agriculture decline and the peasant become loaded with debt. And what was the effect becomes, in its turn, the cause. Each generation leaves behind another more deeply in debt; each new generation begins under more unfavourable and more aggravating conditions; mortgaging begets mortgaging, and when it becomes impossible for the peasant to offer his small holding as security for new debts, that is, to encumber it with new mortgages, he falls a direct victim to usury, and usurious interest rates become so much the more exorbitant.

Thus it came about that the French peasant cedes to the capitalist, in the form of interest on the mortgages encumbering the soil and in the form of interest on the advances made by the usurer without mortgages, not only ground rent, not only the industrial profit, in a word, not only the whole net profit, but even a part of the wages, and that therefore he has sunk to the level of the Irish tenant farmer—all under the pretence of being a private proprietor.

This process was accelerated in France by the ever-growing burden of taxes, by court costs called forth in part directly by the formalities themselves with which French legislation encumbers the ownership of land, in part by the innumerable conflicts over parcels everywhere bounding and crossing each other, and in part by the litigiousness of the peasants, whose enjoyment of property is limited to the fanatical assertion of their title to their fancied property, of their property rights.

According to a statistical statement of 1840, the gross production of French agriculture amounted to 5,237,178,000 francs. Of this, the costs of cultivation come to 3,552,000,000 francs, including the consumption by the persons working. There remains a net product of 1,685,178,000 francs, from which 550,000,000 have to be deducted for interest on mortgages, 100,000,000 for law officials, 350,000,000 for taxes and 107,000,000 for registration money, stamp duty, mortgage fees, etc. There is left one-third of the net product, or 538,000,000; when distributed over the population, not 25 francs per head net product. Naturally neither usury outside of mortgage nor lawyers' fees, etc., are included in this calculation.

The condition of the French peasants, when the republic had added new burdens to their old ones, is comprehensible. It can
be seen that their exploitation differs only in form from the 
exploitation of the industrial proletariat. The exploiter is the 
same: capital. The individual capitalists exploit the individual 
peasants through mortgages and usury; the capitalist class ex-

torts the peasant class through the state taxes. The peasant's 
title to property is the talisman by which capital held him him-
erto under its spell, the pretext under which it set him against 
the industrial proletariat. Only the fall of capital can raise the 
peasant; only an anti-capitalist, a proletarian government can 
break his economic misery, his social degradation. The constitu-
tional republic is the dictatorship of his united exploiters; the 
social-democratic, the Red republic, is the dictatorship of his 
allies. And the scale rises or falls, according to the votes that the 
peasant casts into the ballot box. He himself has to decide his 
fate. So spoke the Socialists in pamphlets, almanacs, calendars 
and leaflets of all kinds. This language became more under-
standable to him through the counter-writings of the party of 
Order, which, for its part, turned to him, and which, by gross 
exaggeration, by its brutal conception and representation of the 
intentions and ideas of the Socialists, struck the true peasant 
and overstimulated his lust after forbidden fruit. But most 
understandable was the language of the actual experience that 
the peasant class had gained from the use of the suffrage, were 
the disillusionments overwhelming him, blow upon blow, with 
revolutionary speed. Revolutions are the locomotives of history.

The gradual revolutionising of the peasants was manifested 
by various symptoms. It already revealed itself in the elections 
to the Legislative Assembly; it was revealed in the state of siege 
in the five departments bordering Lyons; it was revealed a few 
months after June 13 in the election of a Montagnard in place 
of the former president of the Chambre introuvable* by the 
Department of the Gironde; it was revealed on December 20, 
1849, in the election of a Red in place of a deceased Legitimist 
deputy in the Department du Gard,130 that promised land of the 
Legitimists, the scene of the most frightful infamies committed 
against the republicans in 1794 and 1795 and the centre of the 
terreur blanche in 1815, where liberals and Protestants were 
publicly murdered. This revolutionising of the most stationary 
class is most clearly evident since the reintroduction of the wine 
tax. The governmental measures and the laws of January and

* Chambre introuvable: This is the name given by history to the fana-
tically ultra-royalist and reactionary Chamber of Deputies elected imme-
diately after the second overthrow of Napoleon, in 1815. [Note by Engels 
to the edition of 1895.]
February 1850 are directed almost exclusively against the *departments* and the *peasants*. The most striking proof of their progress.

The *Hautpoul circular*, by which the gendarme was appointed inquisitor of the prefect, of the sub-prefect and, above all, of the mayor, and by which espionage was organised even in the hidden corners of the remotest village community; the *law against the schoolteachers*, by which they, the men of talent, the spokesmen, the educators and interpreters of the peasant class, were subjected to the arbitrary power of the prefect, they, the proletarians of the learned class, were chased like hunted beasts from one community to another; the *bill against the mayors*, by which the Damocles sword of dismissal was hung over their heads, and they, the presidents of the peasant communities, were every moment set in opposition to the President of the Republic and the party of Order; the *ordinance* which transformed the seventeen military districts of France into four pasha-lics and forced the barracks and the bivouac on the French as their national *salon*; the *education law*, by which the party of Order proclaimed the unconsciousness and the forcible stupefaction of France as the condition of its life under the regime of universal suffrage—what were all these laws and measures? Desperate attempts to reconquer the departments and the peasants of the departments for the party of Order.

Regarded as *repression*, they were wretched methods that wrung the neck of their own purpose. The big measures, like the retention of the wine tax, of the 45 centimes tax, the scornful rejection of the peasant petitions for the repayment of the military, etc., all these legislative thunderbolts struck the peasant class only once, wholesale, from the centre; the laws and measures instanced made attack and the resistance *general*, the topic of the day in every hut; they inoculated every village with revolution; they *localised and peasantised the revolution*.

On the other hand, do not these proposals of Bonaparte and their acceptance by the National Assembly prove the unity of the two powers of the constitutional republic, so far as it is a question of repression of anarchy, that is, of all the classes that rise against the bourgeois dictatorship? Had not *Soulouque*, directly after his brusque message, assured the Legislative Assembly of his *dévouement* to order, through the immediately following message of *Carlier*, that dirty, mean caricature of Fouché, as Louis Bonaparte himself was the shallow caricature of Napoleon?

---

*Dévouement*: Devotion.—*Ed.*
The education law shows us the alliance of the young Catholics with the old Voltaireians. Could the rule of the united bourgeois be anything else but the coalesced despotism of the pro-Jesuit Restoration and the make-believe free-thinking July monarchy? Had not the weapons that the one bourgeois faction had distributed among the people against the other faction in their mutual struggle for supremacy again to be torn from it, the people, since the latter was confronting their united dictatorship? Nothing has aroused the Paris shopkeeper more than this coquettish étalage* of Jesuitism, not even the rejection of the concordats à l'amicable.

Meanwhile the collisions between the different factions of the party of Order, as well as between the National Assembly and Bonaparte, continued. The National Assembly was far from pleased that Bonaparte, immediately after his coup d'état, after appointing his own, Bonapartist, ministry, summoned before him the invalids of the monarchy, newly appointed prefects, and made their unconstitutional agitation for his re-election as President the condition of their appointment; that Carlier celebrated his inauguration with the closing of a Legitimist club, or that Bonaparte founded a journal of his own, Le Napoléon,134 which betrayed the secret longings of the President to the public, while his ministers had to deny them from the tribune of the Legislative Assembly. The latter was far from pleased by the defiant retention of the ministry, notwithstanding its various votes of no confidence; far from pleased by the attempt to win the favour of the non-commissioned officers by an extra pay of four sous a day, and the favour of the proletariat by a plagiarisation of Eugène Sue's Mystères,** by an honour loan bank; far from pleased, finally, by the effrontery with which the ministers were made to move the deportation of the remaining June insurgents to Algiers, in order to heap unpopularity on the Legislative Assembly en gros,*** while the President reserved popularity for himself en détail,**** by individual grants of pardon. Thiers let fall threatening words about coups d'état and coups de tête,***** and the Legislative Assembly revenged itself on Bonaparte by rejecting every proposed law which he put forward for his own benefit, and by enquiring, with noisy mistrust, in every instance where he made a proposal in the common interest, whether he did not aspire, through increase of

---

* Étalage: Display.—Ed.
** Full English title: The Mysteries of Paris.—Ed.
*** En gros: Wholesale.—Ed.
**** En détail: Retail.—Ed.
***** Coups de tête: Rash deeds.—Ed.
the executive power, to augment the personal power of Bonaparte. In a word, it revenged itself by a conspiracy of contempt.

The Legitimist party, on its part, saw with vexation the more capable Orleanists once more occupying almost all posts and centralisation increasing, while it sought its salvation principally in decentralisation. And so it was. The counter-revolution centralised forcibly, that is, it prepared the mechanism of the revolution. It even centralised the gold and silver of France in the Paris bank through the compulsory quotation of bank notes, and so created the ready war chest of the revolution.

Lastly, the Orleanists saw with vexation the emergent principle of legitimacy contrasted with their bastard principle, and themselves every moment snubbed and maltreated as the bourgeois mésalliance of a noble spouse.

Little by little we have seen peasants, petty bourgeois, the middle classes in general, stepping alongside the proletariat, driven into open antagonism to the official republic and treated by it as antagonists. Revolt against bourgeois dictatorship, need of a change of society, adherence to democratic-republican institutions as organs of their movement, grouping round the proletariat as the decisive revolutionary power—these are the common characteristics of the so-called party of social-democracy, the party of the Red republic. This party of Anarchy, as its opponents christened it, is no less a coalition of different interests than the party of Order. From the smallest reform of the old social disorder to the overthrow of the old social order, from bourgeois liberalism to revolutionary terrorism—as far apart as this lie the extremes that form the starting point and the finishing point of the party of "Anarchy."

Abolition of the protective tariff—Socialism! For it strikes at the monopoly of the industrial faction of the party of Order. Regulation of the state budget—Socialism! For it strikes at the monopoly of the financial faction of the party of Order. Free admission of foreign meat and corn—Socialism! For it strikes at the monopoly of the third faction of the party of Order, large landed property. The demands of the free-trade party, that is, of the most advanced English bourgeois party, appear in France as so many socialist demands. Voltairianism—Socialism! For it strikes at a fourth faction of the party of Order, the Catholic. Freedom of the press, right of association, universal public education—Socialism, Socialism! They strike at the general monopoly of the party of Order.

So swiftly had the march of the revolution ripened conditions that the friends of reform of all shades, the most moderate
claims of the middle classes, were compelled to group themselves round the banner of the most extreme party of revolution, round the red flag.

Yet, manifold as the Socialism of the different large sections of the party of Anarchy was, according to the economic conditions and the total revolutionary requirements of their class or fraction of a class arising out of these, in one point it is in harmony: in proclaiming itself the means of emancipating the proletariat and the emancipation of the latter as its object. Deliberate deception on the part of some; self-deception on the part of the others, who give out the world transformed according to their own needs as the best world for all, as the realisation of all revolutionary claims and the elimination of all revolutionary collisions.

Behind the general socialist phrases of the “party of Anarchy,” which sound rather alike, there is concealed the Socialism of the “National,” of the “Presse” and the “Siècle,” which more or less consistently wants to overthrow the rule of the finance aristocracy and to free industry and trade from their hitherto existing fetters. This is the Socialism of industry, of trade and of agriculture, whose bosses in the party of Order deny these interests, in so far as they no longer coincide with their private monopolies. Socialism proper, petty-bourgeois Socialism, Socialism par excellence, is distinct from this bourgeois Socialism, to which, as to every variety of Socialism, a section of the workers and petty bourgeois naturally rallies. Capital hounds this class chiefly as its creditor, so it demands credit institutions; capital crushes it by competition, so it demands associations supported by the state; capital overwhelms it by concentration, so it demands progressive taxes, limitations on inheritance, taking over of large construction projects by the state, and other measures that forcibly stem the growth of capital. Since it dreams of the peaceful achievement of its Socialism—allowing, perhaps, for a second February Revolution lasting a brief day or so—the coming historical process naturally appears to it as an application of systems, which the thinkers of society, whether in companies or as individual inventors, devise or have devised. Thus they become the eclectics or adepts of the existing socialist systems, of doctrinaire Socialism, which was the theoretical expression of the proletariat only as long as it had not yet developed further into a free historical movement of its own.

While this utopia, doctrinaire Socialism, which subordinates the total movement to one of its moments, which puts in place of common, social production the brainwork of individual pedants and, above all, in fantasy does away with the revolu-
tionary struggle of the classes and its requirements by small conjurers' tricks or great sentimentality; while this doctrinaire Socialism, which at bottom only idealises present society, takes a picture of it without shadows and wants to achieve its ideal athwart the realities of present society; while the proletariat surrenders this Socialism to the petty bourgeoisie; while the struggle of the different socialist leaders among themselves sets forth each of the so-called systems as a pretentious adherence to one of the transit points of the social revolution as against another—the proletariat rallies more and more round revolutionary Socialism, round Communism, for which the bourgeoisie has itself invented the name of Blanqui. This Socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from these social relations.

The scope of this exposition does not permit of developing the subject further.

We have seen that just as in the party of Order the finance aristocracy necessarily took the lead, so in the party of "Anarchy" the proletariat. While the different classes, united in a revolutionary league, grouped themselves round the proletariat, while the departments became ever more unsafe and the Legislative Assembly itself ever more morose towards the pretensions of the French Soulouque, the long deferred and delayed by-election of substitutes for the Montagnards, proscribed after June 13, drew near.

The government, scorned by its foes, maltreated and daily humiliated by its alleged friends, saw only one means of emerging from this repugnant and untenable position—a revolt. A revolt in Paris would have permitted the proclamation of a state of siege in Paris and the departments and thus the control of the elections. On the other hand, the friends of order, in face of a government that had gained victory over anarchy, were constrained to make concessions, if they did not want to appear as anarchists themselves.

The government set to work. At the beginning of February 1850, provocation of the people by chopping down the trees of liberty. In vain. If the trees of liberty lost their place, it itself lost its head and fell back, frightened by its own provocations.

* Napoleon III.—Ed.
tion. The National Assembly, however, received this clumsy attempt at emancipation on the part of Bonaparte with ice-cold mistrust. The removal of the wreaths of the immortelles from the July column was no more successful. It gave a part of the army an opportunity for revolutionary demonstrations and the National Assembly the occasion for a more or less veiled vote of no confidence in the ministry. In vain the government press threatened the abolition of universal suffrage and the invasion of the Cossacks. In vain was d'Hautpoul's direct challenge, issued right in the Legislative Assembly to the Left, to betake itself to the streets, and his declaration that the government was ready to receive it. Hautpoul received nothing but a call to order from the President, and the party of Order, with silent, malicious joy, allowed a deputy of the Left to mock Bonaparte's usurpatory longings. In vain, finally, was the prophecy of a revolution on February 24. The government caused February 24 to be ignored by the people.

The proletariat did not allow itself to be provoked to revolt, because it was on the point of making a revolution.

Unhindered by the provocations of the government, which only heightened the general exasperation at the existing situation, the election committee, wholly under the influence of the workers, put forward three candidates for Paris: Deflotte, Vidal and Carnot. Deflotte was a June deportee, amnestied through one of Bonaparte's popularity-seeking ideas; he was a friend of Blanqui and had taken part in the attempt of May 15. Vidal, known as a Communist writer through his book Concerning the Distribution of Wealth, was formerly secretary to Louis Blanc in the Luxembourg Commission. Carnot, son of the man of the Convention who had organised the victory, the least compromised member of the National party, Minister of Education in the Provisional Government and the Executive Commission, was through his democratic public education bill a living protest against the education law of the Jesuits. These three candidates represented the three allied classes: at the head, the June insurgent, the representative of the revolutionary proletariat; next to him, the doctrinaire Socialist, the representative of the socialist petty bourgeoisie; finally, the third, the representative of the republican bourgeois party, the democratic formulas of which had gained a socialist significance vis-à-vis the party of Order and had long lost their own significance. This was a general coalition against the bourgeoisie and the government, as in February. But this time the proletariat was at the head of the revolutionary league.

In spite of all efforts the socialist candidates won. The army
itself voted for the June insurgent against its own War Minister, La Hitte. The party of Order was thunderstruck. The elections in the departments did not solace them; they gave a majority to the Montagnards.

The election of March 10, 1850! It was the revocation of June 1848: the butchers and deporters of the June insurgents returned to the National Assembly, but returned, bowed down, in the train of the deported, and with their principles on their lips. It was the revocation of June 13, 1849: the Montagne, proscribed by the National Assembly, returned to the National Assembly, but as advance trumpeters of the revolution, no longer as its commanders. It was the revocation of December 10: Napoleon had lost out with his Minister La Hitte. The parliamentary history of France knows only one analogy: the rejection of d’Haussez, minister of Charles X, in 1830. Finally, the election of March 10, 1850, was the cancellation of the election of May 13, which had given the party of Order a majority. The election of March 10 protested against the majority of May 13. March 10 was a revolution. Behind the ballots lie the paving stones.

“The vote of March 10 means war,” shouted Ségur d’Aguesseau, one of the most advanced members of the party of Order.

With March 10, 1850, the constitutional republic entered a new phase, the phase of its dissolution. The different factions of the majority are again united among themselves and with Bonaparte; they are again the saviours of order; he is again their neutral man. If they remember that they are royalists it happens only from despair of the possibility of a bourgeois republic; if he remembers that he is a pretender, it happens only because he despairs of remaining President.

At the command of the party of Order, Bonaparte answers the election of Deflotte, the June insurgent, by appointing Baroche Minister of Internal Affairs, Baroche, the accuser of Blanc and Barbès, of Ledru-Rollin and Guinard. The Legislative Assembly answers the election of Carnot by adopting the education law, the election of Vidal by suppressing the socialist press. The party of Order seeks to blare away its own fears by the trumpet blasts of its press. “The sword is holy,” cries one of its organs; “the defenders of order must take the offensive against the Red party,” cries another; “between Socialism and society there is a duel to the death, a war without surcease or mercy; in this duel of desperation one or the other must go under; if society does not annihilate Socialism, Socialism will annihilate society,” crows a third cock of order. Throw up the barricades of order, the barricades of religion, the barricades of the family! An end must be made of the 127,000 voters of Paris!137 A Bar-
tholomew’s night for the Socialists! And the party of Order believes for a moment in its own certainty of victory.

Their organs hold forth most fanatically of all against the “boutiquiers of Paris.” The June insurgent of Paris elected by the shopkeepers of Paris as their representative! This means that a second June 1848 is impossible; this means that a second June 13, 1849 is impossible; this means that the moral influence of capital is broken; this means that the bourgeois assembly now represents only the bourgeoisie; this means that big property is lost, because its vassal, small property, seeks its salvation in the camp of the propertyless.

The party of Order naturally returns to its inevitable commonplace. “More repression,” it cries, “tenfold repression!” But its power of repression has diminished tenfold, while resistance has increased a hundredfold. Must not the chief instrument of repression, the army, itself be repressed? And the party of Order speaks its last word: “The iron ring of suffocating legality must be broken. The constitutional republic is impossible. We must fight with our true weapons; since February 1848, we have fought the revolution with its weapons and on its terrain; we have accepted its institutions; the constitution is a fortress which safeguards only the besiegers, not the besieged! By smuggling ourselves into holy Ilion in the belly of the Trojan horse, we have, unlike our forefathers, the Grecs,* not conquered the hostile town, but made prisoners of ourselves.”

The foundation of the constitution, however, is universal suffrage. Annihilation of universal suffrage—such is the last word of the party of Order, of the bourgeois dictatorship.

On May 4, 1848, on December 20, 1848, on May 13, 1849, and on July 8, 1849, universal suffrage admitted that they were right. On March 10, 1850, universal suffrage admitted that it had itself been wrong. Bourgeois rule as the outcome and result of universal suffrage, as the express act of the sovereign will of the people—that is the meaning of the bourgeois constitution. But has the constitution any further meaning from the moment that the content of this suffrage, of this sovereign will, is no longer bourgeois rule? Is it not the duty of the bourgeoisie so to regulate the suffrage that it wills the reasonable, its rule? By ever and anon putting an end to the existing state power and creating it anew out of itself, does not universal suffrage put an end to all stability, does it not every moment question all the powers that be, does it not annihilate authority, does it not threaten

* Grecs—play on words: Greeks, but also professional cheats. [Note by Engels to the edition of 1895.]
to elevate anarchy itself to the position of authority? After March 10, 1850, who would still doubt it?

By repudiating universal suffrage, with which it hitherto draped itself and from which it sucked its omnipotence, the bourgeoisie openly confesses, “Our dictatorship has hitherto existed by the will of the people; it must now be consolidated against the will of the people.” And, consistently, it seeks its props no longer within France, but without, in foreign countries, in invasion.

With the invasion, it, a second Coblenz, its seat established in France itself, rouses all the national passions against itself. With the attack on universal suffrage it provides a general pretext for the new revolution, and the revolution requires such a pretext. Every special pretext would divide the factions of the revolutionary league, and give prominence to their differences. The general pretext stuns the semi-revolutionary classes; it permits them to deceive themselves concerning the definite character of the coming revolution, concerning the consequences of their own act. Every revolution requires a banquet question. Universal suffrage is the banquet question of the new revolution.

The bourgeois factions in coalition, however, are already condemned, since they take flight from the only possible form of their united power, from the most potent and complete form of their class rule, the constitutional republic, back to the subordinate, incomplete, weaker form of monarchy. They resemble that old man who, in order to regain his youthful strength, fetched out his boyhood apparel and suffered torment trying to get his withered limbs into it. Their republic had the sole merit of being the hothouse of the revolution.

March 10, 1850 bears the inscription:

*Après moi le déluge! After me the deluge!*

IV

THE ABOLITION OF UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE IN 1850

(The continuation of the three foregoing chapters is found in the Reuue in the fifth and sixth double issue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung the last to appear. Here, after the great commercial crisis that broke out in England in 1847 had first been described and the coming to a head of the political complications on the European Continent in the Revolutions of February and March 1848 had been explained by its reactions there, it

* The words are ascribed to Louis XV.—Ed.*
is then shown how the prosperity of trade and industry that again set in during the course of 1848 and increased still further in 1849 paralysed the revolutionary upsurge and made possible the simultaneous victories of the reaction. With special reference to France, it is then said:*)

The same symptoms have shown themselves in France since 1849, and particularly since the beginning of 1850. The Parisian industries are abundantly employed and the cotton factories of Rouen and Mülhausen are also doing pretty well, although here, as in England, the high prices of the raw material have exercised a retarding influence. The development of prosperity in France was, in addition, especially promoted by the comprehensive tariff reform in Spain and by the reduction of the duties on various luxury articles in Mexico; the export of French commodities to both markets has considerably increased. The growth of capital in France led to a series of speculations, for which the exploitation of the California gold mines on a large scale served as a pretext. A swarm of companies has sprung up, the low denomination of whose shares and whose socialist-coloured prospectuses appeal directly to the purses of the petty bourgeois and the workers, but which all and sundry result in that sheer swindling which is characteristic of the French and Chinese alone. One of these companies is even patronised directly by the government. The import duties in France during the first nine months of 1848 amounted to 63,000,000 francs, of 1849 to 95,000,000 francs and of 1850 to 93,000,000 francs. Moreover, in the month of September 1850, they again rose by more than a million compared with the same month of 1849. Exports also rose in 1849, and still more in 1850.

The most striking proof of restored prosperity is the bank's reintroduction of specie payment by the law of August 6, 1850. On March 15, 1848, the bank had been authorised to suspend specie payment. Its note circulation, including the provincial banks, amounted at that time to 373,000,000 francs (£14,920,000). On November 2, 1849, this circulation amounted to 482,000,000 francs, or £19,280,000, an increase of £4,360,000, and on September 2, 1850, to 496,000,000 francs, or £19,840,000, an increase of about £5,000,000. This was not accompanied by any depreciation of the notes; on the contrary, the increased circulation of the notes was accompanied by the steadily increasing accumulation of gold and silver in the vaults of the bank, so that in the summer of 1850 its metallic reserve amounted to about

*) The introductory paragraph was written by Engels for the 1895 edition.
—Ed.
£14,000,000, an unprecedented sum in France. That the bank was thus placed in a position to increase its circulation and therewith its active capital by 123,000,000 francs, or £5,000,000, is striking proof of the correctness of our assertion in an earlier issue¹ that the finance aristocracy has not only not been overthrown by the revolution, but has even been strengthened. This result becomes still more evident from the following survey of French bank legislation during the last few years. On June 10, 1847, the bank was authorised to issue notes of 200 francs; hitherto the smallest denomination had been 500 francs. A decree of March 15, 1848, declared the notes of the Bank of France legal tender and relieved the bank of the obligation of redeeming them in specie. Its note issue was limited to 350,000,000 francs. It was simultaneously authorised to issue notes of 100 francs. A decree of April 27 prescribed the merging of the departmental banks in the Bank of France; another decree, of May 2, 1848, increased the latter's note issue to 442,000,000 francs. A decree of December 22, 1849, raised the maximum of the note issue to 525,000,000 francs. Finally, the law of August 6, 1850, re-established the exchangeability of notes for specie. These facts, the continual increase in the circulation, the concentration of the whole of French credit in the hands of the bank and the accumulation of all French gold and silver in the bank's vaults led M. Proudhon to the conclusion that the bank must now shed its old snakeskin and metamorphose itself into a Proudhonist people's bank. He did not even need to know the history of the English bank restriction from 1797-1819¹³⁹; he only needed to direct his glance across the Channel to see that this fact, for him unprecedented in the history of bourgeois society, was nothing more than a very normal bourgeois event, which now only occurred in France for the first time. One sees that the allegedly revolutionary theoreticians who, after the Provisional Government, talked big in Paris, were just as ignorant of the nature and the results of the measures taken as the gentlemen of the Provisional Government themselves.

In spite of the industrial and commercial prosperity that France momentarily enjoys, the mass of the people, the twenty-five million peasants, suffer from a great depression. The good harvests of the last few years have forced the prices of corn much lower even than in England, and the position of the peasants under such circumstances, in debt, sucked dry by usury and crushed by taxes, must be anything but splendid. The history of the last three years has, however, provided sufficient proof that this class

¹ See pp. 268-72 of this volume.—Ed.
of the population is absolutely incapable of any revolutionary initiative.

Just as the period of crisis occurs later on the Continent than in England, so does that of prosperity. The original process always takes place in England; it is the demiurge of the bourgeois cosmos. On the Continent, the different phases of the cycle through which bourgeois society is ever speeding anew occur in secondary and tertiary form. First, the Continent exported incomparably more to England than to any other country. This export to England, however, in turn depends on the position of England, particularly with regard to the overseas market. Then England exports to the overseas lands incomparably more than the entire Continent, so that the quantity of Continental exports to these lands is always dependent on England's overseas exports at the time. While, therefore, the crises first produce revolutions on the Continent, the foundation for these is, nevertheless, always laid in England. Violent outbreaks must naturally occur rather in the extremities of the bourgeois body than in its heart, since the possibility of adjustment is greater here than there. On the other hand, the degree to which the Continental revolutions react on England is at the same time the barometer which indicates how far these revolutions really call in question the bourgeois conditions of life, or how far they only hit their political formations.

With this general prosperity, in which the productive forces of bourgeois society develop as luxuriantly as is at all possible within bourgeois relationships, there can be no talk of a real revolution. Such a revolution is only possible in the periods when both these factors, the modern productive forces and the bourgeois productive forms come in collision with each other. The various quarrels in which the representatives of the individual factions of the Continental party of Order now indulge and mutually compromise themselves, far from providing the occasion for new revolutions are, on the contrary, possible only because the basis of the relationships is momentarily so secure and, what the reaction does not know, so bourgeois. From it all attempts of the reaction to hold up bourgeois development will rebound just as certainly as all moral indignation and all enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats. A new revolution is possible only in consequence of a new crisis. It is, however, just as certain as this crisis.

Let us now turn to France.

The victory that the people, in conjunction with the petty bourgeois, had won in the elections of March 10 was annulled by it itself when it provoked the new election of April 28. Vidal was
elected not only in Paris, but also in the Lower Rhine. The Paris Committee, in which the Montagne and the petty bourgeoisie were strongly represented, induced him to accept for the Lower Rhine. The victory of March 10 ceased to be a decisive one; the date of the decision was once more postponed; the tension of the people was relaxed; it became accustomed to legal triumphs instead of revolutionary ones. The revolutionary meaning of March 10, the rehabilitation of the June insurrection, was finally completely annihilated by the candidature of Eugène Sue, the sentimental petty-bourgeois social-fantast, which the proletariat could at best accept as a joke to please the grisettes. As against this well-meaning candidature, the party of Order, emboldened by the vacillating policy of its opponents, put up a candidate who was to represent the June victory. This comic candidate was the Spartan pater familias Leclerc, from whose person, however, the heroic armour was torn piece by piece by the press, and who experienced a brilliant defeat in the election. The new election victory on April 28 put the Montagne and the petty bourgeoisie in high feather. They already exulted in the thought of being able to arrive at the goal of their wishes in a purely legal way and without again pushing the proletariat into the foreground through a new revolution; they reckoned positively on bringing Ledru-Rollin into the presidential chair and a majority of Montagnards into the Assembly through universal suffrage in the new elections of 1852. The party of Order, rendered perfectly certain, by the prospective elections, by Sue's candidature and by the mood of the Montagne and the petty bourgeoisie, that the latter were resolved to remain quiet no matter what happened, answered the two election victories with an election law which abolished universal suffrage.

The government took good care not to make this legislative proposal on its own responsibility. It made an apparent concession to the majority by entrusting the working out of the bill to the high dignitaries of this majority, to the seventeen bourgeois. Thus, it was not the government that proposed the repeal of the universal suffrage to the Assembly; the majority of the Assembly proposed it to itself.

On May 8, the project was brought into the Chamber. The entire social-democratic press rose as one man in order to preach to the people dignified bearing, calme majestueux, passivity and trust in its representatives. Every article of these journals was a confession that a revolution would, above all, annihilate the so-called revolutionary press and that, therefore, it was now a question of its self-preservation. The allegedly revolutionary press betrayed its whole secret. It signed its own death warrant.
On May 21, the Montagne put the preliminary question to debate and moved the rejection of the whole project on the ground that it violated the constitution. The party of Order answered that the constitution would be violated if it were necessary; there was, however, no need for this at present, because the constitution was capable of every interpretation, and because the majority alone was competent to decide on the correct interpretation. To the unbridled, savage attacks of Thiers and Montalembert the Montagne opposed a decorous and refined humanism. It took its stand on the ground of law; the party of Order referred it to the ground on which the law grows, to bourgeois property. The Montagne whimpered: Did they really want, then, to conjure up revolutions by main force? The party of Order replied: One would await them.

On May 22, the preliminary question was settled by 462 votes to 227. The same men who had proved with such solemn profundity that the National Assembly and every individual deputy would be renouncing his mandate if he renounced the people, his mandator, now stuck to their seats and suddenly sought to let the country act, through petitions at that, instead of acting themselves; and still sat there unmoved when, on May 31, the law went through in splendid fashion. They sought to revenge themselves by a protest in which they recorded their innocence of the rape of the constitution, a protest which they did not even submit openly, but smuggled into the President's pocket from behind.

An army of 150,000 men in Paris, the long deferment of the decision, the appeasing attitude of the press, the pusillanimity of the Montagne and of the newly elected representatives, the majestic calm of the petty bourgeois, but, above all, the commercial and industrial prosperity, prevented any attempt at revolution on the part of the proletariat.

Universal suffrage had fulfilled its mission. The majority of the people had passed through the school of development, which is all that universal suffrage can serve for in a revolutionary period. It had to be set aside by a revolution or by the reaction.

The Montagne developed a still greater display of energy on an occasion that soon afterwards arose. From the tribune War Minister d'Hautpoul had termed the February Revolution a baneful catastrophe. The orators of the Montagne, who, as always, distinguished themselves by their morally indignant bluster, were not allowed by the President, Dupin, to speak. Girardin proposed to the Montagne that it should walk out at once en masse. Result: the Montagne remained seated, but Girardin was cast out from its midst as unworthy.
The election law still needs one thing to complete it, a new press law. This was not long in coming. A proposal of the government, made many times more drastic by amendments of the party of Order, increased the caution money, put an extra stamp on feuilleton novels (answer to the election of Eugène Sue), taxed all publications appearing weekly or monthly up to a certain number of sheets and finally provided that every article of a journal must bear the signature of the author. The provisions concerning the caution money killed the so-called revolutionary press; the people regarded its extinction as satisfaction for the abolition of universal suffrage. However, neither the tendency nor the effect of the new law extended only to this section of the press. As long as the newspaper press was anonymous, it appeared as the organ of a numberless and nameless public opinion; it was the third power in the state. Through the signature of every article, a newspaper became a mere collection of literary contributions from more or less known individuals. Every article sank to the level of an advertisement. Hitherto the newspapers had circulated as the paper money of public opinion; now they were resolved into more or less bad solo bills, whose worth and circulation depended on the credit not only of the drawer but also of the endorser. The press of the party of Order had incited not only for the repeal of universal suffrage but also for the most extreme measures against the bad press. However, in its sinister anonymity even the good press was irksome to the party of Order and still more to its individual provincial representatives. As for itself, it demanded only the paid writer, with name, address and description. In vain the good press bemoaned the ingratitude with which its services were rewarded. The law went through; the provision concerning the giving of names hit it hardest of all. The names of republican journalists were pretty well known; but the respectable firms of the *Journal des Débats*, the *Assemblée Nationale*, the *Constitutionnel*, etc., etc., cut a sorry figure in their high protestations of state wisdom, when the mysterious company all at once disintegrated into purchasable penny-a-liners of long practice, who had defended all possible causes for cash, like Granier de Cassagnac, or into old milksops who called themselves statesmen, like Capefigue, or into coquettish fops, like M. Lemoinne of the *Débats*.

In the debate on the press law the *Montagne* had already sunk to such a level of moral degeneracy that it had to confine itself to applauding the brilliant tirades of an old notability of Louis Philippe's time, M. Victor Hugo.

With the election law and the press law the revolutionary and democratic party exits from the official stage. Before their
departure home, shortly after the end of the session, the two factions of the Montagne, the socialist democrats and the democratic Socialists, issued two manifestos, two testimonia paupertatis,* in which they proved that while power and success were never on their side, they nonetheless had ever been on the side of eternal justice and all the other eternal truths.

Let us now consider the party of Order. The Neue Rheinische Zeitung had said (Heft 3, S. 16): "As against the hankering for restoration on the part of the united Orleanists and Legitimists, Bonaparte defends his title to his actual power, the republic; as against the hankering for restoration on the part of Bonaparte, the party of Order defends its title to its common rule, the republic; as against the Orleanists, the Legitimists, and as against the Legitimists, the Orleanists, defend the status quo, the republic. All these factions of the party of Order, each of which has its own king and its own restoration in petto, mutually enforce, as against their rivals' hankering for usurpation and revolt, the common rule of the bourgeoisie, the form in which the special claims remain neutralised and reserved—the republic.... And Thiers spoke more truly than he suspects when he said: 'We, the royalists, are the true pillars of the constitutional republic.'"**

This comedy of the républicains malgré eux,*** the antipathy to the status quo and the constant consolidation of it; the incessant friction between Bonaparte and the National Assembly; the ever renewed threat of the party of Order to split into its separate component parts, and the ever repeated conjugation of its factions; the attempt of each faction to transform each victory over the common foe into a defeat for its temporary allies; the mutual petty jealousy, chicanery, harassment, the tireless drawing of swords that ever and again ends with a baiser Lamourette143—this whole unedifying comedy of errors never developed more classically than during the last six months.

The party of Order regarded the election law at the same time as a victory over Bonaparte. Had not the government abdicated when it handed over the editing of and responsibility for its own proposal to the Commission of Seventeen? And did not the chief strength of Bonaparte as against the Assembly lie in the fact that he was the chosen of six millions? Bonaparte, on his part, treated the election law as a concession to the Assembly,

---

* Testimonia paupertatis: Certificates of poverty.—Ed.
** See pp. 268, 269 of this volume.—Ed.
*** Republicans in spite of themselves. (Allusion to Molière's comedy Le Médecin malgré lui.)—Ed.
with which he claimed to have purchased harmony between the legislative and executive powers. As reward, the vulgar adventurer demanded an increase of three millions in his civil list. Dared the National Assembly enter into a conflict with the executive at a moment when it had excommunicated the great majority of Frenchmen? It was roused to anger; it appeared to want to go to extremes; its Commission rejected the motion; the Bonapartist press threatened, and referred to the disinherited people, deprived of its franchise; numerous noisy attempts at an arrangement took place, and the Assembly finally gave way in fact, but at the same time revenged itself in principle. Instead of increasing the civil list in principle by three millions per annum, it granted him an accommodation of 2,160,000 francs. Not satisfied with this, it made even this concession only after it had been supported by Changarnier, the general of the party of Order and the protector thrust upon Bonaparte. Therefore it really granted the two millions not to Bonaparte, but to Changarnier. This sop, thrown to him de mauvaise grâce, was accepted by Bonaparte quite in the spirit of the donor. The Bonapartist press blustered anew against the National Assembly. When, now in the debate on the press law, the amendment was made on the signing of names, which, in turn, was directed especially against the less important papers, the representatives of the private interests of Bonaparte, the principal Bonapartist paper, the Pouvoir, published an open and vehement attack on the National Assembly. The ministers had to disavow the paper before the Assembly; the gérant of the Pouvoir was summoned before the bar of the National Assembly and sentenced to pay the highest fine, 5,000 francs. Next day, the Pouvoir published a still more insolent article against the Assembly, and, as the revenge of the government, the public prosecutor promptly prosecuted a number of Legitimist journals for violating the constitution.

Finally there came the question of proroguing the Chamber. Bonaparte desired this in order to be able to operate unhindered by the Assembly. The party of Order desired it, partly for the purpose of carrying on its factional intrigues, partly for the pursuit of the private interests of the individual deputies. Both needed it in order to consolidate and push further the victories of the reaction in the provinces. The Assembly therefore adjourned from August 11 until November 11. Since, however, Bonaparte in no way concealed that his only concern was to get rid of

* De mauvaise grâce: With a bad grace.—Ed.
** Gérant: Responsible manager.—Ed.
the irksome surveillance of the National Assembly, the Assembly imprinted on the vote of confidence itself the stamp of want of confidence in the President. All Bonapartists were kept off the permanent commission of twenty-eight members, who stayed on during the recess as guardians of the virtue of the republic. In their stead, even some republicans of the Siècle and the National were elected to it, in order to prove to the President the attachment of the majority to the constitutional republic.

Shortly before and, especially, immediately after the prorogation of the Chamber, the two big factions of the party of Order, the Orleanists and the Legitimists, appeared to want to be reconciled, and this by a fusion of the two royal houses under whose flags they were fighting. The papers were full of reconciliation proposals that were said to have been discussed at the sickbed of Louis Philippe at St. Leonards, when the death of Louis Philippe suddenly simplified the situation. Louis Philippe was the usurper; Henry V, the dispossessed; the Count of Paris, on the other hand, owing to the childlessness of Henry V, his lawful heir to the throne. Every pretext for objecting to a fusion of the two dynastic interests was now removed. But now, precisely, the two factions of the bourgeoisie first discovered that it was not zeal for a definite royal house that divided them, but that it was rather their divided class interests that kept the two dynasties apart. The Legitimists, who had made a pilgrimage to the residence of Henry V at Wiesbaden just as their competitors had to St. Leonards, received there the news of Louis Philippe’s death. Forthwith they formed a ministry in partibus infidelium, which consisted mostly of members of that commission of guardians of the virtue of the republic and which on the occasion of a squabble in the bosom of the party came out with the most outspoken proclamation of right by the grace of God. The Orleanists rejoiced over the compromising scandal that this manifesto called forth in the press, and did not conceal for a moment their open enmity to the Legitimists.

During the adjournment of the National Assembly, the Councils of the Departments met. The majority of them declared for a more or less qualified revision of the constitution, that is, they declared for a not definitely specified monarchist restoration, for a “solution,” and confessed at the same time that they were too incompetent and too cowardly to find this solution. The Bonapartist faction at once construed this desire for revision in the sense of a prolongation of Bonaparte’s presidency.

The constitutional solution, the retirement of Bonaparte in May 1852, the simultaneous election of a new president by all the electors of the land, the revision of the constitution by a
Chamber of Revision during the first months of the new presidency, is utterly inadmissible for the ruling class. The day of the new presidential election would be the day of rendezvous for all the hostile parties, the Legitimists, the Orleanists, the bourgeois republicans, the revolutionists. It would have to come to a violent decision between the different factions. Even if the party of Order should succeed in uniting round the candidature of a neutral person outside the dynastic families, he would still be opposed by Bonaparte. In its struggle with the people, the party of Order is compelled constantly to increase the power of the executive. Every increase of the executive’s power increases the power of its bearer, Bonaparte. In the same measure, therefore, as the party of Order strengthens its joint might, it strengthens the fighting resources of Bonaparte’s dynastic pretensions, it strengthens his chance of frustrating a constitutional solution by force on the day of the decision. He will then have, as against the party of Order, no more scruples about the one pillar of the constitution than that party had, as against the people, about the other pillar in the matter of the election law. He would, seemingly even against the Assembly appeal to universal suffrage. In a word, the constitutional solution questions the entire political status quo and behind the jeopardising of the status quo the bourgeois sees chaos, anarchy, civil war. He sees his purchases and sales, his promissory notes, his marriages, his agreements, duly acknowledged before a notary, his mortgages, his ground rents, house rents, profits, all his contracts and sources of income called in question on the first Sunday in May 1852, and he cannot expose himself to this risk. Behind the jeopardising of the political status quo lurks the danger of the collapse of the entire bourgeois society. The only possible solution in the sense of the bourgeois is the postponement of the solution. It can save the constitutional republic only by a violation of the constitution, by the prolongation of the power of the President. This is also the last word of the press of Order, after the protracted and profound debates on the “solutions” in which it indulged after the session of the general councils. The high and mighty party of Order thus finds itself, to its shame, compelled to take seriously the ridiculous, commonplace and, to it, odious person of the pseudo-Bonaparte.

This dirty figure likewise deceived himself concerning the causes that clothed him more and more with the character of the indispensable man. While his party had sufficient insight to ascribe the growing importance of Bonaparte to circumstances, he believed that he owed it solely to the magic power of his name and his continual caricaturing of Napoleon. He became
more enterprising every day. To offset the pilgrimages to St.
Leonards and Wiesbaden, he made his round trips through
France. The Bonapartists had so little faith in the magic effect
of his personality that they sent with him everywhere as cla-
queurs people from the Society of December 10,* that organisa-
tion of the Paris lumpenproletariat, packed en masse into rail-
way trains and post-chaises. They put speeches into the mouth
of their marionette which, according to the reception in the dif-
ferent towns, proclaimed republican resignation or perennial
tenacity as the keynote of the President's policy. In spite of all
manoeuvres these journeys were anything but triumphal proces-
sions.

When Bonaparte believed he had thus enthused the people,
he set out to win the army. He caused great reviews to be held
on the plain of Satory, near Versailles, at which he sought to
buy the soldiers with garlic sausages, champagne and cigars.
Whereas the genuine Napoleon, amid the hardships of his cam-
paigns of conquest, knew how to cheer up his weary soldiers
with outbursts of patriarchal familiarity, the pseudo-Napoleon
believed it was in gratitude that the troops shouted: "Vive Napo-
léon, vive le saucisson!" that is, hurrah for the sausage [Wurst],
hurrah for the buffoon [Hanswurst]!

These reviews led to the outbreak of the long suppressed dis-
sension between Bonaparte and his War Minister d'Hautpoul,
on the one hand, and Changarnier, on the other. In Changarnier,
the party of Order had found its real neutral man, in whose
case there could be no question of his own dynastic claims. It
had designated him Bonaparte's successor. In addition, Changar-
nier had become the great general of the party of Order through
his conduct on January 29 and June 13, 1849, the modern Alex-
ander, whose brutal intervention had, in the eyes of the timid
bourgeois, cut the Gordian knot of the revolution. At bottom
just as ridiculous as Bonaparte, he had thus become a power
in the very cheapest manner and was set up by the National
Assembly to watch the President. He himself coquettetd, for
example, in the matter of the salary grant, with the protection
that he gave Bonaparte, and rose up ever more overpoweringly
against him and the ministers. When, on the occasion of the
election law, an insurrection was expected, he forbade his of-
ficers to take any orders whatever from the War Minister or
the President. The press was also instrumental in magnifying
the figure of Changarnier. With the complete absence of great
personalities, the party of Order naturally found itself com-

* See pp. 442-44 of this volume.—Ed.
pelled to endow a single individual with the strength lacking in its class as a whole and so puff up this individual to a prodigy. Thus arose the myth of Changarnier, the "bulwark of society." The arrogant charlatanry, the secretive air of importance with which Changarnier condescended to carry the world on his shoulders, forms the most ridiculous contrast to the events during and after the Satory review, which irrefutably proved that it needed only a stroke of the pen by Bonaparte, the infinitely little, to bring this fantastic offspring of bourgeois fear, the colossus Changarnier, back to the dimensions of mediocrity, and transform him, society's heroic saviour, into a pensioned general.

Bonaparte had for some time been revenging himself on Changarnier by provoking the War Minister to disputes in matters of discipline with the irksome protector. The last review of Satory finally brought the old animosity to a climax. The constitutional indignation of Changarnier knew no bounds when he saw the cavalry regiments file past with the unconstitutional cry: vive l'Empereur! In order to forestall any unpleasant debate on this cry in the coming session of the Chamber, Bonaparte removed the War Minister d'Hautpoul by appointing him Governor of Algiers. In his place he put a reliable old general of the time of the empire, one who was fully a match for Changarnier in brutality. But so that the dismissal of d'Hautpoul might not appear as a concession to Changarnier, he simultaneously transferred General Neumayer, the right hand of the great saviour of society, from Paris to Nantes. It had been Neumayer who at the last review had induced the whole of the infantry to file past the successor of Napoleon in icy silence. Changarnier, himself hit in the person of Neumayer, protested and threatened. To no purpose. After two days' negotiations, the decree transferring Neumayer appeared in the Moniteur, and there was nothing left for the hero of order but to submit to discipline or resign.

Bonaparte's struggle with Changarnier is the continuation of his struggle with the party of Order. The re-opening of the National Assembly on November 11 will, therefore, take place under threatening auspices. It will be a storm in a teacup. In essence the old game must go on. Meanwhile the majority of the party of Order will, despite the clamour of the sticklers on principle of its different factions, be compelled to prolong the power of the President. Similarly, Bonaparte, already humbled by lack of money, will, despite all preliminary protestations, accept this prolongation of power from the hands of the National Assembly as simply delegated to him. Thus the solution is postponed; the status quo continued; one faction of the
party of Order compromised, weakened, made impossible by the other; the repression of the common enemy, the mass of the nation, extended and exhausted, until the economic relations themselves have again reached the point of development where a new explosion blows into the air all these squabbling parties with their constitutional republic.

For the peace of mind of the bourgeois it must be said, however, that the scandal between Bonaparte and the party of Order has the result of ruining a multitude of small capitalists on the Bourse and putting their assets into the pockets of the big wolves of the Bourse.

Written by Marx between January and November 1, 1850

Originally published in the journal *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5-6 for 1850

Signed: *Karl Marx*
FREDERICK ENGELS

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN GERMANY

I

GERMANY AT THE OUTBREAK OF THE REVOLUTION

The first act of the revolutionary drama on the Continent of Europe has closed. The “powers that were” before the hurricane of 1848, are again “the powers that be,” and the more or less popular rulers of a day, provisional governors, triumvirs, dictators, with their tail of representatives, civil commissioners, military commissioners, prefects, judges, generals, officers and soldiers, are thrown upon foreign shores, and “transported beyond the seas” to England or America, there to form new governments “in partibus infidelium,” European committees, central committees, national committees, and to announce their advent with proclamations quite as solemn as those of any less imaginary potentates.

A more signal defeat than that undergone by the continental revolutionary party—or rather parties—upon all points of the line of battle, cannot be imagined. But what of that? Has not the struggle of the British middle classes for their social and political supremacy embraced forty-eight, that of the French middle classes forty years of unexampled struggles? And was their triumph ever nearer than at the very moment when restored monarchy thought itself more firmly settled than ever? The times of that superstition which attributed revolutions to the ill-will of a few agitators, have long passed away. Everyone knows nowadays, that wherever there is a revolutionary convulsion, there must be some social want in the background, which is prevented by outworn institutions from satisfying itself. The want may not yet be felt as strongly, as generally, as might insure immediate success, but every attempt at forcible repres- sion will only bring it forth stronger and stronger, until it bursts its fetters. If, then, we have been beaten, we have nothing else to do but to begin again from the beginning. And, fortunately, the probably very short interval of rest which is allowed us between the close of the first and the beginning of the second act of the movement, gives us time for a very necessary piece of work: the study of the causes that necessitated both the late outbreak, and its defeat; causes that are not to be sought for
in the accidental efforts, talents, faults, errors or treacheries of some of the leaders, but in the general social state and conditions of existence of each of the convulsed nations. That the sudden movements of February and March, 1848, were not the work of single individuals, but spontaneous, irresistible manifestations of national wants and necessities, more or less clearly understood, but very distinctly felt by numerous classes in every country, is a fact recognised everywhere; but when you inquire into the causes of the counter-revolutionary successes, there you are met on every hand with the ready reply that it was Mr. This or Citizen That, who “betrayed” the people. Which reply may be very true, or not, according to circumstances, but under no circumstances does it explain anything—not even show how it came to pass that the “people” allowed themselves to be thus betrayed. And what a poor chance stands a political party whose entire stock-in-trade consists in a knowledge of the solitary fact, that Citizen So-and-so is not to be trusted.

The inquiry into, and the exposition of, the causes both of the revolutionary convulsion and its suppression, are, besides, of paramount importance in a historical point of view. All these petty personal quarrels and recriminations—all these contradictory assertions, that it was Marrast, or Ledru-Rollin, or Louis Blanc, or any other member of the Provisional Government, or the whole of them, that steered the revolution amidst the rocks upon which it foundered—of what interest can they be, what light can they afford to the American or Englishman, who observed all these various movements from a distance too great to allow of his distinguishing any of the details of operations? No man in his senses will ever believe that eleven men,* mostly of very indifferent capacity, either for good or evil, were able in three months to ruin a nation of thirty-six millions, unless those thirty-six millions saw as little of their way before them as the eleven did. But how it came to pass, that those thirty-six millions were at once called upon to decide for themselves which way to go, although partly groping in dim twilight, and how then they got lost and their old leaders were for a moment allowed to return to their leadership, that is just the question.

If, then, we try to lay before the readers of The Tribune the causes which, while they necessitated the German Revolution of 1848, led quite as inevitably to its momentary repression in 1849 and '50, we shall not be expected to give a complete history of the events as they passed in that country. Later events,

* Members of the French Provisional Government.—Ed.
and the judgment of coming generations, will decide what portion of that confused mass of seemingly accidental, incoherent and incongruous facts is to form a part of the world's history. The time for such a task has not yet arrived; we must confine ourselves to the limits of the possible, and be satisfied, if we can find rational causes, based upon undeniable facts, to explain the chief events, the principal vicissitudes of that movement, and to give us a clue as to the direction which the next and perhaps not very distant outbreak will impart to the German people.

And firstly, what was the state of Germany at the outbreak of the revolution?

The composition of the different classes of the people which form the groundwork of every political organization was, in Germany, more complicated than in any other country. While in England and France feudalism was entirely destroyed, or at least reduced, as in the former country, to a few insignificant forms, by a powerful and wealthy middle class, concentrated in large towns, and particularly in the Capital, the feudal nobility in Germany had retained a great portion of their ancient privileges. The feudal system of tenure was prevalent almost everywhere. The Lords of the Land had even retained the jurisdiction over their tenants. Deprived of their political privileges, of the right to control the Princes, they had preserved almost all their medieval supremacy over the peasantry of their demesnes, as well as their exemption from taxes. Feudalism was more flourishing in some localities than in others, but nowhere except on the left bank of the Rhine was it entirely destroyed. This feudal nobility, then extremely numerous and partly very wealthy, was considered, officially, the first "Order" in the country. It furnished the higher Government officials, it almost exclusively officered the army.

The bourgeoisie of Germany was by far not as wealthy and concentrated as that of France or England. The ancient manufactures of Germany had been destroyed by the introduction of steam, and by the rapidly extending supremacy of English manufactures; the more modern manufactures, started under the Napoleonic continental system,14 established in other parts of the country, did not compensate for the loss of the old ones, nor suffice to create a manufacturing interest strong enough to force its wants upon the notice of Governments jealous of every extension of non-noble wealth and power. If France carried her silk manufactures victorious through fifty years of revolutions and wars, Germany, during the same time, all but lost her ancient linen trade. The manufacturing districts, besides, were
few and far between; situated far inland, and using, mostly, foreign, Dutch or Belgian ports for their imports and exports, they had little or no interest in common with the large seaport towns on the North Sea and the Baltic; they were, above all, unable to create large manufacturing and trading centers, such as Paris and Lyons, London and Manchester. The causes of this backwardness of German manufactures were manifold, but, two will suffice to account for it: the unfavorable geographical situation of the country, at a distance from the Atlantic, which had become the great highway for the world's trade, and the continuous wars in which Germany was involved, and which were fought on her soil, from the sixteenth century to the present day. It was this want of numbers, and particularly of anything like concentrated numbers, which prevented the German middle classes from attaining that political supremacy which the English bourgeoisie has enjoyed ever since 1688, and which the French conquered in 1789. And yet, ever since 1815, the wealth, and with the wealth, the political importance of the middle class in Germany, was continually growing. Governments were, although reluctantly, compelled to bow at least to its more immediate material interests. It may even be truly said, that from 1815 to 1830, and from 1832 to 1840, every particle of political influence, which, having been allowed to the middle class in the Constitutions of the smaller States, was again wrested from them during the above two periods of political reaction—that every such particle was compensated for by some more practical advantage allowed to them. Every political defeat of the middle class drew after it a victory on the field of commercial legislation. And, certainly, the Prussian Protective Tariff of 1818, and the formation of the Zollverein, were worth a good deal more to the traders and manufacturers of Germany than the equivocal right of expressing, in the chambers of some diminutive dukedom, their want of confidence in ministers who laughed at their votes. Thus, with growing wealth and extending trade, the bourgeoisie soon arrived at a stage where it found the development of its most important interests checked by the political constitution of the country—by its random division among thirty-six princes with conflicting tendencies and caprices; by the feudal fetters upon agriculture and the trade connected with it; by the prying superintendence to which an ignorant and presumptuous bureaucracy subjected all its transactions. At the same time, the extension and consolidation of the Zollverein, the general introduction of steam communication, the growing competition in the home trade, brought the commercial classes of the different States and Provinces closer together, equalized
their interests, centralized their strength. The natural consequence was the passing of the whole mass of them into the camp of the Liberal Opposition, and the gaining of the first serious struggle of the German middle class for political power. This change may be dated from 1840, from the moment when the bourgeoisie of Prussia assumed the lead of the middle-class movement of Germany. We shall hereafter revert to this Liberal Opposition movement of 1840-47.

The great mass of the nation, which neither belonged to the nobility nor to the bourgeoisie, consisted, in the towns, of the small trading and shopkeeping class and the working people, and in the country, of the peasantry.

The small trading and shopkeeping class is exceedingly numerous in Germany, in consequence of the stunted development which the large capitalists and manufacturers, as a class, have had in that country. In the larger towns it forms almost the majority of the inhabitants; in the smaller ones it entirely predominates, from the absence of wealthier competitors for influence. This class, a most important one in every modern body politic, and in all modern revolutions, is still more important in Germany, where during the recent struggles it generally played the decisive part. Its intermediate position between the class of larger capitalists, traders and manufacturers, the bourgeoisie, properly so called, and the proletarian or industrial class, determines its character. Aspiring to the position of the first, the least adverse turn of fortune hurls the individuals of this class down into the ranks of the second. In monarchical and feudal countries the custom of the court and aristocracy becomes necessary to its existence; the loss of this custom might ruin a great part of it. In the smaller towns, a military garrison, a county government, a court of law with its followers, form very often the base of its prosperity; withdraw these and down go the shopkeepers, the tailors, the shoemakers, the joiners. Thus, eternally tossed about between the hope of entering the ranks of the wealthier class, and the fear of being reduced to the state of proletarians or even paupers; between the hope of promoting their interests by conquering a share in the direction of public affairs, and the dread of rousing, by ill-timed opposition, the ire of a Government which disposes of their very existence, because it has the power of removing their best customers; possessed of small means, the insecurity of the possession of which is in the inverse ratio of the amount; this class is extremely vacillating in its views. Humble and crouchingly submissive under a powerful feudal or monarchical government, it turns to the side of Liberalism when the middle class is in
the ascendent; it becomes seized with violent Democratic fits as soon as the middle class has secured its own supremacy, but falls back into the abject despondency of fear as soon as the class below itself, the proletarians, attempt an independent movement. We shall, by and by, see this class, in Germany, pass alternately from one of these stages to the other.

The working class in Germany is, in its social and political development, as far behind that of England and France as the German bourgeoisie is behind the bourgeoisie of those countries. Like master, like man. The evolution of the conditions of existence for a numerous, strong, concentrated and intelligent proletarian class, goes hand in hand with the development of the conditions of existence for a numerous, wealthy, concentrated and powerful middle class. The working-class movement itself never is independent, never is of an exclusively proletarian character, until all the different factions of the middle class, and particularly its most progressive faction, the large manufacturers, have conquered political power and remodelled the State according to their wants. It is then that the inevitable conflict between the employer and the employed becomes imminent and cannot be adjourned any longer; that the working class can no longer be put off with delusive hopes and promises never to be realized; that the great problem of the nineteenth century, the abolition of the proletariat, is at last brought forward fairly and in its proper light. Now, in Germany, the mass of the working class were employed, not by those modern manufacturing lords of which Great Britain furnishes such splendid specimens, but by small tradesmen whose entire manufacturing system is a mere relic of the Middle Ages. And as there is an enormous difference between the great cotton lord and the petty cobbler or master tailor, so there is a corresponding distance from the wide-awake factory operative of modern manufacturing Babylons to the bashful journeyman tailor or cabinet-maker of a small country town, who lives in circumstances and works after a plan very little different from those of the like sort of men some five hundred years ago. This general absence of modern conditions of life, of modern modes of industrial production; of course was accompanied by a pretty equally general absence of modern ideas, and it is therefore not to be wondered at if, at the outbreak of the revolution, a large part of the working classes should cry out for the immediate re-establishment of guilds and medieval privileged trades' corporations. Yet, from the manufacturing districts, where the modern system of production predominated, and in consequence of the facilities of intercommunication and mental development afforded by the migratory life
of a large number of the working men, a strong nucleus formed itself whose ideas about the emancipation of their class were far clearer and more in accordance with existing facts and historical necessities; but they were a mere minority. If the active movement of the middle classes may be dated from 1840, that of the working class commences its advent by the insurrections of the Silesian and Bohemian* factory operatives in 1844, 152 and we shall soon have occasion to pass in review the different stages through which this movement passed.

Lastly, there was the great class of the small farmers, the peasantry, which, with its appendix of farm-laborers, constitutes a considerable majority of the entire nation. But this class again subdivided itself into different fractions. There were, firstly, the more wealthy farmers, what is called in Germany Gross- and Mittel-Bauern, ** proprietors of more or less extensive farms, and each of them commanding the services of several agricultural laborers. This class, placed between the large untaxed feudal landowners and the smaller peasantry and farm-laborers, for obvious reasons found in an alliance with the anti-feudal middle class of the towns its most natural political course. Then there were, secondly, the small freeholders, predominating in the Rhine country, where feudalism had succumbed before the mighty strokes of the great French Revolution. Similar independent small freeholders also existed here and there in other provinces, where they had succeeded in buying off the feudal charges formerly due upon their lands. This class, however, was a class of freeholders by name only, their property being generally mortgaged to such an extent, and under such onerous conditions, that not the peasant, but the usurer who had advanced the money, was the real landowner. Thirdly, the feudal tenants, who could not be easily turned out of their holdings, but who had to pay a perpetual rent, or to perform in perpetuity a certain amount of labor in favor of the lord of the manor. Lastly, the agricultural laborers, whose condition, in many large farming concerns, was exactly that of the same class in England, and who, in all cases, lived and died poor, ill-fed, and the slaves of their employers. These three latter classes of the agricultural population, the small freeholders, the feudal tenants, and the agricultural laborers, never troubled their heads much about politics before the revolution, but it is evident that this event must have opened to them a new career, full of brilliant prospects. To every one of them the revolution offered advantages.

* Czech.—Ed.
** Big and middle peasants.—Ed.
and the movement once fairly engaged in, it was to be expected that, each in their turn, they would join it. But at the same time it is quite as evident, and equally borne out by the history of all modern countries, that the agricultural population, in consequence of its dispersion over a great space, and of the difficulty of bringing about an agreement among any considerable portion of it, never can attempt a successful independent movement; they require the initiatory impulse of the more concentrated, more enlightened, more easily moved people of the towns.

The preceding short sketch of the most important of the classes, which in their aggregate formed the German nation at the outbreak of the recent movements, will already be sufficient to explain a great part of the incoherence, incongruence and apparent contradiction which prevailed in that movement. When interests so varied, so conflicting, so strangely crossing each other, are brought into violent collision; when these contending interests in every district, every province are mixed in different proportions; when, above all, there is no great center in the country, no London, no Paris, the decisions of which, by their weight, may supersede the necessity of fighting out the same quarrel over and over again in every single locality; what else is to be expected but that the contest will dissolve itself into a mass of unconnected struggles, in which an enormous quantity of blood, energy and capital is spent, but which for all that remain without any decisive results?

The political dismemberment of Germany into three dozen of more or less important principalities is equally explained by this confusion and multiplicity of the elements which compose the nation, and which again vary in every locality. Where there are no common interests there can be no unity of purpose, much less of action. The German Confederation, it is true, was declared everlastinglly indissoluble; yet the Confederation and its organ, the Diet, never represented German unity. The very highest pitch to which centralization was ever carried in Germany was the establishment of the Zollverein; by this the States on the North Sea were also forced into a Customs Union of their own, Austria remaining wrapped up in her separate prohibitive tariff. Germany had the satisfaction to be, for all practical purposes, divided between three independent powers only, instead of between thirty-six. Of course, the paramount supremacy of the Russian Czar, as established in 1814, underwent no change on this account.

* Alexander I.—Ed.
Having drawn these preliminary conclusions from our premises, we shall see, in our next, how the aforesaid various classes of the German people were set into movement one after the other, and what character this movement assumed on the outbreak of the French Revolution of 1848.

London, September, 1851

II

THE PRUSSIAN STATE

The political movement of the middle class, or bourgeoisie, in Germany, may be dated from 1840. It had been preceded by symptoms showing that the moneyed and industrial class of that country was ripening into a state which would no longer allow it to continue apathetic and passive under the pressure of a half-feudal, half-bureaucratic monarchism. The smaller Princes of Germany, partly to insure to themselves a greater independence against the supremacy of Austria and Prussia, or against the influence of the nobility in their own States, partly in order to consolidate into a whole the disconnected provinces united under their rule by the Congress of Vienna, one after the other granted constitutions of a more or less liberal character. They could do so without any danger to themselves; for if the Diet of the Confederation, this mere puppet of Austria and Prussia, was to encroach upon their independence as sovereigns, they knew that in resisting its dictates they would be backed by public opinion and the Chambers; and if, on the contrary, these Chambers grew too strong, they could readily command the power of the Diet to break down all opposition. The Bavarian, Württemberg, Baden, or Hanoverian constitutional institutions could not, under such circumstances, give rise to any serious struggle for political power, and therefore the great bulk of the German middle class kept very generally aloof from the petty squabbles raised in the legislatures of the small States, well knowing that without a fundamental change in the policy and constitution of the two great powers of Germany, no secondary efforts and victories would be of any avail. But, at the same time, a race of liberal lawyers, professional oppositionists, sprung up in these small assemblies: the Rottecks, the Welckers, the Roemers, the Jordans, the Stüves, the Eisenmanns, those great "popular men" (Volksmänner), who after a more or less noisy, but always unsuccessful, opposition of twenty years, were carried to the summit of power by the revolutionary spring tide
of 1848, and who, after having there shown their utter impotency and insignificance, were hurled down again in a moment. These first specimens, upon German soil, of the trader in politics and opposition, by their speeches and writings made familiar to the German ear the language of constitutionalism, and by their very existence, foreboded the approach of a time when the middle class would seize upon and restore to their proper meaning the political phrases which these talkative attorneys and professors were in the habit of using without knowing much about the sense originally attached to them.

German literature, too, labored under the influence of the political excitement into which all Europe had been thrown by the events of 1830. A crude constitutionalism, or a still cruder republicanism, were preached by almost all writers of the time. It became more and more the habit, particularly of the inferior sorts of literati, to make up for the want of cleverness in their productions by political allusions which were sure to attract attention. Poetry, novels, reviews, the drama, every literary production teemed with what was called "tendency," that is, with more or less timid exhibitions of an anti-governmental spirit. In order to complete the confusion of ideas reigning after 1830 in Germany, with these elements of political opposition there were mixed up ill-digested university-recollections of German philosophy, and misunderstood gleanings from French socialism, particularly Saint-Simonism; and the clique of writers who expatiated upon this heterogeneous conglomerate of ideas, presumptuously called themselves "Young Germany," or "the Modern School." They have since repented their youthful sins, but not improved their style of writing.

Lastly, German philosophy, that most complicated, but at the same time most sure thermometer of the development of the German mind, had declared for the middle class, when Hegel pronounced, in his Philosophy of Law, Constitutional Monarchy to be the final and most perfect form of Government. In other words, he proclaimed the approaching advent of the middle classes of the country to political power. His school, after his death, did not stop here. While the more advanced section of his followers, on one hand, subjected every religious belief to the ordeal of a rigorous criticism, and shook to its foundation the ancient fabric of Christianity, they at the same time brought forward bolder political principles than hitherto it had been the fate of German ears to hear expounded, and attempted to restore to glory the memory of the heroes of the first French Revolution. The abstruse philosophical language in which these ideas were clothed, if it obscured the mind of both the writer
and the reader, equally blinded the eyes of the censor, and thus it was that the "Young Hegelian" writers enjoyed a liberty of the press unknown in every other branch of literature.

Thus it was evident that public opinion was undergoing a great change in Germany. By degrees, the vast majority of those classes whose education or position in life enabled them, under an absolute monarchy, to gain some political information, and to form anything like an independent political opinion, united into one mighty phalanx of opposition against the existing system. And in passing judgment upon the slowness of political development in Germany, no one ought to omit taking into account the difficulty of obtaining correct information upon any subject in a country, where all sources of information were under control of the Government; where from the Ragged School and Sunday School, to the Newspaper and the University, nothing was said, taught, printed or published, but what had previously obtained its approbation. Look at Vienna, for instance. The people of Vienna, in industry and manufactures, second perhaps to none in Germany, in spirit, courage, and revolutionary energy, proving themselves far superior to all, were yet more ignorant as to their real interests, and committed more blunders during the revolution than any others, and this was due, in a very great measure, to the almost absolute ignorance with regard to the very commonest political subjects in which Metternich's Government had succeeded in keeping them.

It needs no further explanation why, under such a system, political information was an almost exclusive monopoly of such classes of society as could afford to pay for its being smuggled into the country, and more particularly of those whose interests were most seriously attacked by the existing state of things—namely, the manufacturing and commercial classes. They, therefore, were the first to unite in a mass against the continuance of a more or less disguised absolutism, and from their passing into the ranks of the opposition must be dated the beginning of the real revolutionary movement in Germany.

The oppositional pronunciamento of the German bourgeoisie may be dated from 1840, from the death of the late King of Prussia,* the last surviving founder of the Holy Alliance of 1815.73 The new King was known to be no supporter of the predominantly bureaucratic and military monarchy of his father. What the French middle classes had expected from the advent of Louis XVI, the German bourgeoisie hoped, in some measure, from Frederick William IV of Prussia. It was agreed upon all

---

* Friedrich-Wilhelm III.—Ed.
hands that the old system was exploded, worn out, and must be given up; and what had been borne in silence under the old King, now was loudly proclaimed to be intolerable.

But if Louis XVI, "Louis-le-Désiré," had been a plain, unpretending simpleton, half-conscious of his own nullity, without any fixed opinions, ruled principally by the habits contracted during his education, "Frederick William-le-Désiré" was something quite different. While he certainly surpassed his French original in weakness of character, he was neither without pretensions nor without opinions. He had made himself acquainted, in an amateur sort of way, with the rudiments of most sciences, and thought himself, therefore, learned enough to consider final his judgment upon every subject. He made sure he was a first-rate orator, and there was certainly no commercial traveller in Berlin who could beat him either in prolixity of pretended wit or in fluency of elocution. And above all, he had his opinions. He hated and despised the bureaucratic element of the Prussian Monarchy, but only because all his sympathies were with the feudal element. Himself one of the founders of and chief contributors to the Berlin Political Weekly Paper, the so-called Historical School (a school living upon the ideas of Bonald, De Maistre, and other writers of the first generation of French Legitimists), he aimed at a restoration, as complete as possible, of the predominant social position of the nobility. The King, first nobleman of his realm, surrounded in the first instance by a splendid court of mighty vassals, princes, dukes and counts; in the second instance, by a numerous and wealthy lower nobility; ruling according to his discretion over his loyal burgesses and peasants, and thus being himself the chief of a complete hierarchy of social ranks or castes, each of which was to enjoy its particular privileges, and to be separated from the others by the almost insurmountable barrier of birth or of a fixed, inalterable social position; the whole of these castes or "estates of the realm" balancing each other, at the same time, so nicely in power and influence, that a complete independence of action should remain to the King—such was the beau idéal which Frederick William IV undertook to realize, and which he is again trying to realize at the present moment.

It took some time before the Prussian bourgeoisie, not very well versed in theoretical questions, found out the real purport of their King's tendency. But what they very soon found out, was the fact that he was bent upon things quite the reverse of what they wanted. Hardly did the new King find his "gift of the gad" unfettered by his father's death when he set about proclaiming his intentions in speeches without number; and every
speech, every act of his went far to estrange from him the sympathies of the middle class. He would not have cared much for that, if it had not been for some stern and startling realities which interrupted his poetic dreams. Alas, that romanticism is not very quick at accounts, and that feudalism, ever since Don Quixote, reckons without its host! Frederick William IV partook too much of that contempt for ready cash which ever has been the noblest inheritance of the sons of the Crusaders. He found, at his accession, a costly, although parsimoniously arranged system of Government, and a moderately filled State Treasury. In two years every trace of a surplus was spent in court festivals, royal progresses, largesses, subventions to needy, seedy and greedy noblemen, &c., and the regular taxes were no longer sufficient for the exigencies of either court or government. And thus, his Majesty found himself very soon placed between a glaring deficit on one side, and a law of 1820 on the other, by which any new loan, or any increase of the then existing taxation, was made illegal without the assent of "the future Representation of the People." This representation did not exist; the new King was less inclined than even his father to create it; and if he had been, he knew that public opinion had wonderfully changed since his accession.

Indeed the middle classes, who had partly expected that the new King would at once grant a Constitution, proclaim the Liberty of the Press, Trial by Jury, &c., &c.—in short, himself take the lead of that peaceful revolution which they wanted in order to obtain political supremacy—the middle classes had found out their error and had turned ferociously against the King. In the Rhine Province, and more or less generally, all over Prussia, they were so exasperated that they, being short themselves of men able to represent them in the Press, went to the length of an alliance with the extreme philosophical party, of which we have spoken above. The fruit of this alliance was the Rhenish Gazette, of Cologne, a paper which was suppressed after fifteen months' existence, but from which may be dated the existence of the Newspaper Press in Germany. This was in 1842. The poor King, whose commercial difficulties were the keenest satire upon his medieval propensities, very soon found out that he could not continue to reign without making some slight concession to the popular outcry for that "Representation of the People," which, as the last remnant of the long-forgotten promises of 1813 and 1815, had been embodied in the law of 1820. He found the least objectionable mode of satisfying this untoward law in calling together the Standing Committees of the Provincial Diets. The Provincial Diets had been instituted in 1823. They
consisted, for every one of the eight provinces of the kingdom, of: 1. The higher nobility, the formerly sovereign families of the German Empire, the heads of which were members of the Diet by birthright. 2. Of the representatives of the knights or lower nobility. 3. Of representatives of towns; and 4. Of deputies of the peasantry or small farming class. The whole was arranged in such a manner that in every province the two sections of the nobility always had a majority of the Diet. Every one of these eight Provincial Diets elected a Committee, and these eight Committees were now called to Berlin, in order to form a Representative Assembly for the purpose of voting the much-desired loan. It was stated that the Treasury was full, and that the loan was required, not for current wants, but for the construction of a State Railway. But the united Committees gave the King a flat refusal, declaring themselves incompetent to act as the Representatives of the People, and called upon his majesty to fulfill the promise of a Representative Constitution which his father had given when he wanted the aid of the people against Napoleon.

The sitting of the united Committees proved that the spirit of opposition was no longer confined to the bourgeoisie. A part of the peasantry had joined them, and many nobles, being themselves large farmers on their own property, and dealers in corn, wool, spirits and flax, requiring the same guaranties against absolutism, bureaucracy and feudal restoration, had equally pronounced against the Government and for a Representative Constitution. The King's plan had signally failed; he had got no money, and had increased the power of the opposition. The subsequent sitting of the Provincial Diets themselves was still more unfortunate for the King. All of them asked for reforms, for the fulfillment of the promises of 1813 and '15, for a Constitution and a Free Press; the resolutions, to this effect, of some of them, were rather disrespectfully worded, and the ill-humored replies of the exasperated King made the evil still greater.

In the meantime the financial difficulties of the Government went on increasing. For a time abatements made upon the monies appropriated for the different public services, fraudulent transactions with the "Seehandlung," a commercial establishment speculating and trading for account and risk of the State, and long since acting as its money-broker, had sufficed to keep up appearances; increased issues of State paper money had furnished some resources; and the secret, upon the whole, had been pretty well kept. But all these contrivances were soon exhausted. There was another plan tried: the establishment of a Bank, the capital of which was to be furnished partly by the
State and partly by private shareholders; the chief direction to belong to the State, in such a manner as to enable the Government to draw upon the funds of this Bank to a large amount, and thus to repeat the same fraudulent transactions that would no longer do with the "Seehandlung." But, as a matter of course, there were no capitalists to be found who would hand over their money upon such conditions; the statutes of the Bank had to be altered, and the property of the shareholders guarantied from the encroachments of the Treasury, before any shares were subscribed for. Thus, this plan having failed, there remained nothing but to try a loan—if capitalists could be found who would lend their cash without requiring the permission and guarantee of that mysterious "future Representation of the People." Rothschild was applied to, and he declared that if the loan was to be guaranteed by this "Representation of the People," he would undertake the thing at a moment's notice—if not, he could not have anything to do with the transaction.

Thus every hope of obtaining money had vanished, and there was no possibility of escaping the fatal "Representation of the People." Rothschild's refusal was known in Autumn, 1846, and in February of the next year the King called together all the eight Provincial Diets to Berlin, forming them into one "United Diet." This Diet was to do the work required, in case of need, by the law of 1820; it was to vote loans and increased taxes, but beyond that it was to have no rights. Its voice upon general legislation was to be merely consultative; it was to assemble, not at fixed periods, but whenever it pleased the King; it was to discuss nothing but what the Government pleased to lay before it. Of course, the members were very little satisfied with the part they were expected to perform. They repeated the wishes they had enounced when they met in the provincial assemblies; the relations between them and the Government soon became acrimonious, and when the loan, which was again stated to be required for railway constructions, was demanded from them, they again refused to grant it.

This vote very soon brought their sitting to a close. The King, more and more exasperated, dismissed them with a reprimand, but still remained without money. And, indeed, he had every reason to be alarmed at his position, seeing that the Liberal league, headed by the middle classes, comprising a large part of the lower nobility and all the manifold discontents that had been accumulated in the different sections of the lower orders—that this Liberal league was determined to have what it wanted. In vain the King had declared, in the opening speech, that he would never, never grant a Constitution in the modern
sense of the word; the Liberal league insisted upon such a modern, anti-feudal, Representative Constitution, with all its sequels, liberty of the press, trial by jury, &c.; and before they got it, not a farthing of money would they grant. There was one thing evident: that things could not go on long in this manner, and that either one of the parties must give way, or that a rupture, a bloody struggle, must ensue. And the middle classes knew that they were on the eve of a revolution, and they prepared themselves for it. They sought to obtain, by every possible means, the support of the working class of the towns, and of the peasantry in the agricultural districts, and it is well known that there was, in the latter end of 1847, hardly a single prominent political character among the bourgeoisie who did not proclaim himself a "Socialist," in order to insure to himself the sympathy of the proletarian class. We shall see these "Socialists" at work by and by.

This eagerness of the leading bourgeoisie to adopt at least the outward show of Socialism, was caused by a great change that had come over the working classes of Germany. There had been, ever since 1840, a fraction of German workmen who, travelling in France and Switzerland, had more or less imbibed the crude Socialist and Communist notions then current among the French workmen. The increasing attention paid to similar ideas in France, ever since 1840, made Socialism and Communism fashionable in Germany also, and as far back as 1843, all newspapers teemed with discussions of social questions. A school of Socialists very soon formed itself in Germany, distinguished more for the obscurity than for the novelty of its ideas; its principal efforts consisted in the translation of French Fourierist, Saint-Simonian and other doctrines into the abstruse language of German philosophy. The German Communist School, entirely different from this sect, was formed about the same time.

In 1844 there occurred the Silesian weavers' riots, followed by the insurrection of the calico printers in Prague. These riots, cruelly suppressed, riots of working men, not against the Government, but against their employers, created a deep sensation, and gave a new stimulus to Socialist and Communist propaganda amongst the working people. So did the bread riots during the year of famine, 1847. In short, in the same manner as Constitutional opposition rallied around its banner the great bulk of the propertied classes (with the exception of the large Feudal land-holders), so the working classes of the larger towns looked for their emancipation to the Socialist and Communist doctrines, although, under the then existing press laws, they could be
made to know only very little about them. They, could not be expected to have any very definite ideas as to what they wanted—they only knew that the programme of the Constitutional bourgeoisie did not contain all they wanted, and that their wants were no wise contained in the Constitutional circle of ideas.

There was then no separate republican party in Germany. People were either constitutional monarchists, or more or less clearly defined Socialists or Communists.

With such elements, the slightest collision must have brought about a great revolution. While the higher nobility, and the older civil and military officers, were the only safe supports of the existing system; while the lower nobility, the trading middle classes, the universities, the school-masters of every degree, and even part of the lower ranks of the bureaucracy and military officers, were all leagued against the Government; while, behind these, there stood the dissatisfied masses of the peasantry, and of the proletarians of the large towns, supporting, for the time being, the liberal opposition, but already muttering strange words about taking things into their own hands; while the Bourgeoisie was ready to hurl down the Government, and the Proletarians were preparing to hurl down the Bourgeoisie in its turn;—this Government went on obstinately in a course which must bring about a collision. Germany was, in the beginning of 1848, on the eve of a revolution, and this revolution was sure to come, even had the French revolution of February not hastened it.

What the effects of this Parisian Revolution were upon Germany, we shall see in our next.

London, September, 1851

III

THE OTHER GERMAN STATES

In our last we confined ourselves almost exclusively to that State which, during the years 1840 to 1848, was by far the most important in the German movement; namely, to Prussia. It is, however, time to pass a rapid glance over the other States of Germany during the same period.

As to the petty States, they had, ever since the revolutionary movements of 1830, completely passed under the dictatorship of the Diet, that is, of Austria and Prussia. The several constitutions, established as much as a means of defense against the
dictates of the larger States, as to insure popularity to their princely authors and unity to heterogeneous assemblies of provinces, formed by the Congress of Vienna, without any leading principle whatever—these constitutions, illusory as they were, had yet proved dangerous to the authority of the petty princes themselves during the excited times of 1830 and 1831. They were all but destroyed; whatever of them was allowed to remain, was less than a shadow, and it required the loquacious self-complacency of a Welcker, a Rotteck, a Dahlmann, to imagine that any results could possibly flow from the humble opposition, mingled with degrading flattery, which they were allowed to show off in the impotent chambers of these petty States.

The more energetic portion of the middle class in these smaller States, very soon after 1840, abandoned all the hopes they had formerly based upon the development of Parliamentary government in these dependencies of Austria and Prussia. No sooner had the Prussian bourgeoisie, and the classes allied to it, shown a serious resolution to struggle for Parliamentary government in Prussia, than they were allowed to take the lead of the Constitutional movement over all non-Austrian Germany. It is a fact which now will not be any longer contested, that the nucleus of those Constitutionalists of Central Germany, who afterwards seceded from the Frankfort National Assembly, and who, from the place of their separate meetings, were called the Gotha party, long before 1848 contemplated a plan which, with little modification, they in 1849 proposed to the representatives of all Germany. They intended a complete exclusion of Austria from the German Confederation, the establishment of a new Confederation with a new fundamental law and with a federal Parliament, under the protection of Prussia, and the incorporation of the more insignificant States into the larger ones. All this was to be carried out the moment Prussia entered into the ranks of constitutional monarchy, established the liberty of the press, assumed a policy independent from that of Russia and Austria, and thus enabled the Constitutionalists of the lesser States to obtain a real control over their respective Governments. The inventor of this scheme was Professor Germinus, of Heidelberg (Baden). Thus the emancipation of the Prussian bourgeoisie was to be the signal for that of the middle classes of Germany generally, and for an alliance, offensive and defensive, of both against Russia and Austria; for Austria was, as we shall see presently, considered as an entirely barbarian country, of which very little was known, and that little not to the credit of its population; Austria, therefore, was not considered as an essential part of Germany.
As to the other classes of society, in the smaller States, they followed, more or less rapidly, in the wake of their equals in Prussia. The shopkeeping class got more and more dissatisfied with their respective Governments, with the increase of taxation, with the curtailments of those political sham-privileges of which they used to boast when comparing themselves to the "slaves of despotism" in Austria and Prussia; but as yet they had nothing definite in their opposition which might stamp them as an independent party, distinct from the Constitutionalism of the higher bourgeoisie. The dissatisfaction among the peasantry was equally growing, but it is well known that this section of the people, in quiet and peaceful times, will never assert its interests and assume its position as an independent class, except in countries where universal suffrage is established. The working classes in the trades and manufactures of the towns commenced to be infected with the "poison" of Socialism and Communism, but there being few towns of any importance out of Prussia, and still fewer manufacturing districts, the movement of this class, owing to the want of centers of action and propaganda, was extremely slow in the smaller States.

Both in Prussia and in the smaller States, the difficulty of giving vent to political opposition created a sort of religious opposition in the parallel movements of German Catholicism and Free Congregationalism.\(^{166}\) History affords us numerous examples where, in countries which enjoy the blessings of a State Church, and where political discussion is fettered, the profane and dangerous opposition against the worldly power is hid under the more sanctified and apparently more disinterested struggle against spiritual despotism. Many a government that will not allow of any of its acts being discussed, will hesitate before it creates martyrs and excites the religious fanaticism of the masses. Thus in Germany, in 1845, in every State, either the Roman Catholic or the Protestant religion, or both, were considered part and parcel of the law of the land. In every State, too, the clergy of either of those denominations, or of both, formed an essential part of the bureaucratic establishment of the Government. To attack Protestant or Catholic orthodoxy, to attack priestcraft, was, then, to make an underhand attack upon the Government itself. As to the German Catholics, their very existence was an attack upon the Catholic Governments of Germany, particularly Austria and Bavaria; and as such it was taken by those Governments. The Free Congregationalists, Protestant Dissenters, somewhat resembling the English and American Unitarians,\(^{167}\) openly professed their opposition to the clerical and rigidly orthodox tendency of the King of Prussia and his favorite Minister for
the Educational and Clerical Department, Mr. Eichhorn. The two new sects, rapidly extending for a moment, the first in Catholic, the second in Protestant countries, had no other distinction but their different origin; as to their tenets, they perfectly agreed upon this most important point—that all definite dogmas were nugatory. This want of any definition was their very essence; they pretended to build that great temple under the roof of which all Germans might unite; they thus represented, in a religious form, another political idea of the day—that of German Unity; and yet, they could never agree among themselves.

The idea of German Unity, which the above-mentioned sects sought to realize at least upon religious ground, by inventing a common religion for all Germans, manufactured expressly for their use, habits, and taste—this idea was indeed very widely spread, particularly in the smaller States. Ever since the dissolution of the German Empire, by Napoleon, the cry for a union of all the *disjecta membra* of the German body had been the most general expression of discontent with the established order of things, and most so in the smaller States, where the costliness of a court, an administration, an army, in short, the dead weight of taxation, increased in a direct ratio with the smallness and impotency of the State. But what this German Unity was to be when carried out, was a question upon which parties disagreed. The bourgeoisie, which wanted no serious revolutionary convulsions, were satisfied with what we have seen they considered "practicable," namely, a union of all Germany, exclusive of Austria, under the supremacy of a constitutional government of Prussia; and surely, without conjuring dangerous storms, nothing more could, at that time, be done. The shopkeeping class and the peasantry, as far as these latter troubled themselves about such things, never arrived at any definition of that German Unity they so loudly clamored after; a few dreamers, mostly feudalist reactionists, hoped for the re-establishment of the German Empire; some few ignorant, *soi-disant* radicals, admiring Swiss institutions, of which they had not yet made that practical experience which afterward most ludicrously undeceived them, pronounced for a federated republic; and it was only the most extreme party which, at that time, dared pronounce for a German Republic, one and indivisible. Thus, German Unity was in itself a question big with disunion, discord, and, in the case of certain eventualities, even civil war.

---

* Disjecta membra: Scattered members.—Ed.
** Soi-disant: So-called.—Ed.
To resume, then; this was the state of Prussia and the smaller States of Germany, at the end of 1847. The middle class, feeling its power, and resolved not to endure much longer the fetters with which a feudal and bureaucratic despotism enchainèd their commercial transactions, their industrial productivity, their common action as a class; a portion of the landed nobility so far changed into producers of mere marketable commodities as to have the same interests and to make common cause with the middle class; the smaller trading class, dissatisfied, grumbling at the taxes, at the impediments thrown in the way of their business, but without any definite plan for such reforms as should secure their position in the social and political body; the peasantry, oppressed here by feudal exactions, there by money-lenders, usurers, and lawyers; the working people of the towns, infected with the general discontent, equally hating the Government and the large industrial capitalists, and catching the contagion of Socialist and Communist ideas; in short, a heterogeneous mass of opposition, springing from various interests, but more or less led on by the bourgeoisie, in the first ranks of which again marched the bourgeoisie of Prussia and particularly of the Rhine Province. On the other hand, governments disagreeing upon many points, distrustful of each other, and particularly of that of Prussia, upon which yet they had to rely for protection; in Prussia, a government forsaken by public opinion, forsaken by even a portion of the nobility, leaning upon an army and a bureaucracy which every day got more infected by the ideas and subjected to the influence of the oppositional bourgeoisie—a government, besides all this, penniless in the most literal meaning of the word, and which could not procure a single cent to cover its increasing deficit, but by surrendering at discretion to the opposition of the bourgeoisie. Was there ever a more splendid position for the middle class of any country, while it struggled for power against the established government?

London, September, 1851

IV

AUSTRIA

We have now to consider Austria, that country which up to March, 1848, was sealed up to the eyes of foreign nations almost as much as China before the late war with England.\(^{170}\)

As a matter of course, we can here take into consideration nothing but German Austria. The affairs of the Polish, Hun-
garian or Italian Austrians do not belong to our subject, and as far as they, since 1848, have influenced the fate of the German Austrians, they will have to be taken into account hereafter.

The Government of Prince Metternich turned upon two hinges: firstly, to keep every one of the different nations, subjected to the Austrian rule, in check by all other nations similarly conditioned; secondly, and this always has been the fundamental principle of absolute monarchies, to rely for support upon two classes, the feudal landlords and the large stockjobbing capitalists; and to balance, at the same time, the influence and power of either of these classes by that of the other, so as to leave full independence of action to the Government. The landed nobility, whose entire income consisted in feudal revenues of all sorts, could not but support a government which proved their only protection against that downtrodden class of serfs, upon whose spoils they lived; and whenever the less wealthy portion of them, as in Galicia, in 1846, rose in opposition against the Government, Metternich, in an instant, let loose upon them these very serfs, who at any rate profited by the occasion to wreak a terrible vengeance upon their more immediate oppressors. On the other hand, the large capitalists of the Exchange were chained to Metternich’s Government by the vast share they had in the public funds of the country. Austria, restored to her full power in 1815, restoring and maintaining in Italy absolute monarchy ever since 1820, freed of part of her liabilities by the bankruptcy of 1810, had after the peace very soon re-established her credit in the great European money markets, and in proportion as her credit grew, she had drawn against it. Thus all the large European money-dealers had engaged considerable portions of their capital in the Austrian funds; they all of them were interested in upholding the credit of that country, and as Austrian public credit, in order to be upheld, ever required new loans, they were obliged from time to time to advance new capital in order to keep up the credit of the securities for that which they already had advanced. The long peace after 1815, and the apparent impossibility of a thousand years old empire, like Austria, being upset, increased the credit of Metternich’s Government in a wonderful ratio, and made it even independent of the good will of the Vienna bankers and stockjobbers; for as long as Metternich could obtain plenty of money at Frankfort and Amsterdam, he had, of course, the satisfaction of seeing the Austrian capitalists at his feet. They were, besides, in every other respect at his mercy; the large profits which bankers, stockjobbers and government contractors always contrive to draw out of an absolute monarchy, were compensated for by the almost unlimited
power which the Government possessed over their persons and fortunes; and not the smallest shadow of an opposition was, therefore, to be expected from this quarter. Thus, Metternich was sure of the support of the two most powerful and influential classes of the empire, and he possessed, besides, an army and a bureaucracy which, for all purposes of absolutism, could not be better constituted. The civil and military officers in the Austrian service form a race of their own; their fathers have been in the service of the Kaiser, and so will their sons be; they belong to none of the multifarious nationalities congregated under the wing of the double-headed eagle; they are, and ever have been, removed from one end of the empire to the other, from Poland to Italy, from Germany to Transylvania; Hungarian, Pole, German, Rumanian, Italian, Croat, every individual not stamped with "imperial and royal" authority, &c., bearing a separate national character, is equally despised by them; they have no nationality, or rather they alone make up the really Austrian nation. It is evident what a pliable and at the same time powerful instrument, in the hands of an intelligent and energetic chief, such a civil and military hierarchy must be.

As to the other classes of the population, Metternich, in the true spirit of a statesman of the ancien régime, cared little for their support. He had, with regard to them, but one policy: to draw as much as possible out of them in the shape of taxation, and at the same time, to keep them quiet. The trading and manufacturing middle class was but of slow growth in Austria. The trade of the Danube was comparatively unimportant; the country possessed but one port, Trieste, and the trade of this port was very limited. As to the manufacturers, they enjoyed considerable protection, amounting even in most cases to the complete exclusion of all foreign competition; but this advantage had been granted to them principally with a view to increase their tax-paying capabilities, and was in a high degree counterpoised by internal restrictions on manufactures, privileges of guilds and other feudal corporations, which were scrupulously upheld as long as they did not impede the purposes and views of the Government. The petty tradesmen were encased in the narrow bounds of these medieval guilds, which kept the different trades in a perpetual war of privilege against each other, and at the same time, by all but excluding individuals of the working class from the possibility of raising themselves in the social scale, gave a sort of hereditary stability to the members of those involuntary associations. Lastly, the peasant and the working man were treated as mere taxable matter, and the only care that was taken of them, was to keep them as much as possible
in the same conditions of life in which they then existed, and in which their fathers had existed before them. For this purpose, every old established hereditary authority was upheld in the same manner as that of the State; the authority of the landlord over the petty tenant-farmer, that of the manufacturer over the operative, of the small master over the journeyman and apprentice, of the father over the son, was everywhere rigidly maintained by the Government, and every branch of disobedience punished, the same as a transgression of the law, by that universal instrument of Austrian justice—the stick.

Finally, to wind up into one comprehensive system all these attempts at creating an artificial stability, the intellectual food allowed to the nation was selected with the minutest caution, and dealt out as sparingly as possible. Education was everywhere in the hands of the Catholic priesthood, whose chiefs, in the same manner as the large feudal landowners, were deeply interested in the conservation of the existing system. The universities were organized in a manner which allowed them to produce nothing but special men, that might or might not obtain great proficiency in sundry particular branches of knowledge, but which, at all events, excluded that universal liberal education which other universities are expected to impart. There was absolutely no newspaper press, except in Hungary, and the Hungarian papers were prohibited in all other parts of the monarchy. As to general literature, its range had not widened for a century; it had been narrowed again after the death of Joseph II. And all around the frontier, wherever the Austrian States touched upon a civilized country, a cordon of literary censors was established in connection with the cordon of custom-house officials, preventing any foreign book or newspaper from passing into Austria before its contents had been twice or three times thoroughly sifted, and found pure of even the slightest contamination of the malignant spirit of the age.

For about thirty years after 1815, this system worked with wonderful success. Austria remained almost unknown to Europe, and Europe was quite as little known in Austria. The social state of every class of the population, and of the population as a whole, appeared not to have undergone the slightest change. Whatever rancor there might exist from class to class—and the existence of this rancor was, for Metternich, a principal condition of government, which he even fostered by making the higher classes the instruments of all government exactions, and thus throwing the odium upon them—whatever hatred the people might bear to the inferior officials of the State, there existed, upon the whole, little or no dissatisfaction with the Central
Government. The Emperor was adored, and old Francis the First seemed to be borne out by facts, when, doubting of the durability of this system, he complacently added: "and yet it will hold while I live, and Metternich."

But there was a slow underground movement going on which baffled all Metternich's efforts. The wealth and influence of the manufacturing and trading middle class increased. The introduction of machinery and steam power in manufactures upset in Austria, as it had done everywhere else, the old relations and vital conditions of whole classes of society; it changed serfs into free men, small farmers into manufacturing operatives; it undermined the old feudal trades-corporations and destroyed the means of existence of many of them. The new commercial and manufacturing population came everywhere into collision with the old feudal institutions. The middle classes, more and more induced by their business to travel abroad, introduced some mythical knowledge of the civilized countries situated beyond the imperial line of customs; the introduction of railways, finally, accelerated both the industrial and intellectual movement. There was, too, a dangerous part in the Austrian State establishment, viz.: the Hungarian feudal Constitution, with its parliamentary proceedings and its struggles of the impoverished and oppositional mass of the nobility against the Government and its allies, the magnates. Pressburg,* the seat of the Diet, was at the very gates of Vienna. All the elements contributed to create among the middle classes, of the towns, a spirit, not exactly of opposition, for opposition was as yet impossible, but of discontent; a general wish for reforms, more of an administrative than of a constitutional nature. And in the same manner as in Prussia, a portion of the bureaucracy joined the bourgeoisie. Among this hereditary caste of officials the traditions of Joseph II were not forgotten; the more educated functionaries of the Government, who themselves sometimes meddled with imaginary possible reforms, by far preferred the progressive and intellectual despotism of that Emperor to the "paternal" despotism of Metternich. A portion of the poorer nobility equally sided with the middle class, and as to the lower classes of the population, who always had found plenty of grounds to complain of their superiors, if not of the Government, they in most cases could not but adhere to the reformatory wishes of the bourgeoisie.

It was about this time, say 1843 or 1844, that a particular branch of literature, agreeably to this change, was established in Germany. A few Austrian writers, novelists, literary critics,

* The Slav name: Bratislava.—Ed.
bad poets, the whole of them of very indifferent ability, but gifted with that peculiar industrialism proper to the Jewish race, established themselves in Leipsic and other German towns out of Austria, and there, out of the reach of Metternich, published a number of books and pamphlets on Austrian affairs. They and their publishers made "a roaring trade" of it. All Germany was eager to become initiated into the secrets of the policy of European China; and the Austrians themselves, who obtained these publications by the wholesale smuggling carried on upon the Bohemian® frontier, were still more curious. Of course, the secrets let out in these publications were of no great importance, and the reform plans schemed out by their well-wishing authors bore the stamp of an innocuousness almost amounting to political virginity. A constitution and a free press for Austria were things considered unattainable; administrative reforms, extension of the rights of the provincial diets, admission of foreign books and newspapers, and a less severe censorship—the loyal and humble desires of these good Austrians did hardly go any further.

At all events, the growing impossibility of preventing the literary intercourse of Austria with the rest of Germany, and through Germany with the world, contributed much toward the formation of an anti-governmental public opinion, and brought at least some little political information within the reach of part of the Austrian population. Thus, by the end of 1847, Austria was seized, although in an inferior degree, by that political and politico-religious agitation which then prevailed in all Germany; and if its progress in Austria was more silent, it did nevertheless find revolutionary elements enough to work upon. There was the peasant, serf or feudal tenant, ground down into the dust by lordly or government exactions; then the factory operative, forced, by the stick of the policeman, to work upon any terms the manufacturer chose to grant; then the journeyman, debarred by the corporative laws from any chance of gaining an independence in his trade; then the merchant, stumbling, at every step in business, over absurd regulations; then the manufacturer, in uninterrupted conflict with trades-guilds jealous of their privileges, or with greedy and meddling officials; then the schoolmaster, the savant, the better educated functionary, vainly struggling against an ignorant and presumptuous clergy, or a stupid and dictating superior. In short, there was not a single class satisfied, for the small concessions Government was obliged now and then to make were made not at its own expense, for the

* Czech.—Ed.
Treasury could not afford that, but at the expense of the high aristocracy and clergy; and, as to the great bankers and fund-holders, the late events in Italy, the increasing opposition of the Hungarian Diet, and the unwonted spirit of discontent and cry for reform manifesting themselves all over the Empire, were not of a nature to strengthen their faith in the solidity and solvency of the Austrian Empire.

Thus Austria, too, was marching, slowly but surely, toward a mighty change, when of a sudden an event broke out in France which at once brought down the impending storm, and gave the lie to old Francis's assertion, that the building would hold out both during his and Metternich's lifetime.

London, September, 1851

*  

V  

THE VIENNA INSURRECTION

On the 24th of February, 1848, Louis Philippe was driven out of Paris and the French Republic was proclaimed. On the 13th of March following, the people of Vienna broke the power of Prince Metternich and made him flee shamefully out of the country. On the 18th of March the people of Berlin rose in arms, and, after an obstinate struggle of eighteen hours, had the satisfaction of seeing the King surrender himself over to their hands. Simultaneous outbreaks of a more or less violent nature, but all with the same success, occurred in the capitals of the smaller States of Germany. The German people, if they had not accomplished their first revolution, were at least fairly launched into the revolutionary career.

As to the incidents of these various insurrections, we cannot enter here into the details of them: what we have to explain is their character, and the position which the different classes of the population took up with regard to them.

The revolution of Vienna may be said to have been made by an almost unanimous population. The bourgeoisie, with the exception of the bankers and stockjobbers, the petty trading class, the working people, one and all, arose at once against a government detested by all, a government so universally hated, that the small minority of nobles and money-lords which had supported it, made itself invisible on the very first attack. The middle classes had been kept in such a degree of political ignorance by Metternich, that to them the news from Paris about the reign of Anarchy, Socialism and Terror, and about impending struggles
between the class of capitalists and the class of laborers, proved quite unintelligible. They, in their political innocence, either could attach no meaning to these news, or they believed them to be fiendish inventions of Metternich, to frighten them into obedience. They, besides, had never seen working men act as a class, or stand up for their own distinct class interests. They had, from their past experience, no idea of the possibility of any differences springing up between classes that now were so heartily united in upsetting a government hated by all. They saw the working people agree with themselves upon all points: a constitution, trial by jury, liberty of the press, &c. Thus, they were, in March, 1848, at least, heart and soul with the movement, and the movement, on the other hand, at once constituted them the (at least in theory) predominant class of the State.

But it is the fate of all revolutions that this union of different classes, which in some degree is always the necessary condition of any revolution, cannot subsist long. No sooner is the victory gained against the common enemy, than the victors become divided among themselves into different camps and turn their weapons against each other. It is this rapid and passionate development of class antagonism which, in old and complicated social organisms, makes a revolution such a powerful agent of social and political progress; it is this incessantly quick upshooting of new parties succeeding each other in power which, during those violent commotions, makes a nation pass in five years over more ground than it would have done in a century under ordinary circumstances.

The revolution, in Vienna, made the middle class the theoretically predominant class; that is to say, the concessions wrung from the Government were such as, once carried out practically and adhered to for a time, would inevitably have secured the supremacy of the middle class. But, practically, the supremacy of that class was far from being established. It is true that by the establishment of a National Guard, which gave arms to the bourgeois, and petty tradesmen, that class obtained both force and importance; it is true, that by the installation of a "Committee of Safety," a sort of revolutionary, irresponsible government, in which the bourgeoisie predominated, it was placed at the head of power. But at the same time, the working classes were partially armed too; they and the students had borne the brunt of the fight, as far as fight there had been; and the students, about 4,000 strong, well armed and far better disciplined than the National Guard, formed the nucleus, the real strength of the revolutionary force, and were noways willing to act as a mere instrument in the hands of the Committee of Safety.
Though they recognized it and even were its most enthusiastic supporters, they yet formed a sort of independent and rather turbulent body, deliberating for themselves in the "Aula," keeping an intermediate position between the bourgeoisie and the working classes, preventing, by constant agitation, things to settle down to the old everyday tranquility, and very often forcing their resolutions upon the Committee of Safety. The working men, on the other hand, almost entirely thrown out of employment, had to be employed in public works at the expense of the State, and the money for this purpose had of course to be taken out of the purse of the tax-payers or out of the chest of the city of Vienna. All this could not but become very unpleasant to the tradesmen of Vienna. The manufactures of the city, calculated for the consumption of the rich and aristocratic courts of a large country, were as a matter of course entirely stopped by the revolution, by the flight of the aristocracy and court; trade was at a standstill, and the continuous agitation and excitement kept up by the students and working people was certainly not the means to "restore confidence," as the phrase went. Thus, a certain coolness very soon sprung up between the middle classes on the one side, and the turbulent students and working people on the other; and if, for a long time, this coolness was not ripened into open hostility, it was because the Ministry, and particularly the Court, in their impatience to restore the old order of things, constantly justified the suspicions and the turbulent activity of the more revolutionary parties, and constantly made arise, even before the eyes of the middle classes, the spectre of old Metternichian despotism. Thus on the 15th of May, and again on the 26th, there were fresh risings of all classes in Vienna, on account of the Government having tried to attack or to undermine some of the newly conquered liberties, and on each occasion, the alliance between the National Guard or armed middle class, the students, and the working men, was again cemented for a time.

As to the other classes of the population, the aristocracy and the money-lords had disappeared, and the peasantry were busily engaged everywhere in removing, down to the very last vestiges, of feudalism. Thanks to the war in Italy, and the occupation which Vienna and Hungary gave to the Court, they were left at full liberty, and succeeded in their work of liberation, in Austria, better than in any other part of Germany. The Austrian Diet very shortly after had only to confirm the steps already practically taken by the peasantry, and whatever else the Government of Prince Schwarzenberg may be enabled to restore, it will never have the power of re-establishing the feudal servitude
of the peasantry. And if Austria at the present moment is again comparatively tranquil, and even strong, it is principally because the great majority of the people, the peasants, have been real gainers by the revolution, and because whatever else has been attacked by the restored Government, these palpable, substantial advantages, conquered by the peasantry, are as yet untouched.

London, October, 1851

VI

THE BERLIN INSURRECTION

The second center of revolutionary action was Berlin. And from what has been stated in the foregoing papers, it may be guessed that there this action was far from having that unanimous support of almost all classes by which it was accompanied in Vienna. In Prussia the bourgeoisie had been already involved in actual struggles with the Government; a rupture had been the result of the "United Diet"; a bourgeois revolution was impending, and that revolution might have been, in its first outbreak, quite as unanimous as that of Vienna, had it not been for the Paris revolution of February. That event precipitated everything, while, at the same time, it was carried out under a banner totally different from that under which the Prussian bourgeoisie was preparing to defy its Government. The revolution of February upset, in France, the very same sort of government which the Prussian bourgeoisie were going to set up in their own country. The revolution of February announced itself as a revolution of the working classes against the middle classes; it proclaimed the downfall of middle-class government and the emancipation of the working man. Now the Prussian bourgeoisie had of late had quite enough of working-class agitation in their own country. After the first terror of the Silesian riots had passed away, they had even tried to give this agitation a turn in their own favor; but they always had retained a salutary horror of revolutionary Socialism and Communism; and, therefore, when they saw men at the head of the Government in Paris whom they considered as the most dangerous enemies of property, order, religion, family, and of the other penates of the modern bourgeois, they at once experienced a considerable cooling down of their own revolutionary ardor. They knew that the moment must be seized, and that without the aid of the working masses they would be defeated; and yet their courage failed them. Thus they sided
with the Government in the first partial and provincial out-
breaks, tried to keep the people quiet in Berlin, who during
five days met in crowds before the royal palace to discuss the
news and ask for changes in the Government; and when at last,
after the news of the downfall of Metternich, the King* made
some slight concessions, the bourgeoisie considered the revolu-
tion as completed, and went to thank his Majesty for having
fulfilled all the wishes of his people. But then followed the attack
of the military on the crowd, the barricades, the struggle, and
the defeat of Royalty. Then everything was changed; the very
working classes, which it had been the tendency of the bourgeoi-
sie to keep in the background, had been pushed forward, had
fought and conquered, and all at once were conscious of their
strength. Restrictions of suffrage, of the liberty of the press, of
the right to sit on juries, of the right of meeting—restrictions
that would have been very agreeable to the bourgeoisie, because
they would have touched upon such classes only as were beneath
it—now were no longer possible. The danger of a repetition of
the Parisian scenes of "anarchy" was imminent. Before this
danger all former differences disappeared. Against the victorious
working man, although he had not yet uttered any specific de-
mands for himself, the friends and the foes of many years united,
and the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the supporters of
the overturned system was concluded upon the very barricades
of Berlin. The necessary concessions, but no more than was
unavoidable, were to be made; a minority of the opposition
leaders of the United Diet was to be formed, and in return for
its services in saving the Crown, it was to have the support of
all the props of the old Government, the feudal aristocracy, the
bureaucracy, the army. These were the conditions upon which
Messrs. Camphausen and Hansemann undertook the formation
of a Cabinet.

Such was the dread evinced, by the new ministers, of the
aroused masses, that in their eyes every means was good if it
only tended to strengthen the shaken foundations of authority.
They, poor deluded wretches, thought every danger of a restora-
tion of the old system had passed away; and thus they made use
of the whole of the old state machinery for the purpose of restor-
ing "order." Not a single bureaucrat or military officer was
dismissed; not the slightest change was made in the old bu-
reaucratic system of administration. These precious constitutional
and responsible ministers even restored to their posts those
functionaries whom the people, in the first heat of revolutionary

* Friedrich-Wilhelm IV.—Ed.
ardor, had driven away on account of their former acts of bureaucratic overbearing. There was nothing altered, in Prussia, but the persons of the ministers; even the ministerial staffs in the different departments were not touched upon, and all the constitutional place-hunters, who had formed the chorus of the newly-elevated rulers, and who had expected their share of power and office, were told to wait until restored stability allowed changes to be operated in the bureaucratic personnel which now were not without danger.

The King, chap-fallen in the highest degree after the insurrection of the 18th of March, very soon found out that he was quite as necessary to these "liberal" ministers as they were to him. The throne had been spared by the insurrection; the throne was the last existing obstacle to "anarchy", the liberal middle class and its leaders, now in the ministry, had therefore every interest to keep on excellent terms with the Crown. The King, and the reactionary camarilla that surrounded him, were not slow in discovering this, and profited by the circumstance in order to fetter the march of the ministry even in those petty reforms that were from time to time intended.

The first care of the ministry was to give a sort of legal appearance to the recent violent changes. The United Diet was convoked, in spite of all popular opposition, in order to vote, as the legal and constitutional organ of the people, a new electoral law for the election of an assembly, which was to agree with the Crown upon a new Constitution. The elections were to be indirect, the mass of voters electing a number of electors, who then were to choose the representative. In spite of all opposition, this system of double elections passed. The United Diet was then asked for a loan of twenty-five millions of dollars, opposed by the popular party, but equally agreed to.

These acts of the ministry gave a most rapid development to the popular, or as it now called itself, the democratic party. This party, headed by the petty trading and shopkeeping class, and uniting under its banner, in the beginning of the revolution, the large majority of the working people, demanded direct and universal suffrage, the same as established in France, a single Legislative Assembly, and full and open recognition of the revolution of the 18th of March, as the base of the new governmental system. The more moderate faction would be satisfied with a thus "democratized" monarchy, the more advanced demanded the ultimate establishment of the Republic. Both factions agreed in recognizing the German National Assembly at Frankfort as the supreme authority of the country, while the Constitutionalists and Reactionists affected a great horror of the sovereignty of
this body, which they professed to consider as utterly revolutionary.

The independent movement of the working classes had, by the revolution, been broken up for a time. The immediate wants and circumstances of the movement were such as not to allow of any of the specific demands of the Proletarian party to be put in the foreground. In fact, as long as the ground was not cleared for the independent action of the working men, as long as direct and universal suffrage was not yet established, as long as the 36 larger and smaller States continued to cut up Germany into numberless morsels, what else could the Proletarian party do but watch the—for them all-important—movement of Paris, and struggle in common with the petty shopkeepers for the attainment of those rights which would allow them to fight, afterward, their own battle?

There were only three points, then, by which the Proletarian party in its political action essentially distinguished itself from the petty trading class, or properly so-called democratic party: firstly, in judging differently the French movement, with regard to which the democrats attacked, and the Proletarian Revolutionists defended the extreme party in Paris; secondly, in proclaiming the necessity of establishing a German Republic, one and indivisible, while the very extremest ultras among the democrats only dared to sigh for a Federative Republic; and thirdly, in showing upon every occasion, that revolutionary boldness and readiness for action, in which any party, headed by and composed principally of petty tradesmen, will always be deficient.

The Proletarian, or really revolutionary party, succeeded only very gradually in withdrawing the mass of the working people from the influence of the democrats, whose tail they formed in the beginning of the revolution. But in due time the indecision, weakness and cowardice of the democratic leaders did the rest, and it may now be said to be one of the principal results of the last years' convulsions, that wherever the working class is concentrated in anything like considerable masses, they are entirely freed from that democratic influence which led them into an endless series of blunders and misfortunes during 1848 and 1849. But we had better not anticipate; the events of these two years will give us plenty of opportunities to show the democratic gentlemen at work.

The peasantry in Prussia, the same as in Austria, but with less energy, feudalism pressing, upon the whole, not quite so hard upon them here, had profited by the revolution to free themselves at once from all feudal shackles; But here, from the reasons stated before, the middle classes at once turned against
them, their oldest, their most indispensable allies; the democrats, equally frightened with the bourgeoisie by what was called attacks upon private property, failed equally to support them; and thus, after three months’ emancipation, after bloody struggles and military executions, particularly in Silesia, feudalism was restored by the hands of the, until yesterday, anti-feudal bourgeoisie. There is not a more damning fact to be brought against them than this. Similar treason against its best allies, against itself, never was committed by any party in history, and, whatever humiliation and chastisement may be in store for this middle-class party, it has deserved by this one act every morsel of it.

London, October, 1851

VII

THE FRANKFORT NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

It will perhaps be in the recollection of our readers that in the six preceding papers we followed up the revolutionary move-ment of Germany to the two great popular victories of March 13, in Vienna, and March 18, in Berlin. We saw, both in Austria and Prussia, the establishment of Constitutional Governments and the proclamation, as leading rules for all future policy, of liberal or middle-class principles; and the only difference observable between the two great centers of action was this, that in Prussia the liberal bourgeoisie in the persons of two wealthy merchants, Messrs. Camphausen and Hansemann, directly seized upon the reins of power; while in Austria, where the bourgeoisie was, politically, far less educated, the liberal Bureaucratie walked into office and professed to hold power in trust for them. We have further seen, how the parties and classes of society, that were heretofore all united in their opposition to the old Government, got divided among themselves after the victory or even during the struggle; and how that same liberal bourgeoisie that alone prof-itied from the victory turned round immediately upon its allies of yesterday, assumed a hostile attitude against every class or party of a more advanced character, and concluded an alliance with the conquered feudal and bureaucratic interests. It was in fact evident, even from the beginning of the revolutionary drama, that the liberal bourgeoisie could not hold its ground against the vanquished, but not destroyed, feudal and bureaucratic parties except by relying upon the assistance of the popular and more advanced parties; and that it equally required, against the torrent of these more advanced masses, the assistance of the feudal nobility and of the bureaucracy. Thus, it was clear enough, that
the bourgeoisie, in Austria and Prussia, did not possess sufficient strength to maintain their power and to adapt the institutions of the country to their own wants and ideas. The liberal Bourgeois Ministry was only a halting place from which, according to the turn circumstances might take, the country would either have to go on to the more advanced stage of Unitarian Republicanism, or to relapse into the old clerico-feudal and bureaucratic régime. At all events, the real, decisive struggle was yet to come; the events of March had only engaged the combat.

Austria and Prussia being the two ruling States of Germany, every decisive revolutionary victory in Vienna or Berlin would have been decisive for all Germany. And as far as they went, the events of March, 1848, in these two cities, decided the turn of German affairs. It would, then, be superfluous to recur to the movements that occurred in the minor States; and we might, indeed, confine ourselves to the consideration of Austrian and Prussian affairs exclusively, if the existence of these minor States had not given rise to a body which was, by its very existence, a most striking proof of the abnormal situation of Germany and of the incompleteness of the late revolution; a body so abnormal, so ludicrous by its very position, and yet so full of its own importance, that history will, most likely, never afford a pendant to it. This body was the so-called German National Assembly at Frankfort-on-the-Main.

After the popular victories of Vienna and Berlin, it was a matter of course that there should be a Representative Assembly for all Germany. This body was consequently elected, and met at Frankfort, by the side of the old Federative Diet. The German National Assembly was expected, by the people, to settle every matter in dispute, and to act as the highest legislative authority for the whole of the German Confederation. But at the same time the Diet which had convoked it had in no way fixed its attributions. No one knew whether its decrees were to have force of law, or whether they were to be subject to the sanction of the Diet or of the individual Governments. In this perplexity, if the Assembly had been possessed of the least energy, it would have immediately dissolved and sent home the Diet—than which no corporate body was more unpopular in Germany—and replaced it by a Federal Government chosen from among its own members. It would have declared itself the only legal expression of the sovereign will of the German people, and thus attached legal validity to every one of its decrees. It would, above all, have secured to itself an organized and armed force in the country sufficient to put down any opposition on the part of the Governments. And all this was easy, very easy at that early period of
the revolution. But that would have been expecting a great deal too much from an Assembly composed in its majority of liberal attorneys and doctrinaire professors, an Assembly which, while it pretended to embody the very essence of German intellect and science, was in reality nothing but a stage where old and worn-out political characters exhibited their involuntary ludicrousness and their impotence of thought, as well as action, before the eyes of all Germany. This Assembly of old women was, from the first day of its existence, more frightened of the least popular movement than of all the reactionary plots of all the German Governments put together. It deliberated under the eyes of the Diet, nay, it almost craved the Diet's sanction to its decrees, for its first resolutions had to be promulgated by that odious body. Instead of asserting its own sovereignty, it studiously avoided the discussion of any such dangerous questions. Instead of surrounding itself by a popular force, it passed to the order of the day over all the violent encroachments of the Governments; Mayence, under its very eyes, was placed in a state of siege and the people there disarmed, and the National Assembly did not stir. Later on it elected Archduke John of Austria Regent of Germany, and declared that all its resolutions were to have the force of law; but then, Archduke John was only instituted in his new dignity after the consent of all the Governments had been obtained, and he was instituted not by the Assembly, but by the Diet; and as to the legal force of the decrees of the Assembly, that point was never recognized by the larger Governments, nor enforced by the Assembly itself; it therefore remained in suspense. Thus we had the strange spectacle of an Assembly pretending to be the only legal representative of a great and sovereign nation, and yet never possessing either the will or the force to make its claims recognized. The debates of this body, without any practical result, were not even of any theoretical value, reproducing, as they did, nothing but the most hackneyed commonplace themes of superannuated philosophical and juridical schools; every sentence that was said or rather stammered forth in that Assembly having been printed a thousand times over and a thousand times better long before.

Thus, the pretended new central authority of Germany left every thing as it had found it. So, far from realizing the long-demanded unity of Germany, it did not dispossess the most insignificant of the princes who ruled her; it did not draw closer the bonds of union between her separated provinces; it never moved a single step to break down the custom-house barriers that separated Hanover from Prussia and Prussia from Austria; it did not even make the slightest attempt to remove the
obnoxious dues that everywhere obstruct river navigation in Prussia. But the less this Assembly did, the more it blustered. It created a German Fleet—upon paper; it annexed Poland and Schleswig; it allowed German Austria to carry on war against Italy, and yet prohibited the Italians from following up the Austrians into their safe retreat in Germany; it gave three cheers and one cheer more for the French Republic and it received Hungarian Embassies, which certainly went home with far more confused ideas about Germany than what they had come with.

This Assembly had been, in the beginning of the Revolution, the bugbear of all German Governments. They had counted upon a very dictatorial and revolutionary action on its part—on account of the very want of definiteness in which it had been found necessary to leave its competency. These Governments, therefore, got up a most comprehensive system of intrigues in order to weaken the influence of this dreaded body; but they proved to have more luck than wits, for this Assembly did the work of the Governments better than they themselves could have done. The chief feature among these intrigues was the convocation of local Legislative Assemblies, and in consequence, not only the lesser States convoked their Legislatures, but Prussia and Austria also called Constituent Assemblies. In these, as in the Frankfort House of Representatives, the liberal middle class, or its allies, liberal lawyers and bureaucrats, had the majority, and the turn affairs took in each of them was nearly the same. The only difference is this, that the German National Assembly was the parliament of an imaginary country, as it had declined the task of forming what nevertheless was its own first condition of existence, viz.: a United Germany; that it discussed the imaginary and never-to-be-carried-out measures of an imaginary Government of its own creation, and that it passed imaginary resolutions for which nobody cared; while in Austria and Prussia the constituent bodies were at least real parliaments, upsetting and creating real ministries, and forcing, for a time at least, their resolutions upon the Princes with whom they had to contend. They, too, were cowardly, and lacked enlarged views of revolutionary resolution; they, too, betrayed the people, and restored power to the hands of feudal, bureaucratic and military despotism. But then, they were at least obliged to discuss practical questions of immediate interest, and to live upon earth with other people, while the Frankfort humbugs were never happier than when they could roam in "the airy realms of dream," im Luftreich des Traums.* Thus the proceedings of the Berlin and Vienna Constit-

* Heine, Deutschland, ein Winternärchen (Germany. A Winter Tale), Chapter VII.—Ed.
uents form an important part of German revolutionary history, while the lucubrations of the Frankfort collective tomfoolery merely interest the collector of literary and antiquarian curiosities.

The people of Germany, deeply feeling the necessity of doing away with the obnoxious territorial division that scattered and annihilated the collective force of the nation, for some time expected to find in the Frankfort National Assembly at least the beginning of a new era. But the childish conduct of that set of wiseacres soon disenchanted the national enthusiasm. The disgraceful proceedings occasioned by the armistice of Malmoe (September, 1848) made the popular indignation burst out against a body, which, it had been hoped, would give the nation a fair field for action, and which instead, carried away by unequalled cowardice, only restored to their former solidity the foundations upon which the present counter-revolutionary system is built.

London, January, 1852

VIII

POLES, TSCHECHS AND GERMANS

From what has been stated in the foregoing articles, it is already evident that unless a fresh revolution was to follow that of March, 1848, things would inevitably return, in Germany, to what they were before this event. But such is the complicated nature of the historical theme upon which we are trying to throw some light, that subsequent events cannot be clearly understood without taking into account what may be called the foreign relations of the German Revolution. And these foreign relations were of the same intricate nature as the home affairs.

The whole of the eastern half of Germany, as far as the Elbe, Saale and Bohemian Forest⁹, has, it is well known, been reconquered during the last thousand years, from invaders of Slavonic origin. The greater part of these territories have been Germanized, to the perfect extinction of all Slavonic nationality and language, for several centuries past; and if we except a few totally isolated remnants, amounting in the aggregate to less than a hundred thousand souls (Kassubians in Pomerania, Wends or Sorbians in Lusatia), their inhabitants are, to all intents and purposes, Germans. But the case is different along the whole of

---

⁹ Czech Forest.—Ed.
the frontier of ancient Poland, and in the countries of the Tschechian tongue, in Bohemia and Moravia. Here the two nationalities are mixed up in every district, the towns being generally more or less German, while the Slavonic element prevails in the rural villages, where, however, it is also gradually disintegrated and forced back by the steady advance of German influence.

The reason of this state of things is this. Ever since the time of Charlemagne the Germans have directed their most constant and persevering efforts to the conquest, colonization, or, at least, civilization of the East of Europe. The conquests of the feudal nobility, between the Elbe and the Oder, and the feudal colonies of the military orders of knights in Prussia and Livonia only laid the ground for a far more extensive and effective system of Germanization by the trading and manufacturing middle classes, which in Germany, as in the rest of Western Europe, rose into social and political importance since the fifteenth century. The Slavonians, and particularly the Western Slavonians (Poles and Tschechs), are essentially an agricultural race: trade and manufactures never were in great favor with them. The consequence was, that with the increase of population and the origin of cities, in these regions, the production of all articles of manufacture fell into the hands of German immigrants, and the exchange of these commodities against agricultural produce became the exclusive monopoly of the Jews, who, if they belong to any nationality, are in these countries certainly rather Germans than Slavonians. This has been, though in a less degree, the case in all the East of Europe. The handicraftsman, the small shopkeeper, the petty manufacturer is a German up to this day in Petersburg, Pesht, Jassy and even Constantinople; while the money-lender, the publican, the hawker—a very important man in these thinly populated countries—is very generally a Jew, whose native tongue is a horribly corrupted German. The importance of the German element in the Slavonic frontier localities, thus rising with the growth of towns, trade and manufactures, was still increased when it was found necessary to import almost every element of mental culture from Germany; after the German merchant, and handicraftsman, the German clergyman, the German schoolmaster, the German savant came to establish himself upon Slavonic soil. And lastly, the iron tread of conquering armies, or the cautious, well-remediated grasp of diplomacy not only followed, but many times went ahead of the slow but sure advance of denationalization by social developments. Thus, great parts of Western Prussia and Posen have been Germanized since the first partition of Poland, by sales and grants of public
domains to German colonists, by encouragements given to German capitalists for the establishment of manufactories, &c., in those neighborhoods, and very often, too, by excessively despotic measures against the Polish inhabitants of the country. In this manner, the last seventy years had entirely changed the line of demarcation between the German and Polish nationalities. The revolution of 1848 calling forth, at once, the claim of all oppressed nations to an independent existence, and to the right of settling their own affairs for themselves, it was quite natural that the Poles should at once demand the restoration of their country within the frontiers of the old Polish Republic before 1772. It is true, this frontier, even at that time, had become obsolete, if taken as the delimitation of German and Polish nationality; it had become more so every year since by the progress of Germanization; but then, the Germans had proclaimed such an enthusiasm for the restoration of Poland, that they must expect to be asked, as a first proof of the reality of their sympathies, to give up their share of the plunder. On the other hand, should whole tracts of land, inhabited chiefly by Germans, should large towns, entirely German, be given up to a people that as yet had never given any proofs of its capability of progressing beyond a state of feudalism based upon agricultural serfdom? The question was intricate enough. The only possible solution was in a war with Russia; the question of delimitation between the different revolutionized nations would have been made a secondary one to that of first establishing a safe frontier against the common enemy; the Poles, by receiving extended territories in the east, would have become more tractable and reasonable in the west; and Riga and Mitau would have been deemed, after all, quite as important to them as Danzig and Elbing. Thus the advanced party in Germany, deeming a war with Russia necessary to keep up the Continental movement, and considering that the national re-establishment even of a part of Poland would inevitably lead to such a war, supported the Poles; while the reigning liberal middle-class party clearly foresaw its downfall from any national war against Russia, which would have called more active and energetic men to the helm, and therefore, with a feigned enthusiasm for the extension of German nationality, they declared Prussian Poland, the chief seat of Polish revolutionary agitation, to be part and parcel of the German Empire that was to be. The promises given to the Poles in the first days of excitement were shamefully broken; Polish armaments, got up with the sanction of the Government,

* Lettish name: Selgava.—Ed.
** Polish names: Gdansk and Elblong.—Ed.
were dispersed and massacred by Prussian artillery; and as soon as the month of April, 1848, within six weeks of the Berlin Revolution, the Polish movement was crushed, and the old national hostility revived between Poles and Germans. This immense and incalculable service to the Russian Autocrat was performed by the liberal merchant-ministers, Camphausen and Hansemann. It must be added, that this Polish campaign was the first means of reorganising and reassuring that same Prussian army, which afterward turned out the Liberal party and crushed the movement which Messrs. Camphausen and Hansemann had taken such pains to bring about. "Whereby they sinned, thereby are they punished." Such has been the fate of all the upstarts of 1848 and '49, from Ledru-Rollin to Changarnier, and from Camphausen down to Haynau.

The question of nationality gave rise to another struggle in Bohemia. This country, inhabited by two millions of Germans, and three millions of Slavonians of the Tschechian tongue, had great historical recollections, almost all connected with the former supremacy of the Tschechs. But then the force of this branch of the Slavonic family had been broken ever since the wars of the Hussites in the fifteenth century; the provinces speaking the Tschechian language were divided, one part forming the kingdom of Bohemia, another the principality of Moravia, a third, the Carpathian hill-country of the Slovaks, being part of Hungary. The Moravians and Slovaks had long since lost every vestige of national feeling and vitality, although mostly preserving their language. Bohemia was surrounded by thoroughly German countries on three sides out of four. The German element had made great progress on her own territory; even in the capital, in Prague, the two nationalities were pretty equally matched; and everywhere capital, trade, industry, and mental culture were in the hands of the Germans. The chief champion of the Tschechian nationality, Professor Palacky, is himself nothing but a learned German run mad, who even now cannot speak the Tschechian language correctly and without foreign accent. But as it often happens, dying Tschechian nationality—dying according to every fact known in history for the last four hundred years—made in 1848 a last effort to regain its former vitality—an effort whose failure, independently of all revolutionary considerations, was to prove that Bohemia could only exist, henceforth, as a portion of Germany, although part of her inhabitants might yet, for some centuries, continue to speak a non-German language. 176

London, February, 1852
IX

PANSLAVISM. THE SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN WAR

Bohemia and Croatia (another disjected member of the Slavonic family, acted upon by the Hungarian as Bohemia by the German) were the homes of what is called on the European Continent "Panslavism." Neither Bohemia nor Croatia was strong enough to exist as a nation by herself. Their respective nationalities, gradually undermined by the action of historical causes that inevitably absorbs it into a more energetic stock, could only hope to be restored to something like independence by an alliance with other Slavonic nations. There were twenty-two millions of Poles, forty-five millions of Russians, eight millions of Serbians and Bulgarians—why not form a mighty Confederation of the whole eighty millions of Slavonians, and drive back or exterminate the intruder upon the holy Slavonic soil, the Turk, the Hungarian, and, above all, the hated, but indispensable Niemetz, the German? Thus, in the studies of a few Slavonian dilettanti of historical science was this ludicrous, this anti-historical movement got up, a movement which intended nothing less than to subjugate the civilized West under the barbarian East, the town under the country, trade, manufactures, intelligence, under the primitive agriculture of Slavonian serfs. But behind this ludicrous theory stood the terrible reality of the Russian Empire, that empire which by every movement proclaims the pretension of considering all Europe as the domain of the Slavonic race and especially of the only energetic part of this race, of the Russians; that empire which, with two capitals such as St. Petersburg and Moscow, has not yet found its center of gravity, as long as the "City of the Czar" (Constantinople, called in Russian Tzarigrad, the Czar's city), considered by every Russian peasant as the true metropolis of his religion and his nation, is not actually the residence of its Emperor; that empire which, for the last 150 years, has never lost, but always gained territory by every war it has commenced. And well known in Central Europe are the intrigues by which Russian policy supported the new-fangled system of Panslavism, a system than which none better could be invented to suit its purposes. Thus, the Bohemian and Croatian Panslavists, some intentionally, some without knowing it, worked in the direct interest of Russia; they betrayed the revolutionary cause for the shadow of a nationality which, in the best of cases, would have shared the fate of the Polish nationality under Russian sway. It must, however, be said for the honour of the Poles, that
they never got to be seriously entangled in these Panslavistic traps; and if a few of the aristocracy turned furious Panslavists, they knew that by Russian subjugation they had less to lose than by a revolt of their own peasant serfs.

The Bohemians and Croats called, then, a general Slavonic Congress at Prague, for the preparation of the universal Slavonian alliance. 177 This Congress would have proved a decided failure even without the interference of the Austrian military. The several Slavonic languages differ quite as much as the English, the German and the Swedish, and when the proceedings opened, there was no common Slavonic tongue by which the speakers could make themselves understood. French was tried, but was equally unintelligible to the majority, and the poor Slavonic enthusiasts, whose only common feeling was a common hatred against the Germans, were at last obliged to express themselves in the hated German language, as the only one that was generally understood! But just then, another Slavonic Congress was assembling in Prague, in the shape of Galician lancers, Croatian and Slovak grenadiers, and Bohemian gunners and cuirassiers; and this real, armed Slavonic Congress, under the command of Windischgrätz, in less than twenty-four hours drove the founders of an imaginary Slavonian supremacy out of the town and dispersed them to the winds.

The Bohemian, Moravian, Dalmatian, and part of the Polish Deputies (the aristocracy) to the Austrian Constituent Diet, made in that Assembly a systematic war upon the German element. The Germans and part of the Poles (the impoverished nobility) were in this Assembly the chief supporters of revolutionary progress; the mass of the Slavonic Deputies, in opposing them, were not satisfied with thus showing clearly the reactionary tendencies of their entire movement, but they were degraded enough to tamper and conspire with the very same Austrian Government which had dispersed their meeting at Prague. They, too, were paid for this infamous conduct; after supporting the Government during the insurrection of October, 1848, an event which finally secured to them the majority in the Diet, this now almost exclusively Slavonic Diet was dispersed by Austrian soldiers, the same as the Prague Congress, and the Panslavists threatened with imprisonment if they should stir again. And they have only obtained this, that Slavonic nationality is now being everywhere undermined by Austrian centralization, a result for which they may thank their own fanaticism and blindness.

If the frontiers of Hungary and Germany had admitted of any doubt, there would certainly have been another quarrel there. But, fortunately, there was no pretext, and the interests of both
nations being intimately related, they struggled against the same enemies, viz., the Austrian Government and the Panslavistic fanaticism. The good understanding was not for a moment disturbed. But the Italian revolution entangled a part at least of Germany in an internecine war; and it must be stated here, as a proof how far the Metternichian system had succeeded in keeping back the development of the public mind, that during the first six months of 1848 the same men that had in Vienna mounted the barricades, went, full of enthusiasm, to join the army that fought against the Italian patriots. This deplorable confusion of ideas did not, however, last long.

Lastly, there was the war with Denmark about Schleswig and Holstein. These countries, unquestionably German by nationality, language, and predilection, are also, from military, naval and commercial grounds, necessary to Germany. Their inhabitants have, for the last three years, struggled hard against Danish intrusion. The right of treaties, besides, was for them. The revolution of March brought them into open collision with the Danes, and Germany supported them. But while in Poland, in Italy, in Bohemia, and later on, in Hungary, military operations were pushed with the utmost vigor, in this, the only popular, the only, at least partially, revolutionary war, a system of resultless marches and counter-marches was adopted, and an interference of foreign diplomacy was submitted to, which led, after many an heroic engagement, to a most miserable end. The German Governments betrayed, during this war, the Schleswig-Holstein revolutionary army on every occasion, and allowed it purposely to be cut up, when dispersed or divided, by the Danes. The German corps of volunteers were treated the same.

But while thus the German name earned nothing but hatred on every side, the German constitutional and liberal Governments rubbed their hands for joy. They had succeeded in crushing the Polish and Bohemian movements. They had everywhere revived the old national animosities, which heretofore had prevented any common understanding and action between the German, the Pole, the Italian. They had accustomed the people to scenes of civil war and repression by the military. The Prussian army had regained its confidence in Poland, the Austrian army in Prague; and while the superabundant patriotism ("die patriotische Überkraft", as Heine has it\(^*\)) of revolutionary, but short-sighted youth was led, in Schleswig and Lombardy, to be

\(^*\) Heine, "Bei des Nachtwächters Ankunft zu Paris" ("On the Arrival of the Night-Watchman in Paris") (from the cycle *Zeitgedichte*—Modern Poems).—Ed.
crushed by the grape-shot of the enemy, the regular army, the real instrument of action, both of Prussia and Austria, was placed in a position to regain public favor by victories over the foreigner. But we repeat: these armies, strengthened by the Liberals as a means of action against the more advanced party, no sooner had recovered their self-confidence and their discipline in some degree, than they turned themselves against the Liberals, and restored to power the men of the old system. When Radetzky, in his camp behind the Adige, received the first orders from the "responsible Ministers" at Vienna, he exclaimed: "Who are these Ministers? They are not the Government of Austria! Austria is, now, nowhere, but in my camp; I and my Army, we are Austria; and when we shall have beaten the Italians we shall reconquer the Empire for the Emperor!" And old Radetzky was right—but the imbecile, "responsible" Ministers at Vienna heeded him not.

London, February, 1852

X

THE PARIS RISING. THE FRANKFORT ASSEMBLY

As early as the beginning of April, 1848, the revolutionary torrent had found itself stemmed all over the Continent of Europe by the league which those classes of Society that had profited by the first victory immediately formed with the vanquished. In France, the petty trading class and the republican fraction of the bourgeoisie had combined with the monarchist bourgeoisie against the proletarians; in Germany and Italy, the victorious bourgeoisie had eagerly courted the support of the feudal nobility, the official bureaucracy and the army, against the mass of the people and the petty traders. Very soon the united Conservative and Counter-Revolutionary parties again regained the ascendant. In England, an untimely and ill-prepared popular demonstration (April 10) turned out in a complete and decisive defeat of the movement party. In France, two similar movements (16th April and 15th May) were equally defeated. In Italy, King Bomba regained his authority by a single stroke on the 15th of May. In Germany, the different new bourgeoisie governments and their respective constituent assemblies consolidated themselves, and if the eventful 15th of May gave rise, in Vienna, to a popular victory, this was an event of merely secondary importance, and may be considered the last successful flash
of popular energy. In Hungary, the movements appeared to turn into the quiet channel of perfect legality, and the Polish movement, as we have seen in our last, was stifled in the bud by Prussian bayonets. But as yet nothing was decided as to the eventual turn which things would take, and every inch of ground lost by the revolutionary parties in the different countries only tended to close their ranks more and more for the decisive action.

The decisive action drew near. It could be fought in France only; for France, as long as England took no part in the revolutionary strife, or as Germany remained divided, was, by its national independence, civilization and centralization, the only country to impart the impulse of a mighty convulsion to the surrounding countries. Accordingly, when, on the 23d of June, 1848, the bloody struggle began in Paris, when every succeeding telegraph or mail more clearly exposed the fact to the eyes of Europe, that this struggle was carried on between the mass of the working people on the one hand, and all the other classes of the Parisian population, supported by the army, on the other; when the fighting went on for several days with an exasperation unequalled in the history of modern civil warfare, but without any apparent advantage for either side—then it became evident to every one that this was the great decisive battle which would, if the insurrection were victorious, deluge the whole continent with renewed revolutions, or, if it was suppressed, bring about an, at least momentary, restoration of counter-revolutionary rule.

The proletarians of Paris were defeated, decimated, crushed with such an effect that even now they have not yet recovered from the blow. And immediately, all over Europe, the new and old conservatives and counter-revolutionists raised their heads with an effrontery that showed how well they understood the importance of the event. The press was everywhere attacked, the rights of meeting and association were interfered with, every little event in every small provincial town was taken profit of to disarm the people, to declare a state of siege, to drill the troops in the new maneuvers and artifices that Cavaignac had taught them. Besides, for the first time since February, the invincibility of a popular insurrection in a large town had been proved to be a delusion; the honor of the armies had been restored; the troops, hitherto always defeated in street battles of importance, regained confidence in their efficiency even in this kind of struggle.

From this defeat of the ouvriers of Paris may be dated the first positive steps and definite plans of the old feudal-bureaucratic party in Germany, to get rid even of their momentary allies, the middle classes, and to restore Germany to the state
she was in before the events of March. The army again was the
decisive power in the State, and the army belonged not to the
middle classes, but to themselves. Even in Prussia, where before
1848 a considerable leaning of part of the lower grades of officers
towards a constitutional government had been observed, the
disorder introduced into the army by the revolution had brought
back those reasoning young men to their allegiance; as soon as
the private soldier took a few liberties with regard to the officers,
the necessity of discipline and passive obedience became at once
strikingly evident to them. The vanquished nobles and bureau-
crats now began to see their way before them; the army, more
united than ever, flushed with victory in minor insurrections and
in foreign warfare, jealous of the great success the French
soldiers had just attained—this army had only to be kept in
constant petty conflicts with the people, and, the decisive mo-
ment once at hand, it could with one great blow crush the
revolutionists and set aside the presumptions of the middle-class
parliamentarians. And the proper moment for such a decisive
blow arrived soon enough.

We pass over the sometimes curious, but mostly tedious,
parliamentary proceedings and local struggles that occupied, in
Germany, the different parties during the summer. Suffice it
to say that the supporters of the middle-class interest, in spite
of numerous parliamentary triumphs, not one of which led to
any practical result, very generally felt that their position be-
tween the extreme parties became daily more untenable, and
that, therefore, they were obliged now to seek the alliance of
the reactionists, and the next day, to court the favor of the
more popular fractions. This constant vacillation gave the finish-
ing stroke to their character in public opinion, and according to
the turn events were taking, the contempt, into which they had
sunk, profited for the moment principally to the bureaucrats
and feudalists.

By the beginning of autumn the relative position of the
different parties had become exasperated and critical enough
to make a decisive battle inevitable. The first engagements in
this war between the democratic and revolutionary masses and
the army took place at Frankfort. Though a mere secondary
engagement, it was the first advantage of any note the troops
acquired over insurrection, and had a great moral effect. The
fancy government established by the Frankfort National As-
ssembly had been allowed by Prussia, for very obvious reasons,
to conclude an armistice with Denmark which not only surren-
dered to Danish vengeance the Germans of Schleswig, but which
also entirely disclaimed the more or less revolutionary prin-
principles which were generally supposed in the Danish war. This armistice was, by a majority of two or three, rejected in the Frankfort Assembly. A sham Ministerial crisis followed this vote, but three days later the Assembly reconsidered their vote, and were actually induced to cancel it and acknowledge the armistice. This disgraceful proceeding roused the indignation of the people. Barricades were erected, but already sufficient troops had been drawn to Frankfort, and, after six hours fighting, the insurrection was suppressed. Similar but less important movements connected with this event took place in other parts of Germany (Baden, Cologne), but were equally defeated.

This preliminary engagement gave to the counter-revolutionary party the one great advantage, that now the only Government which had entirely—at least in semblance—originated with popular election, the Imperial Government of Frankfort, as well as the National Assembly, was ruined in the eyes of the people. This Government and this Assembly had been obliged to appeal to the bayonets of the troops against the manifestation of the popular will. They were compromised, and what little regard they might have been hitherto enabled to claim, this repudiation of their origin, the dependency upon the anti-popular Governments and their troops, made both the Lieutenant of the Empire, his Ministers and his Deputies, to be henceforth complete nullities. We shall soon see how first Austria, then Prussia, and later on the smaller States too, treated with contempt every order, every request, every deputation they received from this body of impotent dreamers.

We now come to the great counter-stroke, in Germany, of the French battle of June, to that event which was as decisive for Germany as the proletarian struggle of Paris had been for France; we mean the revolution and subsequent storming of Vienna, in October, 1848. But the importance of this battle is such, and the explanation of the different circumstances that more immediately contributed to its issue will take up such a portion of The Tribune's columns, as to necessitate its being treated in a separate letter.

London, February, 1852

XI

THE VIENNA INSURRECTION

We now come to the decisive event which formed the counter-revolutionary part in Germany to the Parisian insurrection of June, and which, by a single blow, turned the scale in favor of
the counter-revolutionary party—the insurrection of October, 1848, in Vienna.

We have seen what the position of the different classes was, in Vienna, after the victory of the 13th of March. We have also seen how the movement of German Austria was entangled with and impeded by the events in the non-German provinces of Austria. It only remains for us, then, briefly to survey the causes which led to this last and most formidable rising of German Austria.

The high aristocracy and the stockjobbing bourgeoisie, which had formed the principal non-official supports of the Metternichian Government, were enabled, even after the events of March, to maintain a predominating influence with the Government, not only by the court, the army and the bureaucracy, but still more by the horror of "anarchy," which rapidly spread among the middle classes. They very soon ventured a few feelers in the shape of a Press Law, a nondescript Aristocratic Constitution and an Electoral Law based upon the old division of "Estates." The so-called constitutional ministry, consisting of half Liberal, timid, incapable bureaucrats, on the 14th of May, even ventured a direct attack upon the revolutionary organisations of the masses by dissolving the Central Committee of Delegates of the National Guard and Academic Legion, a body formed for the express purpose of controlling the Government and calling out against it, in case of need, the popular forces. But this act only provoked the insurrection of the 15th of May, by which the Government was forced to acknowledge the Committee, to repeal the Constitution and the Electoral Law, and to grant the power of framing a new fundamental law to a Constitutional Diet, elected by universal suffrage. All this was confirmed on the following day by an Imperial proclamation. But the reactionary party, which also had its representatives in the ministry, soon got their "Liberal" colleagues to undertake a new attack upon the popular conquests. The Academic Legion, the stronghold of the movement party, the center of continuous agitation, had, on this very account, become obnoxious to the more moderate burghers of Vienna; on the 26th a ministerial decree dissolved it. Perhaps this blow might have succeeded, if it had been carried out by a part of the National Guard only; but the Government, not trusting them either, brought the military forward, and at once the National Guard turned round, united with the Academic Legion, and thus frustrated the ministerial project.

In the meantime, however, the Emperor and his court had, on the 16th of May, left Vienna and fled to Innspruck. Here,

* Ferdinand I.—Ed.
surrounded by the bigoted Tyroleans, whose loyalty was roused again by the danger of an invasion of their country by the Sardolombardian army, supported by the vicinity of Radetzky's troops, within shell-range of whom Innspruck lay, here the counter-revolutionary party found an asylum, from whence, uncontrolled, unobserved and safe, it might rally its scattered forces, repair and spread again all over the country the network of its plots. Communications were re-opened with Radetzky, with Jellachich, and with Windischgrätz, as well as with the reliable men in the administrative hierarchy of the different provinces; intrigues were set on foot with the Slavonic chiefs; and thus a real force at the disposal of the counter-revolutionary camarilla was formed, while the impotent Ministers in Vienna were allowed to wear their short and feeble popularity out in continual bickerings with the revolutionary masses, and in the debates of the forthcoming Constituent Assembly. Thus, the policy of leaving the movement of the capital to itself for a time, a policy which must have led to the omnipotence of the movement party in a centralized and homogeneous country like France, here, in Austria, in a heterogeneous political conglom erate, was one of the safest means of reorganizing the strength of the reactionists.

In Vienna, the middle class, persuaded that after three successive defeats, and in the face of a Constituent Assembly based upon universal suffrage, the Court party was no longer an opponent to be dreaded, fell more and more into that weariness and apathy, and that eternal outcry for order and tranquillity, which has everywhere seized this class after violent commotions and consequent derangement of trade. The manufacturers of the Austrian Capital are almost exclusively limited to articles of luxury, for which, since the revolution and the flight of the Court, there had necessarily been very little demand. The shout for a return to a regular system of Government, and for a return of the Court, both of which were expected to bring about a revival of commercial prosperity—this shout became now general among the middle classes. The meeting of the Constituent Assembly, in July, was hailed with delight as the end of the revolutionary era; so was the return of the Court, which, after the victories of Radetzky in Italy, and after the advent of the reactionary Ministry of Dobilhoff, considered itself strong enough to brave the popular torrent, and which, at the same time, was wanted in Vienna in order to complete its intrigues with the Slavonic majority of the Diet. While the Constituent Diet discussed the laws on the emancipation of the peasantry from feudal bondage and forced labor for the nobility, the Court
completed a master-stroke. On the 19th of August, the Emperor was made to review the National Guard; the imperial family, the courtiers, the general officers, outbid each other in flatteries to the armed burghers, who were already intoxicated with pride at thus seeing themselves publicly acknowledged as one of the important bodies of the State; and immediately afterward a decree, signed by M. Schwarzer, the only popular Minister in the Cabinet, was published, withdrawing the Government aid given hitherto to the workmen out of employ. The trick succeeded; the working classes got up a demonstration; the middle-class National Guards declared for the decree of their Minister; they were launched upon the "Anarchists," fell like tigers on the unarmed and unresisting workpeople, and massacred a great number of them on the 23d of August. Thus the unity and strength of the revolutionary force was broken; the class struggle between Bourgeois and Proletarian had come, in Vienna too, to a bloody outbreak, and the counter-revolutionary camarilla saw the day approaching on which it might strike its grand blow.

The Hungarian affairs very soon offered an opportunity to proclaim openly the principles upon which it intended to act. On the 5th of October an imperial decree in the Vienna official Gazette—a decree countersigned by none of the responsible ministers for Hungary—declared the Hungarian Diet dissolved, and named the Ban Jellachich, of Croatia, civil and military governor of that country—Jellachich, the leader of South-Slavonian reaction, a man who was actually at war with the lawful authorities of Hungary. At the same time orders were given to the troops in Vienna to march out and form part of the army which was to enforce Jellachich's authority. This, however, was showing the cloven foot too openly; every man in Vienna felt that war upon Hungary was war upon the principle of constitutional government, which principle was in the very decree trampled upon by the attempt of the Emperor to make decrees with legal force, without the countersign of a responsible minister. The people, the Academic Legion, the National Guard of Vienna, on the 6th of October rose in mass and resisted the departure of the troops; some grenadiers passed over to the people; a short struggle took place between the popular forces and the troops; the Minister of War, Latour, was massacred by the people, and in the evening the latter were victors. In the meantime, Ban Jellachich, beaten at Stuhlweissenburg by Perczel, had taken refuge near Vienna on German-

* Hungarian name: Székesfehérvár.—Ed.
Austrian territory; the Viennese troops that were to march to his support now took up an ostensibly hostile and defensive position against him; and the Emperor and Court had again fled to Olmütz, on semi-Slavonic territory.

But at Olmütz, the Court found itself in very different circumstances to what it had been at Innspruck. It was now in a position to open immediately the campaign against the revolution. It was surrounded by the Slavonian deputies of the Constituent, who flocked in masses to Olmütz, and by the Slavonian enthusiasts from all parts of the monarchy. The campaign, in their eyes, was to be a war of Slavonian restoration and of extermination against the two intruders upon what was considered Slavonian soil, against the German and the Magyar. Windischgrätz, the conqueror of Prague, now commander of the army that was concentrated around Vienna, became at once the hero of Slavonian nationality. And his army concentrated rapidly from all sides. From Bohemia, Moravia, Styria, Upper Austria and Italy, marched regiment after regiment on routes that converged at Vienna, to join the troops of Jellachich and the ex-garrison of the capital. Above sixty thousand men were thus united toward the end of October, and soon they commenced hemming in the imperial city on all sides, until, on the 30th of October, they were far enough advanced to venture upon the decisive attack.

In Vienna, in the meantime, confusion and helplessness was prevalent. The middle class, as soon as the victory was gained, became again possessed of their old distrust against the "anarchic" working classes; the working men, mindful of the treatment they had received, six weeks before, at the hands of the armed tradesmen, and of the unsteady, wavering policy of the middle class at large, would not trust to them the defense of the city, and demanded arms and military organization for themselves. The Academic Legion, full of zeal for the struggle against imperial despotism, were entirely incapable of understanding the nature of the estrangement of the two classes, or of otherwise comprehending the necessities of the situation. There was confusion in the public mind, confusion in the ruling councils. The remnant of the Diet, German deputies, and a few Slavonians, acting the part of spies for their friends at Olmütz, besides a few of the more revolutionary Polish deputies, sat in permanency, but instead of taking part resolutely, they lost all their time in idle debates upon the possibility of resisting the imperial army without overstep-
ping the bounds of Constitutional conventionalities. The Committee of Safety composed of deputies of almost all the popular bodies of Vienna, although resolved to resist, was yet dominated by a majority of burghers and petty tradesmen, who never allowed it to follow up any determined, energetic line of action. The council of the Academic Legion passed heroic resolutions, but was noways able to take the lead. The working classes, distrusted, disarmed, disorganized, hardly emerging from the intellectual bondage of the old régime, hardly awaking not to a knowledge, but to a mere instinct of their social position and proper political line of action, could only make themselves heard by loud demonstrations, and could not be expected to be up to the difficulties of the moment. But they were ready—as ever they were in Germany during the Revolution—to fight to the last, as soon as they obtained arms.

That was the state of things in Vienna. Outside, the reorganized Austrian army, flushed with the victories of Radetzky in Italy; sixty or seventy thousand men, well armed, well organized, and if not well commanded, at least possessing commanders. Inside, confusion, class division, disorganization; a national guard of which part was resolved not to fight at all; part irresolute, and only the smallest part ready to act; a proletarian mass, powerful by numbers, but without leaders, without any political education, subject to panic as well as to fits of fury almost without cause, a prey to every false rumor spread about, quite ready to fight, but unarmed, at least in the beginning, and incompletely armed and barely organized when at last they were led to the battle; a helpless Diet, discussing theoretical quibbles while the roof over their heads was almost burning; a leading committee without impulse or energy. Everything was changed from the days of March and May, when, in the counter-revolutionary camp, all was confusion, and when the only organized force was that created by the revolution. There could hardly be a doubt about the issue of such a struggle, and whatever doubt there might be, was settled by the events of the 30th and 31st October and 1st November.

London, March, 1852

XII

THE STORMING OF VIENNA. THE BETRAYAL OF VIENNA

When at last the concentrated army of Windischgrätz commenced the attack upon Vienna, the forces that could be brought forward in defense were exceedingly insufficient for the purpose.
Of the National Guard, only a portion was to be brought to the entrenchments. A Proletarian Guard, it is true, had at last been hastily formed, but owing to the lateness of the attempt to thus make available the most numerous, most daring and most energetic part of the population it was too little inured to the use of arms and to the very first rudiments of discipline, to offer a successful resistance. Thus the Academic Legion, three to four thousand strong, well exercised and disciplined to a certain degree, brave and enthusiastic, was, militarily speaking, the only force which was in a state to do its work successfully. But what were they, together with the few reliable National Guards, and with the confused mass of the armed proletarians, in opposition to the far more numerous regulars of Windischgrätz, not counting even the brigand hordes of Jellachich, hordes that were, by the very nature of their habits, very useful in a war from house to house, from lane to lane? And what, but a few old, outworn, ill-mounted and ill-served pieces of ordnance had the insurgents to oppose to that numerous and perfectly appointed artillery, of which Windischgrätz made such an unscrupulous use?

The nearer the danger drew, the more grew the confusion in Vienna. The Diet, up to the last moment, could not collect sufficient energy to call in for aid the Hungarian army of Perczel, encamped a few leagues below the capital. The Committee\textsuperscript{5} passed contradictory resolutions, they themselves being, like the popular armed masses, floated up and down with the rising and alternately receding tide of rumors and counter-rumors. There was only one thing upon which all agreed—to respect property; and this was done in a degree almost ludicrous for such times. As to the final arrangement of a plan of defense, very little was done. Bem, the only man present who could have saved Vienna, if any could, then in Vienna an almost unknown foreigner, a Slavonian by birth, gave up the task, overwhelmed as he was by universal distrust. Had he persevered, he might have been lynched as a traitor. Messenhauser, the commander of the insurgent forces, more of a novel writer than even of a subaltern officer, was totally inadequate to the task; and yet, after eight months of revolutionary struggles, the popular party had not produced or acquired a military man of more ability than he. Thus the contest began. The Viennese, considering their utterly inadequate means of defense, considering their utter absence of military skill and organization in the ranks, offered a most heroic resistance. In many places the order

\textsuperscript{5} See pp. 327-28 of this volume.—Ed.
given by Bem, when he was in command, "to defend that post to the last man," was carried out to the letter. But force prevailed. Barricade after barricade was swept away by the imperial artillery in the long and wide avenues which form the main streets of the suburbs; and on the evening of the second day's fighting the Croats occupied the range of houses facing the glacis of the Old Town. A feeble and disorderly attack of the Hungarian army had been utterly defeated; and during an armistice, while some parties in the Old Town capitulated, while others hesitated and spread confusion, while the remnants of the Academic Legion prepared fresh entrenchments, an entrance was made by the Imperialists, and in the midst of this general disorder the Old Town was carried.

The immediate consequences of this victory, the brutalities and executions by martial law, the unheard-of cruelties and infamies committed by the Slavonian hordes let loose upon Vienna, are too well known to be detailed here. The ulterior consequences, the entire new turn given to German affairs by the defeat of the revolution in Vienna, we shall have reason to notice hereafter. There remain two points to be considered in connection with the storming of Vienna. The people of that capital had two allies: the Hungarians and the German people. Where were they in the hour of trial?

We have seen that the Viennese, with all the generosity of a newly-freed people, had risen for a cause which, though ultimately their own, was, in the first instance and above all, that of the Hungarians. Rather than suffer the Austrian troops to march upon Hungary, they would draw their first and most terrific onslaught upon themselves. And while they thus nobly came forward for the support of their allies, the Hungarians, successful against Jellachich, drove him upon Vienna, and by their victory strengthened the force that was to attack that town. Under these circumstances, it was the clear duty of Hungary to support, without delay and with all disposable forces, not the Diet at Vienna, not the Committee of Safety or any other official body at Vienna, but the Viennese Revolution. And if Hungary should even have forgotten that Vienna had fought the first battle of Hungary, she owed it to her own safety not to forget that Vienna was the only outpost of Hungarian independence, and that after the fall of Vienna nothing could meet the advance of the Imperial troops against herself. Now, we know very well all the Hungarians can say and have said in defense of their inactivity during the blockade and storming of Vienna: the insufficient state of their own force, the refusal of the Diet or any other official body in Vienna to call them in, the neces-
sity to keep on constitutional ground, and to avoid complications with the German Central Power. But the fact is, as to the insufficient state of the Hungarian army, that in the first days after the Viennese Revolution and the arrival of Jellachich, nothing was wanted in the shape of regular troops, as the Austrian regulars were very far from being concentrated; and that a courageous, unrelenting following up of the first advantage over Jellachich, even with nothing but the Land Sturm that had fought at Stuhlweissenburg, would have sufficed to effect a junction with the Viennese, and to adjourn to that day six months every concentration of an Austrian army. In war, and particularly in revolutionary warfare, rapidity of action until some decided advantage is gained is the first rule, and we have no hesitation in saying that upon merely military grounds Perczel ought not to have stopped until his junction with the Viennese was effected. There was certainly some risk, but who ever won a battle without risking something? And did the people of Vienna risk nothing when they drew upon themselves—they, a population of four hundred thousand—the forces that were to march to the conquest of twelve millions of Hungarians? The military fault committed by waiting until the Austrians had united, and by making the feeble demonstration at Schwechat which ended, as it deserved to do, in an inglorious defeat—this military fault certainly incurred more risks than a resolute march upon Vienna against the disbanded brigands of Jellachich would have done.

But, it is said, such an advance of the Hungarians, unless authorized by some official body, would have been a violation of the German territory, would have brought on complications with the Central Power at Frankfort, and would have been, above all, an abandonment of the legal and constitutional policy which formed the strength of the Hungarian cause. Why, the official bodies in Vienna were nonentities! Was it the Diet, was it the popular Committees, who had risen for Hungary, or was it the people of Vienna, and they alone, who had taken to the musket to stand the brunt of the first battle for Hungary's independence? It was not this nor that official body in Vienna which it was important to uphold—all these bodies might, and would have been, upset very soon in the progress of the revolutionary development—but it was the ascendency of the revolutionary movement, the unbroken progress of popular action itself, which alone was in question, and which alone could save Hungary from invasion. What forms this revolutionary movement afterward might take, was the business of the Viennese, not of the Hungarians, so long as Vienna and German Austria
at large continued their allies against the common enemy. But the question is, whether in this stickling of the Hungarian Government for some quasi-legal authorization, we are not to see the first clear symptom of that pretense to a rather doubtful legality of proceeding, which, if it did not save Hungary, at least told very well, at a later period, before the English middle-class audiences.

As to the pretext of possible conflicts with the Central Power of Germany at Frankfort, it is quite futile. The Frankfort authorities were de facto upset by the victory of the counter-revolution at Vienna; they would have been equally upset had the revolution, there, found the support necessary to defeat its enemies. And lastly, the great argument that Hungary could not leave legal and constitutional ground, may do very well for British free traders, but it will never be deemed sufficient in the eyes of history. Suppose the people of Vienna had stuck to "legal and constitutional" means on the 13th of March and on the 6th of October, what then of the "legal and constitutional" movement, and of all the glorious battles which, for the first time, brought Hungary to the notice of the civilized world? The very legal and constitutional ground, upon which it is asserted the Hungarians moved in 1848 and '49, was conquered for them by the exceedingly illegal and unconstitutional rising of the people of Vienna on the 13th of March. It is not to our purpose here to discuss the revolutionary history of Hungary, but it may be deemed proper if we observe that it is utterly useless to professedly use merely legal means of resistance against an enemy who scorns such scruples; and if we add, that had it not been for this eternal pretense of legality which Görgey seized upon and turned against the Government, the devotion of Görgey's army to its General, and the disgraceful catastrophe of Vilagos, would have been impossible. And when, at last, to save their honor, the Hungarians came across the Leitha, in the latter end of October 1848, was that not quite as illegal as any immediate and resolute attack would have been?

We are known to harbor no unfriendly feelings toward Hungary. We stood by her during the struggle; we may be allowed to say, that our paper, the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, has done more than any other to render the Hungarian cause popular in Germany, by explaining the nature of the struggle between the Magyar and Slavonian races, and by following up the Hungarian war in a series of articles which have had paid them the compliment of being plagiarized in almost every subsequent book upon the subject, the works of native Hungarians and "eye-witnesses" not excepted. We even now,
in any future continental convulsion, consider Hungary as the necessary and natural ally of Germany. But we have been severe enough upon our own countrymen to have a right to speak out upon our neighbors; and then, we have here to record facts with historical impartiality, and we must say, that in this particular instance, the generous bravery of the people of Vienna was not only far more noble, but also more far-sighted than the cautious circumspection of the Hungarian Government. And, as Germans, we may further be allowed to say, that not for all the showy victories and glorious battles of the Hungarian campaign would we exchange that spontaneous, single-handed rising and heroic resistance of the people of Vienna, our countrymen, which gave Hungary the time to organize the army that could do such great things.

The second ally of Vienna was the German people. But they were everywhere engaged in the same struggle as the Viennese. Frankfort, Baden, Cologne, had just been defeated and disarmed. In Berlin and Breslau the people were at daggers drawn with the army, and daily expected to come to blows. Thus it was in every local center of action. Everywhere questions were pending that could only be settled by the force of arms; and now it was that for the first time were severely felt the disastrous consequences of the continuation of the old dismemberment and decentralization of Germany. The different questions in every State, every province, every town were fundamentally the same; but they were brought forward everywhere under different shapes and pretexts, and had everywhere attained different degrees of maturity. Thus it happened, that while in every locality the decisive gravity of the events at Vienna was felt, yet nowhere could an important blow be struck with any hope of bringing the Viennese succor or making a diversion in their favor; and there remained nothing to aid them but the Parliament and Central Power of Frankfort; they were appealed to on all hands, but what did they do?

The Frankfort Parliament and the bastard child it had brought to light by incestuous intercourse with the old German Diet, the so-called Central Power, profited by the Viennese movement to show forth their utter nullity. This contemptible Assembly, as we have seen, had long since sacrificed its virginity, and young as it was, it was already turning gray-headed and experienced in all the artifices of prating and pseudo-diplomatic prostitution. Of the dreams and illusions of power, of German regeneration and unity, that in the beginning had pervaded it,
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nothing remained but a set of Teutonic clap-trap phraseology
that was repeated on every occasion, and a firm belief of each
individual member in his own importance, as well as in the
credulity of the public. The original naïveté was discarded; the
representatives of the German people had turned practical men,
that is to say, they had made it out that the less they did, and
the more they prated, the safer would be their position as the
umpires of the fate of Germany. Not that they considered their
proceedings superfluous; quite the contrary, but they had found
out that all really great questions, being to them forbidden
ground, had better be let alone; and there, like a set of Byzantine
doctors of the Lower Empire, they discussed, with an impor-
tance and assiduity worthy of the fate that at last overtook
them, theoretical dogmas long ago settled in every part of the
civilized world, or microscopical practical questions which never
led to any practical result. Thus, the Assembly being a sort of
Lancastrian School¹⁴⁸⁷ for the mutual instruction of members,
and being, therefore, very important to themselves, they were
persuaded it was doing even more than the German people had
a right to expect, and looked upon every one as a traitor to the
country who had the impudence to ask them to come to any
result.

When the Viennese insurrection broke out, there was a host
of interpellations, debates, motions, and amendments upon it,
which of course led to nothing. The Central Power was to in-
terfere. It sent two Commissioners, Messrs. Welcker, the ex-
Liberal, and Mosle, to Vienna. The travels of Don Quixote and
Sancho Panza form matter for an Odyssey in comparison to the
heroic feats and wonderful adventures of these two knights-
errant of German Unity. Not daring to go to Vienna, they were
bullied by Windischgrätz, wondered at by the idiot Emperor,*
and impudently hoaxed by the Minister Stadion. Their
despatches and reports are perhaps the only portion of the
Frankfort transactions that will retain a place in German
literature; they are a perfect satirical romance, ready cut and
dried, and an eternal monument of disgrace for the Frankfort
Assembly and its government.

The left side of the Assembly⁷⁵ had also sent two Commis-
sioners to Vienna, in order to uphold its authority there—
Messrs. Fröbel and Robert Blum. Blum, when danger drew near,
judged rightly that here the great battle of the German Revolu-
tion was to be fought, and unhesitatingly resolved to stake his
head on the issue. Fröbel, on the contrary, was of opinion that

* Ferdinand I.—Ed.
it was his duty to preserve himself for the important duties of his post at Frankfort. Blum was considered one of the most eloquent men of the Frankfort Assembly; he certainly was the most popular. His eloquence would not have stood the test of any experienced Parliamentary Assembly; he was too fond of the shallow declamations of a German dissenting preacher, and his arguments wanted both philosophical acumen and acquaintance with practical matter of fact. In politics, he belonged to “Moderate Democracy,” a rather indefinite sort of thing, cherished on account of this very want of definiteness in its principles. But with all this, Robert Blum was by nature a thorough, though somewhat polished, plebeian, and in decisive moments his plebeian instinct and plebeian energy got the better of his indefinite and therefore indecisive political persuasion and knowledge. In such moments he raised himself far above the usual standard of his capacities.

Thus, in Vienna, he saw at a glance that here, and not in the midst of the would-be elegant debates of Frankfort, the fate of his country would have to be decided; he at once made up his mind, gave up all idea of retreat, took a command in the revolutionary force, and behaved with extraordinary coolness and decision. It was he who retarded for a considerable time the taking of the town and covered one of its sides from attack by burning the Tabor Bridge over the Danube. Everybody knows how after the storming he was arrested, tried by a court martial, and shot. He died like a hero. And the Frankfort Assembly, horror-struck as it was, yet took the bloody insult with a seeming good grace. A resolution was carried, which, by the softness and diplomatic decency of its language, was more an insult to the grave of the murdered martyr than a damning stain upon Austria. But it was not to be expected that this contemptible Assembly should resent the assassination of one of its members, particularly of the leader of the Left.

London, March, 1852

XIII

THE PRUSSIAN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY.
THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

On the 1st of November Vienna fell, and on the 9th of the same month the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in Berlin showed how much this event had at once raised the spirit and the strength of the counter-revolutionary party all over Germany.
The events of the summer of 1848 in Prussia are soon told. The Constituent Assembly, or rather “the Assembly elected for the purpose of agreeing upon a Constitution with the Crown,” and its majority of representatives of the middle-class interest, had long since forfeited all public esteem by lending itself to all the intrigues of the Court, from fear of the more energetic elements of the population. They had confirmed, or rather restored, the obnoxious privileges of feudalism, and thus betrayed the liberty and the interest of the peasantry. They had neither been able to draw up a constitution, nor to amend in any way the general legislation. They had occupied themselves almost exclusively with nice theoretical distinctions, mere formalities, and questions of constitutional etiquette. The Assembly, in fact, was more a school of parliamentary savoir vivre for its members, than a body in which the people could take any interest. The majorities were, besides, very nicely balanced, and almost always decided by the wavering “Centers,” whose oscillations from Right to Left, and vice versa, upset first the Ministry of Camphausen, then that of Auerswald and Hansemann. But while thus the Liberals, here as everywhere else, let the occasion slip out of their hands, the Court reorganized its elements of strength among the nobility, and the most uncultivated portion of the rural population, as well as in the army and bureaucracy. After Hansemann’s downfall, a ministry of bureaucrats and military officers, all staunch reactionists, was formed, which, however, seemingly gave way to the demands of the Parliament; and the Assembly, acting upon the commodious principle of “measures, not men,” were actually duped into applauding this ministry, while they, of course, had no eyes for the concentration and organization of counter-revolutionary forces which that same ministry carried on pretty openly. At last, the signal being given by the fall of Vienna, the King dismissed his ministers and replaced them by “men of action,” under the leadership of the present Premier, M. Manteuffel. Then the dreaming Assembly at once awoke to the danger; it passed a vote of no confidence in the Cabinet, which was at once replied to by a decree removing the Assembly from Berlin, where it might, in case of a conflict, count upon the support of the masses, to Brandenburg, a petty provincial town dependent entirely upon the Government. The Assembly, however, declared that it could not be adjourned, removed, or dissolved, except with its own consent. In the meantime, General Wrangel entered Berlin at the head of some

* Savoir vivre: Good breeding.—Ed.
** Friedrich-Wilhelm IV.—Ed.
forty thousand troops. In a meeting of the municipal magistrates and the officers of the National Guard, it was resolved not to offer any resistance. And now, after the Assembly and its constituents, the Liberal bourgeoisie, had allowed the combined reactionary party to occupy every important position and to wrest from their hands almost every means of defense, began that grand comedy of "passive and legal resistance" which they intended to be a glorious imitation of the example of Hampden and of the first efforts of the Americans in the War of Independence. Berlin was declared in a state of siege, and Berlin remained tranquil; the National Guard was dissolved by the Government, and its arms were delivered up with the greatest punctuality. The Assembly was hunted down during a fortnight, from one place of meeting to another, and everywhere dispersed by the military, and the members of the Assembly begged of the citizens to remain tranquil. At last, the Government having declared the Assembly dissolved, it passed a resolution to declare the levying of taxes illegal, and then its members dispersed themselves over the country to organize the refusal of taxes. But they found that they had been woefully mistaken in the choice of their means. After a few agitated weeks, followed by severe measures of the Government against the Opposition, every one gave up the idea of refusing the taxes in order to please a defunct Assembly that had not even had the courage to defend itself.

Whether it was, in the beginning of November, 1848, already too late to try armed resistance, or whether a part of the army, on finding serious opposition, would have turned over to the side of the Assembly, and thus decided the matter in its favor, is a question which may never be solved. But in revolution, as in war, it is always necessary to show a strong front, and he who attacks is in the advantage; and in revolution, as in war, it is of the highest necessity to stake everything on the decisive moment, whatever the odds may be. There is not a single successful revolution in history that does not prove the truth of these axioms. Now, for the Prussian Revolution, the decisive moment had come in November, 1848; the Assembly, at the head, officially, of the whole revolutionary interest, did neither show a strong front, for it receded at every advance of the enemy; much less did it attack, for it chose even not to defend itself; and when the decisive moment came, when Wrangel, at the head of forty thousand men, knocked at the gates of Berlin, instead of finding, as he and all his officers fully expected, every street studded with barricades, every window turned into a loophole, he found the gates open and the streets obstructed only by peaceful Berliner burghers, enjoying the joke they had played.
upon him, by delivering themselves up, hands and feet tied, unto the astonished soldiers. It is true, the Assembly and the people, if they had resisted, might have been beaten; Berlin might have been bombarded, and many hundreds might have been killed, without preventing the ultimate victory of the royalist party. But that was no reason why they should surrender their arms at once. A well-contested defeat is a fact of as much revolutionary importance as an easily-won victory. The defeats of Paris, in June, 1848, and of Vienna, in October, certainly did far more in revolutionizing the minds of the people of these two cities than the victories of February and March. The Assembly and the people of Berlin would, probably, have shared the fate of the two towns above-named; but they would have fallen gloriously, and would have left behind themselves, in the minds of the survivors, a wish of revenge, which in revolutionary times is one of the highest incentives to energetic and passionate action. It is a matter of course that, in every struggle, he who takes up the gauntlet risks being beaten; but is that a reason why he should confess himself beaten, and submit to the yoke without drawing the sword?

In a revolution, he who commands a decisive position and surrenders it, instead of forcing the enemy to try his hands at an assault, invariably deserves to be treated as a traitor.

The same decree of the King of Prussia which dissolved the Constituent Assembly also proclaimed a new Constitution, founded upon the draft which had been made by a Committee of that Assembly, but enlarging, in some points, the powers of the Crown, and rendering doubtful, in others, those of the Parliament. This Constitution established two Chambers, which were to meet soon for the purpose of confirming and revising it.

We need hardly ask where the German National Assembly was during the "legal and peaceful" struggle of the Prussian Constitutionists. It was, as usual, at Frankfort, occupied with passing very tame resolutions against the proceedings of the Prussian Government, and admiring the "imposing spectacle of the passive, legal, and unanimous resistance of a whole people against brutal force." The Central Government sent Commissioners to Berlin, to intercede between the Ministry and the Assembly; but they met the same fate as their predecessors at Olmütz, and were politely shown out. The Left of the National Assembly, i.e., the so-called Radical party, sent also their Commissioners; but after having duly convinced themselves of the utter helplessness of the Berlin Assembly, and confessed their own equal helplessness, they returned to Frankfort, to report progress, and to testify to the admirably peaceful conduct of the
population of Berlin. Nay, more: when Mr. Bassermann, one of the Central Government's Commissioners, reported that the late stringent measures of the Prussian Ministers were not without foundation, inasmuch as there had of late been seen loitering about the streets of Berlin sundry savage-looking characters, such as always appear previous to anarchical movements (and which ever since have been named "Bassermannic characters"), these worthy deputies of the Left, and energetic representatives of the revolutionary interest, actually arose to make oath and testify that such was not the case! Thus, within two months, the total impotency of the Frankfort Assembly was signally proved. There could be no more glaring proofs that this body was totally inadequate to its task; nay, that it had not even the remotest idea of what its task really was. The fact, that both in Vienna and in Berlin the fate of the revolution was settled, that in both these capitals the most important and vital questions were disposed of, without the existence of the Frankfort Assembly ever being taken the slightest notice of—this fact alone is sufficient to establish that the body in question was a mere debating-club, composed of a set of dupes, who allowed the governments to use them as a parliamentary puppet, shown to amuse the shopkeepers and petty tradesmen of petty States and petty towns, as long as it was considered convenient to divert the attention of these parties. How long this was considered convenient we shall soon see. But it is a fact worthy of attention, that among all the "eminent" men of this Assembly, there was not one who had the slightest apprehension of the part they were made to perform, and that even up to the present day, ex-members of the Frankfort Club have invariably organs of historical perception quite peculiar to themselves.

London, March, 1852

XIV

THE RESTORATION OF ORDER. DIET AND CHAMBER

The first months of the year 1849 were employed by the Austrian and Prussian Governments in following up the advantages obtained in October and November last. The Austrian Diet, ever since the taking of Vienna, had carried on a merely nominal existence in a small Moravian country-town, named Kremser.9 Here the Slavonian Deputies, who, with their constit-

9 Czech name: Kroměříž.—Ed.
uents. had been mainly instrumental in raising the Austrian Government from its prostration, were singularly punished for their treachery against the European Revolution; as soon as the Government had recovered its strength, it treated the Diet and its Slavonian majority with the utmost contempt, and when the first successes of the imperial arms foreboded a speedy termination of the Hungarian war, the Diet, on the 4th of March, was dissolved and the deputies dispersed by military force. Then at last the Slavonians saw that they were duped, and then they shouted: Let us go to Frankfort and carry on there the opposition which we cannot pursue here! But it was then too late, and the very fact that they had no other alternative than either to remain quiet or to join the impotent Frankfort Assembly—this fact alone was sufficient to show their utter helplessness.

Thus ended, for the present and most likely for ever, the attempts of the Slavonians of Germany to recover an independent national existence. Scattered remnants of numerous nations, whose nationality and political vitality had long been extinguished, and who in consequence had been obliged, for almost a thousand years, to follow in the wake of a mightier nation, their conqueror, the same as the Welsh in England, the Basque in Spain, the Bas-Bretons in France, and at a more recent period the Spanish and French Creoles in those portions of North America occupied of late by the Anglo-American race—these dying nationalities, the Bohemians, Carinthians, Dalmatians, &c., had tried to profit by the universal confusion of 1848, in order to restore their political status quo of A. D. 800. The history of a thousand years ought to have shown them that such a regression was impossible; that if all the territory east of the Elbe and Saale had at one time been occupied by kindred Slavonians, this fact merely proved the historical tendency, and at the same time the physical and intellectual power of the German nation to subdue, absorb, and assimilate its ancient eastern neighbors; that this tendency of absorption on the part of the Germans had always been and still was one of the mightiest means by which the civilization of western Europe had been spread in the east of that Continent; that it could only cease whenever the process of Germanization had reached the frontier of large, compact, unbroken nations, capable of an independent national life, such as the Hungarians and in some degree the Poles; and that, therefore, the natural and inevitable fate of these dying nations was to allow this progress of dissolution and absorption by their stronger neighbors to complete itself. Certainly this is no very flattering prospect for the national ambition of the Panslavistic dreamers who succeeded in
agitating a portion of the Bohemian and South-Slavonian people; but can they expect that history would retrograde a thousand years in order to please a few phthisical bodies of men, who in every part of the territory they occupy are interspersed and surrounded by Germans, who from times almost immemorial have had for all purposes of civilization no other language but the German, and who lack the very first conditions of national existence, numbers and compactness of territory? Thus, the Panslavistic rising, which everywhere in the German and Hungarian Slavonic territories was the cloak for the restoration to independence of all these numberless petty nations, everywhere clashed with the European revolutionary movements, and the Slavonians, although pretending to fight for liberty, were invariably (the democratic portion of the Poles excepted) found on the side of despotism and reaction. Thus it was in Germany, thus in Hungary, thus even here and there in Turkey. Traitors to the popular cause, supporters and chief props to the Austrian Government’s cabal, they placed themselves in the position of outlaws in the eyes of all revolutionary nations. And although nowhere the mass of the people had a part in the petty squabbles about nationality raised by the Panslavistic leaders, for the very reason that they were too ignorant, yet it will never be forgotten that in Prague, in a half-German town, crowds of Slavonian fanatics cheered and repeated the cry: “Rather the Russian knout than German Liberty!” After their first evaporated effort in 1848, and after the lesson the Austrian Government gave them, it is not likely that another attempt at a later opportunity will be made. But if they should try again under similar pretexts to ally themselves to the counter-revolutionary force, the duty of Germany is clear. No country in a state of revolution and involved in external war can tolerate a Vendée in its very heart.

As to the Constitution proclaimed by the Emperor at the same time with the dissolution of the Diet, there is no need to revert to it, as it never had a practical existence and is now done away with altogether. Absolutism has been restored in Austria to all intents and purposes ever since the 4th of March, 1849.

In Prussia, the Chambers met in February for the ratification and revision of the new Charter proclaimed by the King. They sat for about six weeks, humble and meek enough in their behavior toward the Government, yet not quite prepared to go the lengths the King and his ministers wished them to go. There-

* Franz-Josef I.—Ed.
fore, as soon as a suitable occasion presented itself, they were dissolved.

Thus both Austria and Prussia had for the moment got rid of the shackles of parliamentary control. The Governments now concentrated all power in themselves and could bring that power to bear wherever it was wanted: Austria upon Hungary and Italy, Prussia upon Germany. For Prussia, too, was preparing for a campaign by which "order" was to be restored in the smaller States.

Counter-revolution being now paramount in the two great centers of action of Germany, in Vienna and Berlin, there remained only the lesser States in which the struggle was still undecided, although the balance there, too, was leaning more and more against the revolutionary interest. These smaller States, we have said, found a common center in the National Assembly at Frankfort. Now, this so-called National Assembly, although its reactionist spirit had long been evident, so much so that the very people of Frankfort had risen in arms against it, yet its origin was of a more or less revolutionary nature; it occupied an abnormal, revolutionary position in January; its competence had never been defined, and it had at last come to the decision—which, however, was never recognized by the larger States—that its resolutions had the force of law. Under these circumstances, and when the constitutionalist-monarchical party saw their positions turned by the recovering absolutists, it is not to be wondered that the liberal, monarchical bourgeoisie of almost the whole of Germany should place their last hopes upon the majority of this Assembly, just as the petty shopkeeping interest, the nucleus of the Democratic party, gathered in their growing distress around the minority of that same body which indeed formed the last compact parliamentary phalanx of Democracy. On the other hand, the larger Governments, and particularly the Prussian Ministry, saw more and more the incompatibility of such an irregular elective body with the restored monarchical system of Germany, and if they did not at once force its dissolution, it was only because the time had not yet come and because Prussia hoped first to use it for the furthering of its own ambitious purposes.

In the meantime, that poor Assembly itself fell into a greater and greater confusion. Its deputations and commissaries had been treated with the utmost contempt, both in Vienna and Berlin; one of its members,* in spite of his parliamentary inviolability, had been executed in Vienna as a common rebel. Its

* Robert Blum.—Ed.
decrees were nowhere heeded; if they were noticed at all by the larger powers, it was merely by protesting notes which disputed the authority of the Assembly to pass laws and resolutions binding upon their governments. The Representative of the Assembly, the Central Executive Power, was involved in diplomatic squabbles with almost all the cabinets of Germany, and in spite of all their efforts neither Assembly nor Central Government could bring Austria or Prussia to state their ultimate views, plans, and demands. The Assembly, at last, commenced to see clearly, at least so far, that it had allowed all power to slip out of its hands, that it was at the mercy of Austria and Prussia, and that if it intended making a federal Constitution for Germany at all, it must set about the thing at once and in good earnest. And many of the vacillating members also saw clearly that they had been egregiously duped by the governments. But what were they, in their impotent position, able to do now? The only thing that could have saved them would have been promptly and decidedly to pass over into the popular camp; but the success, even of that step, was more than doubtful; and then, where in this helpless crowd of undecided, short-sighted, self-conceited beings who, when the eternal noise of contradictory rumors and diplomatic notes completely stunned them, sought their only consolation and support in the everlastingly repeated assurance that they were the best, the greatest, the wisest men of the country, and that they alone could save Germany—where, we say, among these poor creatures, whom a single year of parliamentary life had turned into complete idiots, where were the men for a prompt and decisive resolution, much less for energetic and consistent action?

At last the Austrian Government threw off the mask. In its Constitution of the 4th of March it proclaimed Austria an indivisible monarchy, with common finances, system of customs-duties, of military establishments, thereby effacing every barrier and distinction between the German and non-German provinces. This declaration was made in the face of resolutions and articles of the intended federal Constitution, which had been already passed by the Frankfort Assembly. It was the gauntlet of war thrown down to it by Austria, and the poor Assembly had no other choice but to take it up. This it did with a deal of blustering, but which Austria, in the consciousness of her power, and of the utter nothingness of the Assembly, could well afford to allow to pass. And this precious representation, as it styled itself, of the German people, in order to revenge itself for this insult on the part of Austria, saw nothing better before it than to throw itself, hands and feet tied, at the feet of the Prussian
Government. Incredible as it would seem, it bent its knees before the very ministers whom it had condemned as unconstitutional and anti-popular, and whose dismissal it had in vain insisted upon. The details of this disgraceful transaction, and the tragi-comical events that followed, will form the subject of our next.

London, April, 1852

XV

THE TRIUMPH OF PRUSSIA

We now come to the last chapter in the history of the German Revolution: the conflict of the National Assembly with the Governments of the different States, especially of Prussia; the insurrection of Southern and Western Germany, and its final overthrow by Prussia.

We have already seen the Frankfort National Assembly at work. We have seen it kicked at by Austria, insulted by Prussia, disobeyed by the lesser States, duped by its own impotent Central "Government," which again was the dupe of all and every prince in the country. But at last things began to look threatening for this weak, vacillating, insipid legislative body. It was forced to come to the conclusion that "the sublime idea of German Unity was threatened in its realization," which meant neither more nor less than that the Frankfort Assembly, and all it had done and was about to do, were very likely to end in smoke. Thus it set to work in good earnest in order to bring forth as soon as possible its grand production, the "Imperial Constitution."

There was, however, one difficulty. What Executive Government was there to be? An Executive Council? No; that would have been, they thought in their wisdom, making Germany a Republic. A "President"? That would come to the same. Thus they must revive the old imperial dignity. But—as of course a prince was to be Emperor—who should it be? Certainly none of the Diī minorum gentium,* from Reuss-Schleiz-Greiz-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf** up to Bavaria***; neither Austria nor Prussia would have borne that. It could only be Austria or Prussia. But which of the two? There is no doubt that, under otherwise favorable circumstances, this august Assembly would be sitting up to the present day discussing this important dilemma without

---

* Literally: junior gods; figuratively: second-rate personages.—Ed.
** Heinrich LXXII.—Ed.
*** The reference is here to the King of Bavaria, Maximilian II.—Ed.
being able to come to a conclusion, if the Austrian Government had not cut the Gordian knot and saved them the trouble.

Austria knew very well that from the moment in which she could again appear before Europe with all her provinces subdued, as a strong and great European power, the very law of political gravitation would draw the remainder of Germany into her orbit, without the help of any authority which an imperial crown conferred by the Frankfort Assembly could give her. Austria had been far stronger, far freer in her movements, since she shook off the powerless crown of the German Empire—a crown which clogged her own independent policy, while it added not one iota to her strength, either within or without of Germany. And supposing the case that Austria could not maintain her footing in Italy and Hungary—why, then she was dissolved, annihilated in Germany too, and could never pretend to re-seize a crown which had slipped from her hands while she was in the full possession of her strength. Thus Austria at once declared against all imperialist resurrections, and plainly demanded the restoration of the German Diet, the only Central Government of Germany known and recognized by the treaties of 1815; and on the 4th of March, 1849, issued that Constitution which had no other meaning than to declare Austria an indivisible, centralized, and independent monarchy, distinct even from that Germany which the Frankfort Assembly was to reorganize.

This open declaration of war left, indeed, the Frankfort wiseacres no other choice but to exclude Austria from Germany, and to create out of the remainder of that country a sort of Lower Empire, a "Little Germany," the rather shabby imperial mantle of which was to fall on the shoulders of his Majesty of Prussia. This, it will be recollected, was the renewal of an old project fostered already some six or eight years ago by a party of South and Middle German liberal doctrinaires, who considered as a godsend the degrading circumstances by which their old crotchet was now again brought forward as the latest "new move" for the salvation of the country.

They accordingly finished, in February and March, 1849, the debate on the Imperial Constitution, together with the Declaration of Rights and the Imperial Electoral Law; not, however, without being obliged to make, in a great many points, the most contradictory concessions—now to the Conservative or rather Reactionary party—now to the more advanced fractions of the Assembly. In fact, it was evident that the leadership of the Assembly, which had formerly belonged to the Right and Right Center (the Conservatives and Reactionists), was gradually,
although slowly, passing toward the Left or Democratic side of that body. The rather dubious position of the Austrian Deputies in an Assembly which had excluded their country from Germany, and in which yet they were called upon to sit and vote, favored the derangement of its equipoise; and thus, as early as the end of February, the Left Center and the Left found themselves, by the help of the Austrian votes, very generally in a majority, while on other days the Conservative fraction of the Austrians, all of a sudden and for the fun of the thing, voting with the Right, threw the balance—again on the other side. They intended by these sudden soubresauts* to bring the Assembly into contempt, which, however, was quite unnecessary, the mass of the people being long since convinced of the utter hollowness and futility of anything coming from Frankfort. What a specimen of a Constitution, in the meantime, was framed under such jumping and counter-jumping, may easily be imagined.

The Left of the Assembly—this élite and pride of revolutionary Germany, as it believed itself to be—was entirely intoxicated with the few paltry successes it obtained by the good-will, or rather the ill-will, of a set of Austrian politicians acting under the instigation and for the interest of Austrian despotism. Whenever the slightest approximation to their own not-very-well-defined principles had, in a homœopathically diluted shape, obtained a sort of sanction by the Frankfort Assembly, these Democrats proclaimed that they had saved the country and the people. These poor, weak-minded men, during the course of their generally very obscure lives, had been so little accustomed to anything like success, that they actually believed their paltry amendments, passed with two or three votes' majority, would change the face of Europe. They had from the beginning of their legislative career been more imbued than any other fraction of the Assembly with that incurable malady, parliamentary cretinism, a disorder which penetrates its unfortunate victims with the solemn conviction that the whole world, its history and future, are governed and determined by a majority of votes in that particular representative body which has the honor to count them among its members, and that all and everything going on outside the walls of their house—wars, revolutions, railway-constructing, colonizing of whole new continents, California gold discoveries, Central American canals, Russian armies, and whatever else may have some little claim to influence upon the destinies of mankind—is nothing compared to the incommensurable events hinging upon the important question,

* Soubresauts: Jumps, leaps.—Ed.
whatever it may be, just at that moment occupying the attention of their honorable House. Thus it was the Democratic party of the Assembly, by effectually smuggling a few of their nostrums into the "Imperial Constitution," that first became bound to support it, although in every essential point it flatly contradicted their own oft-proclaimed principles; and at last, when this mongrel work was abandoned and bequeathed to them by its main authors, accepted the inheritance, and held out for this monarchical Constitution even in opposition to everybody who then proclaimed their own republican principles.

But it must be confessed that in this the contradiction was merely apparent. The indeterminate, self-contradictory, immature character of the Imperial Constitution was the very image of the immature, confused, conflicting political ideas of these democratic gentlemen. And if their own sayings and writings—as far as they could write—were not sufficient proof of this, their actions would furnish such proof; for among sensible people it is a matter of course to judge of a man not by his professions, but by his actions; not by what he pretends to be, but by what he does and what he really is; and the deeds of these heroes of German Democracy speak loud enough for themselves, as we shall learn by and by. However, the Imperial Constitution with all its appendages and paraphernalia was definitively passed, and on the 28th of March the King of Prussia was, by 290 votes against 248 who abstained and some 200 who were absent, elected Emperor of Germany, minus Austria. The historical irony was complete; the imperial farce executed in the streets of astonished Berlin, three days after the Revolution of March 18, 1848, by Frederick William IV, while in a state which elsewhere would come under the Maine Liquor Law—this disgusting farce, just one year afterward, had been sanctioned by the pretended Representative Assembly of all Germany. That, then, was the result of the German Revolution!

London, July, 1852

XVI

THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AND THE GOVERNMENTS

The National Assembly of Frankfort, after having elected the King of Prussia Emperor of Germany (minus Austria), sent a deputation to Berlin to offer him the crown, and then adjourned. On the 3d of April Frederick William received the Deputies. He told them that, although he accepted the right of precedence
over all the other Princes of Germany, which this vote of the people's representatives had given him, yet he could not accept the Imperial crown as long as he was not sure that the remaining Princes acknowledged his supremacy and the Imperial Constitution conferring those rights upon him. It would be, he added, for the Governments of Germany to see whether this Constitution was such as could be ratified by them. At all events, Emperor or not, he always would be found ready, he concluded, to draw the sword against either the external or the internal foe. We shall soon see how he kept his promise in a manner rather startling for the National Assembly.

The Frankfort wiseacres, after profound diplomatic inquiry, at last came to the conclusion that this answer amounted to a refusal of the crown. They then (April 12) resolved: That the Imperial Constitution was the law of the land, and must be maintained; and not seeing their way at all before themselves, elected a Committee of Thirty, to make proposals as to the means how this Constitution could be carried out.

This resolution was the signal for the conflict between the Frankfort Assembly and the German Governments, which now broke out.

The middle classes, and especially the smaller trading class, had all at once declared for the new Frankfort Constitution. They could not await any longer the moment which was "to close the revolution." In Austria and Prussia the revolution had, for the moment, been closed by the interference of the armed power; the classes in question would have preferred a less forcible mode of performing that operation, but they had not had a chance; the thing was done, and they had to make the best of it, a resolution which they at once took and carried out most heroically. In the smaller States, where things had been going on comparatively smoothly, the middle classes had long since been thrown back into that showy, but resultless, because powerless, parliamentary agitation which was most congenial to themselves. The different States of Germany, as regarded each of them separately, appeared thus to have attained that new and definitive form which was supposed to enable them to enter, henceforth, the path of peaceful and constitutional development. There only remained one open question, that of the new political organization of the German Confederacy. And this question, the only one which still appeared fraught with danger, it was considered a necessity to resolve at once. Hence the pressure exerted upon the Frankfort Assembly by the middle classes, in order to induce it to get the Constitution ready as soon as possible; hence the resolution among the higher and lower bourgeoisie to accept
and to support this Constitution, whatever it might be, in order to create a settled state of things without delay. Thus, from the very beginning, the agitation for the Imperial Constitution arose out of a reactionary feeling, and sprung up among those classes which were long since tired of the revolution.

But there was another feature in it. The first and fundamental principles of the future German Constitution had been voted during the first months of spring and summer, 1848—a time when popular agitation was still rife. The resolutions then passed—though completely reactionary then—now, after the arbitrary acts of the Austrian and Prussian Governments, appeared exceedingly liberal, and even democratic. The standard of comparison had changed. The Frankfort Assembly could not, without moral suicide, strike out these once-voted provisions, and model the Imperial Constitution upon those which the Austrian and Prussian Governments had dictated sword in hand. Besides, as we have seen, the majority in that Assembly had changed sides, and the Liberal and Democratic party were rising in influence. Thus the Imperial Constitution not only was distinguished by its apparently exclusive popular origin, but at the same time, full of contradiction as it was, it yet was the most liberal Constitution of all Germany. Its greatest fault was, that it was a mere sheet of paper, with no power to back its provisions.

Under these circumstances it was natural that the so-called Democratic party, that is, the mass of the petty trading class, should cling to the Imperial Constitution. This class had always been more forward in its demands than the Liberal Monarchico-Constitutional bourgeoisie; it had shown a bolder front, it had very often threatened armed resistance, it was lavish in its promises to sacrifice its blood and its existence in the struggle for freedom; but it had already given plenty of proofs that on the day of danger it was nowhere, and that it never felt more comfortable than the day after a decisive defeat, when everything being lost, it had at least the consolation to know that somehow or other the matter was settled. While, therefore, the adhesion of the large bankers, manufacturers and merchants was of a more reserved character, more like a simple demonstration in favor of the Frankfort Constitution, the class just beneath them, our valiant democratic shopkeepers, came forward in grand style and, as usual, proclaimed they would rather spill their last drop of blood than let the Imperial Constitution fall to the ground.

Supported by these two parties, the bourgeois adherents of Constitutional Royalty and the more or less democratic shop-
keepers, the agitation for the immediate establishment of the Imperial Constitution gained ground rapidly, and found its most powerful expression in the Parliaments of the several States. The Chambers of Prussia, of Hanover, of Saxony, of Baden, of Württemberg, declared in its favor. The struggle between the Governments and the Frankfort Assembly assumed a threatening aspect.

The Governments, however, acted rapidly. The Prussian Chambers were dissolved, anti-constitutionally, as they had to revise and confirm the Constitution; riots broke out at Berlin, provoked intentionally by the Government; and the next day, the 28th of April, the Prussian Ministry issued a circular note, in which the Imperial Constitution was held up as a most anarchical and revolutionary document, which it was for the Governments of Germany to remodel and purify. Thus Prussia denied, point-blank, that sovereign constituent power which the wise men at Frankfort had always boasted of, but never established. Thus a Congress of Princes, a renewal of the old Federal Diet, was called upon to sit in judgment on that Constitution which had already been promulgated as a law. And at the same time Prussia concentrated troops at Kreuznach, three days' march from Frankfort, and called upon the smaller States to follow its example by also dissolving their Chambers as soon as they should give their adhesion to the Frankfort Assembly. This example was speedily followed by Hanover and Saxony.

It was evident that a decision of the struggle by force of arms could not be avoided. The hostility of the Governments, the agitation among the people were daily showing themselves in stronger colors. The military were everywhere worked upon by the democratic citizens, and in the South of Germany with great success. Large mass meetings were everywhere held, passing resolutions to support the Imperial Constitution and the National Assembly, if need should be, with force of arms. At Cologne, a meeting of deputies of all the municipal councils of Rhenish Prussia took place for the same purpose. In the Palatinate, at Bergen, Fulda, Nuremberg, in the Odenwald, the peasantry met by myriads and worked themselves up into enthusiasm. At the same time, the Constituent Assembly of France dissolved, and the new elections were prepared amid violent agitation, while on the eastern frontier of Germany the Hungarians had within a month, by a succession of brilliant victories, rolled back the tide of Austrian invasion from the Theiss to the Leitha, and were every day expected to take Vienna by storm. Thus, popular imagination being on all hands worked up to the highest pitch, and the aggressive policy of the Governments defining itself more
clearly every day, a violent collision could not be avoided, and cowardly imbecility only could persuade itself that the struggle was to come off peaceably. But this cowardly imbecility was most extensively represented in the Frankfort Assembly.

London, July, 1852

XVII

INSURRECTION

The inevitable conflict between the National Assembly of Frankfort and the States' Government of Germany, at last broke out in open hostilities during the first days of May, 1849. The Austrian deputies, recalled by their Government, had already left the Assembly and returned home, with the exception of a few members of the Left or Democratic party. The great body of the Conservative members, aware of the turn things were about to take, withdrew even before they were called upon to do so by their respective Governments. Thus, even independently of the causes which in the foregoing papers have been shown to strengthen the influence of the Left, the mere desertion of their posts by the members of the Right sufficed to turn the old minority into a majority of the Assembly. The new majority which, at no former time, had dreamt of ever obtaining that good fortune, had profited by their places on the opposition benches to spout against the weakness, the indecision, the indolence of the old majority and of its Imperial Lieutenancy. Now all at once, they were called on to replace that old majority. They were now to show what they could perform. Of course, their career was to be one of energy, determination, activity. They, the élite of Germany, would soon be able to drive onwards the senile Lieutenant of the Empire and his vacillating ministers, and in case that was impossible, they would—there could be no doubt about it—by force of the sovereign right of the people, depose that impotent Government, and replace it by an energetic, indefatigable Executive, who would assure the salvation of Germany. Poor fellows! their rule—if rule it can be named where no one obeyed—was a still more ridiculous affair than even the rule of their predecessors.

The new majority declared that, in spite of all obstacles, the Imperial Constitution must be carried out, and at once; that on the 15th of July ensuing the people were to elect the deputies for the new House of Representatives, and that this House was to meet at Frankfort on the 22d of August following. Now, this
was an open declaration of war against those Governments that had not recognized the Imperial Constitution, the foremost among which were Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, comprising more than three-fourths of the German population; a declaration of war which was speedily accepted by them. Prussia and Bavaria, too, recalled the deputies sent from their territories to Frankfurt, and hastened their military preparations against the National Assembly; while, on the other hand, the demonstrations of the Democratic party (out of Parliament) in favor of the Imperial Constitution and of the National Assembly, acquired a more turbulent and violent character, and the mass of the working people, led by the men of the most extreme party, were ready to take up arms in a cause which, if it was not their own, at least gave them a chance of somewhat approaching their aims by clearing Germany of its old monarchical encumbrances. Thus everywhere the people and the Governments were at daggers drawn upon this subject; the outbreak was inevitable; the mine was charged, and it only wanted a spark to make it explode. The dissolution of the Chambers in Saxony, the calling in of the Landwehr (military reserve) in Prussia, the open resistance of the Government to the Imperial Constitution, were such sparks; they fell, and all at once the country was in a blaze. In Dresden, on the 4th of May, the people victoriously took possession of the town and drove out the King* while all the surrounding districts sent reinforcements to the insurgents. In Rhenish Prussia and Westphalia the Landwehr refused to march, took possession of the arsenals and armed itself in defense of the Imperial Constitution. In the Palatinate the people seized the Bavarian Government officials and the public moneys, and instituted a Committee of Defense, which placed the province under the protection of the National Assembly. In Württemberg the people forced the King** to acknowledge the Imperial Constitution, and in Baden the army, united with the people, forced the Grand Duke*** to flight and erected a Provisional Government. In other parts of Germany the people only awaited a decisive signal from the National Assembly to rise in arms and place themselves at its disposal.

The position of the National Assembly was far more favorable than could have been expected after its ignoble career. The Western half of Germany had taken up arms in its behalf; the military everywhere were vacillating; in the lesser States they were undoubtedly favorable to the movement. Austria was prostrated by the victorious advance of the Hungarians, and Russia,
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that reserve force of the German Governments, was straining all its powers in order to support Austria against the Magyar armies. There was only Prussia to subdue; and with the revolutionary sympathies existing in that country, a chance certainly existed of attaining that end. Everything, then, depended upon the conduct of the Assembly.

Now, insurrection is an art quite as much as war or any other, and subject to certain rules of proceeding, which, when neglected, will produce the ruin of the party neglecting them. Those rules, logical deductions from the nature of the parties and the circumstances one has to deal with in such a case, are so plain and simple that the short experience of 1848 had made the Germans pretty well acquainted with them. Firstly, never play with insurrection unless you are fully prepared to face the consequences of your play. Insurrection is a calculus with very indefinite magnitudes, the value of which may change every day; the forces opposed to you have all the advantage of organization, discipline and habitual authority; unless you bring strong odds against them, you are defeated and ruined. Secondly, the insurrectionary carrier once entered upon, act with the greatest determination, and on the offensive. The defensive is the death of every armed rising; it is lost before it measures itself with its enemies. Surprise your antagonists while their forces are scattering, prepare new successes, however small but daily; keep up the moral ascendant which the first successful rising has given to you; rally thus those vacillating elements to your side which always follow the strongest impulse, and which always look out for the safer side; force your enemies to a retreat before they can collect their strength against you; in the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary policy yet known: de l'audace, de l'audace, encore de l'audace!

What, then, was the National Assembly of Frankfort to do if it would escape the certain ruin which it was threatened with? First of all, to see clearly through the situation, and to convince itself that there was now no other choice than either to submit to the Governments unconditionally or take up the cause of the armed insurrection without reserve or hesitation. Secondly, to publicly recognize all the insurrections that had already broken out, and to call the people to take up arms everywhere in defense of the national representation, outlawing all princes, ministers, and others who should dare to oppose the sovereign people represented by its mandataries. Thirdly, to at once depose the German Imperial Lieutenant, to create a strong, active, unscrupulous Executive, to call insurgent troops to Frankfort for its immediate protection, thus offering at the same time a legal
pretext for the spread of the insurrection, to organize into a compact body all the forces at its disposal, and, in short, to profit quickly and unhesitatingly by every available means for strengthening its position and impairing that of its opponents.

Of all this, the virtuous Democrats in the Frankfort Assembly did just the contrary. Not content with letting things take the course they liked, these worthies went so far as to suppress by their opposition all insurrectionary movements which were preparing. Thus, for instance, did Mr. Karl Vogt at Nuremberg. They allowed the insurrections of Saxony, of Rhenish Prussia, of Westphalia to be suppressed without any other help than a posthumous, sentimental protest against the unfeeling violence of the Prussian Government. They kept up an underhand diplomatic intercourse with the South German insurrection, but never gave them the support of their open acknowledgment. They knew that the Lieutenant of the Empire sided with the Governments, and yet they called upon him, who never stirred, to oppose the intrigues of these Governments. The Ministers of the Empire, old Conservatives, ridiculed this impotent Assembly in every sitting, and they suffered it. And when William Wolff, a Silesian Deputy, and one of the editors of the New Rhenish Gazette, called upon them to outlaw the Lieutenant of the Empire*—who was, he justly said, nothing but the first and greatest traitor to the Empire—he was hooted down by the unanimous and virtuous indignation of those democratic revolutionists! In short, they went on talking, protesting, proclaiming, pronouncing, but never had the courage nor the sense to act; while the hostile troops of the Governments drew nearer and nearer, and their own Executive, the Lieutenant of the Empire, was busily plotting with the German Princes their speedy destruction. Thus, even the last vestige of consideration was lost to this contemptible Assembly; the insurgents, who had risen to defend it, ceased to care any more for it, and when at last it came to a shameful end, as we shall see, it died without anybody taking any notice of its unhonored exit.

London, August, 1852

XVIII

PETTY TRADERS

In our last we showed that the struggle between the German Governments on the one side, and the Frankfort Parliament on the other, had ultimately acquired such a degree of violence

* Johann.—Ed.
that in the first days of May a great portion of Germany broke out in open insurrection: first Dresden, then the Bavarian Palatinate, parts of Rhenish Prussia, and at last Baden.

In all cases, the real fighting body of the insurgents, that body which first took up arms and gave battle to the troops, consisted of the working classes of the towns. A portion of the poorer country population, laborers and petty farmers, generally joined them after the actual outbreak of the conflict. The greater number of the young men of all classes, below the capitalist class, was to be found, for a time at least, in the ranks of the insurgent armies, but this rather indiscriminate aggregate of young men very soon thinned as soon as the aspect of affairs took a somewhat serious turn. The students particularly, those "representatives of intellect," as they liked to call themselves, were the first to quit their standards, unless they were retained by the bestowal of officer's rank, for which they, of course, had very seldom any qualification.

The working class entered upon this insurrection as they would have done upon any other which promised either to remove some obstacles in their progress toward political dominion and social revolution, or at least to tie the more influential but less courageous classes of society to a more decided and revolutionary course than they had followed hitherto. The working class took up arms with a full knowledge that this was, in the direct bearings of the case, no quarrel of its own; but it followed up its only true policy: to allow no class that has risen on its shoulders (as the bourgeoisie had done in 1848) to fortify its class-government, without opening, at least, a fair field to the working class for the struggle for its own interests; and, in any case, to bring matters to a crisis, by which either the nation was fairly and irresistibly launched in the revolutionary career, or else the status quo before the revolution restored as near as possible, and thereby a new revolution rendered unavoidable. In both cases the working classes represented the real and well-understood interest of the nation at large, in hastening as much as possible that revolutionary course which, for the old societies of civilized Europe, has now become a historical necessity, before any of them can again aspire to a more quiet and regular development of its resources.

As to country people that joined the insurrection, they were principally thrown into the arms of the revolutionary party by the relatively enormous load of taxation, and partly of feudal burdens, pressing upon them. Without any initiative of their own, they formed the tail of the other classes engaged in the insurrection, wavering between the working men on one
side, and the petty trading class on the other. Their own private social position, in almost every case, decided which way they turned; the agricultural laborer generally supported the city artisan, the small farmer was apt to go hand in hand with the small shopkeeper.

This class of petty tradesmen, the great importance and influence of which we have already several times adverted to, may be considered as the leading class of the insurrection of May, 1849. There being, this time, none of the large towns of Germany among the center of the movement, the petty trading class, which in middling and lesser towns always predominates, found the means of getting the direction of the movement into its hands. We have, moreover, seen that, in this struggle for the Imperial Constitution and for the rights of the German Parliament, there were the interests of this peculiar class at stake. The Provisional Governments formed in all the insurgent districts represented in the majority of each of them this section of the people, and the length they went to may therefore be fairly taken as the measure of what the German petty bourgeoisie is capable of—capable, as we shall see, of nothing but ruining any movement that entrusts itself to its hands.

The petty bourgeoisie, great in boasting, is very impotent for action and very shy in risking anything. The *mesquin* character of its commercial transactions and its credit operations is eminently apt to stamp its character with a want of energy and encouraged insurrection by big words and great boasting as to mark its political career. Accordingly, the petty bourgeoisie encouraged insurrection by big words and great boasting as to what it was going to do; it was eager to seize upon power as soon as the insurrection, much against its will, had broken out; it used this power to no other purpose but to destroy the effects of the insurrection. Wherever an armed conflict had brought matters to a serious crisis, there the shopkeepers stood aghast at the dangerous situation created for them; aghast at the people who had taken their boasting appeals to arms in earnest; aghast at the power thus thrust into their own hands; aghast, above all, at the consequences for themselves, for their social positions, for their fortunes, of the policy in which they were forced to engage themselves. Were they not expected to risk "life and property", as they used to say, for the cause of the insurrection? Were they not forced to take official positions in the insurrection, whereby, in case of defeat, they risked the loss of their capital? And in case of victory, were they not sure to be immediately turned out of office and see their entire policy subverted by the victorious proletarians who formed the main
body of their fighting army? Thus placed between opposing dangers which surrounded them on every side, the petty bourgeoisie knew not to turn its power to any other account than to let everything take its chance, whereby, of course, there was lost what little chance of success there might have been, and thus to ruin the insurrection altogether. Its policy or rather want of policy everywhere was the same, and, therefore, the insurrections of May, 1849, in all parts of Germany, are all cut out to the same pattern.

In Dresden, the struggle was kept on for four days in the streets of the town. The shopkeepers of Dresden, the “communal guard,” not only did not fight, but in many instances favored the proceedings of the troops against the insurgents. These again consisted almost exclusively of working men from the surrounding manufacturing districts. They found an able and cool-headed commander in the Russian refugee, Michael Bakunin, who afterward was taken prisoner, and now is confined in the dungeons of Mukacevo,9 Hungary. The intervention of numerous Prussian troops crushed this insurrection.

In Rhenish Prussia, the actual fighting was of little importance. All the large towns being fortresses commanded by citadels, there could be only skirmishing on the part of the insurgents. As soon as a sufficient number of troops had been drawn together, there was an end to armed opposition.

In the Palatinate and Baden, on the contrary, a rich, fruitful province, and an entire State, fell into the hands of the insurrection. Money, arms, soldiers, warlike stores, everything was ready for use. The soldiers of the regular army themselves joined the insurgents; nay, in Baden, they were among the foremost of them. The insurrections in Saxony and Rhenish Prussia sacrificed themselves in order to gain time for the organization of this South-German movement. Never was there such a favorable position for a provincial and partial insurrection as this. A revolution was expected in Paris, the Hungarians were at the gates of Vienna, in all the central States of Germany not only the people, but even the troops, were strongly in favor of the insurrection, and only wanted an opportunity to join it openly. And yet the movement, having got once into the hands of the petty bourgeoisie, was ruined from its very beginning. The petty bourgeois rulers, particularly of Baden—M. Brentano at the head of them—never forgot that by usurping the place and prerogatives of the “lawful” sovereign, the Grand Duke, they were committing high treason. They sat down in their ministerial arm-

9 Ukrainian name: Mukachevo.—Ed.
chairs with the consciousness of criminality in their hearts. What can you expect of such cowards? They not only abandoned the insurrection to its own uncentralized and therefore ineffective spontaneity, they actually did everything in their power to take the sting out of the movement, to unman, to destroy it. And they succeeded, thanks to the zealous support of that deep class of politicians, the “Democratic” heroes of the petty bourgeoisie, who actually thought they were “saving the country,” while they allowed themselves to be led by their noses by a few men of a sharper cast, such as Brentano.

As to the fighting part of the business, never were military operations carried on in a more slovenly, more stolid way than under the Badish General-in-Chief Sigel, an ex-Lieutenant of the regular army. Everything was got into confusion, every good opportunity was lost, every precious moment was loitered away with planning colossal but impracticable projects, until, when at last the talented Pole, Mierosławski, took up the command, the army was disorganized, beaten, dispirited, badly provided for, opposed to an enemy four times more numerous, and withal he could do nothing more than fight, at Waghäusel, a glorious, though unsuccessful, battle, carry out a clever retreat, offer a last hopeless fight under the walls of Rastatt, and resign. As in every insurrectionary war, where armies are mixed of well-drilled soldiers and raw levies, there was plenty of heroism and plenty of unsoldierlike, often inconceivable panic in the revolutionary army; but, imperfect as it could not but be, it had at least the satisfaction that four times its number were not considered sufficient to put it to the rout, and that a hundred thousand regular troops, in a campaign against twenty thousand insurgents, treated them, militarily, with as much respect as if they had had to fight the Old Guard of Napoleon.

In May the insurrection had broken out; by the middle of July, 1849, it was entirely subdued, and the first German Revolution was closed.

XIX

THE CLOSE OF THE INSURRECTION

While the South and West of Germany was in open insurrection, and while it took the Governments from the first opening of hostilities at Dresden to the capitulation of Rastatt, rather more than ten weeks, to stifle this final blazing up of the first German Revolution, the National Assembly disappeared from
the political theatre without any notice being taken of its exit.

We left this august body at Frankfort, perplexed by the insolent attacks of the Governments upon its dignity, by the impotency and treacherous listlessness of the Central Power it had itself created, by the risings of the petty trading class for its defense, and of the working class for a more revolutionary ultimate end. Desolation and despair reigned supreme among its members; events had at once assumed such a definite and decisive shape, that in a few days the illusions of these learned legislators, as to their real power and influence, were entirely broken down. The Conservatives, at the signal given by the Governments, had already retired from a body which henceforth could not exist any longer, except in defiance of the constituted authorities. The Liberals gave the matter up in utter discomfiture; they, too, threw up their commissions as representatives. Honorable gentlemen decamped by hundreds. From eight or nine hundred members the number had dwindled down so rapidly, that now 150, and a few days after 100, were declared a quorum. And even these were difficult to muster, although the whole of the Democratic party remained.

The course to be followed by the remnants of a Parliament was plain enough. They had only to take their stand openly and decidedly with the insurrection, to give it, thereby, whatever strength legality could confer upon it, while they themselves at once acquired an army for their own defense. They had to summon the Central Power to stop all hostilities at once; and if, as could be foreseen, this power neither could nor would do so, to depose it at once and put another more energetic Government in its place. If insurgent troops could not be brought to Frankfort (which, in the beginning, when the State Governments were little prepared and still hesitating, might have been easily done), then the Assembly could have adjourned at once to the very center of the insurgent district. All this, done at once, and resolutely, not later than the middle or end of May, might have opened chances both for the insurrection and for the National Assembly.

But such a determined course was not to be expected from the representatives of German shopocracy. These aspiring statesmen were not at all freed from their illusions. Those members who had lost their fatal belief in the strength and inviolability of the Parliament, had already taken to their heels; the Democrats, who remained, were not so easily induced to give up dreams of power and greatness which they had cherished for a twelve-month. True to the course they had hitherto pursued, they shrunk back from decisive action until every chance of success, nay,
every chance to succumb with, at least, the honors of war, had passed away. In order, then, to develop a factitious, busy-body sort of activity, the sheer impotence of which, coupled with its high pretensions, could not but excite pity and ridicule, they continued insinuating resolutions, addresses, and requests to an Imperial Lieutenant, who not even noticed them, to Ministers; who were in open league with the enemy. And when at last William Wolff, member for Striegau,* one of the editors of the New Rhenish Gazette, the only really revolutionary man in the whole Assembly, told them that if they meant what they said, they had better give over talking and declare the Imperial Lieutenant, the chief traitor to the country, an outlaw at once; then the entire compressed virtuous indignation of these parliamentary gentlemen burst out with an energy which they never found when the Government heaped insult after insult upon them. Of course, for Wolff's proposition was the first sensible word spoken within the walls of St. Paul's Church; of course, for it was the very thing that was to be done—and such plain language, going so direct to the purpose, could not but insult a set of sentimentalists, who were resolute in nothing but irresolution, and who, too cowardly to act, had once for all made up their minds that in doing nothing, they were doing exactly what was to be done. Every word which cleared up, like lightning, the infatuated but intentional nebulousness of their minds, every hint that was adapted to lead them out of the labyrinth where they obstinately themselves to take up as lasting an abode as possible, every clear conception of matters as they actually stood, was, of course, a crime against the majesty of this Sovereign Assembly.

Shortly after the position of the honorable gentlemen in Frankfort became untenable, in spite of resolutions, appeals, interpellations, and proclamations, they retreated, but not into the insurged districts; that would have been too resolute a step. They went to Stuttgart, where the Württemberg Government kept up a sort of expectative neutrality. There, at last, they declared the Lieutenant of the Empire to have forfeited his power, and elected from their own body a Regency of five. This Regency at once proceeded to pass a Militia Law, which was actually in all due force sent to all the Governments of Germany. They, the very enemies of the Assembly, were ordered to levy forces in its defense! Then there was created—on paper, of course—an army for the defense of the National Assembly. Divisions, brigades, regiments, batteries, everything was regulated and
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ordained. Nothing was wanting but reality, for that army, of course, never was called into existence.

One last scheme offered itself to the National Assembly. The Democratic population from all parts of the country sent deputations to place itself at the disposal of the Parliament, and to urge it on to a decisive action. The people, knowing what the intentions of the Württemberg Government were, implored the National Assembly to force that Government into an open and active participation with their insurgent neighbors. But No. The National Assembly, in going to Stuttgart, had delivered itself up to the tender mercies of the Württemberg Government. The members knew it, and repressed the agitation among the people. They thus lost the last remnant of influence which they might yet have retained. They earned the contempt they deserved, and the Württemberg Government, pressed by Prussia and the Imperial Lieutenant, put a stop to the Democratic farce by shutting up, on the 18th of June, 1849, the room where the Parliament met, and by ordering the members of the Regency to leave the country.

Next they went to Baden, into the camp of the insurrection, but there they were now useless. Nobody noticed them. The Regency, however, in the name of the Sovereign German People, continued to save the country by its exertions. It made an attempt to get recognized by foreign powers, by delivering passports to anybody who would accept of them. It issued proclamations and sent Commissioners to insure those very districts of Württemberg whose active assistance it had refused when it was yet time; of course without effect. We have now under our eye an original report sent to the Regency by one of these Commissioners, Mr. Roesler (member for Oels*), the contents of which are rather characteristic. It is dated Stuttgart, 30th June, 1849. After describing the adventures of half-a-dozen of these Commissioners in a resultless search for cash, he gives a series of excuses for not having yet gone to his post, and then delivers himself of a most weighty argument respecting possible differences between Prussia, Austria, Bavaria and Württemberg, with their possible consequences. After having fully considered this, he comes, however, to the conclusion that there is no more chance. Next he proposes to establish relays of trustworthy men for the conveyance of intelligence, and a system of espionage as to the intentions of the Württemberg Ministry, and movements of the troops. This letter never reached its address, for when it was written the "Regency" had already passed entirely into the

* Polish name: Olesnica.—Ed.
“foreign department,” viz., Switzerland; and while poor Mr. Roesler troubled his head about the intentions of the formidable ministry of a sixth-rate kingdom, a hundred thousand Prussian, Bavarian, and Hessian soldiers had already settled the whole affair in the last battle under the walls of Rastatt.

Thus vanished the German Parliament, and with it the first and the last creation of the revolution. Its convocation had been the first evidence that there actually had been a revolution in January; and it existed as long as this, the first modern German Revolution, was not yet brought to a close. Chosen under the influence of the capitalist class by a dismembered, scattered, rural population, for the most part only awaking from the dullness of feudalism, this Parliament served to bring in one body upon the political arena all the great popular names of 1820-1848, and then to utterly ruin them. All the celebrities of the middle-class Liberalism were here collected; the bourgeoisie expected wonders; it earned shame for itself and for its representatives. The industrial and commercial capitalist class were more severely defeated in Germany than in any other country; they were first worsted, broken, expelled from office in every individual State of Germany, and then put to rout, disgraced, and hooted in the Central German Parliament. Political Liberalism, the rule of the bourgeoisie, be it under a monarchical or republican form of government, is forever impossible in Germany.

In the latter period of its existence, the German Parliament served to disgrace forever that section which had ever since March, 1848, headed the official opposition, the Democrats representing the interests of the small trading, and partially of the farming class. That class was, in May and June, 1849, given a chance to show its means of forming a stable government in Germany. We have seen how it failed; not so much by adverse circumstances as by the actual and continual cowardice in all trying movements that had occurred since the outbreak of the revolution; by showing in politics the same short-sighted, pusillanimous, waiving spirit, which is characteristic of its commercial operations. In May, 1849, it had, by this course, lost the confidence of the real fighting mass of all European insurrections, the working class. But yet, it had a fair chance. The German Parliament belonged to it, exclusively, after the Reactionists and Liberals had withdrawn. The rural population was in its favor. Two-thirds of the armies of the smaller States, one-third of the Prussian army, the majority of the Prussian Landwehr (reserve or militia), were ready to join it, if it only acted resolutely, and with that courage which is the result of a clear insight in the state of things. But the politicians, who led on this class, were not
more clear-sighted than the host of petty tradesmen which followed them. They proved even to be more infatuated, more ardently attached to delusions voluntarily kept up, more credulous, more incapable of resolutely dealing with facts than the Liberals. Their political importance, too, is reduced below the freezing point. But they not having actually carried their commonplace principles into execution, they were, under very favorable circumstances, capable of a momentary resurrection, when this last hope was taken from them, just as it was taken from their colleagues of the “pure Democracy” in France, by the coup d'etat of Louis Bonaparte.

The defeat of the South-West German insurrection, and the dispersion of the German Parliament, bring the history of the first German Revolution to a close. We have now to throw a parting glance upon the victorious members of the counter-revolutionary alliance; we shall do this in our next letter.193

London, September 24, 1852

Written by Engels in August 1851-September 1852
Published in The New-York Daily Tribune on October 25 and 28, November 6, 7, 12 and 28, 1851; February 27, March 5, 15, 18 and 19, April 9, 17 and 24, July 27, August 19, September 18, and October 2 and 23, 1852
Signed: Karl Marx
You will have ere this received by the European papers numerous reports of the Communist Monster Trial at Cologne, Prussia, and of its result. But as none of the reports is anything like a faithful statement of the facts, and as these facts throw a glaring light upon the political means by which the Continent of Europe is kept in bondage, I consider it necessary to revert to this trial.

The Communist or Proletarian party, as well as other parties, had lost, by suppression of the rights of association and meeting, the means of giving to itself a legal organization on the Continent. Its leaders, besides, had been exiled from their countries. But no political party can exist without an organization; and that organization which both the Liberal bourgeois and the Democratic shopkeeping class were enabled more or less to supply by the social station, advantages, and long-established, everyday intercourse of their members, the proletarian class, without such social station and pecuniary means, was necessarily compelled to seek in secret association. Hence, both in France and Germany, sprang up those numerous secret societies which have, ever since 1849, one after another been discovered by the police and prosecuted as conspiracies; but if many of them were really conspiracies, formed with the actual intention of upsetting the Government for the time being—and he is a coward that under certain circumstances would not conspire, just as he is a fool who, under other circumstances, would do so—there were some other societies which were formed with a wider and more elevated purpose, which knew, that the upsetting of an existing Government was but a passing stage in the great impending struggle, and which intended to keep together and to prepare the party, whose nucleus they formed, for the last, decisive combat which must one day or another crush forever in Europe the domination, not of mere “tyrants,” “despots” and “usurpers,” but of a power far superior, and far more formidable than theirs; that of capital over labor.
The organization of the advanced Communist party in Germany was of this kind. In accordance with the principles of its "Manifesto" (published in 1848) and with those explained in the series of articles on Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany, published in The New-York Daily Tribune, this party never imagined itself capable of producing, at any time and at its pleasure, that revolution which was to carry its ideas into practice. It studied the causes that had produced the revolutionary movements of 1848, and the causes that made them fail. Recognizing the social antagonism of classes at the bottom of all political struggles, it applied itself to the study of the conditions under which one class of society can and must be called on to represent the whole of the interests of a nation, and thus politically to rule over it. History showed to the Communist party, how, after the landed aristocracy of the Middle Ages, the monied power of the first capitalists arose and seized the reins of Government; how the social influence and political rule of this financial section of capitalists was superseded by the rising strength, since the introduction of steam, of the manufacturing capitalists, and how at the present moment two more classes claim their turn of domination, the petty trading class, and the industrial working class. The practical revolutionary experience of 1848-49 confirmed the reasonings of theory, which led to the conclusion that the democracy of the petty traders must first have its turn, before the Communist working class could hope to permanently establish itself in power and destroy that system of wages-slavery which keeps it under the yoke of the bourgeoisie. Thus the secret organization of the Communists could not have the direct purpose of upsetting the present governments of Germany. Being formed to upset not these, but the insurrectionary government, which is sooner or later to follow them, its members might, and certainly would, individually lend an active hand to a revolutionary movement against the present status quo in its time; but the preparation of such a movement, otherwise than by secret spreading of Communist opinions by the masses, could not be an object of the Association. So well was this foundation of the society understood by the majority of its members, that when the place-hunting ambition of some tried to turn it into a conspiracy for making an ex tempore revolution, they were speedily turned out.

Now, according to no law upon the face of the earth, could such an association be called a plot, a conspiracy for purposes of high treason. If it was a conspiracy, it was one against, not the existing Government, but its probable successors. And the Prus-

* See pp. 300-87 of this volume.—Ed.
sian Government was aware of it. That was the cause why the eleven defendants were kept in solitary confinement during eighteen months, spent, on the part of the authorities, in the strangest judicial feats. Imagine, that after eight months’ detention, the prisoners were remanded for some months more, “there being no evidence of any crime against them!” And when at last they were brought before a jury, there was not a single overt act of a treasonable nature proved against them. And yet they were convicted, and you will speedily see how.

One of the emissaries of the society* was arrested in May, 1851, and from documents found upon him, other arrests followed. A Prussian police officer, a certain Stieber, was immediately ordered to trace the ramifications, in London, of the pretended plot. He succeeded in obtaining some papers connected with the above-mentioned seceders from the society, who had, after being turned out, formed an actual conspiracy in Paris and London. These papers were obtained by a double crime. A man named Reuter was bribed to break open the writing desk of the secretary** of the society, and steal the papers therefrom. But that was nothing yet. This theft led to the discovery and conviction of the so-called Franco-German plot, in Paris,*** but it gave no clue as to the great Communist Association. The Paris plot, we may as well here observe, was under the direction of a few ambitious imbeciles and political chevaliers d’industrie**** in London, and of a formerly convicted forger, then acting as a police spy in Paris;*** their dupes made up, by rabid declamations and blood-thirsty rantings, for the utter insignificance of their political existence.

The Prussian police, then, had to look out for fresh discoveries. They established a regular office of secret police at the Prussian Embassy in London. A police agent, Greif by name, held his odious vocation under the title of an attaché to the Embassy—a step which would suffice to put all Prussian Embassies out of the pale of international law, and which even the Austrians have not yet dared to take. Under him worked a certain Fleury, a merchant in the City of London, a man of some fortune and rather respectfully connected, one of those low creatures who do the basest actions from an innate inclination to infamy. Another agent was a commercial clerk named Hirsch, who, however, had already been denounced as
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* Peter Nothjung.—Ed.
** Oswald Dietz.—Ed.
*** Chevaliers d’industrie: Adventurers, swindlers.—Ed.
**** Julien Cherval.—Ed.
a spy on his arrival. He introduced himself into the society of some German Communist refugees in London, and they, in order to obtain proofs of his real character, admitted him for a short time. The proofs of his connection with the police were very soon obtained, and Mr. Hirsch, from that time, absented himself. Although, however, he thus resigned all opportunities of gaining the information he was paid to procure, he was not inactive. From his retreat in Kensington, where he never met one of the Communists in question, he manufactured every week pretended reports of pretended sittings of a pretended Central Committee of that very conspiracy which the Prussian police could not get hold of. The contents of these reports were of the most absurd nature; not a Christian name was correct, not a name correctly spelt, not a single individual made to speak as he would be likely to speak. His master, Fleury, assisted him in this forgery, and it is not yet proved that "Attaché" Greif can wash his hands of these infamous proceedings. The Prussian Government, incredible to say, took these silly fabrications for gospel truth, and you may imagine what a confusion such depositions created in the evidence to be brought before the jury. When the trial came on, Mr. Stieber, the already mentioned police officer, got into the witness-box, swore to all these absurdities, and, with no little self-complacency, maintained that he had a secret agent in the very closest intimacy with those parties in London who were considered the prime movers in this awful conspiracy. This secret agent was very secret indeed, for he had hid his face for eight months in Kensington, for fear he might actually see one of the parties whose most secret thoughts, words and doings he pretended to report week after week.

Messrs. Hirsch and Fleury, however, had another invention in store. They worked up the whole of the reports they had made into an "original Minute Book" of the sittings of the secret supreme committee, whose existence was maintained by the Prussian police; and Mr. Stieber, finding that this book wondrously agreed with the reports already received from the same parties, at once laid it before the jury, declaring upon his oath that after serious examination and according to his fullest conviction that book was genuine. It was then that most of the absurdities reported by Hirsch were made public. You may imagine the surprise of the pretended members of that secret committee when they found things stated of them which they never knew before. Some who were baptized William, were here christened Louis or Charles; others, at the time they were at the other end of England, were made to have pronounced speeches in London; others were reported to have read letters
they never had received; they were made to have met regularly on a Thursday, when they used to have a convivial reunion, once a week, on Wednesdays; a working man, who could hardly write, figured as one of the takers of minutes and signed as such; and they all of them were made to speak in a language which, if it may be that of Prussian police stations, was certainly not that of a reunion in which literary men, favorably known in their country, formed the majority. And, to crown the whole, a receipt was forged for a sum of money, pretended to have been paid by the fabricators to the pretended secretary of the fictitious Central Committee for this book; but the existence of this pretended secretary rested merely upon a hoax that some malicious Communist had played upon the unfortunate Hirsch.

This clumsy fabrication was too scandalous an affair not to produce the contrary of its intended effect. Although the London friends of the defendants were deprived of all means to bring the facts of the case before the jury—although the letters they sent to the counsel for the defense were suppressed by the post —although the documents and affidavits they succeeded in getting into the hands of these legal gentlemen were not admitted in evidence, yet the general indignation was such that even the public accusers, nay, even Mr. Stieber—whose oath had been given as a guarantee for the authenticity of that book—were compelled to recognize it as a forgery.

This forgery, however, was not the only thing of the kind of which the police was guilty. Two or three more cases of the sort came out during the trial. The documents stolen by Reuter were interpolated by the police so as to disfigure their meaning. A paper, containing some rabid nonsense, was written in a handwriting imitating that of Dr. Marx, and for a time it was pretended that it had been written by him, until at last the prosecution was obliged to acknowledge the forgery. But for every police infamy that was proved as such, there were five or six fresh ones brought forward, which could not, at the moment, be unveiled, the defense being taken by surprise, the proofs having to be got from London, and every correspondence of the counsel for the defense with the London Communist refugees being in open court treated as complicity in the alleged plot!

That Greif and Fleury are what they are here represented to be has been stated by Mr. Stieber himself, in his evidence; as to Hirsch, he has before a London magistrate confessed that he forged the "Minute Book" by order and with the assistance of Fleury, and then made his escape from this country in order to evade a criminal prosecution.
The Government could stand few such branding disclosures as came to light during the trial. It had a jury such as the Rhenish Province had not yet seen. Six nobles, of the purest reactionist water, four Lords of Finance, two Government officials. These were not the men to look closely into the confused mass of evidence heaped before them during six weeks, when they heard it continually dinned into their ears that the defendants were the chiefs of a dreadful Communist conspiracy, got up in order to subvert everything sacred—property, family, religion, order, government and law! And yet, had not the Government, at the same time, brought it to the knowledge of the privileged classes, that an acquittal in this trial would be the signal for the suppression of the jury; and that it would be taken as a direct political demonstration—as a proof of the middle-class liberal opposition being ready to unite even with the most extreme revolutionists—the verdict would have been an acquittal. As it was, the retroactive application of the new Prussian code enabled the Government to have seven prisoners convicted, while four merely were acquitted, and those convicted were sentenced to imprisonment varying from three to six years, as you have, doubtless, already stated at the time the news reached you.

Written by Engels on November 29, 1852
Published in The New-York Daily Tribune No. 3645, December 22, 1852
Signed: Karl Marx
AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

My friend Joseph Weydemeyer,* whose death was so untimely, intended to publish a political weekly in New York starting from January 1, 1852. He invited me to provide this weekly with a history of the coup d'état. Down to the middle of February, I accordingly wrote him weekly articles under the title: The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. Meanwhile Weydemeyer's original plan had fallen through. Instead, in the spring of 1852 he began to publish a monthly, Die Revolution, the first number of which consists of my Eighteenth Brumaire. A few hundred copies of this found their way into Germany at that time, without, however, getting into the actual book trade. A German publisher of extremely radical pretensions to whom I offered the sale of my book was most virtuously horrified at a "presumption" so "contrary to the times".

From the above facts it will be seen that the present work took shape under the immediate pressure of events and its historical material does not extend beyond the month of February (1852). Its re-publication now is due in part to the demand of the book trade, in part to the urgent requests of my friends in Germany.

Of the writings dealing with the same subject approximately at the same time as mine, only two deserve notice: Victor Hugo's Napoleon the Little and Proudhon's Coup d'État.

Victor Hugo confines himself to bitter and witty invective against the responsible publisher of the coup d'état. The event itself appears in his work like a bolt from the blue. He sees in it only the violent act of a single individual. He does not notice that he makes this individual great instead of little by ascribing to him a personal power of initiative such as would be without parallel in world history. Proudhon, for his part, seeks to represent the coup d'état as the result of an antecedent historical development. Unnoticeably, however, his historical construc-
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* Military commandant of the St. Louis district during the American Civil War. [Note by Marx.]
tion of the coup d'état becomes a historical apologia for its hero. Thus he falls into the error of our so-called objective historians. I, on the contrary, demonstrate how the class struggle in France created circumstances and relationships that made it possible for a grotesque mediocrity to play a hero's part.

A revision of the present work would have robbed it of its peculiar colouring. Accordingly I have confined myself to mere correction of printer's errors and to striking out allusions now no longer intelligible.

The concluding words of my work: "But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendôme Column",¹⁹⁶ have already been fulfilled.²

Colonel Charras opened the attack on the Napoleon cult in his work on the campaign of 1815. Subsequently, and particularly in the last few years, French literature made an end of the Napoleon legend with the weapons of historical research, of criticism, of satire and of wit. Outside France this violent breach with the traditional popular belief, this tremendous mental revolution, has been little noticed and still less understood.

Lastly, I hope that my work will contribute towards eliminating the school-taught phrase now current, particularly in Germany, of so-called Caesarism. In this superficial historical analogy the main point is forgotten, namely, that in ancient Rome the class struggle took place only within a privileged minority, between the free rich and the free poor, while the great productive mass of the population, the slaves, formed the purely passive pedestal for these combatants. People forget Sismondi's significant saying: The Roman proletariat lived at the expense of society, while modern society lives at the expense of the proletariat.¹⁹⁷ With so complete a difference between the material, economic conditions of the ancient and the modern class struggles, the political figures produced by them can likewise have no more in common with one another than the Archbishop of Canterbury has with the High Priest Samuel.

Karl Marx

London, June 23, 1869

Published in the second edition of Marx's work The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte that appeared in Hamburg in July 1869

* See p. 487 of this volume.—Ed.
F. ENGELS'S PREFACE TO THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION

The fact that a new edition of The Eighteenth Brumaire has become necessary, thirty-three years after its first appearance, proves that even today this little book has lost none of its value. It was in truth a work of genius. Immediately after the event that struck the whole political world like a thunderbolt from the blue, that was condemned by some with loud cries of moral indignation and accepted by others as salvation from the revolution and as punishment for its errors, but was only wondered at by all and understood by none—immediately after this event Marx came out with a concise, epigrammatic exposition that laid bare the whole course of French history since the February days in its inner interconnection, reduced the miracle of December 2198 to a natural, necessary result of this interconnection and in so doing did not even need to treat the hero of the coup d'état otherwise than with the contempt he so well deserved. And the picture was drawn with such a master hand that every fresh disclosure since made has only provided fresh proofs of how faithfully it reflected reality. This eminent understanding of the living history of the day, this clear-sighted appreciation of events at the moment of happening, is indeed without parallel.

But for this, Marx's thorough knowledge of French history was needed. France is the land where, more than anywhere else, the historical class struggles were each time fought out to a decision, and where, consequently, the changing political forms within which they move and in which their results are summarised have been stamped in the sharpest outlines. The centre of feudalism in the Middle Ages, the model country of unified monarchy, resting on estates, since the Renaissance, France demolished feudalism in the Great Revolution and established the unalloyed rule of the bourgeoisie in a classical purity unequalled by any other European land. And the struggle of the upward-striving proletariat against the ruling bourgeoisie appeared here in an acute form unknown elsewhere. This was the reason why Marx not only studied the past history of France with particular predilection, but also followed her current history in every detail, stored up the material for future use and, consequently, events never took him by surprise.

In addition, however, there was still another circumstance. It was precisely Marx who had first discovered the great law of motion of history, the law according to which all historical struggles, whether they proceed in the political, religious, philosophical or some other ideological domain, are in fact only the more or
less clear expression of struggles of social classes, and that the existence and thereby the collisions, too, between these classes are in turn conditioned by the degree of development of their economic position, by the mode of their production and of their exchange determined by it. This law, which has the same significance for history as the law of the transformation of energy has for natural science—this law gave him here, too, the key to an understanding of the history of the Second French Republic. He put his law to the test on these historical events, and even after thirty-three years we must still say that it has stood the test brilliantly.

Frederick Engels

Written in 1885
Published in the book:
Karl Marx. Der Achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte, Hamburg, 1885

Printed according to the text of the book
Translated from the German
THE EIGHTEENTH BRUMAIRE OF LOUIS BONAPARTE

I

Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second as farce. Caussidière for Danton, Louis Blanc for Robespierre, the Montagne of 1848 to 1851 for the Montagne of 1793 to 1795, the Nephew for the Uncle. And the same caricature occurs in the circumstances attending the second edition of the eighteenth Brumaire!

Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living. And just when they seem engaged in revolutionising themselves and things, in creating something that has never yet existed, precisely in such periods of revolutionary crisis they anxiously conjure up the spirits of the past to their service and borrow from them names, battle cries and costumes in order to present the new scene of world history in this time-honoured disguise and this borrowed language. Thus Luther donned the mask of the Apostle Paul, the Revolution of 1789 to 1814 draped itself alternately as the Roman republic and the Roman empire, and the Revolution of 1848 knew nothing better to do than to parody, now 1789, now the revolutionary tradition of 1793 to 1795. In like manner a beginner who has learnt a new language always translates it back into his mother tongue, but he has assimilated the spirit of the new language and can freely express himself in it only when he finds his way in it without recalling the old and forgets his native tongue in the use of the new.

Consideration of this conjuring up of the dead of world history reveals at once a salient difference. Camille Desmoulins, Danton, Robespierre, Saint-Just, Napoleon, the heroes as well as the parties and the masses of the old French Revolution, performed the task of their time in Roman costume and with Roman phrases, the task of unchaining and setting up modern bourgeois
society. The first ones knocked the feudal basis to pieces and mowed off the feudal heads which had grown on it. The other created inside France the conditions under which alone free competition could be developed, parcelled landed property exploited and the unchained industrial productive power of the nation employed; and beyond the French borders he everywhere swept the feudal institutions away, so far as was necessary to furnish bourgeois society in France with a suitable up-to-date environment on the European Continent. The new social formation once established, the antediluvian Colossi disappeared and with them resurrected Romanity—the Brutuses, Gracchi, Publicolas, the tribunes, the senators, and Caesar himself. Bourgeois society in its sober reality had begotten its true interpreters and mouthpieces in the Says, Cousins, Royer-Collards, Benjamin Constants and Guizots; its real military leaders sat behind the office desks, and the hogheaded Louis XVIII was its political chief. Wholly absorbed in the production of wealth and in peaceful competitive struggle, it no longer comprehended that ghosts from the days of Rome had watched over its cradle. But unheroic as bourgeois society is, it nevertheless took heroism, sacrifice, terror, civil war and battles of peoples to bring it into being. And in the classically austere traditions of the Roman republic its gladiators found the ideals and the art forms, the self-deceptions that they needed in order to conceal from themselves the bourgeois limitations of the content of their struggles and to keep their enthusiasm on the high plane of the great historical tragedy. Similarly, at another stage of development, a century earlier, Cromwell and the English people had borrowed speech, passions and illusions from the Old Testament for their bourgeois revolution. When the real aim had been achieved, when the bourgeois transformation of English society had been accomplished, Locke supplanted Habakkuk.

Thus the awakening of the dead in those revolutions served the purpose of glorifying the new struggles, not of parodying the old; of magnifying the given task in imagination, not of fleeing from its solution in reality; of finding once more the spirit of revolution, not of making its ghost walk about again.

From 1848 to 1851 only the ghost of the old revolution walked about, from Marrast, the républicain en gants jaunes,* who disguised himself as the old Bailly, down to the adventurer, who hides his commonplace repulsive features under the iron death mask of Napoleon. An entire people, which had imagined that

* Republican in yellow gloves.—Ed.
by means of a revolution it had imparted to itself an accelerated power of motion, suddenly finds itself set back into a defunct epoch and, in order that no doubt as to the relapse may be possible, the old names arise again, the old chronology, the old names, the old edicts, which had long become a subject of antiquarian erudition, and the old minions of the law, who had seemed long decayed. The nation feels like that mad Englishman in Bedlam who fancies that he lives in the times of the ancient Pharaohs and daily bemoans the hard labour that he must perform in the Ethiopian mines as a gold digger, immured in this subterranean prison, a dimly burning lamp fastened to his head, the overseer of the slaves behind him with a long whip, and at the exits a confused welter of barbarian mercenaries, who understand neither the forced labourers in the mines nor one another, since they speak no common language. “And all this is expected of me,” sighs the mad Englishman, “of me, a freeborn Briton, in order to make gold for the old Pharaohs.” “In order to pay the debts of the Bonaparte family,” sighs the French nation. The Englishman, so long as he was in his right mind, could not get rid of the fixed idea of making gold. The French, so long as they were engaged in revolution, could not get rid of the memory of Napoleon, as the election of December 10 proved. They hankered to return from the perils of revolution to the flesh-pots of Egypt, and December 2, 1851 was the answer. They have not only a caricature of the old Napoleon, they have the old Napoleon himself, caricatured as he must appear in the middle of the nineteenth century.

The social revolution of the nineteenth century cannot draw its poetry from the past, but only from the future. It cannot begin with itself before it has stripped off all superstition in regard to the past. Earlier revolutions required recollections of past world history in order to drug themselves concerning their own content. In order to arrive at its own content, the revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead. There the phrase went beyond the content; here the content goes beyond the phrase.

The February Revolution was a surprise attack, a taking of the old society unawares, and the people proclaimed this unexpected stroke as a deed of world importance, ushering in a new epoch. On December 2 the February Revolution is conjured away by a cardsharper’s trick, and what seems overthrown is no longer the monarchy but the liberal concessions that were wrung from it by centuries of struggle. Instead of society having conquered a new content for itself, it seems that the state only returned to its oldest form, to the shamelessly simple domination
of the sabre and the cowl. This is the answer to the coup de main* of February 1848, given by the coup de tête** of December 1851. Easy come, easy go. Meanwhile the interval of time has not passed by unused. During the years 1848 to 1851 French society has made up, and that by an abbreviated because revolutionary method, for the studies and experiences which, in a regular, so to speak, textbook course of development, would have had to precede the February Revolution, if it was to be more than a ruffling of the surface. Society now seems to have fallen back behind its point of departure; it has in truth first to create for itself the revolutionary point of departure, the situation, the relations, the conditions under which alone modern revolution becomes serious.

Bourgeois revolutions, like those of the eighteenth century, storm swiftly from success to success; their dramatic effects outdo each other; men and things seem set in sparkling exhilaration; ecstasy is the everyday spirit; but they are short-lived; soon they have attained their zenith, and a long crapatent depression lays hold of society before it learns soberly to assimilate the results of its storm-and-stress period. On the other hand, proletarian revolutions, like those of the nineteenth century, criticise themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltrinesses of their first attempts, seem to throw down their adversary only in order that he may draw new strength from the earth and rise again, more gigantic, before them, recoil ever and anon from it. The prodigiousness of their own aims, until a situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out:

Hic Rhodus, hic salta!
Here is the rose, here dance!²⁰³

For the rest, every fairly competent observer, even if he had not followed the course of French development step by step, must have had a presentiment that an unheard-of fiasco was in store for the revolution. It was enough to hear the self-complacent howl of victory with which Messieurs the Democrats congratulated each other on the expected gracious consequences of the second Sunday in May 1852.²⁰⁴ In their minds the second Sunday in May 1852 had become a fixed idea, a dogma, like the

* Coup de main: Unexpected stroke.—Ed.
** Coup de tête: Rash act.—Ed.
day on which Christ should reappear and the millennium begin, in the minds of the Chiliasts. As ever, weakness had taken refuge in a belief in miracles, fancied the enemy overcome when he was only conjured away in imagination, and it lost all understanding of the present in a passive glorification of the future that was in store for it and of the deeds it had in petto but which it merely did not want to carry out as yet. Those heroes who seek to disprove their demonstrated incapacity by mutually offering each other their sympathy and getting together in a crowd had tied up their bundles, collected their laurel wreaths in advance and were just then engaged in discounting on the exchange market the republics in partibus for which they had already providently organised the government personnel with all the calm of their unassuming disposition. December 2 struck them like a thunderbolt from a clear sky, and the peoples that in periods of pusillanimous depression gladly let their inward apprehension be drowned out by the loudest bawlers will perchance have convinced themselves that the times are past when the cackle of geese could save the Capitol.

The Constitution, the National Assembly, the dynastic parties, the blue and the red republicans, the heroes of Africa, the thunder from the platform, the sheet lightning of the daily press, the entire literature, the political names and the intellectual reputations, the civil law and the penal code, the liberté, égalité, fraternité and the second Sunday in May 1852—all has vanished like a phantasmagoria before the spell of a man whom even his enemies do not make out to be a magician. Universal suffrage seems to have survived only for a moment, in order that with its own hand it may make its last will and testament before the eyes of all the world and declare in the name of the people itself: All that exists deserves to perish.

It is not enough to say, as the French do, that their nation was taken unawares. A nation and a woman are not forgiven the unguarded hour in which the first adventurer that came along could violate them. The riddle is not solved by such turns of speech, but merely formulated differently. It remains to be explained how a nation of thirty-six millions can be surprised and delivered unresisting into captivity by three swindlers.

Let us recapitulate in general outline the phases that the French Revolution went through from February 24, 1848, to December 1851.

Three main periods are unmistakable: the February period; May 4, 1848, to May 28, 1849: the period of the constitution of

* Mephistopheles in Goethe's Faust.—Ed.
The republic, or of the Constituent National Assembly; May 28, 1849, to December 2, 1851: the period of the constitutional republic or of the Legislative National Assembly.

The first period, from February 24, or the overthrow of Louis Philippe, to May 4, 1848, the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, the February period proper, may be described as the prologue to the revolution. Its character was officially expressed in the fact that the government improvised by it itself declared that it was provisional and, like the government, everything that was mooted, attempted or enunciated during this period proclaimed itself to be only provisional. Nothing and nobody ventured to lay claim to the right of existence and of real action. All the elements that had prepared or determined the revolution, the dynastic opposition, the republican bourgeoisie, the democratic-republican petty bourgeoisie and the social-democratic workers, provisionally found their place in the February government.

It could not be otherwise. The February days originally intended an electoral reform, by which the circle of the politically privileged among the possessing class itself was to be widened and the exclusive domination of the aristocracy of finance overthrown. When it came to the actual conflict, however, when the people mounted the barricades, the National Guard maintained a passive attitude, the army offered no serious resistance and the monarchy ran away, the republic appeared to be a matter of course. Every party construed it in its own way. Having secured it arms in hand, the proletariat impressed its stamp upon it and proclaimed it to be a social republic. There was thus indicated the general content of the modern revolution, a content which was in most singular contradiction to everything that, with the material available, with the degree of education attained by the masses, under the given circumstances and relations, could be immediately realised in practice. On the other hand, the claims of all the remaining elements that had collaborated in the February Revolution were recognised by the lion's share that they obtained in the government. In no period do we, therefore, find a more confused mixture of high-flown phrases and actual uncertainty and clumsiness, of more enthusiastic striving for innovation and more deeply-rooted domination of the old routine, of more apparent harmony of the whole of society and more profound estrangement of its elements. While the Paris proletariat still revelled in the vision of the wide prospects that had opened before it and indulged in seriously-meant discussions on social problems, the old powers of society had grouped themselves, assembled, reflected and found unexpected support in the mass of the nation, the peasants and petty bourgeois, who all at
once stormed on to the political stage, after the barriers of the July monarchy had fallen.

The second period, from May 4, 1848, to the end of May 1849, is the period of the constitution, the foundation, of the bourgeois republic. Directly after the February days not only had the dynastic opposition been surprised by the republicans and the republicans by the Socialists, but all France by Paris. The National Assembly, which met on May 4, 1848, had emerged from the national elections and represented the nation. It was a living protest against the pretensions of the February days and was to reduce the results of the revolution to the bourgeois scale. In vain the Paris proletariat, which immediately grasped the character of this National Assembly, attempted on May 15, a few days after it met, forcibly to negate its existence, to dissolve it, to disintegrate again into its constituent parts the organic form in which the proletariat was threatened by the reacting spirit of the nation. As is known, May 15 had no other result save that of removing Blanqui and his comrades, that is, the real leaders of the proletarian party, from the public stage for the entire duration of the cycle we are considering.

The bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe can be followed only by a bourgeois republic, that is to say, whereas a limited section of the bourgeoisie ruled in the name of the king, the whole of the bourgeoisie will now rule on behalf of the people. The demands of the Paris proletariat are utopian nonsense, to which an end must be put. To this declaration of the Constituent National Assembly the Paris proletariat replied with the June Insurrection, the most colossal event in the history of European civil wars. The bourgeois republic triumphed. On its side stood the aristocracy of finance, the industrial bourgeoisie, the middle class, the petty bourgeois, the army, the lumpenproletariat organised as the Mobile Guard, the intellectual lights, the clergy and the rural population. On the side of the Paris proletariat stood none but itself. More than three thousand insurgents were butchered after the victory, and fifteen thousand were transported without trial. With this defeat the proletariat passes into the background of the revolutionary stage. It attempts to press forward again on every occasion, as soon as the movement appears to make a fresh start, but with ever decreased expenditure of strength and always slighter results. As soon as one of the social strata situated above it gets into revolutionary ferment, the proletariat enters into an alliance with it and so shares all the defeats that the different parties suffer, one after

* See pp. 219-20 of this volume.—Ed.
another. But these subsequent blows become the weaker, the
greater the surface of society over which they are distributed.
The more important leaders of the proletariat in the Assembly
and in the press successively fall victims to the courts, and ever
more equivocal figures come to head it. In part it throws itself
into doctrinaire experiments, exchange banks and workers' as-
associations, hence into a movement in which it renounces the
revolutionising of the old world by means of the latter's own
great, combined resources, and seeks, rather, to achieve its
salvation behind society's back, in private fashion, within its
limited conditions of existence, and hence necessarily suffers
shipwreck. It seems to be unable either to rediscover revolution-
ary greatness in itself or to win new energy from the connec-
tions newly entered into, until all classes with which it contended
in June themselves lie prostrate beside it. But at least it succumbs
with the honours of the great, world-historic struggle; not only
France, but all Europe trembles at the June earthquake, while
the ensuing defeats of the upper classes are so cheaply bought
that they require barefaced exaggeration by the victorious party
to be able to pass for events at all, and become the more
ignominious the further the defeated party is removed from
the proletarian party.

The defeat of the June insurgents, to be sure, had now pre-
pared, had levelled the ground on which the bourgeois republic
could be founded and built up, but it had shown at the same
time that in Europe the questions at issue are other than that
of "republic or monarchy." It had revealed that here bourgeois
republic signifies the unlimited despotism of one class over other
classes. It had proved that in countries with an old civilisation,
with a developed formation of classes, with modern conditions
of production and with an intellectual consciousness in which
all traditional ideas have been dissolved by the work of centuries,
the republic signifies in general only the political form of revo-
lution of bourgeois society and not its conservative form of life,
as, for example, in the United States of North America, where,
though classes already exist, they have not yet become fixed,
but continually change and interchange their elements in
constant flux, where the modern means of production, instead of
coinciding with a stagnant surplus population, rather compen-
sate for the relative deficiency of heads and hands, and where,
finally, the feverish, youthful movement of material production,
which has to make a new world its own, has left neither time
nor opportunity for abolishing the old spirit world.

During the June days all classes and parties had united in the
party of Order against the proletarian class as the party of
Anarchy, of socialism, of communism. They had “saved” society from “the enemies of society.” They had given out the watchwords of the old society, “property, family, religion, order,” to their army as passwords and had proclaimed to the counter-revolutionary crusaders: “By this sign thou shalt conquer!”

From that moment, as soon as one of the numerous parties which had gathered under this sign against the June insurgents seeks to hold the revolutionary battlefield in its own class interest, it goes down before the cry: “Property, family, religion, order.” Society is saved just as often as the circle of its rulers contracts, as a more exclusive interest is maintained against a wider one. Every demand of the simplest bourgeois financial reform, of the most ordinary liberalism, of the most formal republicanism, of the most shallow democracy, is simultaneously castigated as an “attempt on society” and stigmatised as “socialism.” And, finally, the high priests of “the religion of order” themselves are driven with kicks from their Pythian tripods, hauled out of their beds in the darkness of night, put in prison-vans, thrown into dungeons or sent into exile; their temple is razed to the ground, their mouths are sealed, their pens broken, their law torn to pieces in the name of religion, of property, of the family, of order. Bourgeois fanatics for order are shot down on their balconies by mobs of drunken soldiers, their domestic sanctuaries profaned, their houses bombarded for amusement—in the name of property, of the family, of religion and of order. Finally, the scum of bourgeois society forms the holy phalanx of order and the hero Crapulinski* installs himself in the Tulleries as the “saviour of society.”

II

Let us pick up the threads of the development once more.

The history of the Constituent National Assembly since the June days is the history of the domination and the disintegration of the republican faction of the bourgeoisie, of that faction which is known by the names of tricolour republicans, pure republicans, political republicans, formalist republicans, etc.

Under the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe it had formed the official republican opposition and consequently a recognised component part of the political world of the day. It had its rep-

* Crapulinski: The hero of Heine’s poem, Two Knights. In this character, Heine ridicules the spendthrift Polish nobleman (“Crapulinski” comes from the French word crapule—base scoundrel). Here Marx alludes to Louis Bonaparte.—Ed.
resentatives in the Chambers and a considerable sphere of influence in the press. Its Paris organ, the *National*, was considered just as respectable in its way as the *Journal des Débats*. Its character corresponded to this position under the constitutional monarchy. It was not a faction of the bourgeoisie held together by great common interests and marked off by specific conditions of production. It was a clique of republican-minded bourgeois, writers, lawyers, officers and officials that owed its influence to the personal antipathies of the country against Louis Philippe, to memories of the old republic, to the republican faith of a number of enthusiasts, above all, however, to *French nationalism*, whose hatred of the Vienna treaties and of the alliance with England it stirred up perpetually. A large part of the following that the *National* had under Louis Philippe was due to this concealed imperialism, which could consequently confront it later, under the republic, as a deadly rival in the person of Louis Bonaparte. It fought the aristocracy of finance, as did all the rest of the bourgeois opposition. Polemics against the budget, which were closely connected in France with fighting the aristocracy of finance, procured popularity too cheaply and material for puritanical leading articles too plentifully, not to be exploited. The industrial bourgeoisie was grateful to it for its slavish defence of the French protectionist system, which it accepted, however, more on national grounds than on grounds of national economy; the bourgeoisie as a whole, for its vicious denunciation of communism and socialism. For the rest, the party of the *National* was purely republican, that is, it demanded a republican instead of a monarchist form of bourgeois rule and, above all, the lion's share of this rule. Concerning the conditions of this transformation it was by no means clear in its own mind. On the other hand, what was clear as daylight to it and was publicly acknowledged at the reform banquets in the last days of Louis Philippe, was its unpopularity with the democratic petty bourgeois and, in particular, with the revolutionary proletariat. These pure republicans, as is, indeed, the way with pure republicans, were already on the point of contenting themselves in the first instance with a regency of the Duchess of Orleans, when the February Revolution broke out and assigned their best-known representatives a place in the Provisional Government. From the start, they naturally had the confidence of the bourgeoisie and a majority in the Constituent National Assembly. The socialist elements of the Provisional Government were excluded forthwith from the Executive Commission which the National Assembly formed when it met, and the party of the *National* took advan-
tage of the outbreak of the June insurrection to discharge the Executive Commission also, and therewith to get rid of its closest rivals, the petty-bourgeois, or democratic, republicans (Ledru-Rollin, etc). Cavaignac, the general of the bourgeois republican party who commanded the June massacre, took the place of the Executive Commission with sort of dictatorial powers. Marrast, former editor-in-chief of the National, became the perpetual president of the Constituent National Assembly, and the ministries, as well as all other important posts, fell to the portion of the pure republicans.

The republican bourgeois faction, which had long regarded itself as the legitimate heir of the July monarchy, thus found its fondest hopes exceeded; it attained power, however, not as it had dreamed under Louis Philippe, through a liberal revolt of the bourgeoisie against the throne, but through a rising of the proletariat against capital, a rising laid low with grape-shot. What it had pictured to itself as the most revolutionary event turned out in reality to be the most counter-revolutionary. The fruit fell into its lap, but it fell from the tree of knowledge, not from the tree of life.

The exclusive rule of the bourgeois republicans lasted only from June 24 to December 10, 1848. It is summed up in the drafting of a republican constitution and in the state of siege of Paris.

The new Constitution was at bottom only the republicanised edition of the constitutional Charter of 1830. The narrow electoral qualification of the July monarchy, which excluded even a large part of the bourgeoisie from political rule, was incompatible with the existence of the bourgeois republic. In lieu of this qualification, the February Revolution had at once proclaimed direct universal suffrage. The bourgeois republicans could not undo this event. They had to content themselves with adding the limiting proviso of a six months' residence in the constituency. The old organisation of the administration, of the municipal system, of the judicial system, of the army, etc., continued to exist inviolate, or, where the Constitution changed them, the change concerned the table of contents, not the contents; the name, not the subject matter.

The inevitable general staff of the liberties of 1848, personal liberty, liberty of the press, of speech, of association, of assembly, of education and religion, etc., received a constitutional uniform, which made them invulnerable. For each of these liberties is proclaimed as the absolute right of the French citoyen, but always with the marginal note that it is unlimited so far as it is not limited by the "equal rights of others and the public
safety” or by “laws” which are intended to mediate just this harmony of the individual liberties with one another and with the public safety. For example: “The citizens have the right of association, of peaceful and unarmed assembly, of petition and of expressing their opinions, whether in the press or in any other way. The enjoyment of these rights has no limit save the equal rights of others and the public safety.” (Chapter II of the French Constitution, §8.)—“Education is free. Freedom of education shall be enjoyed under the conditions fixed by law and under the supreme control of the state.” (Ibidem, §9.)—“The home of every citizen is inviolable except in the forms prescribed by law.” (Chapter II, §3.) Etc., etc.—The Constitution, therefore, constantly refers to future organic laws which are to put into effect those marginal notes and regulate the enjoyment of these unrestricted liberties in such manner that they will collide neither with one another nor with the public safety. And later, these organic laws were brought into being by the friends of order and all those liberties regulated in such manner that the bourgeoisie in its enjoyment of them finds itself unhindered by the equal rights of the other classes. Where it forbids these liberties entirely to “the others” or permits enjoyment of them under conditions that are just so many police traps, this always happens solely in the interest of “public safety,” that is, the safety of the bourgeoisie, as the Constitution prescribes. In the sequel, both sides accordingly appeal with complete justice to the Constitution: the friends of order, who abrogated all these liberties, as well as the democrats, who demanded all of them. For each paragraph of the Constitution contains its own antithesis, its own Upper and Lower House, namely, liberty in the general phrase, abrogation of liberty in the marginal note. Thus, so long as the name of freedom was respected and only its actual realisation prevented, of course in a legal way, the constitutional existence of liberty remained intact, inviolate, however mortal the blows dealt to its existence in actual life.

This Constitution, made inviolable in so ingenious a manner, was nevertheless, like Achilles, vulnerable in one point, not in the heel, but in the head, or rather in the two heads in which it wound up—the Legislative Assembly, on the one hand, the President, on the other. Glance through the Constitution and you will find that only the paragraphs in which the relationship of the President to the Legislative Assembly is defined are absolute, positive, non-contradictory, incapable of distortion. For here it was a question of the bourgeois republicans safeguarding themselves. §§ 45-70 of the Constitution are so worded that the National Assembly can remove the President constitutionally,
whereas the President can remove the National Assembly only unconstitutionally, only by setting aside the Constitution itself. Here, therefore, it challenges its forcible destruction. It not only sanctifies the division of powers, like the Charter of 1830, it widens it into an intolerable contradiction. The *play of the constitutional powers*, as Guizot termed the parliamentary squabble between the legislative and executive power, is in the Constitution of 1848 continually played *va-banque.* On one side are seven hundred and fifty representatives of the people, elected by universal suffrage and eligible for re-election; they form an uncontrollable, indissoluble, indivisible National Assembly, a National Assembly that enjoys legislative omnipotence, decides in the last instance on war, peace and commercial treaties, alone possesses the right of amnesty and, by its permanence, perpetually holds the front of the stage. On the other side is the President, with all the attributes of royal power, with authority to appoint and dismiss his ministers independently of the National Assembly, with all the resources of the executive power in his hands, bestowing all posts and disposing thereby in France of the livelihoods of at least a million and a half people, for so many depend on the five hundred thousand officials and officers of every rank. He has the whole of the armed forces behind him. He enjoys the privilege of pardoning individual criminals, of suspending National Guards, of discharging, with the concurrence of the Council of State, general, cantonal and municipal councils elected by the citizens themselves. Initiative and direction are reserved to him in all treaties with foreign countries. While the Assembly constantly performs on the boards and is exposed to daily public criticism, he leads a secluded life in the Elysian Fields, and that with Article 45 of the Constitution before his eyes and in his heart, crying to him daily: "*Frère, il faut mourir!*" Your power ceases on the second Sunday of the lovely month of May in the fourth year after your election! Then your glory is at an end, the piece is not played twice and if you have debts, look to it betimes that you pay them off with the six hundred thousand francs granted you by the Constitution, unless, perchance, you should prefer to go to Clichy on the second Monday of the lovely month of May!—Thus, whereas the Constitution assigns actual power to the President, it seeks to secure moral power for the National Assembly. Apart from the fact that it is impossible to create a moral power by para-

* *Va-banque:* Staking one’s all.—*Ed.*
**"Brother, you must die!"—this is how Trappists, members of a Catholic order, greeted each other.—*Ed.*
graphs of law, the Constitution here abrogates itself once more by having the President elected by all Frenchmen through direct suffrage. While the votes of France are split up among the seven hundred and fifty members of the National Assembly, they are here, on the contrary, concentrated on a single individual. While each separate representative of the people represents only this of that party, this or that town, this or that bridgehead, or even only the mere necessity of electing some one of the seven hundred and fifty, in which neither the cause nor the man is closely examined, he is the elect of the nation and the act of his election is the trump that the sovereign people plays once every four years. The elected National Assembly stands in a metaphysical relation, but the elected President in a personal relation, to the nation. The National Assembly, indeed, exhibits in its individual representatives the manifold aspects of the national spirit, but in the President this national spirit finds its incarnation. As against the Assembly, he possesses a sort of divine right; he is President by the grace of the people.

Thetis, the sea-goddess, had prophesied to Achilles that he would die in the bloom of youth. The Constitution, which, like Achilles, had its weak spot, had also, like Achilles, its presentiment that it must go to an early death. It was sufficient for the constitution-making pure republicans to cast a glance from the lofty heaven of their ideal republic at the profane world to perceive how the arrogance of the royalists, the Bonapartists, the Democrats, the Communists as well as their own discredit grew daily in the same measure as they approached the completion of their great legislative work of art, without Thetis on this account having to leave the sea and communicate the secret to them. They sought to cheat destiny by a catch in the Constitution, through §111 of it, according to which every motion for a revision of the Constitution must be supported by at least three-quarters of the votes, cast in three successive debates between which an entire month must always lie, with the added proviso that not less than five hundred members of the National Assembly must vote. Thereby they merely made the impotent attempt still to exercise, when only a parliamentary minority, as which they already saw themselves prophetically in their mind's eye, a power which at the present moment, when they commanded a parliamentary majority and all the resources of governmental authority, was slipping daily more and more from their feeble hands.

Finally the Constitution, in a melodramatic paragraph, entrusts itself "to the vigilance and the patriotism of the whole French people and every single Frenchman," after it had pre-
viously entrusted in another paragraph the "vigilant" and "patriotic" to the tender, most painstaking care of the High Court of Justice, the "haute cour," invented by it for the purpose.

Such was the Constitution of 1848, which on December 2, 1851, was not overthrown by a head, but fell down at the touch of a mere hat; this hat, to be sure, was a three-cornered Napoleonic hat.

While the bourgeois republicans in the Assembly were busy devising, discussing and voting this Constitution, Cavaignac outside the Assembly maintained the state of siege of Paris. The state of siege of Paris was the midwife of the Constituent Assembly in its travail of republican creation. If the Constitution is subsequently put out of existence by bayonets, it must not be forgotten that it was likewise by bayonets, and these turned against the people, that it had to be protected in its mother's womb and by bayonets that it had to be brought into existence. The forefathers of the "respectable republicans" had sent their symbol, the tricolour, on a tour round Europe. They themselves in turn produced an invention that of itself made its way over the whole Continent, but returned to France with ever renewed love until it has now become naturalised in half her Departments—the state of siege. A splendid invention, periodically employed in every ensuing crisis in the course of the French Revolution. But barrack and bivouac, which were thus periodically laid on French society's head to compress its brain and render it quiet; sabre and musket, which were periodically allowed to act as judges and administrators, as guardians and censors, to play policemen and do night watchman's duty; moustache and uniform, which were periodically trumpeted forth as the highest wisdom of society and as its rector—were not barrack and bivouac, sabre and musket, moustache and uniform finally bound to hit upon the idea of rather saving society once and for all by proclaiming their own regime as the highest and freeing civil society completely from the trouble of governing itself? Barrack and bivouac, sabre and musket, moustache and uniform were bound to hit upon this idea all the more as they might then also expect better cash payment for their higher services, whereas from the merely periodical state of siege and the transient rescues of society at the bidding of this or that bourgeois faction little of substance was gleaned save some killed and wounded and some friendly bourgeois grimaces. Should not the military at last one day play state of siege in their own interest and for their own benefit, and at the same time besiege the citizens' purses? Moreover, be it noted in passing, one must not forget that Colonel Bernard, the same military
commission president who under Cavaignac had 15,000 insurgents deported without trial, is at this moment again at the head of the military commissions active in Paris.

Whereas, with the state of siege in Paris, the respectable, the pure republicans planted the nursery in which the praetorians of December 2, 1851\textsuperscript{211} were to grow up, they on the other hand deserve praise for the reason that, instead of exaggerating the national sentiment as under Louis Philippe, they now, when they had command of the national power, crawled before foreign countries, and, instead of setting Italy free, let her be reconquered by Austrians and Neapolitans\textsuperscript{212}. Louis Bonaparte's election as President on December 10, 1848, put an end to the dictatorship of Cavaignac and to the Constituent Assembly.

In § 44 of the Constitution it is stated: "The President of the French Republic must never have lost his status of a French citizen." The first President of the French republic, L. N. Bonaparte, had not merely lost his status of a French citizen, had not only been an English special constable, he was even a naturalised Swiss\textsuperscript{213}.

I have worked out elsewhere the significance of the election of December 10.\textsuperscript{*} I will not revert to it here. It is sufficient to remark here that it was a reaction of the peasants, who had had to pay the costs of the February Revolution, against the remaining classes of the nation, a reaction of the country against the town. It met with great approval in the army, for which the republicans of the National had provided neither glory nor additional pay, among the big bourgeoisie, which hailed Bonaparte as a bridge to monarchy, among the proletarians and petty bourgeoisie, who hailed him as a scourge for Cavaignac. I shall have an opportunity later of going more closely into the relationship of the peasants to the French Revolution.

The period from December 20, 1848, until the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly, in May 1849, comprises the history of the downfall of the bourgeois republicans. After having founded a republic for the bourgeoisie, driven the revolutionary proletariat out of the field and reduced the democratic petty bourgeoisie to silence for the time being, they are themselves thrust aside by the mass of the bourgeoisie, which justly impounds this republic as its property. This bourgeois mass was, however, royalist. One section of it, the large landowners, had ruled during the Restoration\textsuperscript{117} and was accordingly Legitimist.

\textsuperscript{*} See pp. 237-39 of this volume.—Ed.
The other, the aristocrats of finance and big industrialists, had ruled during the July Monarchy and was consequently Orleanist. The high dignitaries of the army, the university, the church, the bar, the academy and of the press were to be found on either side, though in various proportions. Here, in the bourgeois republic, which bore neither the name Bourbon nor the name Orleans, but the name Capital, they had found the form of state in which they could rule conjointly. The June Insurrection had already united them in the "party of Order." Now it was necessary, in the first place, to remove the coterie of bourgeois republicans who still occupied the seats of the National Assembly. Just as brutal as these pure republicans had been in their misuse of physical force against the people, just as cowardly, mealy-mouthed, broken-spirited and incapable of fighting were they now in their retreat, when it was a question of maintaining their republicanism and their legislative rights against the executive power and the royalists. I need not relate here the ignominious history of their dissolution. They did not succumb; they passed out of existence. Their history has come to an end forever, and, both inside and outside the Assembly, they figure in the following period only as memories, memories that seem to regain life whenever the mere name of Republic is once more the issue and as often as the revolutionary conflict threatens to sink down to the lowest level. I may remark in passing that the journal which gave its name to this party, the National, was converted to socialism in the following period.

Before we finish with this period we must still cast a retrospective glance at the two powers, one of which annihilated the other on December 2, 1851, whereas from December 20, 1848, until the exit of the Constituent Assembly, they had lived in conjugal relations. We mean Louis Bonaparte, on the one hand, and the party of the coalesced royalists, the party of Order, of the big bourgeoisie, on the other. On acceding to the presidency, Bonaparte at once formed a ministry of the party of Order, at the head of which he placed Odilon Barrot, the old leader, nota bene, of the most liberal faction of the parliamentary bourgeoisie. M. Barrot had at last secured the ministerial portfolio, the spectre of which had haunted him since 1830, and what is more, the premiership in the ministry; but not, as he had imagined under Louis Philippe, as the most advanced leader of the parliamentary opposition, but with the task of putting a parliament to death, and as the confederate of all his arch-enemies, Jesuits and Legitimists. He brought the bride home at last, but only after she had been prostituted.
Bonaparte seemed to efface himself completely. This party acted for him.

The very first meeting of the council of ministers resolved on the expedition to Rome, which, it was agreed, should be undertaken behind the back of the National Assembly and the means for which were to be wrested from it by false pretences. Thus they began by swindling the National Assembly and secretly conspiring with the absolutist powers abroad against the revolutionary Roman republic. In the same manner and with the same manoeuvres Bonaparte prepared his coup of December 2 against the royalist Legislative Assembly and its constitutional republic. Let us not forget that the same party which formed Bonaparte's ministry on December 20, 1848, formed the majority of the Legislative National Assembly on December 2, 1851.

In August the Constituent Assembly had decided to dissolve only after it had worked out and promulgated a whole series of organic laws that were to supplement the Constitution. On January 6, 1849, the party of Order had a deputy named Rateau move that the Assembly should let the organic laws go and rather decide on its own dissolution. Not only the ministry, with Odilon Barrot at its head, but all the royalist members of the National Assembly told it in bullying accents then that its dissolution was necessary for the restoration of credit, for the consolidation of order, for putting an end to the indefinite provisional arrangements and for establishing a definitive state of affairs; that it hampered the productivity of the new government and sought to prolong its existence merely out of malice; that the country was tired of it. Bonaparte took note of all this invective against the legislative power, learnt it by heart and proved to the parliamentary royalists, on December 2, 1851, that he had learnt from them. He reiterated their own catchwords against them.

The Barrot ministry and the party of Order went further. They caused petitions to the National Assembly to be made throughout France, in which this body was politely requested to decamp. They thus led the unorganised popular masses into the fire of battle against the National Assembly, the constitutionally organised expression of the people. They taught Bonaparte to appeal against the parliamentary assemblies to the people. At length, on January 29, 1849, the day had come on which the Constituent Assembly was to decide concerning its own dissolution. The National Assembly found the building where its sessions were held occupied by the military; Changarnier, the general of the party of Order, in whose hands
the supreme command of the National Guard and troops of the line had been united, held a great military review in Paris, as if a battle were impending, and the royalists in coalition threateningly declared to the Constituent Assembly that force would be employed if it should prove unwilling. It was willing, and got only the very short extra term of life it bargained for. What was January 29 but the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, only carried out by the royalists with Bonaparte against the republican National Assembly? The gentlemen did not observe, or did not wish to observe, that Bonaparte availed himself of January 29, 1849, to have a portion of the troops march past him in front of the Tuileries, and seized with avidity on just this first public summoning of the military power against the parliamentary power to foreshadow Caligula. They, to be sure, saw only their Changarnier.

A motive that particularly actuated the party of Order in forcibly cutting short the duration of the Constituent Assembly’s life was the organic laws supplementing the Constitution, such as the education law, the law on religious worship, etc. To the royalists in coalition it was most important that they themselves should make these laws and not let them be made by the republicans, who had grown mistrustful. Among these organic laws, however, was also a law on the responsibility of the President of the republic. In 1851 the Legislative Assembly was occupied with the drafting of just such a law, when Bonaparte anticipated this coup with the coup of December 2. What would the royalists in coalition not have given in their parliamentary winter campaign of 1851 to have found the Responsibility Law ready to hand, and drawn up, at that, by a mistrustful, hostile, republican Assembly!

After the Constituent Assembly had itself shattered its last weapon on January 29, 1849, the Barrot ministry and the friends of order hounded it to death, left nothing undone that could humiliate it and wrested from the impotent, self-despairing Assembly laws that cost it the last remnant of respect in the eyes of the public. Bonaparte, occupied with his fixed Napoleonic idea, was brazen enough to exploit publicly this degradation of the parliamentary power. For when on May 8, 1849, the National Assembly passed a vote of censure of the ministry because of the occupation of Civitavecchia* by Oudinot, and ordered it to bring back the Roman expedition to its alleged purpose, Bonaparte published the same evening in the Moniteur a letter to Oudinot, in which he congratulated him

* See pp. 248-50 of this volume.—Ed.
on his heroic exploits and, in contrast to the ink-slinging parliamentarians, already posed as the generous protector of the army. The royalists smiled at this. They regarded him simply as their dupe. Finally, when Marrast, the President of the Constituent Assembly, believed for a moment that the safety of the National Assembly was endangered and, relying on the Constitution, requisitioned a colonel and his regiment, the colonel declined, cited discipline in his support and referred Marrast to Changarnier, who scornfully refused him with the remark that he did not like *batonnettes intelligentes.* In November 1851, when the royalists in coalition wanted to begin the decisive struggle with Bonaparte, they sought to put through in their notorious *Questors' Bill* the principle of the direct requisition of troops by the President of the National Assembly. One of their generals, Le Flô, had signed the bill. In vain did Changarnier vote for it and Thiers pay homage to the far-sighted wisdom of the former Constituent Assembly. The War Minister, Saint-Arnaud, answered him as Changarnier had answered Marrast—and to the acclamation of the *Montagne!*

Thus the party of Order, when it was not yet the National Assembly, when it was still only the ministry, had itself stigmatised the parliamentary regime. And it makes an outcry when December 2, 1851 banished this regime from France!

We wish it a happy journey.

**III**

On May 28, 1849, the Legislative National Assembly met. On December 2, 1851, it was dispersed. This period covers the span of life of the constitutional, or parliamentary, republic.

In the first French Revolution the rule of the Constitutionalists is followed by the rule of the Girondins and the rule of the Girondins by the rule of the Jacobins. Each of these parties relies on the more progressive party for support. As soon as it has brought the revolution far enough to be unable to follow it further, still less to go ahead of it, it is thrust aside by the bolder ally that stands behind it and sent to the guillotine. The revolution thus moves along an ascending line.

It is the reverse with the Revolution of 1848. The proletarian party appears as an appendage of the petty-bourgeois-democratic party. It is betrayed and dropped by the latter on April 16, May 15, and in the June days. The democratic party, in its turn, leans on the shoulders of the bourgeois-republican

---

* Intellectual bayonets.—Ed.
party. The bourgeois-republicans no sooner believe themselves well established than they shake off the troublesome comrade and support themselves on the shoulders of the party of Order. The party of Order hunches its shoulders, lets the bourgeois-republicans tumble and throws itself on the shoulders of armed force. It fancies it is still sitting on its shoulders when, one fine morning, it perceives that the shoulders have transformed themselves into bayonets. Each party kicks back at the one behind, which presses upon it, and leans against the one in front, which pushes backwards. No wonder that in this ridiculous posture it loses its balance and, having made the inevitable grimaces, collapses with curious capers. The revolution thus moves in a descending line. It finds itself in this state of retrogressive motion before the last February barricade has been cleared away and the first revolutionary authority constituted.

The period that we have before us comprises the most motley mixture of crying contradictions: constitutionalists who conspire openly against the Constitution; revolutionists who are confessedly constitutional; a National Assembly that wants to be omnipotent and always remains parliamentary; a Montagne that finds its vocation in patience and counters its present defeats by prophesying future victories; royalists who form the patres conscripti* of the republic and are forced by the situation to keep the hostile royal houses, to which they adhere, abroad, and the republic, which they hate, in France; an executive power that finds its strength in its very weakness and its respectability in the contempt that it calls forth; a republic that is nothing but the combined infamy of two monarchies, the Restoration and the July Monarchy, with an imperial label—alliances whose first proviso is separation; struggles whose first law is indecision; wild, inane agitation in the name of tranquillity, most solemn preaching of tranquillity in the name of revolution; passions without truth, truths without passion; heroes without heroic deeds, history without events; development, whose sole driving force seems to be the calendar, wearying with constant repetition of the same tensions and relaxations; antagonisms that periodically seem to work themselves up to a climax only to lose their sharpness and fall away without being able to resolve themselves; pretentiously paraded exertions and philistine terror at the danger of the world coming to an end, and at the same time the pettiest intrigues and court comedies played by the world

* Patres conscripti: Senators.—Ed.
redeemers, who in their *laisser aller* remind us less of the Day of Judgement than of the times of the Fronde—216—the official collective genius of France brought to naught by the artful stupidity of a single individual; the collective will of the nation, as often as it speaks through universal suffrage, seeking its appropriate expression through the inveterate enemies of the interests of the masses, until at length it finds it in the self-will of a filibuster. If any section of history has been painted grey on grey, it is this. Men and events appear as inverted Schlemihls, as shadows that have lost their bodies. The revolution itself paralyses its own bearers and endows only its adversaries with passionate forcefulness. When the "red spectre," continually conjured up and exorcised by the counter-revolutionaries, finally appears, it appears not with the Phrygian cap of anarchy on its head, but in the uniform of order, in *red breeches*.

We have seen that the ministry which Bonaparte installed on December 20, 1848, on his Ascension Day, was a ministry of the party of Order, of the Legitimist and Orleanist coalition. This Barrot-Falloux ministry had outlived the republican Constituent Assembly, whose term of life it had more or less violently cut short, and found itself still at the helm. Changarnier, the general of the allied royalists, continued to unite in his person the general command of the First Army Division and of the National Guard of Paris. Finally, the general elections had secured the party of Order a large majority in the National Assembly. Here the deputies and peers of Louis Philippe encountered a hallowed host of Legitimists, for whom many of the nation's ballots had become transformed into admission cards to the political stage. The Bonapartist representatives of the people were too sparse to be able to form an independent parliamentary party. They appeared merely as the *mauvaise queue* of the party of Order. Thus the party of Order was in possession of the governmental power, the army and the legislative body, in short, of the whole of the state power; it had been morally strengthened by the general elections, which made its rule appear as the will of the people, and by the simultaneous triumph of the counter-revolution on the whole continent of Europe.

Never did a party open its campaign with greater resources or under more favourable auspices.

The shipwrecked *pure republicans* found that they had melted

---

*x* Laisser aller: Letting things take their course.—Ed.

**Mauvaise queue**: Evil appendage.—Ed.
down to a clique of about fifty men in the Legislative National Assembly, the African generals Cavaignac, Lamoricière and Bedeau at their head. The great opposition party, however, was formed by the Montagne. The social-democratic party had given itself this parliamentary baptismal name. It commanded more than two hundred of the seven hundred and fifty votes of the National Assembly and was consequently at least as powerful as any one of the three factions of the party of Order taken by itself. Its numerical inferiority compared with the entire royalist coalition seemed compensated by special circumstances. Not only did the elections in the Departments show that it had gained a considerable following among the rural population. It counted in its ranks almost all the deputies from Paris; the army had made a confession of democratic faith by the election of three non-commissioned officers, and the leader of the Montagne, Ledru-Rollin, in contradistinction to all the representatives of the party of Order, had been raised to the parliamentary peerage by five Departments, which had pooled their votes for him. In view of the inevitable clashes of the royalists among themselves and of the whole party of Order with Bonaparte, the Montagne thus seemed to have all the elements of success before it on May 28, 1849. A fortnight later it had lost everything, honour included.

Before we pursue parliamentary history further, some remarks are necessary to avoid common misconceptions regarding the whole character of the epoch that lies before us. Looked at with the eyes of democrats, the period of the Legislative National Assembly is concerned with what the period of the Constituent Assembly was concerned with: the simple struggle between republicans and royalists. The movement itself, however, they sum up in the one shibboleth: "reaction"—night, in which all cats are grey and which permits them to reel off their night watchman's commonplaces. And, to be sure, at first sight the party of Order reveals a maze of different royalist factions, which not only intrigue against each other—each seeking to elevate its own pretender to the throne and exclude the pretender of the opposing faction—but also all unite in common hatred of, and common onslaughts on, the "republic." In opposition to this royalist conspiracy the Montagne, for its part, appears as the representative of the "republic." The party of Order appears to be perpetually engaged in a "reaction," directed against press, association and the like, neither more nor less than in Prussia, and which, as in Prussia, is carried out in the form of brutal police intervention by the bureaucracy, the gendarmerie and the law courts. The "Montagne," for its
part, is just as continually occupied in warding off these attacks and thus defending the "eternal rights of man" as every so-called people's party has done, more or less, for a century and a half. If one looks at the situation and the parties more closely, however, this superficial appearance, which veils the class struggle and the peculiar physiognomy of this period, disappears.

Legitimists and Orleanists, as we have said, formed the two great factions of the party of Order. Was that which held these factions fast to their pretenders and kept them apart from one another nothing but lily and tricolour, House of Bourbon and House of Orleans, different shades of royalism, was it at all the confession of faith of royalism? Under the Bourbons, big landed property had governed, with its priests and lackeys; under the Orleans, high finance, large-scale industry, large-scale trade, that is, capital, with its retinue of lawyers, professors and smooth-tongued orators. The Legitimate Monarchy was merely the political expression of the hereditary rule of the lords of the soil, as the July Monarchy was only the political expression of the usurped rule of the bourgeois parvenus. What kept the two factions apart, therefore, was not any so-called principles, it was their material conditions of existence, two different kinds of property, it was the old contrast between town and country, the rivalry between capital and landed property. That at the same time old memories, personal enmities, fears and hopes, prejudices and illusions, sympathies and antipathies, convictions, articles of faith and principles bound them to one or the other royal house, who is there that denies this? Upon the different forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, rises an entire superstructure of distinct and peculiarly formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought and views of life. The entire class creates and forms them out of its material foundations and out of the corresponding social relations. The single individual, who derives them through tradition and upbringing, may imagine that they form the real motives and the starting-point of his activity. While Orleanists and Legitimists, while each faction sought to make itself and the other believe that it was loyalty to their two royal houses which separated them, facts later proved that it was rather their divided interests which forbade the uniting of the two royal houses. And as in private life one differentiates between what a man thinks and says of himself and what he really is and does, so in historical struggles one must distinguish still more the phrases and fancies of parties from their real organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves, from their reality.
Orleanists and Legitimists found themselves side by side in the republic, with equal claims. If each side wished to effect the restoration of its own royal house against the other, that merely signified that each of the two great interests into which the bourgeoisie is split—landed property and capital—sought to restore its own supremacy and the subordination of the other. We speak of two interests of the bourgeoisie, for large landed property, despite its feudal coquetry and pride of race, has been rendered thoroughly bourgeois by the development of modern society. Thus the Tories in England long imagined that they were enthusiastic about monarchy, the church and the beauties of the old English Constitution, until the day of danger wrung from them the confession that they are enthusiastic only about ground rent.

The royalists in coalition carried on their intrigues against one another in the press, in Ems,\textsuperscript{126} in Claremont,\textsuperscript{127} outside parliament. Behind the scenes they donned their old Orleanist and Legitimist liveries again and once more engaged in their old tournneys. But on the public stage, in their grand performances of state, as a great parliamentary party, they put off their respective royal houses with mere obeisances and adjourn the restoration of the monarchy \textit{ad infinitum}.\footnote{To infinity.—\textit{Ed.}} They do their real business as the party of Order, that is, under a social, not under a political title; as representatives of the bourgeois world-order, not as knights of errant princesses; as the bourgeois class against other classes, not as royalists against the republicans. And as the party of Order they exercised more unrestricted and sterner domination over the other classes of society than ever previously under the Restoration or under the July Monarchy, a domination which, in general, was only possible under the form of the parliamentary republic, for only under this form could the two great divisions of the French bourgeoisie unite, and thus put the rule of their class instead of the regime of a privileged faction of it on the order of the day. If, nevertheless, they, as the party of Order, also insulted the republic and expressed their repugnance to it, this happened not merely from royalist memories. Instinct taught them that the republic, true enough, makes their political rule complete, but at the same time undermines its social foundation, since they must now confront the subjugated classes and contend against them without mediation, without the concealment afforded by the crown, without being able to divert the national interest by their subordinate struggles among themselves and with the
monarchy. It was a feeling of weakness that caused them to recoil from the pure conditions of their own class rule and to yearn for the former more incomplete, more undeveloped and precisely on that account less dangerous forms of this rule. On the other hand, every time the royalists in coalition come in conflict with the pretender that confronts them, with Bonaparte, every time they believe their parliamentary omnipotence endangered by the executive power, every time, therefore, that they must produce their political title to their rule, they come forward as republicans and not as royalists, from the Orleanist Thiers, who warns the National Assembly that the republic divides them least, to the Legitimist Berryer, who, on December 2, 1851, as a tribune swathed in a tricoloured sash, harangues the people assembled before the town hall of the tenth arrondissement in the name of the republic. To be sure, a mocking echo calls back to him: Henry V! Henry V!

As against the coalesced bourgeoisie, a coalition between petty bourgeois and workers had been formed, the so-called social-democratic party. The petty bourgeois saw that they were badly rewarded after the June days of 1848, that their material interests were imperilled and that the democratic guarantees which were to ensure the effectuation of these interests were called in question by the counter-revolution. Accordingly, they came closer to the workers. On the other hand, their parliamentary representation, the Montagne, thrust aside during the dictatorship of the bourgeois republicans, had in the last half of the life of the Constituent Assembly reconquered its lost popularity through the struggle with Bonaparte and the royalist ministers. It had concluded an alliance with the socialist leaders. In February 1849, banquets celebrated the reconciliation. A joint programme was drafted, joint election committees were set up and joint candidates put forward. From the social demands of the proletariat the revolutionary point was broken off and a democratic turn given to them; from the democratic claims of the petty bourgeoisie the purely political form was stripped off and their socialist point thrust forward. Thus arose the Social-Democracy. The new Montagne, the result of this combination, contained, apart from some supernumeraries from the working class and some socialist sectarians, the same elements as the old Montagne, only numerically stronger. However, in the course of development, it had changed with the class that it represented. The peculiar character of the Social-Democracy is epitomised in the fact that democratic-republican institutions are demanded as a means, not of doing away with two extremes, capital and wage labour, but of weakening their
antagonism and transforming it into harmony. However different the means proposed for the attainment of this end may be, however much it may be trimmed with more or less revolutionary notions, the content remains the same. This content is the transformation of society in a democratic way, but a transformation within the bounds of the petty bourgeoisie. Only one must not form the narrow-minded notion that the petty bourgeoisie, on principle, wishes to enforce an egoistic class interest. Rather, it believes that the special conditions of its emancipation are the general conditions within the frame of which alone modern society can be saved and the class struggle avoided. Just as little must one imagine that the democratic representatives are indeed all shopkeepers or enthusiastic champions of shopkeepers. According to their education and their individual position they may be as far apart as heaven from earth. What makes them representatives of the petty bourgeoisie is the fact that in their minds they do not get beyond the limits which the latter do not get beyond in life, that they are consequently driven, theoretically, to the same problems and solutions to which material interest and social position drive the latter practically. This is, in general, the relationship between the political and literary representatives of a class and the class they represent.

After the analysis given, it is obvious that if the Montagne continually contends with the party of Order for the republic and the so-called rights of man, neither the republic nor the rights of man are its final end, any more than an army which one wants to deprive of its weapons and which resists has taken the field in order to remain in possession of its own weapons.

Immediately, as soon as the National Assembly met, the party of Order provoked the Montagne. The bourgeoisie now felt the necessity of making an end of the democratic petty bourgeois, just as a year before it had realised the necessity of settling with the revolutionary proletariat. Only the situation of the adversary was different. The strength of the proletarian party lay in the streets, that of the petty bourgeois in the National Assembly itself. It was therefore a question of decoying them out of the National Assembly into the streets and causing them to smash their parliamentary power themselves, before time and circumstances could consolidate it. The Montagne rushed headlong into the trap.

The bombardment of Rome by the French troops* was the bait that was thrown to it. It violated Article V of the Constitu-

* See pp. 248-50 of this volume.—Ed.
tion which forbids the French republic to employ its military forces against the freedom of another people. In addition to this, Article 54 prohibited any declaration of war on the part of the executive power without the assent of the National Assembly, and by its resolution of May 8, the Constituent Assembly had disapproved of the Roman expedition. On these grounds Ledru-Rollin brought in a bill of impeachment against Bonaparte and his ministers on June 11, 1849. Exasperated by the wasp stings of Thiers, he actually let himself be carried away to the point of threatening that he would defend the Constitution by every means, even with arms in hand. The Montagne rose to a man and repeated this call to arms. On June 12, the National Assembly rejected the bill of impeachment, and the Montagne left the parliament. The events of June 13 are known: the proclamation issued by a section of the Montagne, declaring Bonaparte and his ministers “outside the Constitution”; the street procession of the democratic National Guards, who, unarmed as they were, dispersed on encountering the troops of Changarnier, etc., etc. A part of the Montagne fled abroad; another part was arraigned before the High Court at Bourges, and a parliamentary regulation subjected the remainder to the schoolmasterly surveillance of the President of the National Assembly. Paris was again declared in a state of siege and the democratic part of its National Guard dissolved. Thus the influence of the Montagne in parliament and the power of the petty bourgeois in Paris were broken.

Lyons, where June 13 had given the signal for a bloody insurrection of the workers, was, along with the five surrounding Departments, likewise declared in a state of siege, a condition that has continued up to the present moment.

The bulk of the Montagne had left its vanguard in the lurch, having refused to subscribe to its proclamation. The press had deserted, only two journals having dared to publish the pronunciamento. The petty bourgeois betrayed their representatives, in that the National Guards either stayed away or, where they appeared, hindered the erection of barricades. The representatives had duped the petty bourgeois, in that the alleged allies from the army were nowhere to be seen. Finally, instead of gaining an accession of strength from it, the democratic party had infected the proletariat with its own weakness and, as is usual with the great deeds of democrats, the leaders had the satisfaction of being able to charge their “people” with desertion, and the people the satisfaction of being able to charge its leaders with humbugging it.

Seldom had an action been announced with more noise than
the impending campaign of the Montagne, seldom had an event been trumpeted with greater certainty or longer in advance than the inevitable victory of the democracy. Most assuredly, the democrats believe in the trumpets before whose blasts the walls of Jericho fell down. And as often as they stand before the ramparts of despotism, they seek to imitate the miracle. If the Montagne wished to triumph in parliament, it should not have called to arms. If it called to arms in parliament, it should not have acted in parliamentary fashion in the streets. If the peaceful demonstration was meant seriously, then it was folly not to foresee that it would be given a war-like reception. If a real struggle was intended, then it was a queer idea to lay down the weapons with which it would have to be waged. But the revolutionary threats of the petty bourgeois and their democratic representatives are mere attempts to intimidate the antagonist. And when they have run into a blind alley, when they have sufficiently compromised themselves to make it necessary to give effect to their threats, then this is done in an ambiguous fashion that avoids nothing so much as the means to the end and tries to find excuses for succumbing. The blaring overture that announced the contest dies away in a pusillanimous snarl as soon as the struggle has to begin, the actors cease to take themselves au sérieux, and the action collapses completely, like a pricked bubble.

No party exaggerates its means more than the democratic, none deludes itself more light-mindedly over the situation. Since a section of the army had voted for it, the Montagne was now convinced that the army would revolt for it. And on what occasion? On an occasion which, from the standpoint of the troops, had no other meaning than that the revolutionists took the side of the Roman soldiers against the French soldiers. On the other hand, the recollections of June 1848 were still too fresh to allow of anything but a profound aversion on the part of the proletariat towards the National Guard and a thorough-going mistrust of the democratic chiefs on the part of the chiefs of the secret societies. To iron out these differences, it was necessary for great, common interests to be at stake. The violation of an abstract paragraph of the Constitution could not provide these interests. Had not the Constitution been repeatedly violated, according to the assurance of the democrats themselves? Had not the most popular journals branded it as counter-revolutionary botch-work? But the democrat, because he represents the petty bourgeoisie, that is, a transition class, in which the interests of two classes are simultaneously mutually blunted, imagines himself elevated above class antagonism
generally. The democrats concede that a privileged class confronts them, but they, along with all the rest of the nation, form the people. What they represent is the people's rights; what interests them is the people's interests. Accordingly, when a struggle is impending, they do not need to examine the interests and positions of the different classes. They do not need to weigh their own resources too critically. They have merely to give the signal and the people, with all its inexhaustible resources, will fall upon the oppressors. Now, if in the performance their interests prove to be uninteresting and their potency impotence, then either the fault lies with pernicious sophists, who split the indivisible people into different hostile camps, or the army was too brutalised and blinded to comprehend that the pure aims of democracy are the best thing for it itself, or the whole thing has been wrecked by a detail in its execution, or else an unforeseen accident has this time spoil the game. In any case, the democrat comes out of the most disgraceful defeat just as immaculate as he was innocent when he went into it, with the newly-won conviction that he is bound to win, not that he himself and his party have to give up the old standpoint, but, on the contrary, that conditions have to ripen to suit him.

Accordingly, one must not imagine the Montagne, decimated and broken though it was, and humiliated by the new parliamentary regulation, as being particularly miserable. If June 13 had removed its chiefs, it made room, on the other hand, for men of lesser calibre, whom this new position flattered. If their impotence in parliament could no longer be doubted, they were entitled now to confine their actions to outbursts of moral indignation and blustering declamation. If the party of Order affected to see embodied in them, as the last official representatives of the revolution, all the terrors of anarchy, they could in reality be all the more insipid and modest. They consoled themselves, however, for June 13 with the profound utterance: But if they dare to attack universal suffrage, well then—then we'll show them what we are made of! Nous verrons!*

So far as the Montagnards who fled abroad are concerned, it is sufficient to remark here that Ledru-Rollin, because in barely a fortnight he had succeeded in ruining irretrievably the powerful party at whose head he stood, now found himself called upon to form a French government in partibus; that to the extent that the level of the revolution sank and the official bigwigs of official France became more dwarf-like, his figure

* We shall see.—Ed.
in the distance, removed from the scene of action, seemed to
grow in stature; that he could figure as the republican pretender
for 1852, and that he issued periodical circulars to the
Wallachians and other peoples, in which the despots of the
Continent are threatened with the deeds of himself and his
confederates. Was Proudhon altogether wrong when he cried
to these gentlemen: "Vous n'êtes que des blagueurs"?*

On June 13, the party of Order had not only broken the
Montagne, it had effected the subordination of the Constitution
to the majority decisions of the National Assembly. And it
understood the republic thus: that the bourgeoisie rules here
in parliamentary forms, without, as in a monarchy, encounter-
ing any barrier such as the veto power of the executive or the
right to dissolve parliament. This was a parliamentary
republic, as Thiers termed it. But whereas on June 13 the bour-
geoisie secured its omnipotence within the house of parliament,
did it not afflict parliament itself, as against the executive
authority and the people, with incurable weakness by expelling
its most popular part? By surrendering numerous deputies
without further ado on the demand of the courts, it abolished
its own parliamentary immunity. The humiliating regulations
to which it subjected the Montagne exalted the President of
the republic in the same measure as they degraded the individ-
ual representatives of the people. By branding an insurrection
for the protection of the constitutional charter an anarchic act
aiming at the subversion of society, it precluded the possibility
of its appealing to insurrection should the executive authority
violate the Constitution in relation to it. And by the irony of
history, the general who on Bonaparte's instructions bombard-
ed Rome and thus provided the immediate occasion for the
constitutional revolt of June 13, that very Oudinot had to be
the man offered by the party of Order imploringly and un-
availingy to the people as general on behalf of the Constitution
against Bonaparte on December 2, 1851. Another hero of
June 13, Vieyra, who was lauded from the tribune of the
National Assembly for the brutalities that he had committed
in the democratic newspaper offices at the head of a gang of
National Guards belonging to high finance circles—this same
Vieyra had been initiated into Bonaparte's conspiracy and he
essentially contributed to depriving the National Assembly in
the hour of its death of any protection by the National Guard.

June 13 had still another meaning. The Montagne had wanted
to force the impeachment of Bonaparte. Its defeat was therefore

* "You are nothing but windbags."—Ed.
a direct victory for Bonaparte, his personal triumph over his democratic enemies. The party of Order gained the victory; Bonaparte had only to cash in on it. He did so. On June 14 a proclamation could be read on the walls of Paris in which the President, reluctantly, against his will, as it were, compelled by the sheer force of events, comes forth from his cloistered seclusion and, posing as misunderstood virtue, complains of the calumnies of his opponents and, while he seems to identify his person with the cause of order, rather identifies the cause of order with his person. Moreover, the National Assembly had, it is true, subsequently approved the expedition against Rome, but Bonaparte had taken the initiative in the matter. After having re-installed the High Priest Samuel in the Vatican, he could hope to enter the Tuileries\(^2\) as King David. He had won the priests over to his side.

The revolt of June 13 was confined, as we have seen, to a peaceful street procession. No war laurels were, therefore, to be won against it. Nevertheless, at a time as poor as this in heroes and events, the party of Order transformed this bloodless battle into a second Austerlitz.\(^2\) Platform and press praised the army as the power of order, in contrast to the popular masses, representing the impotence of anarchy, and extolled Changarnier as the "bulwark of society," a deception in which he himself finally came to believe. Surreptitiously, however, the corps that seemed doubtful were transferred from Paris, the regiments which had shown at the elections the most democratical sentiments were banished from France to Algiers, the turbulent spirits among the troops were relegated to penal detachments, and finally the isolation of the press from the barracks and of the barracks from bourgeois society was systematically carried out.

Here we have reached the decisive turning-point in the history of the French National Guard. In 1830 it was decisive in the overthrow of the Restoration. Under Louis Philippe every rebellion miscarried in which the National Guard stood on the side of the troops. When in the February days of 1848 it evinced a passive attitude towards the insurrection and an equivocal one towards Louis Philippe, he gave himself up for lost and actually was lost. Thus the conviction took root that the revolution could not be victorious \textit{without} the National Guard, nor the army \textit{against} it. This was the superstition of the army in regard to civilian omnipotence. The June days of 1848, when the entire National Guard, with the troops of the line, put down the insurrection, had strengthened the superstition. After Bonaparte's assumption of office, the position of the National Guard was to
some extent weakened by the unconstitutional union, in the person of Changarnier, of the command of its forces with the command of the First Army Division.

Just as the command of the National Guard appeared here as an attribute of the military commander-in-chief, so the National Guard itself appeared as only an appendage of the troops of the line. Finally, on June 13 its power was broken, and not only by its partial disbandment, which from this time on was periodically repeated all over France, until mere fragments of it were left behind. The demonstration of June 13 was, above all, a demonstration of the democratic National Guards. They had not, to be sure, borne their arms, but worn their uniforms against the army; precisely in this uniform, however, lay the talisman. The army convinced itself that this uniform was a piece of woollen cloth like any other. The spell was broken. In the June days of 1848, bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie had united as the National Guard with the army against the proletariat; on June 13, 1849, the bourgeoisie let the petty-bourgeois National Guard be dispersed by the army; on December 2, 1851, the National Guard of the bourgeoisie itself had vanished, and Bonaparte merely registered this fact when he subsequently signed the decree for its disbandment. Thus the bourgeoisie had itself smashed its last weapon against the army, but it had to smash it the moment the petty bourgeoisie no longer stood behind it as a vassal, but before it as a rebel, as in general it was bound to destroy all its means of defence against absolutism with its own hand as soon as it had itself become absolute.

Meanwhile, the party of Order celebrated the reconquest of a power that seemed lost in 1848 only to be found again, freed from its restraints, in 1849, celebrated by means of invectives against the republic and the Constitution, of curses on all future, present and past revolutions, including that which its own leaders had made, and in laws by which the press was muzzled, association destroyed and the state of siege regulated as an organic institution. The National Assembly then adjourned from the middle of August to the middle of October, after having appointed a permanent commission for the period of its absence. During this recess the Legitimists intrigued with Ems, the Orleanists—with Claremont, Bonaparte—by means of princely tours, and the Departmental Councils—in deliberations on a revision of the Constitution: incidents which regularly recur in the periodic recesses of the National Assembly and which I propose to discuss only when they become events. Here it may merely be remarked, in addition, that it was impolitic for the National Assembly to disappear for considerable intervals from
the stage and leave only a single, albeit a sorry, figure to be seen at the head of the republic, that of Louis Bonaparte, while to the scandal of the public the party of Order fell asunder into its royalist component parts and followed its conflicting desires for Restoration. As often as the confused noise of parliament grew silent during these recesses and its body dissolved in the nation, it became unmistakably clear that only one thing was still wanting to complete the true form of this republic: to make the former’s recess permanent and replace the latter’s inscription: Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité by the unambiguous words: Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery!

IV

In the middle of October 1849, the National Assembly met once more. On November 1, Bonaparte surprised it with a message in which he announced the dismissal of the Barrot-Falloux ministry and the formation of a new ministry. No one has ever sacked lackeys with less ceremony than Bonaparte his ministers. The kicks that were intended for the National Assembly were given in the meantime to Barrot and Co.

The Barrot ministry, as we have seen, had been composed of Legitimists and Orleanists, a ministry of the party of Order. Bonaparte had needed it to dissolve the republican Constituent Assembly, to bring about the expedition against Rome and to break the democratic party. Behind this ministry he had seemingly effaced himself, surrendered governmental power into the hands of the party of Order and donned the modest character mask that the responsible editor of a newspaper wore under Louis Philippe, the mask of the homme de paille. He now threw off a mask which was no longer the light veil behind which he could hide his physiognomy, but an iron mask which prevented him from displaying a physiognomy of his own. He had appointed the Barrot ministry in order to blast the republican National Assembly in the name of the party of Order; he dismissed it in order to declare his own name independent of the National Assembly of the party of Order.

Plausible pretexts for this dismissal were not lacking. The Barrot ministry neglected even the decencies that would have let the President of the republic appear as a power side by side with the National Assembly. During the recess of the National Assembly Bonaparte published a letter to Edgar Ney in which

---

* Homme de paille: man of straw.—Ed.
he seemed to disapprove of the illiberal attitude of the Pope,*
just as in opposition to the Constituent Assembly he had pub-
lished a letter in which he commended Oudinot for the attack on
the Roman republic.** When the National Assembly now voted
the budget for the Roman expedition, Victor Hugo, out of alleged
liberalism, brought up this letter for discussion. The party of
Order with scornfully incredulous outcries stifled the idea that
Bonaparte's ideas could have any political importance. Not one
of the ministers took up the gauntlet for him. On another
occasion Barrot, with his well-known hollow rhetoric, let fall
from the platform words of indignation concerning the "abomi-
nable intrigues" that, according to his assertion, went on in the
immediate entourage of the President. Finally, while the
ministry obtained from the National Assembly a widow's pen-
sion for the Duchess of Orleans it rejected any proposal to in-
crease the Civil List of the President. And in Bonaparte the
imperial pretender was so intimately bound up with the adven-
turer down on his luck that the one great idea, that he was called
to restore the empire, was always supplemented by the other,
that it was the mission of the French people to pay his debts.

The Barrot-Falloux ministry was the first and last parliamen-
tary ministry that Bonaparte brought into being. Its dismissal
forms, accordingly, a decisive turning-point. With it the party of
Order lost, never to reconquer it, an indispensable post for the
maintenance of the parliamentary regime, the lever of executive
power. It is immediately obvious that in a country like France,
where the executive power commands an army of officials
numbering more than half a million individuals and therefore
constantly maintains an immense mass of interests and liveli-
hoods in the most absolute dependence; where the state en-
meshes, controls, regulates, superintends and tutors civil society
from its most comprehensive manifestations of life down to its
most insignificant stirrings, from its most general modes of being
to the private existence of individuals; where through the most
extraordinary centralisation this parasitic body acquires a
ubiquity, an omniscience, a capacity for accelerated mobility
and an elasticity which finds a counterpart only in the helpless
dependence, in the loose shapelessness of the actual body politic
—it is obvious that in such a country the National Assembly
forfeits all real influence when it loses command of the min-
isterial posts, if it does not at the same time simplify the admin-
istration of the state, reduce the army of officials as far as

* Pius IX.—Ed.
** See p. 250 of this volume.—Ed.
possible and, finally, let civil society and public opinion create organs of their own, independent of the governmental power. But it is precisely with the maintenance of that extensive state machine in its numerous ramifications that the material interests of the French bourgeoisie are interwoven in the closest fashion. Here it finds posts for its surplus population and makes up in the form of state salaries for what it cannot pocket in the form of profit, interest, rents and honorariums. On the other hand, its political interests compelled it to increase daily the repressive measures and therefore the resources and the personnel of the state power, while at the same time it had to wage an uninterrupted war against public opinion and mistrustfully mutilate, cripple, the independent organs of the social movement, where it did not succeed in amputating them entirely. Thus the French bourgeoisie was compelled by its class position to annihilate, on the one hand, the vital conditions of all parliamentary power, and therefore, likewise, of its own, and to render irresistible, on the other hand, the executive power hostile to it.

The new ministry was called the d'Hautpoul ministry. Not in the sense that General d'Hautpoul had received the rank of Prime Minister. Rather, simultaneously with Barrot's dismissal, Bonaparte abolished this dignity, which, true enough, condemned the President of the republic to the status of the legal nonentity of a constitutional monarch, but of a constitutional monarch without throne or crown, without sceptre or sword, without irresponsibility, without imprescriptible possession of the highest state dignity, and, worst of all, without a Civil List. The d'Hautpoul ministry contained only one man of parliamentary standing, the moneylender Fould, one of the most notorious of the high financiers. To his lot fell the ministry of finance. Look up the quotations on the Paris bourse and you will find that from November 1, 1849, onwards the French fonds* rise and fall with the rise and fall of Bonapartist stocks. While Bonaparte had thus found his ally in the bourse, he at the same time took possession of the police by appointing Carlier Police Prefect of Paris.

Only in the course of development, however, could the consequences of the change of ministers come to light. To begin with, Bonaparte had taken a step forward only to be driven backward all the more conspicuously. His brusque message was followed by the most servile declaration of allegiance to the National Assembly. As often as the ministers dared to make a diffident attempt to introduce his personal fads as legislative proposals, they themselves seemed to carry out, against their

---

* Fonds: Government securities.—Ed.
will only and compelled by their position, comical commissions of whose fruitlessness they were persuaded in advance. As often as Bonaparte blurted out his intentions behind the ministers’ backs and played with his “idées napoléoniennes,” his own ministers disavowed him from the tribune of the National Assembly. His usurpatory longings seemed to make themselves heard only in order that the malicious laughter of his opponents might not be muted. He behaved like an unrecognised genius, whom all the world takes for a simpleton. Never did he enjoy the contempt of all classes in fuller measure than during this period. Never did the bourgeoisie rule more absolutely, never did it display more ostentatiously the insignia of domination.

I have not here to write the history of its legislative activity, which is summarised during this period in two laws: in the law re-establishing the wine tax and the education law abolishing unbelief. If wine drinking was made harder for the French, they were presented all the more plentifully with the water of true life. If in the law on the wine tax the bourgeoisie declared the old, hateful French tax system to be inviolable, it sought through the education law to ensure among the masses the old state of mind that put up with the tax system. One is astonished to see the Orleanists, the liberal bourgeois, these old apostles of Voltaireanism and eclectic philosophy, entrust to their hereditary enemies, the Jesuits, the superintendence of the French mind. However, in regard to the pretenders to the throne, Orleanists and Legitimists could part company, they understood that to secure their united rule necessitated the uniting of the means of repression of two epochs, that the means of subjugation of the July Monarchy had to be supplemented and strengthened by the means of subjugation of the Restoration.

The peasants, disappointed in all their hopes, crushed more than ever by the low level of grain prices on the one hand, and by the growing burden of taxes and mortgage debts on the other, began to bestir themselves in the Departments. They were answered by a drive against the schoolmasters, who were made subject to the clergy, by a drive against the maires,* who were made subject to the prefects, and by a system of espionage, to which all were made subject. In Paris and the large towns reaction itself has the physiognomy of its epoch and challenges more than it strikes down. In the countryside it becomes dull, coarse, petty, tiresome and vexatious, in a word, the gendarme. One comprehends how three years of the regime of the gendarme,

* Maires: Mayors.—Ed.
consecrated by the regime of the priest, were bound to demoralise immature masses.

Whatever amount of passion and declamation might be employed by the party of Order against the minority from the tribune of the National Assembly, its speech remained as monosyllabic as that of the Christians, whose words were to be: Yea, yea; nay, nay! As monosyllabic on the platform as in the press. Flat as a riddle whose answer is known in advance. Whether it was a question of the right of petition or the tax on wine, freedom of the press or free trade, the clubs or the municipal charter, protection of personal liberty or regulation of the state budget, the watchword constantly recurs, the theme remains always the same, the verdict is ever ready and invariably reads: "Socialism!" Even bourgeois liberalism is declared socialistic, bourgeois enlightenment socialistic, bourgeois financial reform socialistic. It was socialistic to build a railway, where a canal already existed, and it was socialistic to defend oneself with a cane when one was attacked with a rapier.

This was not merely a figure of speech, fashion or party tactics. The bourgeoisie had a true insight into the fact that all the weapons which it had forged against feudalism turned their points against itself, that all the means of education which it had produced rebelled against its own civilisation, that all the gods which it had created had fallen away from it. It understood that all the so-called bourgeois liberties and organs of progress attacked and menaced its class rule at its social foundation and its political summit simultaneously, and had therefore become "socialistic." In this menace and this attack it rightly discerned the secret of socialism, whose import and tendency it judges more correctly than so-called socialism knows how to judge itself; the latter can, accordingly, not comprehend why the bourgeoisie callously hardens its heart against it, whether it sentimentally bewails the sufferings of mankind, or in Christian spirit prophesies the millennium and universal brotherly love, or in humanistic style twaddles about mind, education and freedom, or in doctrinaire fashion excogitates a system for the conciliation and welfare of all classes. What the bourgeoisie did not grasp, however, was the logical conclusion that its own parliamentary regime, that its political rule in general, was now also bound to meet with the general verdict of condemnation as being socialistic. As long as the rule of the bourgeois class had not been organised completely, as long as it had not acquired its pure political expression, the antagonism of the other classes, likewise, could not appear in its pure form, and where it did appear could not take the dangerous turn that transforms every struggle
against the state power into a struggle against capital. If in every stirring of life in society it saw “tranquillity” imperilled, how could it want to maintain at the head of society a regime of unrest, its own regime, the parliamentary regime, this regime that, according to the expression of one of its spokesmen, lives in struggle and by struggle? The parliamentary regime lives by discussion; how shall it forbid discussion? Every interest, every social institution, is here transformed into general ideas, debated as ideas; how shall any interest, any institution, sustain itself above thought and impose itself as an article of faith? The struggle of the orators on the platform evokes the struggle of the scribblers of the press; the debating club in parliament is necessarily supplemented by debating clubs in the salons and the pothouses; the representatives, who constantly appeal to public opinion, give public opinion the right to speak its real mind in petitions. The parliamentary regime leaves everything to the decision of majorities; how shall the great majorities outside parliament not want to decide? When you play the fiddle at the top of the state, what else is to be expected but that those down below dance?

Thus, by now stigmatising as “socialistic” what it had previously extolled as “liberal,” the bourgeoisie confesses that its own interests dictate that it should be delivered from the danger of its own rule; that, in order to restore tranquillity in the country, its bourgeois parliament must, first of all, be given its quietus; that in order to preserve its social power intact, its political power must be broken; that the individual bourgeois can continue to exploit the other classes and to enjoy undisturbed property, family, religion and order only on condition that their class be condemned along with the other classes to like political nullity; that in order to save its purse, it must forfeit the crown, and the sword that is to safeguard it must at the same time be hung over its own head as a sword of Damocles.

In the domain of the interests of the general citizenry, the National Assembly showed itself so unproductive that, for example, the discussions on the Paris-Avignon railway, which began in the winter of 1850, were still not ripe for conclusion on December 2, 1851. Where it did not repress or pursue a reactionary course it was stricken with incurable barrenness.

While Bonaparte’s ministry partly took the initiative in framing laws in the spirit of the party of Order, and partly even outdid that party’s harshness in their execution and administration, he, on the other hand, by childishly silly proposals sought to win popularity, to bring out his opposition to the National Assembly, and to hint at a secret reserve that was only temporar-
illy prevented by conditions from making its hidden treasures available to the French people. Such was the proposal to decree an increase in pay of four sous a day to the non-commissioned officers. Such was the proposal of an honour system loan bank for the workers. Money as a gift and money as a loan, it was with prospects such as these that he hoped to allure the masses. Donations and loans—the financial science of the *lumpenproletariat*, whether of high degree or low, is restricted to this. Such were the only springs which Bonaparte knew how to set in action. Never has a pretender speculated more stupidly on the stupidity of the masses.

The National Assembly flared up repeatedly over these unmistakable attempts to gain popularity at its expense, over the growing danger that this adventurer, whom his debts spurred on and no established reputation held back, would venture a desperate *coup*. The discord between the party of Order and the President had taken on a threatening character when an unexpected event threw him back repentant into its arms. We mean the *by-elections of March 10, 1850*. These elections were held for the purpose of filling the representatives' seats that after June 13 had been rendered vacant by imprisonment or exile. Paris elected only social-democratic candidates. It even concentrated most of the votes on an insurgent of June 1848, on Deflotte. Thus did the Parisian petty bourgeoisie, in alliance with the proletariat, revenge itself for its defeat on June 13, 1849. It seemed to have disappeared from the battlefield at the moment of danger only to reappear there on a more propitious occasion with more numerous fighting forces and with a bolder battle cry. One circumstance seemed to heighten the peril of this election victory. The army voted in Paris for the June insurgent against La Hitte, a minister of Bonaparte's, and in the Departments largely for the *Montagnards*, who here, too, though indeed not so decisively as in Paris, maintained the ascendancy over their adversaries.

Bonaparte saw himself suddenly confronted with revolution once more. As on January 29, 1849, as on June 13, 1849, so on March 10, 1850, he disappeared behind the party of Order. He made obeisance, he pusillanimously begged pardon, he offered to appoint any ministry it pleased at the behest of the parliamentary majority, he even implored the Orleanist and Legitimist party leaders, the Thiers, the Berryers, the Brogliest, the Molés, in brief, the so-called burgraves, to take the helm of state themselves. The party of Order proved unable to take advantage of this opportunity that would never return. Instead of boldly possessing itself of the power offered, it did not even compel Bonaparte to
reinstate the ministry dismissed on November 1; it contented itself with humiliating him by its forgiveness and adjoining *M. Baroche* to the d'Hautpoul ministry. As public prosecutor this Baroche had stormed and raged before the High Court at Bourges, the first time against the revolutionists of May 15, the second time against the democrats of June 13, both times because of an attempt on the life of the National Assembly. None of Bonaparte's ministers subsequently contributed more to the degradation of the National Assembly, and after December 2, 1851, we meet him once more as the comfortably installed and highly paid Vice-President of the Senate. He had spat in the revolutionists' soup in order that Bonaparte might eat it up.

The social-democratic party, for its part, seemed only to try to find pretexts for putting its own victory once again in doubt and for blunting its point. Vidal, one of the newly elected representatives of Paris, had been elected simultaneously in Strasbourg. He was induced to decline the election for Paris and accept it for Strasbourg. And so, instead of making its victory at the polls conclusive and thereby compelling the party of Order at once to contest it in parliament, instead of thus forcing the adversary to fight at the moment of popular enthusiasm and favourable mood in the army, the democratic party wearied Paris during the months of March and April with a new election campaign, let the aroused popular passions wear themselves out in this repeated provisional election game, let the revolutionary energy satiate itself with constitutional successes, dissipate itself in petty intrigues, hollow declamations and sham movements, let the bourgeoisie rally and make its preparations, and, lastly, weakened the significance of the March elections by a sentimental commentary in the April by-election, that of Eugène Sue. In a word, it made an April Fool of March 10.

The parliamentary majority understood the weakness of its antagonists. Its seventeen burggraves—for Bonaparte had left to it the direction of and responsibility for the attack—drew up a new electoral law, the introduction of which was entrusted to M. Faucher, who solicited this honour for himself. On May 8 he introduced the law by which universal suffrage was to be abolished, a residence of three years in the locality of the election to be imposed as a condition on the electors and, finally, the proof of this residence made dependent in the case of workers on a certificate from their employers.

Just as the democrats had, in revolutionary fashion, agitated the minds and raged during the constitutional election contest, so now, when it was requisite to prove the serious nature of that victory arms in hand, did they in constitutional fashion preach
order, majestic calm (calme majestueux), lawful action, that is
to say, blind subjection to the will of the counter-revolution,
which imposed itself as the law. During the debate the Mountain
put the party of Order to shame by asserting, against the latter's
revolutionary passionateness, the dispassionate attitude of the
philistine who keeps within the law, and by felling that party to
earth with the fearful reproach that it proceeded in a revolution-
ary manner. Even the newly elected deputies were at pains to
prove by their decorous and discreet action what a misconcep-
tion it was to decry them as anarchists and construe their
election as a victory for revolution. On May 31, the new electoral
law went through. The Montagne contented itself with smuggling
a protest into the pocket of the President. The electoral law was
followed by a new press law, by which the revolutionary news-
paper press\textsuperscript{220} was entirely suppressed. It had deserved its fate.
The National and La Presse,\textsuperscript{125} two bourgeois organs, were left
behind after this deluge as the most advanced outposts of the
revolution.

We have seen how during March and April the democratic
leaders had done everything to embroil the people of Paris in a
sham fight, how after May 8 they did everything to restrain them
from a real fight. In addition to this, we must not forget that the
year 1850 was one of the most splendid years of industrial and
commercial prosperity, and the Paris proletariat was therefore
fully employed. But the election law of May 31, 1850, excluded
it from any participation in political power. It cut it off from the
very arena of the struggle. It threw the workers back into the
position of pariahs which they had occupied before the February
Revolution. By letting themselves be led by the democrats in
face of such an event and forgetting the revolutionary interests
of their class for momentary ease and comfort, they renounced
the honour of being a conquering power, surrendered to their
fate, proved that the defeat of June 1848 had put them out of
the fight for years and that the historical process would for the
present again have to go on over their heads. So far as the petty-
bourgeois democracy is concerned, which on June 13 had cried:
"But if once universal suffrage is attacked, then we'll show
them," it now consoled itself with the contention that the
counter-revolutionary blow which had struck it was no blow
and the law of May 31 no law. On the second Sunday in May
1852, every Frenchman would appear at the polling place with
ballot in one hand and sword in the other. With this prophecy
it rested content. Lastly, the army was disciplined by its superior
officers for the elections of March and April 1850, just as it
had been disciplined for those of May 28, 1849. This time, how-
ever, it said decidedly: "The revolution shall not dupe us a third
time."

The law of May 31, 1850, was the coup d'état of the bour-
geoisie. All its conquests over the revolution hitherto had only
a provisional character. They were endangered as soon as the
existing National Assembly retired from the stage. They depended
on the hazards of a new general election, and the history of
elections since 1848 irrefutably proved that the bourgeoisie's
moral sway over the mass of the people was lost in the same
measure as its actual domination developed. On March 10, uni-
versal suffrage declared itself directly against the domination of
the bourgeoisie; the bourgeoisie answered by outlawing universal
suffrage. The law of May 31 was, therefore, one of the neces-
sities of the class struggle. On the other hand, the Constitution
required a minimum of two million votes to make an election
of the President of the republic valid. If none of the candidates
for the presidency received this minimum, the National Assem-
bly was to choose the President from among the three candidates
to whom the largest number of votes would fall. At the time
when the Constituent Assembly made this law, ten million elec-
tors were registered on the rolls of voters. In its view, therefore,
a fifth of the people entitled to vote was sufficient to make the
presidential election valid. The law of May 31 struck at least
three million votes off the electoral rolls, reduced the number
of people entitled to vote to seven million and, nevertheless,
retained the legal minimum of two million for the presidential
election. It therefore raised the legal minimum from a fifth to
nearly a third of the effective votes, that is, it did everything to
smuggle the election of the President out of the hands of the
people and into the hands of the National Assembly. Thus
through the electoral law of May 31 the party of Order seemed
to have made its rule doubly secure, by surrendering the election
of the National Assembly and that of the President of the repub-
lic to the stationary section of society.

V

As soon as the revolutionary crisis had been weathered and
universal suffrage abolished, the struggle between the National
Assembly and Bonaparte broke out again.

The Constitution had fixed Bonaparte's salary at 600,000
francs. Barely six months after his installation he succeeded in
increasing this sum to twice as much, for Odilon Barrot wrung
from the Constituent National Assembly an extra allowance of
600,000 francs a year for so-called representation moneys. After
June 13, Bonaparte had caused similar requests to be voiced, this time without eliciting response from Barrot. Now, after May 31, he at once availed himself of the favourable moment and caused his ministers to propose a Civil List of three millions in the National Assembly. A long life of adventurous vagabond- age had endowed him with the most developed antennae for feeling out the weak moments when he might squeeze money from his bourgeois. He practised regular chantage.* The National Assembly had violated the sovereignty of the people with his assistance and his cognizance. He threatened to denounce its crime to the tribunal of the people unless it loosened its purse-strings and purchased his silence with three million a year. It had robbed three million Frenchmen of their franchise. He demanded, for every Frenchman out of circulation, a franc in circulation, precisely three million francs. He, the elect of six millions, claimed damages for the votes out of which he said he had retrospectively been cheated. The Commission of the National Assembly refused the importunate one. The Bonapartist press threatened. Could the National Assembly break with the President of the republic at a moment when in principle it had definitely broken with the mass of the nation? It rejected the annual Civil List, it is true, but it granted, for this once, an extra allowance of two million one hundred and sixty thousand francs. It thus rendered itself guilty of the double weakness of granting the money and of showing at the same time by its vexation that it granted it unwillingly. We shall see later for what purpose Bonaparte needed the money. After this vexatious aftermath, which followed on the heels of the abolition of universal suffrage and in which Bonaparte exchanged his humble attitude during the crisis of March and April for challenging impudence to the usurpatory parliament, the National Assembly adjourned for three months, from August 11 to November 11. In its place it left behind a Permanent Commission of twenty-eight members, which contained no Bonapartists, but did contain some moderate republicans. The Permanent Commission of 1849 had included only Order men and Bonapartists. But at that time the party of Order declared itself in permanence against the revolution. This time the parliamentary republic declared itself in permanence against the President. After the law of May 31, this was the only rival that still confronted the party of Order.

When the National Assembly met once more in November 1850, it seemed that, instead of the petty skirmishes it had hitherto had with the President, a great and ruthless struggle,

* Chantage: Blackmail.—Ed.
a life-and-death struggle between the two powers, had become inevitable.

As in 1849 so during this year's parliamentary recess, the party of Order had broken up into its separate factions, each occupied with its own Restoration intrigues, which had obtained fresh nutriment through the death of Louis Philippe. The Legitimist king, Henry V, had even nominated a formal ministry which resided in Paris and in which members of the Permanent Commission held seats. Bonaparte, in his turn, was therefore entitled to make tours of the French Departments, and according to the disposition of the town that he favoured with his presence, now more or less covertly, now more or less overtly, to divulge his own restoration plans and canvass votes for himself. On these processions, which the great official Moniteur and the little private Moniteurs of Bonaparte naturally had to celebrate as triumphal processions, he was constantly accompanied by persons affiliated with the Society of December 10. This society dates from the year 1849. On the pretext of founding a benevolent society, the lumpenproletariat of Paris had been organised into secret sections, each section being led by Bonapartist agents, with a Bonapartist general at the head of the whole. Alongside decayed roués with dubious means of subsistence and of dubious origin, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, lazzaroni, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, maquereaus,* brothel keepers, porters, literati, organ-grinders, rag-pickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars—in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither, which the French term la bohème; from this kindred element Bonaparte formed the core of the Society of December 10. A "benevolent society"—in so far as, like Bonaparte, all its members felt the need of benefiting themselves at the expense of the labouring nation. This Bonaparte, who constitutes himself chief of the lumpenproletariat, who here alone rediscovers in mass form the interests which he personally pursues, who recognises in this scum, offal, refuse of all classes the only class upon which he can base himself unconditionally, is the real Bonaparte, the Bonaparte sans phrase. An old crafty roué, he conceives the historical life of the nations and their performances of state as comedy in the most vulgar sense, as a masquerade where the grand costumes, words and postures merely serve to mask the pettiest knavery. Thus on his expedition to Strasbourg, where

---

* Maquereaus: Procurers.—Ed.
a trained Swiss vulture had played the part of the Napoleonic eagle. For his irruption into Boulogne he puts some London lackeys into French uniforms. They represent the army. In this Society of December 10, he assembles ten thousand rascally fellows, who are to play the part of the people, as Nick Bottom that of the lion.* At a moment when the bourgeoisie itself played the most complete comedy, but in the most serious manner in the world, without infringing any of the pedantic conditions of French dramatic etiquette, and was itself half deceived, half convinced of the solemnity of its own performance of state, the adventurer, who took the comedy as plain comedy, was bound to win. Only when he has eliminated his solemn opponent, when he himself now takes his imperial role seriously and under the Napoleonic mask imagines he is the real Napoleon, does he become the victim of his own conception of the world, the serious buffoon who no longer takes world history for a comedy but his comedy for world history. What the national ateliers** were for the socialist workers, what the Gardes mobiles*** were for the bourgeois republicans, the Society of December 10, the party fighting force characteristic of Bonaparte, was for him. On his journeys the detachments of this society packing the railways had to improvise a public for him, stage public enthusiasm, roar vive l'Empereur, insult and thrash republicans, of course under the protection of the police. On his return journeys to Paris they had to form the advance guard, forestall counter-demonstrations or disperse them. The Society of December 10 belonged to him, it was his work, his very own idea. Whatever else he appropriates is put into his hands by the force of circumstances; whatever else he does, the circumstances do for him or he is content to copy from the deeds of others. But Bonaparte with official phrases about order, religion, family and property in public, before the citizens, and with the secret society of the Schusterles and Spiegelbergs,**** the society of disorder, prostitution and theft, behind him—that is Bonaparte himself as original author, and the history of the Society of December 10 is his own history.

Now it had happened by way of exception that people's representatives belonging to the party of Order came under the

* The reference is to Shakespeare's comedy: A Midsummer Night's Dream, —Ed.
** See pp. 220-21 of this volume.—Ed.
*** See pp. 219-20 of this volume.—Ed.
**** Schusterle and Spiegelberg—characters in Schiller's drama The Robbers.—Ed.
cudgels of the Decembrists. Still more. Yon, the Police Commissi-
moned to the National Assembly and charged with
acting on the deposition of a certain
advised the Permanent Commission that a section of the
had decided to assassinate General Changarnier and
the President of the National Assembly, and had already
designated the individuals who were to perpetrate the deed. One
comprehends the terror of M. Dupin. A parliamentary enquiry
into the Society of December 10, that is, the profanation of
the Bonapartist secret world, seemed inevitable. Just before the
meeting of the National Assembly Bonaparte providently dis-
banded his society, naturally only on paper, for in a detailed
memoir at the end of 1851 Police Prefect Carlier still sought
in vain to move him to really break up the Decembrists.

The Society of December 10 was to remain the private army
of Bonaparte until he succeeded in transforming the public
army into a Society of December 10. Bonaparte made the first
attempt at this shortly after the adjournment of the National
Assembly, and precisely with the money just wrested from it.
As a fatalist, he lives in the conviction that there are certain
higher powers which man, and the soldier in particular, can-
not withstand. Among these powers he counts, first and fore-
mast, cigars and champagne, cold poultry and garlic sausage.
Accordingly, to begin with, he treats officers and non-commissioned officers in his Elysée apartments to cigars and cham-
pagne, to cold poultry and garlic sausage. On October 3 he repeats
this manoeuvre with the mass of the troops at the St. Maur
review, and on October 10 the same manoeuvre on a still larger
scale at the Satory army parade. The Uncle remembered the
campaigns of Alexander in Asia, the Nephew the triumphal
marches of Bacchus in the same land. Alexander was a demigod,
to be sure, but Bacchus was a god and moreover the tutelary
deity of the Society of December 10.

After the review of October 3, the Permanent Commission
summoned War Minister d'Hautpoul. He promised that these
breaches of discipline should not recur. We know how on Octo-
ber 10 Bonaparte kept d'Hautpoul's word. As Commander-in-
Chief of the Paris army, Changarnier had commanded at both
reviews. He, at once a member of the Permanent Commission,
chief of the National Guard, the "saviour" of January 29 and
June 13, the "bulwark of society," the candidate of the party
of Order for presidential honours, the suspected Monk of two
monarchies, had hitherto never acknowledged himself as the
subordinate of the War Minister, had always openly derided
the republican Constitution and had pursued Bonaparte with an
ambiguous lordly protection. Now he was consumed with zeal for discipline against the War Minister and for the Constitution against Bonaparte. While on October 10 a section of the cavalry raised the shout: "Vive Napoléon! Vivent les saucissons!" Changarnier arranged that at least the infantry marching past under the command of his friend Neumayer should preserve an icy silence. As a punishment, the War Minister relieved General Neumayer of his post in Paris at Bonaparte's instigation, on the pretext of appointing him commanding general of the fourteenth and fifteenth military divisions. Neumayer refused this exchange of posts and so had to resign. Changarnier, for his part, published an order of the day on November 2, in which he forbade the troops to indulge in political outrages or demonstrations of any kind while under arms. The Elysée newspapers attacked Changarnier; the papers of the party of Order attacked Bonaparte; the Permanent Commission held repeated secret sessions in which it was repeatedly proposed to declare the country in danger; the army seemed divided into two hostile camps, with two hostile general staffs, one in the Elysée, where Bonaparte resided, the other in the Tuileries, the quarters of Changarnier. It seemed that only the meeting of the National Assembly was needed to give the signal for battle. The French public judged this friction between Bonaparte and Changarnier like that English journalist who characterised it in the following words:

"The political housemaids of France are sweeping away the glowing lava of the revolution with old brooms and wrangle with one another while they do their work."

Meanwhile, Bonaparte hastened to remove the War Minister, d'Hautpoul, to pack him off in all haste to Algiers and to appoint General Schramm War Minister in his place. On November 12, he sent to the National Assembly a message of American prolixity, overloaded with detail, redolent of order, desirous of reconciliation, constitutionally acquiescent, treating of all and sundry, but not of the questions brûlantes of the moment. As if in passing, he made the remark that according to the express provisions of the Constitution the President alone could dispose of the army. The message closed with the following words of great solemnity:

"Above all things, France demands tranquillity.... But bound by an oath, I shall keep within the narrow limits that it has set for me....

* "Hurrah for Napoleon! Hurrah for the sausages!"—Ed.
** Questions brûlantes: Burning questions.—Ed.
As far as I am concerned, elected by the people and owing my power to it alone, I shall always bow to its lawfully expressed will. Should you resolve at this session on a revision of the Constitution, a Constituent Assembly will regulate the position of the executive power. If not, then the people will solemnly pronounce its decision in 1852. But whatever the solutions of the future may be, let us come to an understanding, so that passion, surprise or violence may never decide the destiny of a great nation.... What occupies my attention, above all, is not who will rule France in 1852, but how to employ the time which remains at my disposal so that the intervening period may pass by without agitation or disturbance. I have opened my heart to you with sincerity; you will answer my frankness with your trust, my good endeavours with your co-operation, and God will do the rest."

The respectable, hypocritically moderate, virtuously commonplace language of the bourgeoisie reveals its deepest meaning in the mouth of the autocrat of the Society of December 10 and the picnic hero of St. Maur and Satory.

The burgraves of the party of Order did not delude themselves for a moment concerning the trust that this opening of the heart deserved. About oaths they had long been blasé; they numbered in their midst veterans and virtuosos of political perjury. Nor had they failed to hear the passage about the army. They observed with annoyance that in its discursive enumeration of lately enacted laws the message passed over the most important law, the electoral law, in studied silence, and moreover, in the event of there being no revision of the Constitution, left the election of the President in 1852 to the people. The electoral law was the leaden ball chained to the feet of the party of Order, which prevented it from walking and so much the more from storming forward! Moreover, by the official disbandment of the Society of December 10 and the dismissal of the War Minister d'Hautpoul, Bonaparte had with his own hand sacrificed the scapegoats on the altar of the country. He had blunted the edge of the expected collision. Finally, the party of Order itself anxiously sought to avoid, to mitigate, to gloss over any decisive conflict with the executive power. For fear of losing their conquests over the revolution, they allowed their rival to carry off the fruits thereof. "Above all things, France demands tranquility." This was what the party of Order had cried to the revolution since February,* this was what Bonaparte's message cried to the party of Order. "Above all things, France demands tranquility." Bonaparte committed acts that aimed at usurpation, but the party of Order committed "unrest" if it raised a row about these acts and construed them hypochondriacally. The sausages of Satory were quiet as mice when no one spoke of them. "Above

* 1848.—Ed.
all things, France demands tranquillity.” Bonaparte demanded, therefore, that he be left in peace to do as he liked and the parliamentary party was paralysed by a double fear, by the fear of again evoking revolutionary unrest and by the fear of itself appearing as the instigator of unrest in the eyes of its own class, in the eyes of the bourgeoisie. Consequently, since France demanded tranquillity above all things, the party of Order dared not answer “war” after Bonaparte had talked “peace” in his message. The public, which had anticipated scenes of great scandal at the opening of the National Assembly, was cheated of its expectations. The opposition deputies, who demanded the submission of the Permanent Commission’s minutes on the October events, were outvoted by the majority. On principle, all debates that might cause excitement were eschewed. The proceedings of the National Assembly during November and December 1850 were without interest.

At last, towards the end of December, guerrilla warfare began over a number of prerogatives of parliament. The movement got bogged in petty squabbles regarding the prerogatives of the two powers, since the bourgeoisie had done away with the class struggle for the moment by abolishing universal suffrage.

A judgement for debt had been obtained from the court against Mauguin, one of the People’s Representatives. In answer to the enquiry of the President of the Court, the Minister of Justice, Rouher, declared that a capias should be issued against the debtor without further ado. Mauguin was thus thrown into the debtors’ jail. The National Assembly flared up when it learned of the assault. Not only did it order his immediate release, but it even had him fetched forcibly from Clichy210 the same evening, by its greffier.* In order, however, to confirm its faith in the sanctity of private property and with the idea at the back of its mind of opening, in case of need, an asylum for Montagnards who had become troublesome, it declared imprisonment of People’s Representatives for debt permissible after previously obtaining its consent. It forgot to decree that the President might also be locked up for debt. It destroyed the last semblance of the immunity that enveloped the members of its own body.

It will be remembered that, acting on the information given by a certain Alais, Police Commissioner Yon had denounced a section of the Decembrists for planning the murder of Dupin and Changarnier. In reference to this, at the very first sitting the questors made the proposal that parliament should form a police force of its own, paid out of the private budget of the Nation-

* Greffier: Clerk.—Ed.
al Assembly and absolutely independent of the police prefect. The Minister of the Interior, Baroche, protested against this invasion of his domain. A miserable compromise on this matter was concluded, according to which, true, the police commissioner of the Assembly was to be paid out of its private budget and to be appointed and dismissed by its questors, but only after previous agreement with the Minister of the Interior. Meanwhile criminal proceedings had been taken by the government against Alais, and here it was easy to represent his information as a hoax and through the mouth of the public prosecutor to cast ridicule upon Dupin, Changarnier, Yon and the whole National Assembly. Thereupon, on December 29, Minister Baroche writes a letter to Dupin in which he demands Yon's dismissal. The Bureau of the National Assembly decides to retain Yon in his position, but the National Assembly, alarmed by its violence in the Mauguin affair and accustomed when it has ventured a blow at the executive power to receive two blows from it in return, does not sanction this decision. It dismisses Yon as a reward for his official zeal and robs itself of a parliamentary prerogative indispensable against a man who does not decide by night in order to execute by day, but who decides by day and executes by night.

We have seen how on great and striking occasions during the months of November and December the National Assembly avoided or quashed the struggle with the executive power. Now we see it compelled to take it up on the pettiest occasions. In the Mauguin affair it confirms the principle of imprisoning People's Representatives for debt, but reserves the right to have it applied only to representatives obnoxious to itself and wrangles over this infamous privilege with the Minister of Justice. Instead of availing itself of the alleged murder plot to decree an enquiry into the Society of December 10 and irredeemably unmasking Bonaparte before France and Europe in his true character of chief of the Paris lumpenproletariat, it lets the conflict be degraded to a point where the only issue between it and the Minister of the Interior is which of them has the authority to appoint and dismiss a police commissioner. Thus, during the whole of this period, we see the party of Order compelled by its equivocal position to dissipate and disintegrate its struggle with the executive power in petty jurisdictional squabbles, pettifoggery, legalistic hairsplitting, and delimitational disputes, and to make the most ridiculous matters of form the substance of its activity. It does not dare to take up the conflict at the moment when this has significance from the standpoint of principle, when the executive power has really
exposed itself and the cause of the National Assembly would be the cause of the nation. By so doing it would give the nation its marching orders, and it fears nothing more than that the nation should move. On such occasions it accordingly rejects the motions of the Montagne and proceeds to the order of the day. The question at issue in its larger aspects having thus been dropped, the executive power calmly bides the time when it can again take up the same question on petty and insignificant occasions, when this is, so to speak, of only local parliamentary interests. Then the repressed rage of the party of Order breaks out, then it tears away the curtain from the coulisses, then it denounces the President, then it declares the republic in danger, but then, also, its fervour appears absurd and the occasion for the struggle seems a hypocritical pretext or altogether not worth fighting about. The parliamentary storm becomes a storm in a teacup, the fight becomes an intrigue, the conflict a scandal. While the revolutionary classes gloat with malicious joy over the humiliation of the National Assembly, for they are just as enthusiastic about the parliamentary prerogatives of this Assembly as the latter is about the public liberties, the bourgeoisie outside parliament does not understand how the bourgeoisie inside parliament can waste time over such petty squabbles and imperil tranquillity by such pitiful rivalries with the President. It becomes confused by a strategy that makes peace at the moment when all the world is expecting battles, and attacks at the moment when all the world believes peace has been made.

On December 20, Pascal Duprat interpellated the Minister of the Interior concerning the Gold Bars Lottery. This lottery was a "daughter of Elysium." Bonaparte with his faithful followers had brought her into the world and Police Prefect Carlier had placed her under his official protection, although French law forbids all lotteries with the exception of raffles for charitable purposes. Seven million lottery tickets at a franc apiece, the profits ostensibly to be devoted to shipping Parisian vagabonds to California. On the one hand, golden dreams were to supplant the socialist dreams of the Paris proletariat; the seductive prospect of the first prize, the doctrinaire right to work. Naturally, the Paris workers did not recognise in the glitter of the California gold bars the inconspicuous francs that were enticed out of their pockets. In the main, however, the matter was nothing short of a downright swindle. The vagabonds who wanted to open California gold mines without troubling to leave Paris were Bonaparte himself and his debt-ridden Round Table. The three millions voted by the National Assembly had been squandered in riotous living; in one way or another the coffers
had to be replenished. In vain had Bonaparte opened a national subscription for the building of so-called *cités ouvrières,* and figured at the head of the list himself with a considerable sum. The hard-hearted bourgeois waited mistrustfully for him to pay up his share and since this, naturally, did not ensue, the speculation in socialist castles in the air fell straightway to the ground. The gold bars proved a better draw. Bonaparte & Co. were not content to pocket part of the excess of the seven millions over the bars to be allotted in prizes; they manufactured false lottery tickets; they issued ten, fifteen and even twenty tickets with the same number—a financial operation in the spirit of the Society of December 10! Here the National Assembly was confronted not with the fictitious President of the republic, but with Bonaparte "in the flesh. Here it could catch him in the act, in conflict not with the Constitution but with the *Code pénal.* If on Duprat's interpellation it proceeded to the order of the day, this did not happen merely because Girardin's motion that it should declare itself "*satisfait*" reminded the party of Order of its own systematic corruption. The bourgeois and, above all, the bourgeois inflated into a statesman, supplements his practical meanness by theoretical extravagance. As a statesman he becomes, like the state power that confronts him, a higher being that can only be fought in a higher, consecrated fashion.

Bonaparte, who precisely because he was a Bohemian, a princely *lumpenproletarian,* had the advantage over a rascally bourgeois in that he could conduct the struggle meanly, now saw, after the Assembly had itself guided him with its own hand across the slippery ground of the military banquets, the reviews, the Society of December 10, and, finally, the *Code pénal,* that the moment had come when he could pass from an apparent defensive to the offensive. The minor defeats meanwhile sustained by the Minister of Justice, the Minister of War, the Minister of the Navy and the Minister of Finance, through which the National Assembly signified its snarling displeasure, troubled him little. He not only prevented the ministers from resigning and thus recognising the sovereignty of parliament over the executive power, but could now consummate what he had begun during the recess of the National Assembly: the severance of the military power from parliament, the *removal of Changarnier.*

An Elysée paper published an order of the day alleged to have been addressed during the month of May to the First Military Division, and therefore proceeding from Changarnier, in which

---

* *Cités ouvrières:* Workers' settlements.—Ed.
the officers were recommended, in the event of an insurrection, to give no quarter to the traitors in their own ranks, but to shoot them immediately and refuse the National Assembly the troops, should it requisition them. On January 3, 1851, the Cabinet was interpellated concerning this order of the day. For the investigation of this matter it requests a breathing space, first of three months, then of a week, finally of only twenty-four hours. The Assembly insists on an immediate explanation. Changarnier rises and declares that there never was such an order of the day. He adds that he will always hasten to comply with the demands of the National Assembly and that in case of a clash it can count on him. It receives his declaration with indescribable applause and passes a vote of confidence in him. It abdicates, it decrees its own impotence and the omnipotence of the army by placing itself under the private protection of a general; but the general deceives himself when he puts at its command against Bonaparte a power that he only holds as a fief from the same Bonaparte and when, in his turn, he expects to be protected by this parliament, by his own protégé in need of protection. Changarnier, however, believes in the mysterious power with which the bourgeoisie has endowed him since January 29, 1849. He considers himself the third power, existing side by side with both the other state powers. He shares the fate of the rest of this epoch’s heroes, or rather saints, whose greatness consists precisely in the biassed great opinion of them that their party creates in its own interests and who shrink to everyday figures as soon as circumstances call on them to perform miracles. Unbelief is, in general, the mortal enemy of these reputed heroes and real saints. Hence their majestically moral indignation at the dearth of enthusiasm displayed by wits and scoffers.

The same evening, the ministers were summoned to the Elysée; Bonaparte insists on the dismissal of Changarnier; five ministers refuse to sign it; the Moniteur announces a ministerial crisis, and the press of the party of Order threatens to form a parliamentary army under Changarnier’s command. The party of Order had constitutional authority to take this step. It merely had to appoint Changarnier President of the National Assembly and requisition any number of troops it pleased for its protection. It could do so all the more safely as Changarnier still actually stood at the head of the army and the Paris National Guard and was only waiting to be requisitioned together with the army. The Bonapartist press did not as yet even dare to question the right of the National Assembly directly to requisition troops, a legal scruple that in the given circumstances did not promise any success. That the army would have obeyed the orders of
the National Assembly is probable when one bears in mind that Bonaparté had to search all Paris for eight days in order, fi-
nally, to find two generals—Baraguey d'Hilliers and Saint-Jean
d'Angely—who declared themselves ready to countersign Chan-
garnier's dismissal. That the party of Order, however, would
have found in its own ranks and in parliament the necessary
number of votes for such a resolution is more than doubtful,
when one considers that eight days later two hundred and
eighty-six votes detached themselves from the party and that
in December 1851, at the last hour for decision, the Montagne
still rejected a similar proposal. Nevertheless, the burgraves
might, perhaps, still have succeeded in spurring the mass of
their party to a heroism that consisted in feeling themselves
secure behind a forest of bayonets and accepting the services
of an army that had deserted to their camp. Instead of this,
on the evening of January 6, Messrs. the Burgraves betook
themselves to the Elysée in order to make Bonaparté desist from
dismissing Changarnier by using statesmanlike phrases and
urging considerations of state. Whomver one seeks to persuade,
one acknowledges as master of the situation. On January 12,
Bonaparté, assured by this step, appoints a new ministry in
which the leaders of the old ministry, Fould and Baroche,
remain. Saint-Jean d'Angely becomes War Minister, the Moniteur
publishes the decree dismissing Changarnier, and his command
is divided between Baraguey d'Hilliers, who receives the First
Army Division, and Perrot, who receives the National Guard.
The bulwark of society has been discharged, and while this does
not cause any tiles to fall from the roofs, quotations on the
bourse are, on the other hand, going up.

By repulsing the army, which places itself in the person of
Changarnier at its disposal, and so surrendering the army ir-
revocably to the President, the party of Order declares that the
bourgeoisie has forfeited its vocation to rule. A parliamentary
ministry no longer existed. Having now indeed lost its grip on
the army and National Guard, what forcible means remained
to it with which simultaneously to maintain the usurped
authority of parliament over the people and its constitutional
authority against the President? None. Only the appeal to force-
less principles remained to it now, to principles that it had
itself always interpreted merely as general rules, which one
prescribes for others in order to be able to move all the more
freely oneself. The dismissal of Changarnier and the falling of
the military power into Bonaparté's hands closes the first part
of the period we are considering, the period of struggle between
the party of Order and the executive power. War between the
two powers has now been openly declared, is openly waged, but only after the party of Order has lost both arms and soldiers. Without the ministry, without the army, without the people, without public opinion, after its Electoral Law of May 31 no longer the representative of the sovereign nation, sans eyes, sans ears, sans teeth, sans everything, the National Assembly had undergone a gradual transformation into an ancient French Parliament\(^224\) that has to leave action to the government and content itself with growling remonstrances \textit{post festum}.\(^*\)

The party of Order receives the new ministry with a storm of indignation. General Bedeau recalls to mind the mildness of the Permanent Commission during the recess, and the excessive consideration it had shown by waiving the publication of its minutes. The Minister of the Interior now himself insists on the publication of these minutes, which by this time have naturally become as dull as ditchwater, disclose no fresh facts and have not the slightest effect on the \textit{blasé} public. Upon Rémusat’s proposal the National Assembly retires into its bureaux and appoints a “Committee for Extraordinary Measures.” Paris departs the less from the rut of its everyday routine, since at this moment trade is prosperous, manufactories are busy, corn prices low, foodstuffs overflowing and the savings banks receive fresh deposits daily. The “extraordinary measures” that parliament has announced with so much noise fizzle out on January 18 in a no-confidence vote against the ministry without General Changarnier even being mentioned. The party of Order had been forced to frame its motion in this way in order to secure the votes of the republicans, as of all the measures of the ministry, Changarnier’s dismissal is precisely the only one which the republicans approve of, while the party of Order is in fact not in a position to censure the other ministerial acts, which it had itself dictated.

The no-confidence vote of January 18 was passed by four hundred and fifteen votes to two hundred and eighty-six. Thus, it was carried only by a \textit{coalition} of the extreme Legitimists and Orleanists with the pure republicans and the \textit{Montagne}. Thus it proved that the party of Order had lost in conflicts with Bonaparte not only the ministry, not only the army, but also its independent parliamentary majority, that a squad of representatives had deserted from its camp, out of fanaticism for conciliation, out of fear of the struggle, out of lassitude, out of family regard for the state salaries so near and dear to them, out of speculation on ministerial posts becoming vacant (Odilon

\(^*\) \textit{Post festum}: After the feast, that is, belatedly.—\textit{Ed.}\n
Barrot), out of sheer egoism, which makes the ordinary bourgeois always inclined to sacrifice the general interest of his class for this or that private motive. From the first, the Bonapartist representatives adhered to the party of Order only in the struggle against revolution. The leader of the Catholic party, Montalembert, had already at that time thrown his influence into the Bonapartist scale, since he despised of the parliamentary party's prospects of life. Lastly, the leaders of this party, Thiers and Berryer, the Orleanist and the Legitimist, were compelled openly to proclaim themselves republicans, to confess that their hearts were royalist but their heads republican, that the parliamentary republic was the sole possible form for the rule of the bourgeoisie as a whole. Thus they were compelled, before the eyes of the bourgeois class itself, to stigmatise the Restoration plans, which they continued indefatigably to pursue behind parliament's back as an intrigue as dangerous as it was brainless.

The no-confidence vote of January 18 hit the ministers and not the President. But it was not the ministry, it was the President who had dismissed Changarnier. Should the party of Order impeach Bonaparte himself? On account of his restoration desires? The latter merely supplemented their own. On account of his conspiracy in connection with the military reviews and the Society of December 10? They had buried these themes long since under simple orders of the day. On account of the dismissal of the hero of January 29 and June 13, the man who in May 1850 threatened to set fire to all four corners of Paris in the event of a rising? Their allies of the Montagne and Cavaignac did not even allow them to raise the fallen bulwark of society by means of an official attestation of sympathy. They themselves could not deny the President the constitutional authority to dismiss a general. They only raged because he made an unconstitutional use of his constitutional right. Had they not continually made an unconstitutional use of their parliamentary prerogative, particularly in regard to the abolition of universal suffrage? They were therefore reduced to moving within strictly parliamentary limits. And it took that peculiar malady which since 1848 has raged all over the Continent, parliamentary cretinism, which holds those infected by it fast in an imaginary world and robs them of all sense, all memory, all understanding of the rude external world—it took this parliamentary cretinism for those who had destroyed all the conditions of parliamentary power with their own hands, and were bound to destroy them in their struggle with the other classes, still to regard their parliamentary victories as victories and to believe they hit the
President by striking at his ministers. They merely gave him the opportunity to humili ate the National Assembly afresh in the eyes of the nation. On January 20 the Moniteur announced that the resignation of the entire ministry had been accepted. On the pretext that no parliamentary party any longer had a majority, as the vote of January 18, this fruit of the coalition between Montagne and royalists, proved, and pending the formation of a new majority, Bonaparte appointed a so-called transition ministry, not one member of which was a member of parliament, all being absolutely unknown and insignificant individuals, a ministry of mere clerks and copyists. The party of Order could now work to exhaustion playing with these marionnettes; the executive power no longer thought it worth while to be seriously represented in the National Assembly. The more his ministers were pure dummies, the more manifestly Bonaparte concentrated the whole executive power in his own person and the more scope he had to exploit it for his own ends.

In coalition with the Montagne, the party of Order revenged itself by rejecting the grant to the President of one million eight hundred thousand francs, which the chief of the Society of December 10 had compelled his ministerial clerks to propose. This time a majority of only a hundred and two votes decided the matter; thus twenty-seven fresh votes had fallen away since January 18; the dissolution of the party of Order was making progress. At the same time, in order that there might not for a moment be any mistake about the meaning of its coalition with the Montagne, it scorned even to consider a proposal signed by a hundred and eighty-nine members of the Montagne calling for a general amnesty of political offenders. It sufficed for the Minister of the Interior, a certain Vaïsse, to declare that the tranquillity was only apparent, that in secret great agitation prevailed, that in secret ubiquitous societies were being organised, the democratic papers were preparing to come out again, the reports from the Departments were unfavourable, the Geneva refugees were directing a conspiracy spreading by way of Lyons over all the south of France, France was on the verge of an industrial and commercial crisis, the manufacturers of Roubaix had reduced working hours, that the prisoners of Belle Isle were in revolt—it sufficed for even a mere Vaïsse to conjure up the red spectre and the party of Order rejected without discussion a motion that would certainly have won the National Assembly immense popularity and thrown Bonaparte back into its arms. Instead of letting itself be intimidated by the executive power with the prospect of fresh disturbances, it ought rather
to have allowed the class struggle a little elbowroom, so as to keep the executive power dependent on itself. But it did not feel equal to the task of playing with fire.

Meanwhile, the so-called transition ministry continued to vegetate until the middle of April. Bonaparte wearied and befooled the National Assembly with continual new ministerial combinations. Now he seemed to want to form a republican ministry with Lamartine and Billault, now a parliamentary one with the inevitable Odilon Barrot, whose name may never be missing when a dupe is necessary, then a Legitimist ministry with Vatimesnil and Benoist d'Azy, and then again an Orleanist one with Maleville. While he thus kept the different factions of the party of Order in tension against one another and alarmed them as a whole by the prospect of a republican ministry and the consequent inevitable restoration of universal suffrage, he at the same time engendered in the bourgeoisie the conviction that his honest efforts to form a parliamentary ministry were being frustrated by the irreconcilability of the royalist factions. The bourgeoisie, however, cried out all the louder for a "strong government"; it found it all the more unpardonable to leave France "without administration," the more a general commercial crisis seemed now to be approaching and won recruits for socialism in the towns, just as the ruinously low price of corn did in the countryside. Trade became daily slacker, the unemployed hands increased perceptibly, ten thousand workers, at least, were breadless in Paris, innumerable factories stood idle in Rouen, Mulhouse, Lyons, Roubaix, Tourcoing, St. Etienne, Elbeuf, etc. Under these circumstances Bonaparte could venture, on April 11, to restore the ministry of January 18; Messrs. Fould, Rouher, Baroche, etc., reinforced by M. Léon Faucher, whom the Constituent Assembly during its last days had, with the exception of five votes cast by ministers, unanimously stigmatised by a vote of no-confidence for sending out false telegrams. The National Assembly had therefore gained a victory over the ministry on January 18, had struggled with Bonaparte for three months, only to have Fould and Baroche on April 11 admit the puritan Faucher as a third party into their ministerial alliance.

In November 1849, Bonaparte had contented himself with an unparliamentary ministry, in January 1851 with an extra-parliamentary one, and on April 11 he felt strong enough to form an anti-parliamentary ministry, which harmoniously combined in itself the no-confidence votes of both Assemblies, the Constituent and the Legislative, the republican and the royalist. This gradation of ministries was the thermometer with which parliament
could measure the decrease of its own vital heat. By the end of April the latter had fallen so low that Persigny, in a personal interview, could urge Changarnier to go over to the camp of the President. Bonaparte, he assured him, regarded the influence of the National Assembly as completely destroyed, and the proclamation was already prepared that was to be published after the coup d'état, which was kept steadily in view but was by chance again postponed. Changarnier informed the leaders of the party of Order of the obituary notice, but who believes that bedbug bites are fatal? And parliament, stricken, disintegrated and death-tainted as it was, could not prevail upon itself to see in its duel with the grotesque chief of the Society of December 10 anything but a duel with a bedbug. But Bonaparte answered the party of Order as Agesilaus did King Agis:

"I seem to thee an ant, but one day I shall be a lion." 226

VI

The coalition with the Montagne and the pure republicans, to which the party of Order saw itself condemned in its unavailing efforts to maintain possession of the military power and to reconquer supreme control of the executive power, proved incontrovertibly that it had forfeited its independent parliamentary majority. On May 28, the mere power of the calendar, of the hour hand of the clock, gave the signal for its complete disintegration. With May 28, the last year of the life of the National Assembly began. It had now to decide for continuing the Constitution unaltered or for revising it. But revision of the Constitution, that implied not only rule of the bourgeoisie or of the petty-bourgeois democracy, democracy or proletarian anarchy, parliamentary republic or Bonaparte, it implied at the same time Orleans or Bourbon! Thus fell in the midst of parliament the apple of discord that was bound to inflame openly the conflict of interests which split the party of Order into hostile factions. The party of Order was a combination of heterogeneous social substances. The question of revision generated a political temperature at which the product again decomposed into its original constituents.

The interest of the Bonapartists in a revision was simple. For them it was above all a question of abolishing Article 45, which forbade Bonaparte's re-election and the prorogation of his authority. No less simple appeared the position of the republicans. They unconditionally rejected any revision; they saw in it a universal conspiracy against the republic. Since they commanded more than a quarter of the votes in the National Assem-
bly and, according to the Constitution, three-quarters of the votes were required for a resolution for revision to be legally valid and for the convocation of a revising Assembly, they only needed to count their votes to be sure of victory. And they were sure of victory.

As against these clear positions, the party of Order found itself caught in inextricable contradictions. If it should reject revision, it would imperil the status quo, since it would leave Bonaparte only one way out, that of force, and since on the second Sunday in May 1852, at the decisive moment, it would be surrendering France to revolutionary anarchy, with a President who had lost his authority, with a parliament which for a long time had not possessed it and with a people that meant to reconquer it. If it voted for constitutional revision, it knew that it voted in vain and would be bound to fail constitutional ly because of the veto of the republicans. If it unconstitutionally declared a simple majority vote to be binding, then it could hope to dominate the revolution only if it subordinated itself unconditionally to the sovereignty of the executive power, then it would make Bonaparte master of the Constitution, of its revision and of itself. Only a partial revision which would prolong the authority of the President would pave the way for imperial usurpation. A general revision which would shorten the existence of the republic would bring the dynastic claims into unavoidable conflict, for the conditions of a Bourbon and the conditions of an Orleanist Restoration were not only different, they were mutually exclusive.

The parliamentary republic was more than the neutral territory on which the two factions of the French bourgeoisie, Legitimists and Orleanists, large landed property and industry, could dwell side by side with equality of rights. It was the unavoidable condition of their common rule, the sole form of state in which their general class interest subjected to itself at the same time both the claims of their particular factions and all the remaining classes of society. As royalists they fell back into their old antagonism, into the struggle for the supremacy of landed property or of money, and the highest expression of this antagonism, its personification, was their kings themselves, their dynasties. Hence the resistance of the party of Order to the recall of the Bourbons.

The Orleanist and people's representative Creton had in 1849, 1850 and 1851 periodically introduced a motion for the revocation of the decree exiling the royal families. Just as regularly parliament presented the spectacle of an Assembly of royalists that obdurately barred the gates through which their exiled
kings might return home. Richard III had murdered Henry VI, remarking that he was too good for this world and belonged in heaven. They declared France too bad to possess her kings again. Constrained by force of circumstances, they had become republicans and repeatedly sanctioned the popular decision that banished their kings from France.

A revision of the Constitution—and circumstances compelled taking it into consideration—called in question, along with the republic, the common rule of the two bourgeois factions, and revived, with the possibility of a monarchy, the rivalry of the interests which it had predominantly represented by turns, the struggle for the supremacy of one faction over the other. The diplomats of the party of Order believed they could settle the struggle by an amalgamation of the two dynasties, by a so-called fusion of the royalist parties and their royal houses. The real fusion of the Restoration and the July Monarchy was the parliamentary republic, in which Orleanist and Legitimist colours were obliterated and the various species of bourgeois disappeared in the bourgeois as such, in the bourgeois genus. Now, however, Orleanist was to become Legitimist and Legitimist Orleanist. Royalty, in which their antagonism was personified, was to embody their unity; the expression of their exclusive factional interests was to become the expression of their common class interest; the monarchy was to do that which only the abolition of two monarchies, the republic, could do and had done. This was the philosopher's stone, to produce which the doctors of the party of Order racked their brains. As if the Legitimist monarchy could ever become the monarchy of the industrial bourgeois or the bourgeois monarchy ever become the monarchy of the hereditary landed aristocracy. As if landed property and industry could fraternise under one crown, when the crown could only descend to one head, the head of the elder brother or of the younger, As if industry could come to terms with landed property at all, so long as landed property does not decide itself to become industrial. If Henry V should die tomorrow, the Count of Paris would not on that account become the king of the Legitimists unless he ceased to be the king of the Orleanists. The philosophers of fusion, however, who became more vociferous in proportion as the question of revision came to the fore, who had provided themselves with an official daily organ in the Assemblée Nationale and who are again at work even at this very moment (February 1852), considered the whole difficulty to be due to the opposition and rivalry of the two dynasties. The attempts to reconcile the Orleans family with Henry V, begun since the death of Louis Philippe, but, like the
dynastic intrigues generally, played at only while the National Assembly was in recess, during the entr’actes, behind the scenes, sentimental coquetry with the old superstition rather than seriously meant business, now became grand performances of state, enacted by the party of Order on the public stage, instead of in amateur theatricals, as hitherto. The couriers sped from Paris to Venice,227 from Venice to Claremont, from Claremont to Paris. The Count of Chambord issues a manifesto in which “with the help of all the members of his family” he announces not his, but the “national” Restoration. The Orleanist Salvandy throws himself at the feet of Henry V. The Legitimist chiefs, Berryer, Benoist d’Azy, Saint-Priest, travel to Claremont in order to persuade the Orleans set, but in vain. The fusionists perceive too late that the interests of the two bourgeois factions neither lose exclusiveness nor gain pliancy when they become accentuated in the form of family interests, the interests of two royal houses. If Henry V were to recognise the Count of Paris as his successor—the sole success that the fusion could achieve at best—the House of Orleans would not win any claim that the childlessness of Henry V had not already secured to it, but it would lose all claims that it had gained through the July Revolution. It would waive its original claims, all the titles that it had wrested from the older branch of the Bourbons in almost a hundred years of struggle; it would barter away its historical prerogative, the prerogative of the modern kingdom, for the prerogative of its genealogical tree. The fusion, therefore, would be nothing but a voluntary abdication of the House of Orleans, its resignation to Legitimacy, repentant withdrawal from the Protestant state church into the Catholic. A withdrawal, moreover, that would not even bring it to the throne which it had lost, but to the throne’s steps, on which it had been born. The old Orleanist ministers, Guizot, Duchâtel, etc., who likewise hastened to Claremont to advocate the fusion, in fact represented merely the Katzenjammer* over the July Revolution, the despair felt in regard to the bourgeois kingdom and the kingliness of the bourgeois, the superstitious belief in Legitimacy as the last charm against anarchy. Imagining themselves mediators between Orleans and Bourbon, they were in reality merely Orleanist renegades, and the Prince of Joinville received them as such. On the other hand, the viable, bellicose section of the Orleanists, Thiers, Baze, etc., convinced Louis Philippe’s family all the more easily that if any directly monarchist restoration presupposed the fusion of the two dynasties and if any such fusion,

* Katzenjammer: The “morning-after” feeling.—Ed.
however, presupposed abdication of the House of Orleans, it was, on the contrary, wholly in accord with the tradition of their forefathers to recognise the republic for the moment and wait until events permitted the conversion of the presidential chair into a throne. Rumours of Joinville’s candidature were circulated, public curiosity was kept in suspense and, a few months later, in September, after the rejection of revision, his candidature was publicly proclaimed.

The attempt at a royalist fusion of Orleanists with Legitimists had thus not only failed; it had destroyed their parliamentary fusion, their common republican form, and had broken up the party of Order into its original component parts; but the more the estrangement between Claremont and Venice grew, the more their settlement broke down and the Joinville agitation gained ground, so much the more eager and earnest became the negotiations between Bonaparte’s minister Faucher and the Legitimists.

The disintegration of the party of Order did not stop at its original elements. Each of the two great factions, in its turn, underwent decomposition anew. It was as if all the old nuances that had formerly fought and jostled one another within each of the two circles, whether Legitimist or Orleanist, had thawed out again like dry infusoria on contact with water, as if they had acquired anew sufficient vital energy to form groups of their own and independent antagonisms. The Legitimists dreamed that they were back among the controversies between the Tuileries and the Pavillon Marsan, between Villèle and Polignac. The Orleanists relived the golden days of the tourneys between Guizot, Molé, Broglie, Thiers and Odilon Barrot.

That part of the party of Order which was eager for revision, but was divided again on the limits to revision, a section composed of the Legitimists led by Berryer and Falloux, on the one hand, and by La Rochejaquelein, on the other, and of the conflict-weary Orleanists led by Molé, Broglie, Montalembert and Odilon Barrot, agreed with the Bonapartist representatives on the following indefinite and broadly framed motion:

“With the object of restoring to the nation the full exercise of its sovereignty, the undersigned Representatives move that the Constitution be revised.”

At the same time, however, they unanimously declared through their reporter Tocqueville that the National Assembly had not the right to move the abolition of the republic, that this right was vested solely in the Revising Chamber. For the rest, the Constitution might be revised only in a “legal” manner,
hence only if the constitutionally prescribed three-quarters of the number of votes were cast in favour of revision. On July 19, after six days of stormy debate, revision was rejected, as was to be anticipated. Four hundred and forty-six votes were cast for it, but two hundred and seventy-eight against. The extreme Orleanists, Thiers, Changarnier, etc., voted with the republicans and the Montagne.

Thus the majority of parliament declared against the Constitution, but this Constitution itself declared for the minority and that its vote was binding. But had not the party of Order subordinated the Constitution to the parliamentary majority on May 31, 1850, and on June 13, 1849? Up to now, was not its whole policy based on the subordination of the paragraphs of the Constitution to the decisions of the parliamentary majority? Had it not left to the democrats the antediluvian superstitious belief in the letter of the law, and castigated the democrats for it? At the present moment, however, revision of the Constitution meant nothing but continuation of the presidential authority, just as continuation of the Constitution meant nothing but Bonaparte's deposition. Parliament had declared for him, but the Constitution declared against parliament. He therefore acted in the sense of parliament when he tore up the Constitution, and he acted in the sense of the Constitution when he dispersed parliament.

Parliament had declared the Constitution and, with the latter, its own rule to be "beyond the majority"; by its vote it had abolished the Constitution and prorogued the presidential power, while declaring at the same time that neither can the one die nor the other live so long as it itself continues to exist. Those who were to bury it were standing at the door. While it debated on revision, Bonaparte removed General Baraguey d'Hilliers, who had proved irresolute, from the command of the First Army Division and appointed in his place General Magnan, the victor of Lyons, the hero of the December days, one of his creatures, who under Louis Philippe had already compromised himself more or less in Bonaparte's favour on the occasion of the Boulogne expedition.

The party of Order proved by its decision on revision that it knew neither how to rule nor how to serve; neither how to live nor how to die; neither how to suffer the republic nor how to overthrow it; neither how to uphold the Constitution nor how to throw it overboard; neither how to co-operate with the President nor how to break with him. To whom, then, did it look for the solution of all the contradictions? To the calendar, to the course of events. It ceased to presume to sway the events. It therefore challenged the events to assume sway over it, and
thereby challenged the power to which in the struggle against
the people it had surrendered one attribute after another until
it itself stood impotent before this power. In order that the head
of the executive power might be able the more undisturbedly
to draw up his plan of campaign against it, strengthen his means
of attack, select his tools and fortify his positions, it resolved
precisely at this critical moment to retire from the stage and
adjourn for three months, from August 10 to November 4.

The parliamentary party was not only dissolved into its two
great factions, each of these factions was not only split up
within itself, but the party of Order in parliament had fallen
out with the party of Order outside parliament. The spokesmen
and scribes of the bourgeoisie, its platform and its press, in
short, the ideologists of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie
itself, the representatives and the represented, faced one an-
other in estrangement and no longer understood one another.

The Legitimists in the provinces, with their limited horizon
and their unlimited enthusiasm, accused their parliamentary
leaders, Berryer and Falloux, of deserting to the Bonapartist
camp and of defection from Henry V. Their fleur-de-lis minds
believed in the fall of man, but not in diplomacy.

Far more fateful and decisive was the breach of the commer-
cial bourgeoisie with its politicians. It reproached them, not as
the Legitimists reproached theirs, with having abandoned their
principles, but, on the contrary, with clinging to principles that
had become useless.

I have already indicated above that since Fould’s entry into
the ministry the section of the commercial bourgeoisie which
had held the lion’s share of power under Louis Philippe, namely,
the aristocracy of finance, had become Bonapartist. Fould rep-
resented not only Bonaparte’s interests in the bourse, he repre-
sented at the same time the interests of the bourse before Bona-
parte. The position of the aristocracy of finance is most strik-
ingly depicted in a passage from its European organ, the Lon-
don Economist. In its number of February 1, 1851, its Paris
 correspondent writes:

“Now we have it stated from numerous quarters that above all things
France demands tranquillity. The President declares it in his message
to the Legislative Assembly; it is echoed from the tribune; it is asserted
in the journals; it is announced from the pulpit; it is demonstrated by
the sensitiveness of the public funds at the least prospect of disturbance,
and their firmness the instant it is made manifest that the executive is
victorious.”

In its issue of November 29, 1851, The Economist declares in
its own name:
"The President is the guardian of order, and is now recognised as such on every Stock Exchange of Europe."

The aristocracy of finance, therefore, condemned the parliamentary struggle of the party of Order with the executive power as a disturbance of order, and celebrated every victory of the President over its ostensible representatives as a victory of order. By the aristocracy of finance must here be understood not merely the great loan promoters and speculators in public funds, in regard to whom it is immediately obvious that their interests coincide with the interests of the state power. All modern finance, the whole of the banking business, is interwoven in the closest fashion with public credit. A part of their business capital is necessarily invested and put out at interest in quickly convertible public funds. Their deposits, the capital placed at their disposal and distributed by them among merchants and industrialists, are partly derived from the dividends of holders of government securities. If in every epoch the stability of the state power signified Moses and the prophets to the entire money market and to the priests of this money market, why not all the more so today, when every deluge threatens to sweep away the old states, and the old state debts with them?

The industrial bourgeoisie, too, in its fanaticism for order, was angered by the squabbles of the parliamentary party of Order with the executive power. After their vote of January 18 on the occasion of Changarnier's dismissal, Thiers, Anglas, Sainte-Beuve, etc., received from their constituents in precisely the industrial districts public reproofs in which particularly their coalition with the Montagne was scourged as high treason to order. If, as we have seen, the boastful taunts, the petty intrigues which marked the struggle of the party of Order with the President merited no better reception, then, on the other hand, this bourgeois party, which required its representatives to allow the military power to pass from its own parliament to an adventurous pretender without offering resistance, was not even worth the intrigues that were squandered in its interests. It proved that the struggle to maintain its public interests, its own class interests, its political power, only troubled and upset it, as it was a disturbance of private business.

With barely an exception, the bourgeois dignitaries of the Departmental towns, the municipal authorities, the judges of the Commercial Courts, etc., everywhere received Bonaparte on his tours in the most servile manner, even when, as in Dijon, he made an unrestrained attack on the National Assembly, and especially on the party of Order.
When trade was good, as it still was at the beginning of 1851, the commercial bourgeoisie raged against any parliamentary struggle, lest trade be put out of humour. When trade was bad, as it continually was from the end of February 1851, the commercial bourgeoisie accused the parliamentary struggles of being the cause of stagnation and cried out for them to stop in order that trade might start again. The revision debates came on just in this bad period. Since the question here was whether the existing form of state was to be or not to be, the bourgeoisie felt itself all the more justified in demanding from its Representatives the ending of this torturous provisional arrangement and at the same time the maintenance of the status quo. There was no contradiction in this. By the end of the provisional arrangement it understood precisely its continuation, the postponement to a distant future of the moment when a decision had to be reached. The status quo could be maintained in only two ways: prolongation of Bonaparte's authority or his constitutional retirement and the election of Cavaignac. A section of the bourgeoisie desired the latter solution and knew no better advice to give its Representatives than to keep silent and leave the burning question untouched. They were of the opinion that if their Representatives did not speak, Bonaparte would not act. They wanted an ostrich parliament that would hide its head in order to remain unseen. Another section of the bourgeoisie desired, because Bonaparte was already in the presidential chair, to leave him sitting in it, so that everything might remain in the same old rut. They were indignant because their parliament did not openly infringe the Constitution and abdicate without ceremony.

The General Councils of the Departments, those provincial representative bodies of the big bourgeoisie, which met from August 25 on during the recess of the National Assembly, declared almost unanimously for revision, and thus against parliament and in favour of Bonaparte.

Still more unequivocally than in its falling out with its parliamentary representatives the bourgeoisie displayed its wrath against its literary representatives, its own press. The sentences to ruinous fines and shameless terms of imprisonment, on the verdicts of bourgeois juries, for every attack of bourgeois journalists on Bonaparte's usurpationist desires, for every attempt of the press to defend the political rights of the bourgeoisie against the executive power, astonished not merely France, but all Europe.

While the parliamentary party of Order, by its clamour for tranquillity, as I have shown, committed itself to quiescence,
while it declared the political rule of the bourgeoisie to be incompatible with the safety and existence of the bourgeoisie, by destroying with its own hands in the struggle against the other classes of society all the conditions for its own regime, the parliamentary regime, the extra-parliamentary mass of the bourgeoisie, on the other hand, by its servility towards the President, by its vilification of parliament, by its brutal maltreatment of its own press, invited Bonaparte to suppress and annihilate its speaking and writing section, its politicians and its literati, its platform and its press, in order that it might then be able to pursue its private affairs with full confidence in the protection of a strong and unrestricted government. It declared unequivocally that it longed to get rid of its own political rule in order to get rid of the troubles and dangers of ruling.

And this extra-parliamentary bourgeoisie, which had already rebelled against the purely parliamentary and literary struggle for the rule of its own class and betrayed the leaders of this struggle, now dares after the event to indict the proletariat for not having risen in a bloody struggle, a life-and-death struggle on its behalf! This bourgeoisie, which every moment sacrificed its general class interests, that is, its political interests, to the narrowest and most sordid private interests, and demanded a similar sacrifice from its Representatives, now moans that the proletariat has sacrificed its (the bourgeoisie's) ideal political interests to its (the proletariat's) material interests. It poses as a lovely being that has been misunderstood and deserted in the decisive hour by the proletariat misled by Socialists. And it finds a general echo in the bourgeois world. Naturally, I do not speak here of German shyster politicians and riffraff of the same persuasion. I refer, for example, to the already quoted Economists, which as late as November 29, 1851, that is, four days prior to the coup d'état, had declared Bonaparte to be the "guardian of order," but the Thiers and Berryers to be "anarchists," and on December 27, 1851, after Bonaparte had quieted these anarchists, is already vociferous concerning the treason to "the skill, knowledge, discipline, mental influence, intellectual resources and moral weight of the middle and upper ranks" committed by the masses of "ignorant, untrained, and stupid proletaires." The stupid, ignorant and vulgar mass was none other than the bourgeois mass itself.

In the year 1851, France, to be sure, had passed through a kind of minor trade crisis. The end of February showed a decline in exports compared with 1850; in March trade suffered and factories closed down; in April the position of the industrial Departments appeared as desperate as after the February days;
in May business had still not revived; as late as June 28 the holdings of the Bank of France showed, by the enormous growth of deposits and the equally great decrease in advances on bills of exchange, that production was at a standstill, and it was not until the middle of October that a progressive improvement of business again set in. The French bourgeois attributed this trade stagnation to purely political causes, to the struggle between parliament and the executive power, to the precariousness of a merely provisional form of state, to the terrifying prospect of the second Sunday in May 1852. I will not deny that all these circumstances had a depressing effect on some branches of industry in Paris and the Departments. But in any case this influence of the political conditions was only local and inconsiderable. Does this require further proof than the fact that the improvement of trade set in towards the middle of October, at the very moment when the political situation grew worse, the political horizon darkened and a thunderbolt from Elysium was expected at any moment? For the rest, the French bourgeois, whose "skill, knowledge, spiritual insight and intellectual resources" reach no further than his nose, could throughout the period of the Industrial Exhibition\(^{230}\) in London have found the cause of his commercial misery right under his nose. While in France factories were closed down, in England commercial bankruptcies broke out. While in April and May the industrial panic reached a climax in France, in April and May the commercial panic reached a climax in England. Like the French woollen industry, so the English woollen industry suffered, and as French silk manufacture, so did English silk manufacture. True, the English cotton mills continued working, but no longer at the same profits as in 1849 and 1850. The only difference was that the crisis in France was industrial, in England commercial; that while in France the factories stood idle, in England they extended operations, but under less favourable conditions than in preceding years; that in France it was exports, in England imports which were hardest hit. The common cause, which is naturally not to be sought within the bounds of the French political horizon, was obvious. The years 1849 and 1850 were years of the greatest material prosperity and of an overproduction that appeared as such only in 1851. At the beginning of this year it was given a further special impetus by the prospect of the Industrial Exhibition. In addition there were the following special circumstances: first, the partial failure of the cotton crop in 1850 and 1851, then the certainty of a bigger cotton crop than had been expected; first the rise, then the sudden fall, in short, the fluctuations in the price of cotton. The
crop of raw silk, in France at least, had turned out to be even below the average yield. Woollen manufacture, finally, had expanded so much since 1848 that the production of wool would not keep pace with it and the price of raw wool rose out of all proportion to the price of woollen manufactures. Here, then, in the raw material of three industries for the world market, we have already threefold material for a stagnation in trade. Apart from these special circumstances, the apparent crisis of 1851 was nothing else but the halt which over-production and over-speculation invariably make in describing the industrial cycle, before they summon all their strength in order to rush feverishly through the final phase of this cycle and arrive once more at their starting-point, the general trade crisis. During such intervals in the history of trade commercial bankruptcies break out in England, while in France industry itself is reduced to idleness, being partly forced into retreat by the competition, just then becoming intolerable, of the English in all markets, and being partly singled out for attack as a luxury industry by every business stagnation. Thus, besides the general crisis, France goes through national trade crises of her own, which are nevertheless determined and conditioned far more by the general state of the world market than by French local influences. It will not be without interest to contrast the judgement of the English bourgeois with the prejudice of the French bourgeois. In its annual trade report for 1851, one of the largest Liverpool houses writes:

"Few years have more thoroughly belied the anticipations formed at their commencement than the one just closed; instead of the great prosperity which was almost unanimously looked for it has proved one of the most discouraging that has been seen for the last quarter of a century —this, of course, refers to the mercantile, not to the manufacturing classes. And yet there certainly were grounds for anticipating the reverse at the beginning of the year—stocks of produce were moderate, money was abundant, and food was cheap, a plentiful harvest well secured, unbroken peace on the Continent, and no political or fiscal disturbances at home; indeed, the wings of commerce were never more unfettered.... To what source, then, is this disastrous result to be attributed? We believe to over-trading both in imports and exports. Unless our merchants will put more stringent limits to their freedom of action, nothing but a triennial panic can keep us in check."*

Now picture to yourself the French bourgeois, how in the throes of this business panic his trade-crazy brain is tortured, set in a whirl and stunned by rumours of coups d'état and the restoration of universal suffrage, by the struggle between par-

* The Economist, January 10, 1852, pp. 29-30.—Ed.
liament and the executive power, by the Fronde war between Orleanists and Legitimists, by the communist conspiracies in the south of France, by alleged *Jacqueries* in the Departments of Nièvre and Cher, by the advertisements of the different candidates for the presidency, by the cheapjack slogans of the journals, by the threats of the republicans to uphold the Constitution and universal suffrage by force of arms, by the gospel-preaching émigré heroes in *partibus,* who announced that the world would come to an end on the second Sunday in May 1852—think of all this and you will comprehend why in this unspeakable, deafening chaos of fusion, revision, prorogation, constitution, conspiration, coalition, emigration, usurpation and revolution, the bourgeois madly snorts at his parliamentary republic: "Rather an end with terror than terror without end!"

Bonaparte understood this cry. His power of comprehension was sharpened by the growing turbulence of creditors who, with each sunset which brought settling day, the second Sunday in May 1852, nearer, saw a movement of the stars protesting their earthly bills of exchange. They had become veritable astrologers. The National Assembly had blighted Bonaparte’s hopes of a constitutional prorogation of his authority; the candidature of the Prince of Joinville forbade further vacillation.

If ever an event has, well in advance of its coming, cast its shadow before, it was Bonaparte’s *coup d’état.* As early as January 29, 1849, barely a month after his election, he had made a proposal about it to Changarnier. In the summer of 1849 his own Prime Minister, Odilon Barrot, had covertly denounced the policy of *coups d’état*; in the winter of 1850 Thiers had openly done so. In May 1851, Persigny had sought once more to win Changarnier for the *coup*; the *Messager de l’Assemblée* had published an account of these negotiations. During every parliamentary storm, the Bonapartist journals threatened a *coup d’état,* and the nearer the crisis drew, the louder grew their tone. In the orgies that Bonaparte kept up every night with men and women of the “swell mob,” as soon as the hour of midnight approached and copious potations had loosened tongues and fired imaginations, the *coup d’état* was fixed for the following morning. Swords were drawn, glasses clinked, the Representatives were thrown out of the window, the imperial mantle fell upon Bonaparte’s shoulders, until the following morning banished the spook once more and astonished Paris learned, from vestals of little reticence and from indiscreet paladins, of the danger it had once again escaped. During the months of September and October rumours of a *coup d’état* followed fast one after the other. Simultaneously, the shadow took on colour, like
a variegated daguerreotype. Look up the September and October copies of the organs of the European daily press and you will find, word for word, intimations like the following: "Paris is full of rumours of a coup d'état. The capital is to be filled with troops during the night, and the next morning is to bring decrees which will dissolve the National Assembly, declare the Department of the Seine in a state of siege, restore universal suffrage and appeal to the people. Bonaparte is said to be seeking ministers for the execution of these illegal decrees." The letters that bring these tidings always end with the fateful word "postponed." The coup d'état was ever the fixed idea of Bonaparte. With this idea he had again set foot on French soil. He was so obsessed by it that he continually betrayed it and blurted it out. He was so weak that, just as continually, he gave it up again. The shadow of the coup d'état had become so familiar to the Parisians as a spectacle that they were not willing to believe in it when it finally appeared in the flesh. What allowed the coup d'état to succeed was, therefore, neither the reticent reserve of the chief of the Society of December 10 nor the fact that the National Assembly was caught unawares. If it succeeded, it succeeded despite his indiscretion and with its foreknowledge, a necessary, inevitable result of antecedent development.

On October 10 Bonaparte announced to his ministers his decision to restore universal suffrage; on the sixteenth they handed in their resignations; on the twenty-sixth Paris learned of the formation of the Thorigny ministry. Police Prefect Carlier was simultaneously replaced by Maupas; the head of the First Military Division, Magnan, concentrated the most reliable regiments in the capital. On November 4, the National Assembly resumed its sittings. It had nothing better to do than to recapitulate in a short, succinct form the course it had gone through and to prove that it was buried only after it had died.

The first post that it forfeited in the struggle with the executive power was the ministry. It had solemnly to admit this loss by accepting at full value the Thorigny ministry, a mere shadow cabinet. The Permanent Commission had received M. Giraud with laughter when he presented himself in the name of the new ministers. Such a weak ministry for such strong measures as the restoration of universal suffrage! Yet the precise object was to get nothing through in parliament, but everything against parliament.

On the very first day of its re-opening, the National Assembly received the message from Bonaparte in which he demanded the restoration of universal suffrage and the abolition of the law of May 31, 1850. The same day his ministers introduced a
decree to this effect. The National Assembly at once rejected the ministry's motion of urgency and rejected the law itself on November 13 by three hundred and fifty-five votes to three hundred and forty-eight. Thus, it tore up its mandate once more; it once more confirmed the fact that it had transformed itself from the freely elected representatives of the people into the usurpatory parliament of a class; it acknowledged once more that it had itself cut in two the muscles which connected the parliamentary head with the body of the nation.

If by its motion to restore universal suffrage the executive power appealed from the National Assembly to the people, the legislative power appealed by its Questors' Bill from the people to the army. This Questors' Bill was to establish its right of directly requisitioning troops, of forming a parliamentary army. While it thus designated the army as the arbitrator between itself and the people, between itself and Bonaparte, while it recognised the army as the decisive state power, it had to confirm, on the other hand, the fact that it had long given up its claim to dominate this power. By debating its right to requisition troops, instead of requisitioning them at once, it betrayed its doubts about its own powers. By rejecting the Questors' Bill, it made public confession of its impotence. This bill was defeated, its proponents lacking 108 votes of a majority. The Montagne thus decided the issue. It found itself in the position of Buridan's ass, not, indeed, between two bundles of hay with the problem of deciding which was the more attractive, but between two showers of blows with the problem of deciding which was the harder. On the one hand, there was the fear of Changarnier; on the other, the fear of Bonaparte. It must be confessed that the position was no heroic one.

On November 18, an amendment was moved to the law on municipal elections introduced by the party of Order, to the effect that instead of three years', one year's domicile should suffice for municipal electors. The amendment was lost by a single vote, but this one vote immediately proved to be a mistake. By splitting up into its hostile factions, the party of Order had long ago forfeited its independent parliamentary majority. It showed now that there was no longer any majority at all in parliament. The National Assembly had become incapable of transacting business. Its atomic constituents were no longer held together by any force of cohesion; it had drawn its last breath; it was dead.

Finally, a few days before the catastrophe, the extra-parliamentary mass of the bourgeoisie was solemnly to confirm once more its breach with the bourgeoisie in parliament. Thiers, as a
parliamentary hero infected more than the rest with the incurable disease of parliamentary cretinism, had, after the death of parliament, hatched out, together with the Council of State, a new parliamentary intrigue, a Responsibility Law by which the President was to be firmly held within the limits of the Constitution. Just as, on laying the foundation stone of the new market halls in Paris on September 15, Bonaparte, like a second Masaniello, had enchanted the dames des halles, the fishwives—to be sure, one fishwife outweighed seventeen burgraves in real power; just as after the introduction of the Questors' Bill he enraptured the lieutenants he regaled in the Elysée, so now, on November 25, he swept off their feet the industrial bourgeoisie, which had gathered at the circus to receive at his hands prize medals for the London Industrial Exhibition. I shall give the significant portion of his speech as reported in the Journal des Débats:

"With such unhoped-for successes, I am justified in reiterating how great the French republic would be if it were permitted to pursue its real interests and reform its institutions, instead of being constantly disturbed by demagogues, on the one hand, and by monarchist hallucinations, on the other. (Loud, stormy and repeated applause from every part of the amphitheatre.) The monarchist hallucinations hinder all progress and all important branches of industry. In place of progress nothing but struggle. One sees men who were formerly the most zealous supporters of the royal authority and prerogative become partisans of a Convention merely in order to weaken the authority that has sprung from universal suffrage. (Loud and repeated applause.) We see men who have suffered most from the Revolution, and have deplored it most, provoke a new one, and merely in order to fetter the nation's will.... I promise you tranquillity for the future, etc., etc. (Bravo, bravo, a storm of bravos.)"

Thus the industrial bourgeoisie applauds with servile bravos the coup d'état of December 2, the annihilation of parliament, the downfall of its own rule, the dictatorship of Bonaparte. The thunder of applause on November 25 had its answer in the thunder of cannon on December 4, and it was on the house of Monsieur Sallandrouze, who had clapped most, that they clapped most of the bombs.

Cromwell, when he dissolved the Long Parliament, went alone into its midst, drew out his watch in order that it should not continue to exist a minute after the time limit fixed by him, and drove out each one of the members of parliament with hilariously humorous taunts. Napoleon, smaller than his prototype, at least betook himself on the eighteenth Brumaire to the legislative body and read out to it, though in a faltering voice, its sentence of death. The second Bonaparte, who, moreover, found himself in possession of an executive power very differ-
ent from that of Cromwell or Napoleon, sought his model not in the annals of world history, but in the annals of the Society of December 10, in the annals of the criminal courts. He robs the Bank of France of twenty-five million francs, buys General Magnan with a million, the soldiers with fifteen francs apiece and liquor, comes together with his accomplices secretly like a thief in the night, has the houses of the most dangerous parliamentary leaders broken into and Cavaignac, Lamoricière, Le Flô, Changarnier, Charras, Thiers, Baze, etc., dragged from their beds, the chief squares of Paris and the parliamentary building occupied by troops, and cheapjack placards posted early in the morning on all the walls, proclaiming the dissolution of the National Assembly and the Council of State, the restoration of universal suffrage and the placing of the Seine Department in a state of siege. In like manner, he inserted a little later in the Moniteur a false document which asserted that influential parliamentarians had grouped themselves round him and formed a state consulta.

The rump parliament, assembled in the mairie building of the tenth arrondissement and consisting mainly of Legitimists and Orleanists, votes the deposition of Bonaparte amid repeated cries of “Long live the Republic,” unavailingy harangues the gaping crowds before the building and is finally led off in the custody of African sharpshooters, first to the d’Orsay barracks, and later packed into prison vans and transported to the prisons of Mazar, Ham and Vincennes. Thus ended the party of Order, the Legislative Assembly and the February Revolution. Before hastening to close, let us briefly summarise the latter’s history:


II. Second period. Period of constituting the republic and of the Constituent National Assembly.

1. May 4 to June 25, 1848. Struggle of all classes against the proletariat. Defeat of the proletariat in the June days.


3. December 20, 1848 to May 28, 1849. Struggle of the Constituent Assembly with Bonaparte and with the party of Order in alliance with him. Passing of the Constituent Assembly. Fall of the republican bourgeoisie.

III. Third period. Period of the constitutional republic and of the Legislative National Assembly.

1. May 28, 1849 to June 13, 1849. Struggle of the petty bour-
geoisie with the bourgeoisie and with Bonaparte. Defeat of the petty-bourgeois democracy.


3. May 31, 1850 to December 2, 1851. Struggle between the parliamentary bourgeoisie and Bonaparte.
   (a) May 31, 1850 to January 12, 1851. Parliament loses the supreme command of the army.
   (b) January 12 to April 11, 1851. It is worsted in its attempts to regain the administrative power. The party of Order loses its independent parliamentary majority. Its coalition with the republicans and the Montagne.
   (c) April 11, 1851 to October 9, 1851. Attempts at revision, fusion, prorogation. The party of Order decomposes into its separate constituents. The breach between the bourgeoisie parliament and press and the mass of the bourgeoisie becomes definite.
   (d) October 9 to December 2, 1851. Open breach between parliament and the executive power. Parliament performs its dying act and succumbs, left in the lurch by its own class, by the army and by all the remaining classes. Passing of the parliamentary regime and of bourgeois rule. Victory of Bonaparte. Parody of restoration of empire.

VII

On the threshold of the February Revolution, the social republic appeared as a phrase, as a prophecy. In the June days of 1848, it was drowned in the blood of the Paris proletariat, but it haunts the subsequent acts of the drama like a ghost. The democratic republic announces its arrival. On June 13, 1849, it is dissipated together with its petty bourgeoisie, who have taken to their heels, but in its flight it blows its own trumpet with redoubled boastfulness. The parliamentary republic, together with the bourgeoisie, takes possession of the entire stage; it enjoys its existence to the full, but December 2, 1851 buries it to the accompaniment of the anguished cry of the royalists in coalition: "Long live the Republic!"

The French bourgeoisie balked at the domination of the working proletariat; it has brought the lumpenproletariat to domination, with the chief of the Society of December 10 at the head. The bourgeoisie kept France in breathless fear of the future terrors of red anarch; Bonaparte discounted this future for it when, on December 4, he had the eminent bourgeois of the Boulevard Montmartre and the Boulevard des Italiens shot down
at their windows by the liquor-inspired army of order. It apo-
theosised the sword; the sword rules it. It destroyed the revolu-
tionary press; its own press has been destroyed. It placed popular
meetings under police supervision; its salons are under the
supervision of the police. It disbanded the democratic National
Guards; its own National Guard is disbanded. It imposed a state
of siege; a state of siege is imposed upon it. It supplanted the
juries by military commissions; its juries are supplanted by mil-
itary commissions. It subjected public education to the sway
of the priests; the priests subject it to their own education. It
transported people without trial; it is being transported without
trial. It repressed every stirring in society by means of the state
power; every stirring in its society is suppressed by means of
the state power. Out of enthusiasm for its purse, it rebelled
against its own politicians and men of letters; its politicians and
men of letters are swept aside, but its purse is being plundered
now that its mouth has been gagged and its pen broken. The
bourgeoisie never wearied of crying out to the revolution what
Saint Arsenius cried out to the Christians: "Fuge, tace, quiesce!
Flee, be silent, keep still!" Bonaparte cries to the bourgeoisie:
"Fuge, tace, quiesce! Flee, be silent, keep still!"

The French bourgeoisie had long ago found the solution to
Napoleon's dilemma: "Dans cinquante ans l'Europe sera ré-
publicaine ou cosaque."* It had found the solution to it in the
"république cosaque." No Circe, by means of black magic, has
distorted that work of art, the bourgeois republic, into a mon-
strous shape. That republic has lost nothing but the semblance
of respectability. Present-day** France was contained in a fin-
ished state within the parliamentary republic. It only required a
bayonet thrust for the bubble to burst and the monster to spring
forth before our eyes.

Why did the Paris proletariat not rise in revolt after Decem-
ber 2?

The overthrow of the bourgeoisie had as yet been only de-
creed: the decree had not been carried out. Any serious insur-
rection of the proletariat would at once have put fresh life into
the bourgeoisie, would have reconciled it with the army and
ensured a second June defeat for the workers.

On December 4 the proletariat was incited by bourgeois and
épicier to fight. On the evening of that day several legions of
the National Guard promised to appear, armed and uniformed,
on the scene of battle. For the bourgeois and the épicier had

---

* "In fifty years Europe will be republican or Cossack."—Ed.
** i.e., after the coup d'état of 1851.—Ed.
got wind of the fact that in one of his decrees of December 2
Bonaparte abolished the secret ballot and enjoined them to
record their "yes" or "no" in the official registers after their
names. The resistance of December 4 intimidated Bonaparte.
During the night he caused placards to be posted on all the
street corners of Paris, announcing the restoration of the secret
ballot. The bourgeois and the épicier believed that they had
 gained their end. Those who failed to appear next morning were
the bourgeois and the épicier.

By a coup de main during the night of December 1 to 2,
Bonaparte had robbed the Paris proletariat of its leaders, the
barricade commanders. An army without officers, averse to
fighting under the banner of the Montagnards because of the
memories of June 1848 and 1849 and May 1850, it left to its
vanguard, the secret societies, the task of saving the insurrection-
ary honour of Paris, which the bourgeoisie had so unresistingly
surrendered to the soldiery that, later on, Bonaparte could
sneeringly give as his motive for disarming the National Guard
—his fear that its arms would be turned against it itself by the
anarchists!

"C'est le triomphe complet et définitif du Socialisme!"*
Thus Guizot characterised December 2. But if the overthrow of
the parliamentary republic contains within itself the germ of
the triumph of the proletarian revolution, its immediate and pal-
pable result was the victory of Bonaparte over parliament, of
the executive power over the legislative power, of force without
phrases over the force of phrases. In parliament the nation
made its general will the law, that is, it made the law of the
ruling class its general will. Before the executive power it
renounces all will of its own and submits to the superior com-
mand of an alien will, to authority. The executive power, in
contrast to the legislative power, expresses the heteronomy of a
nation, in contrast to its autonomy. France, therefore, seems
to have escaped the despotism of a class only to fall back beneath
the despotism of an individual, and, what is more, beneath the
authority of an individual without authority. The struggle seems
to be settled in such a way that all classes, equally impotent and
equally mute, fall on their knees before the rifle butt.

But the revolution is thoroughgoing. It is still journeying
through purgatory. It does its work methodically. By December
2, 1851, it had completed one half of its preparatory work; it is
now completing the other half. First it perfected the parlia-
mentary power, in order to be able to overthrow it. Now that it

* "This is the complete and final triumph of socialism!"—Ed.
has attained this, it perfects the executive power, reduces it to its purest expression, isolates it, sets it up against itself as the sole target, in order to concentrate all its forces of destruction against it. And when it has done this second half of its preliminary work, Europe will leap from its seat and exultantly exclaim: Well grubbed, old mole!*

This executive power with its enormous bureaucratic and military organisation, with its ingenious state machinery, embracing wide strata, with a host of officials numbering half a million, besides an army of another half million, this appalling parasitic body, which enmeshes the body of French society like a net and chokes all its pores, sprang up in the days of the absolute monarchy, with the decay of the feudal system, which it helped to hasten. The seigniorial privileges of the landowners and towns became transformed into so many attributes of the state power, the feudal dignitaries into paid officials and the motley pattern of conflicting mediaeval plenary powers into the regulated plan of a state authority whose work is divided and centralised as in a factory. The first French Revolution, with its task of breaking all separate local, territorial, urban and provincial powers in order to create the civil unity of the nation, was bound to develop what the absolute monarchy had begun: centralisation, but at the same time the extent, the attributes and the agents of governmental power. Napoleon perfected this state machinery. The Legitimist monarchy and the July monarchy added nothing but a greater division of labour, growing in the same measure as the division of labour within bourgeois society created new groups of interests, and, therefore, new material for state administration. Every common interest was straightway severed from society, counterposed to it as a higher, general interest, snatched from the activity of society's members themselves and made an object of government activity, from a bridge, a schoolhouse and the communal property of a village community to the railways, the national wealth and the national university of France. Finally, in its struggle against the revolution, the parliamentary republic found itself compelled to strengthen, along with the repressive measures, the resources and centralisation of governmental power. All revolutions perfected this machine instead of smashing it. The parties that contended in turn for domination regarded the possession of this huge state edifice as the principal spoils of the victor.

But under the absolute monarchy, during the first Revolution, under Napoleon, bureaucracy was only the means of preparing

---

* Shakespeare, Hamlet, Act I, Scene V.—Ed.
the class rule of the bourgeoisie. Under the Restoration, under Louis Philippe, under the parliamentary republic, it was the instrument of the ruling class, however much it strove for power of its own.

Only under the second Bonaparte does the state seem to have made itself completely independent. As against civil society, the state machine has consolidated its position so thoroughly that the chief of the Society of December 10 suffices for its head, an adventurer blown in from abroad, raised on the shield by a drunken soldiery, which he has bought with liquor and sausages, and which he must continually ply with sausage anew. Hence the downcast despair, the feeling of most dreadful humiliation and degradation that oppresses the breast of France and makes her catch her breath. She feels dishonoured.

And yet the state power is not suspended in mid air. Bonaparte represents a class, and the most numerous class of French society at that, the small-holding [Parzellen] peasants.

Just as the Bourbons were the dynasty of big landed property and just as the Orleans were the dynasty of money, so the Bonapartes are the dynasty of the peasants, that is, the mass of the French people. Not the Bonaparte who submitted to the bourgeois parliament, but the Bonaparte who dispersed the bourgeois parliament is the chosen of the peasantry. For three years the towns had succeeded in falsifying the meaning of the election of December 10 and in cheating the peasants out of the restoration of the empire. The election of December 10, 1848, has been consummated only by the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.

The small-holding peasants form a vast mass, the members of which live in similar conditions but without entering into manifold relations with one another. Their mode of production isolates them from one another instead of bringing them into mutual intercourse. The isolation is increased by France’s bad means of communication and by the poverty of the peasants. Their field of production, the small holding, admits of no division of labour in its cultivation, no application of science and, therefore, no diversity of development, no variety of talent, no wealth of social relationships. Each individual peasant family is almost self-sufficient; it itself directly produces the major part of its consumption and thus acquires its means of life more through exchange with nature than in intercourse with society. A small holding, a peasant and his family; alongside them another small holding, another peasant and another family. A few score of these make up a village, and a few score of villages make up a Department. In this way, the great mass of the French nation is formed by simple addition of homologous magnitudes, much
as potatoes in a sack form a sack of potatoes. In so far as millions of families live under economic conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, their interests and their culture from those of the other classes, and put them in hostile opposition to the latter, they form a class. In so far as there is merely a local interconnection among these small-holding peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community, no national bond and no political organisation among them, they do not form a class. They are consequently incapable of enforcing their class interests in their own name, whether through a parliament or through a convention. They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented. Their representative must at the same time appear as their master, as an authority over them, as an unlimited governmental power that protects them against the other classes and sends them rain and sunshine from above. The political influence of the small-holding peasants, therefore, finds its final expression in the executive power subordinating society to itself.

Historical tradition gave rise to the belief of the French peasants in the miracle that a man named Napoleon would bring all the glory back to them. And an individual turned up who gives himself out as the man because he bears the name of Napoleon, in consequence of the Code Napoléon, which lays down that la recherche de la paternité est interdite.* After a vagabondage of twenty years and after a series of grotesque adventures, the legend finds fulfilment and the man becomes Emperor of the French. The fixed idea of the Nephew was realised, because it coincided with the fixed idea of the most numerous class of the French people.

But, it may be objected, what about the peasant risings in half of France, the raids on the peasants by the army, the mass incarceration and transportation of peasants?

Since Louis XIV, France has experienced no similar persecution of the peasants "on account of demagogic practices."

But let there be no misunderstanding. The Bonaparte dynasty represents not the revolutionary, but the conservative peasant; not the peasant that strikes out beyond the condition of his social existence, the small holding, but rather the peasant who wants to consolidate this holding; not the country folk who, linked up with the towns, want to overthrow the old order through their own energies, but on the contrary those who, in stupefied seclusion within this old order, want to see themselves and their small holdings saved and favoured by the ghost of

* Inquiry into paternity is forbidden.—Ed.
the empire. It represents not the enlightenment, but the superstition of the peasant; not his judgement, but his prejudice; not his future, but his past; not his modern Cévennes, but his modern Vendée. The three years' rigorous rule of the parliamentary republic had freed a part of the French peasants from the Napoleonic illusion and had revolutionised them, even if only superficially; but the bourgeoisie violently repressed them, as often as they set themselves in motion. Under the parliamentary republic the modern and the traditional consciousness of the French peasant contended for mastery. This progress took the form of an incessant struggle between the schoolmasters and the priests. The bourgeoisie struck down the schoolmasters. For the first time the peasants made efforts to behave independently in the face of the activity of the government. This was shown in the continual conflict between the maires and the prefects. The bourgeoisie deposed the maires. Finally, during the period of the parliamentary republic, the peasants of different localities rose against their own offspring, the army. The bourgeoisie punished them with states of siege and punitive expeditions. And this same bourgeoisie now cries out about the stupidity of the masses, the vile multitude, that has betrayed it to Bonaparte. It has itself forcibly strengthened the empire sentiments [Imperialismus] of the peasant class, it conserved the conditions that form the birthplace of this peasant religion. The bourgeoisie, to be sure, is bound to fear the stupidity of the masses as long as they remain conservative, and the insight of the masses as soon as they become revolutionary.

In the risings after the coup d'état, a part of the French peasants protested, arms in hand, against their own vote of December 10, 1848. The school they had gone through since 1848 had sharpened their wits. But they had made themselves over to the underworld of history; history held them to their word, and the majority was still so prejudiced that in precisely the reddest Departments the peasant population voted openly for Bonaparte. In its view, the National Assembly had hindered his progress. He had now merely broken the fetters that the towns had imposed on the will of the countryside. In some parts the peasants even entertained the grotesque notion of a convention side by side with Napoleon.

After the first revolution had transformed the peasants from semi-villeins into freeholders, Napoleon confirmed and regulated the conditions on which they could exploit undisturbed the soil of France which had only just fallen to their lot and slake their youthful passion for property. But what is now causing the ruin
of the French peasant is his small holding itself, the division of
the land, the form of property which Napoleon consolidated in
France. It is precisely the material conditions which made the
feudal peasant a small-holding peasant and Napoleon an emperor.
Two generations have sufficed to produce the inevitable result:
progressive deterioration of agriculture, progressive indebtedness
of the agriculturist. The "Napoleonic" form of property, which
at the beginning of the nineteenth century was the condition for
the liberation and enrichment of the French country folk, has
developed in the course of this century into the law of their
enslavement and pauperisation. And precisely this law is the first
of the "idées napoléoniennes" which the second Bonaparte has
to uphold. If he still shares with the peasants the illusion that
the cause of their ruin is to be sought, not in this small-holding
property itself, but outside it, in the influence of secondary cir-
cumstances, his experiments will burst like soap bubbles when
they come in contact with the relations of production.

The economic development of small-holding property has
radically changed the relation of the peasants to the other
classes of society. Under Napoleon, the fragmentation of the land
in the countryside supplemented free competition and the begin-
ning of big industry in the towns. The peasant class was the
ubiquitous protest against the landed aristocracy which had just
been overthrown. The roots that small-holding property struck
in French soil deprived feudalism of all nutriment. Its landmarks
formed the natural fortifications of the bourgeoisie against any
surprise attack on the part of its old overlords. But in the course
of the nineteenth century the feudal lords were replaced by
urban usurers; the feudal obligation that went with the land
was replaced by the mortgage; aristocratic landed property was
replaced by bourgeois capital. The small holding of the peasant
is now only the pretext that allows the capitalist to draw profits,
interest and rent from the soil, while leaving it to the tiller of
the soil himself to see how he can extract his wages. The mort-
gage debt burdening the soil of France imposes on the French
peasantry payment of an amount of interest equal to the annual
interest on the entire British national debt. Small-holding
property, in this enslavement by capital to which its devel-
opment inevitably pushes forward, has transformed the mass of
the French nation into troglodytes. Sixteen million peasants
(including women and children) dwell in hovels, a large num-
ber of which have but one opening, others only two and the
most favoured only three. And windows are to a house what theive senses are to the head. The bourgeois order, which at the
beginning of the century set the state to stand guard over the
newly arisen small holding and manured it with laurels, has become a vampire that sucks out its blood and brains and throws them into the alchemistic cauldron of capital. The Code Napoléon is now nothing but a codex of distrains, forced sales and compulsory auctions. To the four million (including children, etc.) officially recognised paupers, vagabonds, criminals and prostitutes in France must be added five million who hover on the margin of existence and either have their haunts in the countryside itself or, with their rags and their children, continually desert the countryside for the towns and the towns for the countryside. The interests of the peasants, therefore, are no longer, as under Napoleon, in accord with, but in opposition to the interests of the bourgeoisie, to capital. Hence the peasants find their natural ally and leader in the urban proletariat, whose task is the overthrow of the bourgeois order. But strong and unlimited government—and this is the second “idée napoléonienne,” which the second Napoleon has to carry out—is called upon to defend this “material” order by force. This “ordre matériel” also serves as the catchword in all of Bonaparte’s proclamations against the rebellious peasants.

Besides the mortgage which capital imposes on it, the small holding is burdened by taxes. Taxes are the source of life for the bureaucracy, the army, the priests and the court, in short, for the whole apparatus of the executive power. Strong government and heavy taxes are identical. By its very nature, small-holding property forms a suitable basis for an all-powerful and innumerable bureaucracy. It creates a uniform level of relationships and persons over the whole surface of the land. Hence it also permits of uniform action from a supreme centre on all points of this uniform mass. It annihilates the aristocratic intermediate grades between the mass of the people and the state power. On all sides, therefore, it calls forth the direct interference of this state power and the interposition of its immediate organs. Finally, it produces an unemployed surplus population for which there is no place either on the land or in the towns, and which accordingly reaches out for state offices as a sort of respectable aims, and provokes the creation of state posts. By the new markets which he opened at the point of the bayonet, by the plundering of the Continent, Napoleon repaid the compulsory taxes with interest. These taxes were a spur to the industry of the peasant, whereas now they rob his industry of its last resources and complete his inability to resist pauperism. And an enormous bureaucracy, well-gallooned and well-fed, is the “idée napoléonienne” which is most congenial of all to the second Bonaparte. How could it be otherwise, seeing that alongside the actual
classes of society he is forced to create an artificial caste, for which the maintenance of his regime becomes a bread-and-butter question? Accordingly, one of his first financial operations was the raising of officials' salaries to their old level and the creation of new sinecures.

Another "idée napoléonienne" is the domination of the priests as an instrument of government. But while in its accord with society, in its dependence on natural forces and its submission to the authority which protected it from above, the small holding that had newly come into being was naturally religious, the small holding that is ruined by debts, at odds with society and authority, and driven beyond its own limitations naturally becomes irreligious. Heaven was quite a pleasing accession to the narrow strip of land just won, more particularly as it makes the weather; it becomes an insult as soon as it is thrust forward as substitute for the small holding. The priest then appears as only the anointed bloodhound of the earthly police—another "idée napoléonienne." On the next occasion, the expedition against Rome will take place in France itself, but in a sense opposite to that of M. de Montalembert.

Lastly, the culminating point of the "idées napoléoniennes" is the preponderance of the army. The army was the point d'honneur² of the small-holding peasants, it was they themselves transformed into heroes, defending their new possessions against the outer world, glorifying their recently won nationhood, plundering and revolutionising the world. The uniform was their own state dress; war was their poetry; the small holding, extended and rounded off in imagination, was their fatherland, and patriotism the ideal form of the sense of property. But the enemies against whom the French peasant has now to defend his property are not the Cossacks; they are the huissiers** and the tax collectors. The small holding lies no longer in the so-called fatherland, but in the register of mortgages. The army itself is no longer the flower of the peasant youth; it is the swamp-flower of the peasant lumpenproletariat. It consists in large measure of remplaçants, of substitutes, just as the second Bonaparte is himself only a remplaçant, the substitute for Napoleon. It now performs its deeds of valour by hounding the peasants in masses like chamois, by doing gendarme duty, and if the internal contradictions of his system chase the chief of the Society of December 10 over the French border, his army, after some acts of brigandage, will reap, not laurels, but thrashings.

* Matter of honour, a point of special touch.—Ed.
** Huissiers: Bailiffs.—Ed.
One sees: all "idées napoléoniennes" are ideas of the undeveloped small holding in the freshness of its youth; for the small holding that has outlived its day they are an absurdity. They are only the hallucinations of its death struggle, words that are transformed into phrases, spirits transformed into ghosts. But the parody of the empire [des Imperialismus] was necessary to free the mass of the French nation from the weight of tradition and to work out in pure form the opposition between the state power and society. With the progressive undermining of small-holding property, the state structure—erected upon it collapses. The centralisation of the state that modern society requires arises only on the ruins of the military-bureaucratic government machinery which was forged in opposition to feudalism.*

The condition of the French peasants provides us with the answer to the riddle of the general elections of December 20 and 21, which bore the second Bonaparte up Mount Sinai, not to receive laws, but to give them.

Manifestly, the bourgeoisie had now no choice but to elect Bonaparte. When the puritans at the Council of Constance complained of the dissolute lives of the popes and wailed about the necessity of moral reform, Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly thundered at them: "Only the devil in person can still save the Catholic Church, and you ask for angels." In like manner, after the coup d'état, the French bourgeoisie cried: Only the chief of the Society of December 10 can still save bourgeois society! Only theft can still save property; only perjury, religion; bastardy, the family; disorder, order!

As the executive authority which has made itself an independent power, Bonaparte feels it to be his mission to safeguard "bourgeois order." But the strength of this bourgeois order lies in the middle class. He looks on himself, therefore, as the representative of the middle class and issues decrees in this sense. Nevertheless, he is somebody solely due to the fact that he has broken the political power of this middle class and daily breaks it anew. Consequently, he looks on himself as the adversary of the political and literary power of the middle class. But by protecting its material power, he generates its political power

* In the 1852 edition this paragraph ended with the following lines, which Marx omitted in the 1869 edition: "The demolition of the state machine will not endanger centralisation. Bureaucracy is only the low and brutal form of a centralisation that is still afflicted with its opposite, with feudalism. When he is disappointed in the Napoleonic Restoration, the French peasant will part with his belief in his small holding, the entire state edifice erected on this small holding will fall to the ground and the proletarian revolution will obtain that chorus without which its solo song becomes a swan song in all peasant countries."—Ed.
anew. The cause must accordingly be kept alive; but the effect, where it manifests itself, must be done away with. But this cannot pass off without slight confusions of cause and effect, since in their interaction both lose their distinguishing features. New decrees that obliterate the border line. As against the bourgeoisie, Bonaparte looks on himself, at the same time, as the representative of the peasants and of the people in general, who wants to make the lower classes of the people happy within the frame of bourgeois society. New decrees that cheat the "True Socialists"\textsuperscript{164} of their statecraft in advance. But, above all, Bonaparte looks on himself as the chief of the Society of December 10, as the representative of the \textit{lumpenproletariat} to which he himself, his entourage, his government and his army belong, and whose prime consideration is to benefit itself and draw California lottery prizes from the state treasury. And he vindicates his position as chief of the Society of December 10 with decrees, without decrees and despite decrees.

This contradictory task of the man explains the contradictions of his government, the confused groping about which seeks now to win, now to humiliate first one class and then another and arrays all of them uniformly against him, whose practical uncertainty forms a highly comical contrast to the imperious, categorical style of the government decrees, a style which is faithfully copied from the Uncle.

Industry and trade, hence the business affairs of the middle class, are to prosper in hothouse fashion under the strong government. The grant of innumerable railway concessions. But the Bonapartist \textit{lumpenproletariat} is to enrich itself. The initiated play \textit{tripotage*} on the \textit{bourse} with the railway concessions. But no capital is forthcoming for the railways. Obligation of the Bank to make advances on railway shares. But, at the same time, the Bank is to be exploited for personal ends and therefore must be cajoled. Release of the Bank from the obligation to publish its report weekly. Leonine agreement of the Bank with the government. The people are to be given employment. Initiation of public works. But the public works increase the obligations of the people in respect of taxes. Hence reduction of the taxes by an onslaught on the \textit{rentiers}, by conversion of the five per cent bonds to four-and-a-half per cent. But, once more, the middle class must receive a \textit{douceur}.*\textsuperscript{2} Therefore doubling of the wine tax for the people, who buy it \textit{en détail}, and halving of the wine tax for the middle class, who drink it \textit{en gros}. Disso-

---

\* \textit{Tripotage:} Hanky-panky.—\textit{Ed.}
\*\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Douceur:} Sop.—\textit{Ed.}
olution of the actual workers' associations, but promises of miracles of association in the future. The peasants are to be helped. Mortgage banks that expedite their getting into debt and accelerate the concentration of property. But these banks are to be used to make money out of the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans. No capitalist wants to agree to this condition, which is not in the decree, and the mortgage bank remains a mere decree, etc., etc.

Bonaparte would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes. But he cannot give to one class without taking from another. Just as at the time of the Fronde it was said of the Duke of Guise that he was the most *obligeant* man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans' obligations to him, so Bonaparte would fain be the most *obligeant* man in France and turn all the property, all the labour of France into a personal obligation to himself. He would like to steal the whole of France in order to be able to make a present of her to France or, rather, in order to be able to buy France anew with French money, for as the chief of the Society of December 10 he must needs buy what ought to belong to him. And all the state institutions, the Senate, the Council of State, the legislative body, the Legion of Honour, the soldiers' medals, the washhouses, the public works, the railways, the *état-major* of the National Guard to the exclusion of privates, and the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans—all become parts of the institution of purchase. Every place in the army and in the government machine becomes a means of purchase. But the most important feature of this process, whereby France is taken in order to give to her, is the percentages that find their way into the pockets of the head and the members of the Society of December 10 during the turnover. The witticism with which Countess L., the mistress of M. de Morny, characterised the confiscation of the Orleans estates: "*C'est le premier vol** de l'aigle*** is applicable to every flight of this *eagle*, which is more like a *raven*. He himself and his adherents call out to one another daily like that Italian Carthusian admonishing the miser who, with boastful display, counted up the goods on which he could yet live for years to come: "*Tu fai conto sopra i beni, bisogna prima far il conto sopra gli anni.*"*** Lest they make a mistake in the years, they count the minutes. A bunch of blokes push their

---

* *Etat-major: General Staff.—Ed.*
** *Vol means flight and theft. [Note by Marx.]*
*** *"It is the first flight (theft) of the eagle."—Ed.*
**** *"Theou countest thy goods, thou shouldst first count thy years." [Note by Marx.]*
way forward to the court, into the ministries, to the head of the administration and the army, a crowd of the best of whom it must be said that no one knows whence he comes, a noisy, disreputable, rapacious bohème that crawls into gallooned coats with the same grotesque dignity as the high dignitaries of Sou- louque. One can visualise clearly this upper stratum of the Society of December 10, if one reflects that Véron-Crevel is its preacher of morals and Granier de Cassagnac its thinker. When Guizot, at the time of his ministry, utilised this Granier on a hole-and-corner newspaper against the dynastic opposition, he used to boast of him with the quip: “C’est le roi des drôles,” “he is the king of buffoons.” One would do wrong to recall the Regency or Louis XV in connection with Louis Bonaparte’s court and clique. For “often already, France has experienced a government of mistresses; but never before a government of hommes entretenus.”**

Driven by the contradictory demands of his situation and being at the same time, like a conjurer, under the necessity of keeping the public gaze fixed on himself, as Napoleon’s substitute, by springing constant surprises, that is to say, under the necessity of executing a coup d’état en miniature every day, Bonaparte throws the entire bourgeois economy into confusion, violates everything that seemed inviolable to the Revolution of 1848, makes some tolerant of revolution, others desirous of revolution, and produces actual anarchy in the name of order, while at the same time stripping its halo from the entire state machine, profanes it and makes it at once loathsome and ridiculous. The cult of the Holy Tunic of Treves he duplicates at Paris in the cult of the Napoleonic imperial mantle. But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendôme Column.196

Written by Marx in December 1851-March 1852

Published in the first issue of the journal Die Revolution, New York, 1852

Signed: Karl Marx

Printed according to the 1869 edition, checked with the 1852 and 1885 editions

Translated from the German

In his work, Cousine Bette, Balzac delineates the thoroughly dissolute Parisian philistine in Crevel, a character which he draws after the model of Dr. Véron, the proprietor of the Constitutionnel. [Note by Marx.]

The words quoted are those of Madame Girardin. [Note by Marx.]

Hommes entretenus: Kept men.—Ed.
...Hindostan is an Italy of Asiatic dimensions, the Himalayas for the Alps, the Plains of Bengal for the Plains of Lombardy, the Deccan for the Appenines, and the Isle of Ceylon for the Island of Sicily. The same rich variety in the products of the soil, and the same dismemberment in the political configuration. Just as Italy has, from time to time, been compressed by the conqueror’s sword into different national masses, so do we find Hindostan, when not under the pressure of the Mohammedan, or the Mogul, or the Briton, dissolved into as many independent and conflicting States as it numbered towns, or even villages. Yet, in a social point of view, Hindostan is not the Italy, but the Ireland of the East. And this strange combination of Italy and of Ireland, of a world of voluptuousness and of a world of woes, is anticipated in the ancient traditions of the religion of Hindostan. That religion is at once a religion of sensualist exuberance, and a religion of self-torturing asceticism; a religion of the Lingam and of the Juggernaut; the religion of the Monk, and of the Bayadere.

I share not the opinion of those who believe in a golden age of Hindostan, without recurring, however, like Sir Charles Wood, for the confirmation of my view, to the authority of Khuli-Khan. But take, for example, the times of Aurung-Zebe; or the epoch, when the Mogul appeared in the North, and the Portuguese in the South; or the age of Mohammedan invasion, and of the Heptarchy in Southern India; or, if you will, go still more back to antiquity, take the mythological chronology of the Brahmin himself, who places the commencement of Indian misery in an epoch even more remote than the Christian creation of the world.

There cannot, however, remain any doubt but that the misery inflicted by the British on Hindostan is of an essentially different and infinitely more intensive kind than all Hindostan had to suffer before. I do not allude to European despotism, planted upon Asiatic despotism, by the British East India Company, forming a more monstrous combination than any of the divine
monsters startling us in the Temple of Salsette. This is no distinctive feature of British colonial rule, but only an imitation of the Dutch, and so much so that in order to characterize the working of the British East India Company, it is sufficient to literally repeat what Sir Stamford Raffles, the English Governor of Java, said of the old Dutch East India Company:

"The Dutch Company, actuated solely by the spirit of gain, and viewing their subjects with less regard or consideration than a West India planter formerly viewed a gang upon his estate, because the latter had paid the purchase money of human property, which the other had not, employed all the existing machinery of despotism to squeeze from the people their utmost mite of contribution, the last dregs of their labour, and thus aggravated the evils of a capricious and semi-barbarous Government, by working it with all the practised ingenuity of politicians, and all the monopolising selfishness of traders."

All the civil wars, invasions, revolutions, conquests, famines, strangely complex, rapid and destructive as the successive action in Hindostan may appear, did not go deeper than its surface. England has broken down the entire framework of Indian society, without any symptoms of reconstitution yet appearing. This loss of his old world, with no gain of a new one, imparts a particular kind of melancholy to the present misery of the Hindoo, and separates Hindostan, ruled by Britain, from all its ancient traditions, and from the whole of its past history.

There have been in Asia, generally, from immemorial times, but three departments of Government: that of Finance, or the plunder of the interior; that of War, or the plunder of the exterior; and, finally, the department of Public Works. Climate and territorial conditions, especially the vast tracts of desert, extending from the Sahara, through Arabia, Persia, India and Tartary, to the most elevated Asiatic highlands, constituted artificial irrigation by canals and waterworks the basis of Oriental agriculture. As in Egypt and India, inundations are used for fertilizing the soil of Mesopotamia, Persia, etc.; advantage is taken of a high level for feeding irrigative canals. This prime necessity of an economical and common use of water, which, in the Occident, drove private enterprise to voluntary association, as in Flanders and Italy, necessitated, in the Orient where civilization was too low and the territorial extent too vast to call into life voluntary association, the interference of the centralizing power of Government. Hence an economical function devolved upon all Asiatic Governments, the function of providing public works. This artificial fertilization of the soil, dependent on a Central Government, and immediately decaying with the neglect of irrigation and drainage, explains the otherwise strange
fact that we now find whole 'territories barren and desert that
were once brilliantly cultivated, as Palmyra, Petra, the ruins
in Yemen, and large provinces of Egypt, Persia and Hindostan; it
also explains how a single war of devastation has been able
to depopulate a country for centuries, and to strip it of all its
civilization.

Now, the British in East India accepted from their predeces-
sors the department of finance and of war, but they have
neglected entirely that of public works. Hence the deterioration
of an agriculture which is not capable of being conducted on
the British principle of free competition, of laissez-faire and
laissez-aller.* But in Asiatic empires we are quite accustomed
to see agriculture deteriorating under one government and re-
viving again under some other government. There the harvests
 correspond to good or bad government, as they change in
Europe with good or bad seasons. Thus the oppression and
neglect of agriculture, bad as it is, could not be looked upon
as the final blow dealt to Indian society by the British intruder,
had it not been attended by a circumstance of quite different
importance, a novelty in the annals of the whole Asiatic world,
However changing the political aspect of India's past must ap-
ppear, its social condition has remained unaltered since its
remotest antiquity, until the first decennium of the 19th cen-
tury. The hand-loom and the spinning-wheel, producing their
regular myriads of spinners and weavers, were the pivots of
the structure of that society. From immemorial times, Europe
received the admirable textures of Indian labor, sending in
return for them her precious metals; and furnishing thereby his
material to the goldsmith, that indispensable member of Indian
society, whose love of finery is so great that even the lowest
class, those who go about nearly naked, have commonly a pair
of golden earrings and a gold ornament of some kind hung
round their necks. Rings on the fingers and toes have also been
common. Women as well as children frequently wore massive
bracelets and anklets of gold or silver, and statuettes of divini-
ties in gold and silver were met with in the households. It was
the British intruder who broke up the Indian hand-loom and
destroyed the spinning-wheel. England began with depriving
the Indian cottons from the European market; it then introduced
twist into Hindostan and in the end inundated the very mother
country of cotton with cottons. From 1818 to 1836 the export of

* "Grant freedom of action" (the motto of the Bourgeois economists, free
traders, who insisted on free trade and non-interference by the state in the
sphere of economic relations).—Ed.
twist from Great Britain to India rose in the proportion of 1 to 5,200. In 1824 the export of British muslins to India hardly amounted to 1,000,000 yards, while in 1837 it surpassed 64,000,000 of yards. But at the same time the population of Dacca decreased from 150,000 inhabitants to 20,000. This decline of Indian towns celebrated for their fabrics was by no means the worst consequence. British steam and science uprooted, over the whole surface of Hindostan, the union between agriculture and manufacturing industry.

These two circumstances—the Hindoo, on the one hand, leaving, like all Oriental peoples, to the central government the care of the great public works, the prime condition of his agriculture and commerce, dispersed, on the other hand, over the surface of the country, and agglomerated in small centers by the domestic union of agricultural and manufacturing pursuits—these two circumstances had brought about, since the remotest times, a social system of particular features—the so-called village system, which gave to each of these small unions their independent organization and distinct life. The peculiar character of this system may be judged from the following description, contained in an old official report of the British House of Commons on Indian affairs:

"A village, geographically considered, is a tract of country comprising some hundred or thousand acres of arable and waste lands; politically viewed it resembles a corporation or township. Its proper establishment of officers and servants consists of the following descriptions: The potail, or head inhabitant, who has generally the superintendence of the affairs of the village, settles the disputes of the inhabitants, attends to the police, and performs the duty of collecting the revenue within his village, a duty which his personal influence and minute acquaintance with the situation and concerns of the people render him the best qualified for this charge. The kurnum keeps the accounts of cultivation, and registers everything connected with it. The tallier and the totie, the duty of the former of which consists in gaining information of crimes and offenses, and in escorting and protecting persons travelling from one village to another; the province of the latter appearing to be more immediately confined to the village, consisting, among other duties, in guarding the crops and assisting in measuring them. The boundary man, who preserves the limits of the village, or gives evidence respecting them in cases of dispute. The Superintendent of Tanks and Watercourses distributes the water for the purposes of agriculture. The Brahmin, who performs the village worship. The schoolmaster, who is seen teaching the children in a village to read and write in the sand. The calendar-Brahmin, or astrologer, etc. These officers and servants generally constitute the establishment of a village; but in some parts of the country it is of less extent; some of the duties and functions above described being united in the same person; in others it exceeds the above-named number of individuals. Under this simple form of municipal government, the inhabitants of the country have lived from time immemorial. The boundaries of the villages have been but seldom altered; and though the villages themselves have been sometimes injured,
and even desolated by war, famine or disease, the same name, the same limits, the same interests, and even the same families, have continued for ages. The inhabitants gave themselves no trouble about the breaking up and divisions of kingdoms; while the village remains entire, they care not to what power it is transferred, or to what sovereign it devolves; its internal economy remains unchanged. The potash is still the head inhabitant, and still acts as the petty judge or magistrate, and collector or rentor of the village."

These small stereotype forms of social organism have been to the greater part dissolved, and are disappearing, not so much through the brutal interference of the British tax-gatherer and the British soldier, as to the working of English steam and English Free Trade. Those family-communities were based on domestic industry, in that peculiar combination of hand-weaving, hand-spinning and hand-tilling agriculture which gave them self-supporting power. English interference having placed the spinner in Lancashire and the weaver in Bengal, or sweeping away both Hindoo spinner and weaver, dissolved these small semi-barbarian, semi-civilized communities, by blowing up their economical basis, and thus produced the greatest, and to speak the truth, the only social revolution ever heard of in Asia.

Now, sickening as it must be to human feeling to witness those myriads of industrious patriarchal and inoffensive social organizations disorganized and dissolved into their units, thrown into a sea of woes, and their individual members losing at the same time their ancient form of civilization, and their hereditary means of subsistence, we must not forget that these idyllic village communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies. We must not forget the barbarian egotism which, concentrating on some miserable patch of land, had quietly witnessed the ruin of empires, the perpetration of unspeakable cruelties, the massacre of the population of large towns, with no other consideration bestowed upon them than on natural events, itself the helpless prey of any aggressor who deigned to notice it at all. We must not forget that this undignified, stagnant, and vegetative life, that this passive sort of existence evoked on the other part, in contradistinction, wild, aimless, unbounded forces of destruction and rendered murder itself a religious rite in Hindostan. We must not forget that these little communities were contaminated by distinctions of caste and by slavery, that they subjugated man to external circumstances instead of elevating man to be the sovereign of circumstances, that they trans-
formed a self-developing social state into never changing natural
destiny, and thus brought about a brutalizing worship of nature,
exhibiting its degradation in the fact that man, the sovereign
of nature, fell down on his knees in adoration of Kanuman, the
monkey, and Sabbala, the cow.

England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in Hindostan,
was actuated only by the vilest interests, and was stupid in her
manner of enforcing them. But that is not the question. The
question is, can mankind fulfil its destiny without a fundamental
revolution in the social state of Asia? If not, whatever may have
been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of
history in bringing about that revolution.

Then, whatever bitterness the spectacle of the crumbling of
an ancient world may have for our personal feelings, we have
the right, in point of history, to exclaim with Goethe:

"Sollte diese Qual uns quälen,
Da sie unsre Lust vermehrt,
Hat nicht Myriaden Seelen
Timur’s Herrschaft aufgezehrt?"

Written by Marx on June 10,
1853

Published in the newspaper
New-York Daily Tribune
No. 3804, June 25, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

* Should this torture then torment us
Since it brings us greater pleasure?
Were not through the rule of Timur
Souls devoured without measure?

(From Goethe’s Westöstlicher Diwan. An Suleika.)—Ed.
I propose in this letter to conclude my observations on India. How came it that English supremacy was established in India? The paramount power of the Great Mogul was broken by the Mogul Viceroy. The power of the Viceroy was broken by the Mahrattas. The power of the Mahrattas was broken by the Afghans, and while all were struggling against all, the Briton rushed in and was enabled to subdue them all. A country not only divided between Mohammedan and Hindoo, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste; a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilibrium, resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not the predestined prey of conquest? If we knew nothing of the past history of Hindostan, would there not be the one great and incontestable fact, that even at this moment India is held in English thraldom by an Indian army maintained at the cost of India? India, then, could not escape the fate of being conquered, and the whole of her past history, if it be anything, is a history of the successive conquests she has undergone. Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history. What we call its history, is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society. The question, therefore, is not whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton.

England has to fulfil a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating—the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia.

Arabs, Turks, Tartars, Moguls, who had successively overrun India, soon became Hindooized, the barbarian conquerors being, by an eternal law of history, conquered themselves by the superior civilization of their subjects. The British were the first
conquerors superior, and therefore, inaccessible to Hindoo civilization. They destroyed it by breaking up the native communities, by uprooting the native industry, and by levelling all that was great and elevated in the native society. The historic pages of their rule in India report hardly anything beyond that destruction. The work of regeneration hardly transpires through a heap of ruins. Nevertheless it has begun.

The political unity of India, more consolidated, and extending farther than it ever did under the Great Moguls, was the first condition of its regeneration. That unity, imposed by the British sword, will now be strengthened and perpetuated by the electric telegraph. The native army, organized and trained by the British drill-sergeant, was the \textit{sine qua non} of Indian self-emancipation, and of India ceasing to be the prey of the first foreign intruder. The free press, introduced for the first time into Asiatic society, and managed principally by the common offspring of Hindoo and Europeans, is a new and powerful agent of reconstruction. The \textit{Zemindaree} and \textit{Ryotwar}\textsuperscript{247} themselves, abominable as they are, involve two distinct forms of private property in land—the great \textit{desideratum} of Asiatic society. From the Indian natives, reluctantly and sparingly educated at Calcutta, under English superintendence, a fresh class is springing up, endowed with the requirements for government and imbued with European science. Steam has brought India into regular and rapid communication with Europe, has connected its chief ports with those of the whole south-eastern ocean, and has revindicated it from the isolated position which was the prime law of its stagnation. The day is not far distant when, by a combination of railways and steam vessels, the distance between England and India, measured by time, will be shortened to eight days, and when that once fabulous country will thus be actually annexed to the Western world.

The ruling classes of Great Britain have had, till now, but an accidental, transitory and exceptional interest in the progress of India. The aristocracy wanted to conquer it, the moneyocracy to plunder it, and the millocracy to undersell it. But now the tables are turned. The millocracy have discovered that the transformation of India into a reproductive country has become of vital importance to them, and that, to that end, it is necessary, above all, to gift her with means of irrigation and of internal communication. They intend now drawing a net of railways over India. And they will do it. The results must be inappreciable.

It is notorious that the productive powers of India are paralyzed by the utter want of means for conveying and exchanging its various produce. Nowhere, more than in India, do we meet
with social destitution in the midst of natural plenty, for want of the means of exchange. It was proved before a Committee of the British House of Commons, which sat in 1848, that

"when grain was selling from 6s. to 8s. a quarter at Kandeish, it was sold at 64s. to 70s. at Poonah, where the people were dying in the streets of famine, without the possibility of gaining supplies from Kandeish, because the clay-roads were impracticable."

The introduction of railways may be easily made to subserve agricultural purposes by the formation of tanks, where ground is required for embankment, and by the conveyance of water along the different lines. Thus irrigation, the *sine qua non* of farming in the East, might be greatly extended, and the frequently recurring local famines, arising from the want of water, would be averted. The general importance of railways, viewed under this head, must become evident, when we remember that irrigated lands, even in the districts near Ghauts, pay three times as much in taxes, afford ten or twelve times as much employment, and yield twelve or fifteen times as much profit, as the same area without irrigation.

Railways will afford the means of diminishing the amount and the cost of the military establishments. Col. Warren, Town Major of the Fort St. William, stated before a Select Committee of the House of Commons:

"The practicability of receiving intelligence from distant parts of the country in as many hours as at present it requires days and even weeks, and of sending instructions with troops and stores, in the more brief period, are considerations which cannot be too highly estimated. Troops could be kept at more distant and healthier stations than at present, and much loss of life from sickness would by this means be spared. Stores could not to the same extent be required at the various dépôts, and the loss by decay, and the destruction incidental to the climate, would also be avoided. The number of troops might be diminished in direct proportion to their effectiveness."

We know that the municipal organization and the economical basis of the village communities have been broken up, but their worst feature, the dissolution of society into stereotype and disconnected atoms, has survived their vitality. The village isolation produced the absence of roads in India, and the absence of roads perpetuated the village isolation. On this plan a community existed with a given scale of low conveniences, almost without intercourse with other villages, without the desires and efforts indispensable to social advance. The British having broken up this self-sufficient *inertia* of the villages, railways will provide the new want of communication and intercourse. Besides,
"one of the effects of the railway system will be to bring into every village affected by it such knowledge of the contrivances and appliances of other countries, and such means of obtaining them, as will first put the hereditary and stipendiary village artisanship of India to full proof of its capabilities, and then supply its defects." (Chapman, The Cotton and Commerce of India.)

I know that the English millocracy intend to endow India with railways with the exclusive view of extracting at diminished expenses the cotton and other raw materials for their manufactures. But when you have once introduced machinery into the locomotion of a country, which possesses iron and coals, you are unable to withhold it from its fabrication. You cannot maintain a net of railways over an immense country without introducing all those industrial processes necessary to meet the immediate and current wants of railway locomotion, and out of which there must grow the application of machinery to those branches of industry not immediately connected with railways. The railway system will therefore become, in India, truly the forerunner of modern industry. This is the more certain as the Hindoos are allowed by British authorities themselves to possess particular aptitude for accommodating themselves to entirely new labor, and acquiring the requisite knowledge of machinery. Ample proof of this fact is afforded by the capacities and expertness of the native engineers in the Calcutta mint, where they have been for years employed in working the steam machinery, by the natives attached to the several steam-engines in the Hurdwar coal districts, and by other instances. Mr. Campbell himself, greatly influenced as he is by the prejudices of the East India Company, is obliged to avow

"that the great mass of the Indian people possesses a great industrial energy, is well fitted to accumulate capital, and remarkable for a mathematical clearness of head, and talent for figures and exact sciences."

"Their intellects," he says, "are excellent."  

Modern industry, resulting from the railway system, will dissolve the hereditary divisions of labor, upon which rest the Indian castes, those decisive impediments to Indian progress and Indian power.

All the English bourgeoisie may be forced to do will neither emancipate nor materially mend the social condition of the mass of the people, depending not only on the development of the productive powers, but on their appropriation by the people. But what they will not fail to do is to lay down the material premises for both. Has the bourgeoisie ever done more? Has it ever effected a progress without dragging individuals and peoples through blood and dirt, through misery and degradation?
The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindoos themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether. At all events, we may safely expect to see, at a more or less remote period, the regeneration of that great and interesting country, whose gentle natures are, to use the expression of Prince Saltykov, even in the most inferior classes, “plus fins et plus adroits que les Italiens,”* whose submission even is counterbalanced by a certain calm nobility, who, notwithstanding their natural languor, have astonished the British officers by their bravery, whose country has been the source of our languages, our religions, and who represent the type of the ancient German in the Jat250 and the type of the ancient Greek in the Brahmin.242

I cannot part with the subject of India without some concluding remarks.

The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked. They are the defenders of property, but did any revolutionary party ever originate agrarian revolutions like those in Bengal, in Madras, and in Bombay? Did they not, in India, to borrow an expression of that great robber, Lord Clive himself, resort to atrocious extortion, when simple corruption could not keep pace with their rapacity? While they prated in Europe about the inviolable sanctity of the national debt, did they not confiscate in India the dividends of the rayahs, who had invested their private savings in the Company’s own funds? While they combated the French revolution under the pretext of defending “our holy religion,” did they not forbid, at the same time, Christianity to be propagated in India, and did they not, in order to make money out of the pilgrims streaming to the temples of Orissa and Bengal, take up the trade in the murder and prostitution perpetrated in the temple of Juggernaut?240 These are the men of “Property, Order, Family, and Religion.”

The devastating effects of English industry, when contemplated with regard to India, a country as vast as Europe, and containing 150 millions of acres, are palpable and confounding. But we must not forget that they are only the organic results of the whole system of production as it is now constituted. That production rests on the supreme rule of capital. The centraliza-

---

* “more refined and more adroit than the Italians”.249—Ed.
tion of capital is essential to the existence of capital as an independent power. The destructive influence of that centralization upon the markets of the world does but reveal, in the most gigantic dimensions, the inherent organic laws of political economy now at work in every civilized town. The bourgeois period of history has to create the material basis of the new world—on the one hand the universal intercourse founded upon the mutual dependency of mankind, and the means of that intercourse; on the other hand the development of the productive powers of man and the transformation of material production into a scientific domination of natural agencies. Bourgeois industry and commerce create these material conditions of a new world in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth. When a great social revolution shall have mastered the results of the bourgeois epoch, the market of the world and the modern powers of production, and subjected them to the common control of the most advanced peoples, then only will human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.

Written by Marx on July 22, 1853

Published in the newspaper
New-York Daily Tribune
No. 3840, August 8, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

Printed according to the newspaper text
The so-called Revolutions of 1848 were but poor incidents—small fractures and fissures in the dry crust of European society. However, they denounced the abyss. Beneath the apparently solid surface, they betrayed oceans of liquid matter, only needing expansion to rend into fragments continents of hard rock. Noisily and confusedly they proclaimed the emancipation of the Proletarian, i.e., the secret of the nineteenth century, and of the revolution of that century. That social revolution, it is true, was no novelty invented in 1848. Steam, electricity, and the self-acting mule were revolutionists of a rather more dangerous character than even citizens Barbès, Raspail and Blanqui. But, although the atmosphere in which we live, weighs upon every one with a 20,000 lb. force, do you feel it? No more than European society before 1848 felt the revolutionary atmosphere enveloping and pressing it from all sides. There is one great fact, characteristic of this our nineteenth century, a fact which no party dares deny. On the one hand, there have started into life industrial and scientific forces, which no epoch of the former human history had ever suspected. On the other hand, there exist symptoms of decay, far surpassing the horrors recorded of the latter times of the Roman empire. In our days everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and overworking it. The new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem bought by the loss of character. At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance. All our invention and progress seem to result in endowing material forces with intellectual life, and in stultifying human life into a material force. This antagonism between modern industry and science on the one hand, modern misery and dissolution on the other hand; this antagonism between the productive powers, and the social relations of
our epoch is a fact, palpable, overwhelming, and not to be controverted. Some parties may wail over it; others may wish to get rid of modern arts, in order to get rid of modern conflicts. Or they may imagine that so signal a progress in industry wants to be completed by as signal a regress in politics. On our part, we do not mistake the shape of the shrewd spirit that continues to mark all these contradictions. We know that to work well the new-fangled forces of society, they only want to be mastered by new-fangled men—and such are the working men. They are as much the invention of modern time as machinery itself. In the signs that bewilder the middle class, the aristocracy and the poor prophets of regression, we do recognise our brave friend, Robin Goodfellow, the old mole that can work in the earth so fast, that worthy pioneer—the Revolution. The English working men are the first born sons of modern industry. They will then, certainly, not be the last in aiding the social revolution produced by that industry, a revolution, which means the emancipation of their own class all over the world, which is as universal as capital-rule and wages-slavery. I know the heroic struggles the English working class have gone through since the middle of the last century—struggles less glorious, because they are shrouded in obscurity, and burked by the middle class historian. To revenge the misdeeds of the ruling class, there existed in the middle ages, in Germany, a secret tribunal, called the "Vehmgericht." If a red cross was seen marked on a house, people knew that its owner was doomed by the "Vehm." All the houses of Europe are now marked with the mysterious red cross. History is the judge—its executioner, the proletarian.

Speech delivered in English by Marx on April 14, 1856

Printed according to the text of the newspaper

Published in the People's Paper of April 19, 1856
I examine the system of bourgeois economics in the following order: capital, landed property, wage labour; state, foreign trade, world market. Under the first three headings, I investigate the economic conditions of life of the three great classes into which modern bourgeois society is divided; the interconnection of the three other headings is obvious at a glance. The first section of the first book, which deals with capital, consists of the following chapters: 1. Commodities; 2. Money, or simple circulation; 3. Capital in general. The first two chapters form the contents of the present part. The total material lies before me in the form of monographs, which were written at widely separated periods, for self-clarification, not for publication, and whose coherent elaboration according to the plan indicated will be dependent on external circumstances.

I am omitting a general introduction which I had jotted down because on closer reflection any anticipation of results still to be proved appears to me to be disturbing, and the reader who on the whole desires to follow me must be resolved to ascend from the particular to the general. A few indications concerning the course of my own politico-economic studies may, on the other hand, appear in place here.

I was taking up law, which discipline, however, I only pursued as a subordinate subject along with philosophy and history. In the years 1842-43, as editor of the Rheinische Zeitung I experienced for the first time the embarrassment of having to take part in discussions on so-called material interests. The proceedings of the Rhenish Landtag on thefts of wood and parceling of landed property, the official polemic which Herr von Schaper, then Oberpräsident of the Rhine Province, opened against the Rheinische Zeitung on the conditions of the Moselle peasantry, and finally debates on free trade and protective tariffs provided the first occasions for occupying myself with economic questions. On the other hand, at that time when the good will "to go further" greatly outweighed knowledge of the subject, a philosophically weakly tinged echo of French social-
ism and communism made itself audible in the Rheinische Zeitung. I declared myself against this amateurism, but frankly confessed at the same time in a controversy with the Allgemeine Augsburger Zeitung\textsuperscript{254} that my previous studies did not permit me even to venture any judgement on the content of the French tendencies. Instead, I eagerly seized on the illusion of the managers of the Rheinische Zeitung, who thought that by a weaker attitude on the part of the paper they could secure a remission of the death sentence passed upon it, to withdraw from the public stage into the study.

The first work which I undertook for a solution of the doubts which assailed me was a critical review of the Hegelian philosophy of right,\textsuperscript{*} a work the introduction\textsuperscript{**} to which appeared in 1844 in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher,\textsuperscript{12} published in Paris. My investigation led to the result that legal relations as well as forms of state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-called general development of the human mind, but rather have their roots in the material conditions of life, the sum total of which Hegel, following the example of the Englishmen and Frenchmen of the eighteenth century, combines under the name of “civil society,” that, however, the anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy. The investigation of the latter, which I began in Paris, I continued in Brussels, whither I had emigrated in consequence of an expulsion order of M. Guizot. The general result at which I arrived and which, once won, served as a guiding thread for my studies, can be briefly formulated as follows: In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the

\textsuperscript{*} K. Marx, Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right. —Ed.

\textsuperscript{**} Ibid., Introduction.—Ed.
property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more, or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production. No social order ever perishes before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself. Therefore mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, it will always be found that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation. In broad outlines Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and modern bourgeois modes of production can be designated as progressive epochs in the economic formation of society. The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production—antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism, but of one arising from the social conditions of life of the individuals; at the same time the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society create the material conditions for the solution of that antagonism. This social formation brings, therefore, the prehistory of human society to a close.

Frederick Engels, with whom, since the appearance of his brilliant sketch on the criticism of the economic categories* (in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher), I maintained a constant exchange of ideas by correspondence, had by another road (compare his The Condition of the Working Class in England)

arrived at the same result as I, and when in the spring of 1845 he also settled in Brussels, we resolved to work out in common the opposition of our view to the ideological view of German philosophy, in fact, to settle accounts with our erstwhile philosophical conscience. The resolve was carried out in the form of a criticism of post-Hegelian philosophy.* The manuscript, two large octavo volumes, had long reached its place of publication in Westphalia when we received the news that altered circumstances did not allow of its being printed. We abandoned the manuscript to the gnawing criticism of the mice all the more willingly as we had achieved our main purpose—self-clarification. Of the scattered works in which we put our views before the public at that time, now from one aspect, now from another, I will mention only the Manifesto of the Communist Party,** jointly written by Engels and myself, and Discours sur le libre échange published by me. The decisive points of our view were first scientifically, although only polemically, indicated in my work published in 1847 and directed against Proudhon: Misère de la Philosophie, etc. A dissertation written in German on Wage Labour,*** in which I put together my lectures on this subject delivered in the Brussels German Workers’ Society, was interrupted, while being printed, by the February Revolution and my consequent forcible removal from Belgium.

The editing of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848 and 1849, and the subsequent events, interrupted my economic studies which could only be resumed in the year 1850 in London. The enormous material for the history of political economy which is accumulated in the British Museum, the favourable vantage point afforded by London for the observation of bourgeois society, and finally the new stage of development upon which the latter appeared to have entered with the discovery of gold in California and Australia, determined me to begin afresh from the very beginning and to work through the new material critically. These studies led partly of themselves into apparently quite remote subjects on which I had to dwell for a shorter or longer period. Especially, however, was the time at my disposal curtailed by the imperative necessity of earning my living. My contributions, during eight years now, to the first English-American newspaper, the New York Tribune, compelled an extraordinary scattering of my studies, since I occupy myself with newspaper correspondence proper only in excep-
tional cases. However, articles on striking economic events in England and on the Continent constituted so considerable a part of my contributions that I was compelled to make myself familiar with practical details which lie outside the sphere of the actual science of political economy.

This sketch of the course of my studies in the sphere of political economy is intended only to show that my views, however they may be judged and however little they coincide with the interested prejudices of the ruling classes, are the result of conscientious investigation lasting many years. But at the entrance to science, as at the entrance to hell, the demand must be posted:

* Qui si convien lasciare ogni sospetto;  
Ogni viltà convien che qui sia morta.*

Karl Marx

London, January 1859

First published in the book  
Zur Kritik der politischen  
Oekonomie von Karl Marx.  
Erstes Heft, Berlin, 1859

Printed according to the text of the book  
Translated from the German

* Here all mistrust must be abandoned  
And here must perish every craven thought.  
[Dante, The Divine Comedy.]—Ed.
In all scientific spheres, the Germans have long ago demonstrated their equality with, and in most of them their superiority over, the remaining civilised nations. Only one science did not count a single German among its leading lights, viz., political economy. The reason is obvious. Political economy is the theoretical analysis of modern bourgeois society and therefore presupposes developed bourgeois conditions, conditions which in Germany, after the wars of the Reformation and the Peasant Wars, particularly after the Thirty Years' War, could not arise for centuries. The separation of Holland from the Empire forced Germany out of world trade and from the outset reduced its industrial development to the scantiest proportions; and while the Germans were so slowly and laboriously recovering from the devastation of the civil wars, while they were using up all their civil energy, which had never been very great, in fruitless struggle against the customs barriers and idiotic trade regulations which every petty princeling and imperial baron imposed on the industry of his subjects, while the imperial towns with their guild mummery and patricianism were falling into decay, Holland, England and France conquered the leading positions in world trade, founded colony after colony and developed the manufacturing industry to the highest pitch of prosperity, until finally England, owing to steam power which only then began to impart value to its coal and iron deposits, attained the foremost position in modern bourgeois development. So long, however, as a struggle had still to be waged against such ludicrously antiquated relics of the Middle Ages as up to 1830 laid fetters on the material bourgeois development of Germany, no German political economy was possible. Only with the establishment of the Customs Union did the Germans arrive at a position in which they could at least understand political economy. From this time, in fact, began the importation of English and French
economics for the benefit of the German bourgeoisie. Presently the learned fraternity and the bureaucracy seized hold of the imported material and worked it up in a fashion not very creditable to the "German spirit." From the medley of high-class swindlers, merchants, schoolmasters and bureaucrats dabbling in authorship there arose thereupon a German economic literature which in its insipidity, shallowness, lack of thought, verbiety and plagiarism was paralleled only by the German novel. Among practically-minded people, the protectionist school of the industrialists was the first to establish itself; and its authority, List, is still the best that German bourgeois-economic literature has produced, although the whole of his glorious work is copied from the Frenchman Ferrier, the theoretical originator of the Continental System. In opposition to this tendency there arose in the forties the free trade school of the merchants in the Baltic provinces, who, with childish but self-interested faith, echoed the arguments of the English free traders. Finally, among the schoolmasters and bureaucrats who had to deal with the theoretical side of the subject, there were to be found dried-up, uncritical herbarium collectors like Herr Rau, speculating wise-acres like Herr Stein, who translated foreign propositions into undigested Hegelian language, or literary gleaners in the "cultural historical" field, like Herr Riehl. The final outcome of this was cameralistics, a mush consisting of all sorts of extraneous matter, with a spattering of eclectic-economic sauce, such as would be useful knowledge for a state-employed law school graduate preparing for his final state board examination.

While thus the bourgeoisie, schoolmasters and bureaucracy in Germany were still labouring to learn by heart the first elements of English-French economics as unassailable dogmas and to attain some degree of clarity about them, the German proletarian party appeared on the scene. Its whole theoretical existence proceeded from the study of political economy; and scientific, independent German economics dates precisely from the moment of its appearance. This German economics is grounded essentially upon the materialist conception of history, the basic features of which are presented briefly in the preface to the above-named work.* The main points of this preface have already been printed in Das Volk, for which reason we refer to it. Not only for economics, but for all historical sciences (and all sciences which are not natural sciences are historical) a revolutionising discovery was made with this proposition, that "the

* See pp. 502-06 of this volume.—Ed.
mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general”; that all the social and political relations, all religious and legal systems, all the theoretical outlooks which emerge in history, are to be comprehended only when the material conditions of life of the respectively corresponding epochs are understood and the former are derived from these material conditions. “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but their social being that determines their consciousness.” The proposition is so simple that it must be self-evident to anyone who is not bemused by idealist delusions. But it involves highly revolutionary consequences, not only for theory but also for practice: “At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.... The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production—antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism, but of one arising from the social conditions of life of the individuals; at the same time the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society create the material conditions for the solution of that antagonism.”* As we pursue our materialist thesis further and apply it to the present, the perspective of a tremendous revolution, indeed the most tremendous revolution of all time, therefore, immediately unfolds itself before us.

On closer consideration, it is, however, immediately evident that this apparently simple proposition, that the consciousness of men depends on their being and not vice versa, at once, and in its first consequences, runs directly counter to all idealism, even the most concealed. All traditional and customary outlooks on everything historical are negated by it. The whole traditional mode of political reasoning falls to the ground; patriotic noble-mindedness fights indignantly against such an unprincipled conception. The new mode of outlook, therefore, necessarily came into conflict, not only with the representatives of the bourgeoisie, but also with the mass of French Socialists who would fain shake the world in its foundations by means of the

* See pp. 503-04 of this volume.—Ed.
magic formula: *liberté, égalité, fraternité*. But above all it aroused great wrath among the German vulgar-democratic vociferators. All the same they have by preference attempted to exploit the new ideas in plagiaristic fashion, but with rare misunderstanding.

The development of the materialist conception even in regard to only a single historical example was a scientific work which would have demanded years of tranquil study, for it is obvious that nothing can be done here with mere phrases, that only a mass of critically sifted, completely mastered historical material can enable one to accomplish such a task. The February Revolution thrust our party on the political stage and thereby made it impossible for it to pursue purely scientific aims. Nevertheless, the basic outlook runs like a red thread through all the literary productions of the party. In all of them it is demonstrated in each particular case how every time the action originated from direct material impulses, and not from the phrases that accompanied the action, how, on the contrary, the political and juristic phrases were derived from the material impulses just as much as the political action and its results.

When, after the defeat of the Revolution of 1848-49, a period of time set in during which it became more and more impossible to influence Germany from without, our party surrendered the field of emigrational quarrels—for that remained the only possible action—to vulgar democracy. While the latter indulged in intrigues to its heart’s content, and squabbled today in order to make up the day after, and the day after that again washed all its dirty linen in public—while vulgar democracy went begging through the whole of America in order immediately afterwards to stage new scandals over the division of the few pence garnered—our party was glad once again to have some leisure for study. It had the great advantage of having a new scientific outlook as its theoretical basis, the working out of which kept it fully occupied; for this reason alone it could never degenerate to such an extent as the "great men" among the emigrants.

The first fruit of these studies is the book under review.

II

In a publication like the one before us there can be no question of a merely desultory criticism of separate chapters taken from economics, of the isolated treatment of this or that disputed economic question. Rather it is from the outset constructed
so as to be a systematic integration of the whole complex of economic science, to be an interconnected development of the laws of bourgeois production and bourgeois exchange. Since the economists are nothing but the interpreters of and apologists for these laws, this development is at the same time a criticism of the whole of economic literature.

Since Hegel’s death hardly any attempt has been made to develop a science in its own inner interconnection. The official Hegelian school had appropriated from the dialectic of the master only the manipulation of the simplest of all tricks, which it applied to anything and everything, often even with ludicrous clumsiness. For it the entire heritage of Hegel was limited to a sheer pattern by the help of which every theme was devised, and to a compilation of words and turns of speech which now had no other purpose than to be at hand at the right time where thought and positive knowledge were lacking. Thus it came about that, as a Bonn professor said, these Hegelians understood nothing about anything, but could write about everything. And indeed, that’s just what their stuff was like. Meanwhile, these gentlemen were, in spite of their sufficiency, so conscious of their weakness that they gave big problems the widest berth possible; the old pedantic science held the field by its superiority in positive knowledge; and only when Feuerbach declared speculative conceptions untenable did Hegelianism gradually fall asleep; and it seemed as if the reign of the old metaphysics, with its fixed categories, had begun anew in science.

The thing had its natural cause. After the régime of the Hegelian Diadochi, which had wound up with pure phrases, there naturally followed an epoch in which the positive content of science again outweighed its formal side. But at the same time Germany plunged into the natural sciences with quite extraordinary energy, which corresponded to the powerful bourgeois development after 1848; and as these sciences, in which the speculative tendency never assumed any kind of importance, became fashionable, there was a recrudescence of the old metaphysical manner of thinking, including the extreme platitudes of Wolff. Hegel fell into oblivion; and there developed the new natural-scientific materialism which is almost indistinguishable theoretically from that of the eighteenth century, and for the most part only enjoys the advantage of having a richer natural-scientific material at its disposal, particularly in chemistry and physiology. The narrow-minded philistine mode of thought of pre-Kantian times we find reproduced even to the most extreme triviality in Büchner and Vogt; and even Moleschott, who swears by Feuerbach, continually gets stuck in the most diverting
fashion among the simplest of all categories. The lumbering cart horse of bourgeois workaday understanding naturally stops dead in confusion before the ditch which separates essence from appearance, cause from effect; but if one goes gaily hunting over such badly broken ground as that of abstract thinking, one must not ride cart horses.

Here, therefore, was another problem to be solved, one which had nothing to do with political economy as such. How was science to be treated? On the one hand, there was the Hegelian dialectics in the wholly abstract, "speculative" form in which Hegel had bequeathed it; on the other hand, there was the ordinary, essentially wolfian-metaphysical method, which had again become fashionable and in which the bourgeois economists too had written their fat, disjointed tomes. This latter method had been so annihilated theoretically by Kant and particularly by Hegel that only lassitude and the lack of any simple alternative method could make possible its continued existence in practice. On the other hand, the Hegelian method was absolutely unusable in its available form. It was essentially idealistic, and the problem here was that of developing a world outlook more materialistic than any previous one. That method took pure thinking as its start, and here one ought to have started from the most stubborn facts. A method which, according to its own admission, "came from nothing through nothing to nothing" was by no means appropriate here in this form. Nevertheless, of all the available logical material, it was the only piece which could be used, at least as a starting-point. It had not been criticised, nor overcome; not one of the opponents of the great dialectician had been able to make a breach in its proud structure; it fell into oblivion, because the Hegelian school had not the slightest notion what to do with it. It was, therefore, above all necessary to subject the Hegelian method to thoroughgoing criticism.

What distinguished Hegel's mode of thought from that of all other philosophers was the tremendous sense of the historical upon which it was based. Abstract and idealist though it was in form, yet the development of his thoughts always proceeded parallel with the development of world history and the latter is really meant to be only the test of the former. If, thereby, the real relation was inverted and stood on its head, nevertheless, the real content entered everywhere into the philosophy; all the more so since Hegel—in contrast to his disciples—did not parade ignorance, but was one of the finest intellects of all time. He was the first who attempted to show a development, an inner coherence, in history; and while today much in his phi-
losophy of history may seem peculiar to us, yet the grandeur of his fundamental outlook is admirable even today, whether one makes comparison with his predecessors or, to be sure, with anyone who, since his time, has indulged in general reflections concerning history. Everywhere, in his Phenomenology, Esthetics, History of Philosophy, this magnificent conception of history prevails, and everywhere the material is treated historically, in a definite, even if abstractly distorted, interconnection with history.

This epoch-making conception of history was the direct theoretical premise for the new materialist outlook, and this alone provided a connecting point for the logical method, too. Since this forgotten dialectics had led to such results even from the standpoint of "pure thinking", and had, in addition, so easily settled accounts with all preceding logic and metaphysics, there must at any rate have been more to it than sophistry and hair-splitting. But the criticism of this method, which all official philosophy had fought shy of and still does, was no trifle.

Marx was, and is, the only one who could undertake the work of extracting from the Hegelian logic the kernel which comprises Hegel's real discoveries in this sphere, and reconstructing the dialectical method, divested of its idealistic trappings, in the simple shape in which it becomes the only true form of development of thought. The working out of the method which forms the foundation of Marx's criticism of political economy we consider a result of hardly less importance than the basic materialist outlook itself.

The criticism of economics, even according to the method acquired, could still be exercised in two ways: historically or logically. Since in history, as in its literary reflection, development as a whole also proceeds from the most simple to the more complex relations, the historical development of the literature of political economy provided a natural guiding thread with which criticism could link up, and the economic categories as a whole would thereby appear in the same sequence as in the logical development. This form apparently has the advantage of greater clearness, since indeed it is the actual development that is followed, but as a matter of fact it would thereby at most become more popular. History often proceeds by leaps and zigzags and it would thus have to be followed up everywhere, whereby not only would much material of minor importance have to be incorporated, but there would be much interruption of the chain of thought; furthermore, the history of economics could not be written without that of bourgeois society and this
would make the task endless, since all preliminary work is lacking. The logical method of treatment was, therefore, the only appropriate one. But this, as a matter of fact, is nothing else but the historical method, only divested of its historical form and disturbing fortuities. The chain of thought must begin with the same thing with which this history begins, and its further course will be nothing else but the reflection of the historical course in abstract and theoretically consistent form; a corrected reflection but corrected according to laws furnished by the real course of history itself, in that each factor can be considered at the point of development of its full maturity, of its classic form.

In this method we proceed from the first and simplest relation that historically and in fact confronts us; here, therefore, from the first economic relation to be found. We analyse this relation. Being a relation of itself implies that it has two sides, related to each other. Each of these sides is considered by itself, which brings us to the way in which they behave to each other, their interaction. Contradictions will result which demand a solution. But as we are not considering here an abstract process of thought taking place solely in our heads, but a real process which actually took place at some particular time or is still taking place, these contradictions, too, will have developed in practice and will probably have found their solution. We shall trace the nature of this solution, and shall discover that it has been brought about by the establishment of a new relation whose two opposite sides we shall now have to develop, and so on.

Political economy begins with commodities, begins from the moment when products are exchanged for one another—whether by individuals or by primitive communities. The product that appears in exchange is a commodity. It is, however, a commodity solely because a relation between two persons or communities attaches to the thing, the product, the relation between producer and consumer who are here no longer united in the same person. Here at once we have an example of a peculiar fact, which runs through the whole of economics and which has caused utter confusion in the minds of the bourgeois economists: economics deals not with things but with relations between persons, and, in the last resort, between classes; these relations are, however, always attached to things and appear as things. This interconnection, which in isolated cases it is true has dawned upon this or that economist, was first discovered by Marx as obtaining for all economics, whereby he made the most difficult questions so simple and clear that now even the bourgeois economists will be able to grasp them.
If now we consider commodities from their various aspects, commodities, to be sure, in their complete development and not as they first laboriously developed in the primitive barter between two primitive communities, they present themselves to us from the two points of view of use value and exchange value, and here we at once enter the sphere of economic dispute. Anyone who would like to have a striking illustration of the fact that the German dialectical method in its present state of elaboration is at least as superior to the old, shallow, garrulous metaphysical method as the railway is to the means of transport of the Middle Ages, should read in Adam Smith or any other official economist of reputation what a torment exchange value and use value were to these gentlemen, how difficult it was for them to keep them properly apart and comprehend each in its peculiar definiteness, and should then compare the clear and simple exposition in Marx.

After use value and exchange value have been explained, commodities are presented as the immediate unity of both, in the form in which they enter the process of exchange. What contradictions result here can afterwards be read on pp. 20 and 21.* We only note that these contradictions are not merely of theoretical, abstract interest, but at the same time reflect the difficulties which emerge from the nature of the direct exchange relations, of simple barter, reflect the impossibilities in which this first crude form of exchange necessarily terminates. The solution of these impossibilities is to be found in the fact that the property of representing the exchange value of all other commodities is transferred to a special commodity—money. Money, or simple circulation, is now explained in the second chapter, namely, 1) money as the measure of value, in which connection value measured in money, price, is precisely defined; 2) as means of circulation, and 3) as the unity of both definitions, as real money, as the representative of all material bourgeois wealth. This closes the development of the first part, reserving the passing of money into capital for the second.

It is seen that with this method the logical development is by no means compelled to keep to the purely abstract sphere. On the contrary, this method requires historical illustration, constant contact with reality. Such proofs are accordingly introduced in great variety, namely, references both to the actual course of history at various stages of social development and also to the economic literature in which the clear working out

---

* See Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.—Ed.
of definitions of economic relations is pursued from the begin-
ing. The criticism of particular, more or less one-sided or con-
fused, modes of conception is, then, in essence already given in
the logical development itself and can be formulated briefly.
In a third article we shall deal with the economic content of
the book itself.\[255\]
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My Dear Monsieur Annenkov,

You would long ago have received my answer to your letter of November 1 but for the fact that my bookseller only sent me Monsieur Proudhon's book, *The Philosophy of Poverty*, last week. I have gone through it in two days in order to be able to give you my opinion about it at once. As I have read the book very hurriedly, I cannot go into details but can only tell you the general impression it has made on me. If you wish, I could go into details in a second letter.

I must frankly confess that I find the book on the whole bad, and very bad. You yourself laugh in your letter at the "patch of German philosophy" which M. Proudhon parades in this formless and pretentious work, but you suppose that the economic argument has not been infected by the philosophic poison. I too am very far from imputing the faults in the economic argument to M. Proudhon's philosophy. M. Proudhon does not give us a false criticism of political economy because he is the possessor of an absurd philosophic theory, but he gives us an absurd philosophic theory because he fails to understand the social system of today in its *enrènement*, to use a word which, like much else, M. Proudhon has borrowed from Fourier.

Why does M. Proudhon talk about God, about universal reason, about the impersonal reason of humanity which never errs, which has always been equal to itself throughout all the ages and of which one need only have the right consciousness in order to know the truth? Why does he resort to feeble Hegelianism to give himself the appearance of a bold thinker?

He himself provides you with the clue to this enigma. M. Proudhon sees in history a series of social developments; he finds progress realised in history; finally he finds that men, as individuals, did not know what they were doing and were mistaken about their own movement, that is to say, their social development seems at the first glance to be distinct, separate and independent of their individual development. He cannot explain these facts, and so the hypothesis of universal reason...
manifesting itself comes in very handy. Nothing is easier than to invent mystical causes, that is to say, phrases which lack common sense.

But when M. Proudhon admits that he understands nothing about the historical development of humanity—he admits this by using such high-sounding words as: Universal Reason, God, etc.—is he not implicitly and necessarily admitting that he is incapable of understanding economic development?

What is society, whatever its form may be? The product of men's reciprocal action. Are men free to choose this or that form of society? By no means. Assume a particular state of development in the productive faculties of man and you will get a particular form of commerce and consumption. Assume particular stages of development in production, commerce and consumption and you will have a corresponding social constitution, a corresponding organisation of the family, of orders or of classes, in a word, a corresponding civil society. Assume a particular civil society and you will get particular political conditions which are only the official expression of civil society. M. Proudhon will never understand this because he thinks he is doing something great by appealing from the state to civil society—that is to say, from the official résumé of society to official society.

It is superfluous to add that men are not free to choose their productive forces—which are the basis of all their history—for every productive force is an acquired force, the product of former activity. The productive forces are therefore the result of practical human energy; but this energy is itself conditioned by the circumstances in which men find themselves, by the productive forces already acquired, by the social form which exists before they do, which they do not create, which is the product of the preceding generation. Because of this simple fact that every succeeding generation finds itself in possession of the productive forces acquired by the previous generation, which serve it as the raw material for new production, a coherence arises in human history, a history of humanity takes shape which is all the more a history of humanity as the productive forces of man and therefore his social relations have been more developed. Hence it necessarily follows that the social history of men is never anything but the history of their individual development, whether they are conscious of it or not. Their material relations are the basis of all their relations. These material relations are only the necessary forms in which their material and individual activity is realised.

M. Proudhon mixes up ideas and things. Men never relinquish what they have won, but this does not mean that they
never relinquish the social form in which they have acquired certain productive forces. On the contrary, in order that they may not be deprived of the result attained and forfeit the fruits of civilisation, they are obliged, from the moment when their mode of carrying on commerce no longer corresponds to the productive forces acquired, to change all their traditional social forms. I am using the word "commerce" here in its widest sense, as we use Verkehr in German. For example: the privileges, the institution of guilds and corporations, the regulatory regime of the Middle Ages, were social relations that alone corresponded to the acquired productive forces and to the social condition which had previously existed and from which these institutions had arisen. Under the protection of the regime of corporations and regulations, capital was accumulated, overseas trade was developed, colonies were founded. But the fruits of this men would have forfeited if they had tried to retain the forms under whose shelter these fruits had ripened. Hence burst two thunderclaps—the Revolutions of 1640 and 1688. All the old economic forms, the social relations corresponding to them, the political conditions which were the official expression of the old civil society, were destroyed in England. Thus the economic forms in which men produce, consume, and exchange, are transitory and historical. With the acquisition of new productive faculties, men change their mode of production and with the mode of production all the economic relations which are merely the necessary relations of this particular mode of production.

This is what M. Proudhon has not understood and still less demonstrated. M. Proudhon, incapable of following the real movement of history, produces a phantasmagoria which presumptuously claims to be dialectical. He does not feel it necessary to speak of the seventeenth, the eighteenth or the nineteenth century, for his history proceeds in the misty realm of imagination and rises far above space and time. In short, it is not history but old Hegelian junk, it is not profane history—a history of man—but sacred history—a history of ideas. From his point of view man is only the instrument of which the idea or the eternal reason makes use in order to unfold itself. The evolutions of which M. Proudhon speaks are understood to be evolutions such as are accomplished within the mystic womb of the absolute idea. If you tear the veil from this mystical language, what it comes to is that M. Proudhon is offering you the order in which economic categories arrange themselves inside his own mind. It will not require great exertion on my part to prove to you that it is the order of a very disorderly mind.
M. Proudhon begins his book with a dissertation on value, which is his pet subject. I will not enter on an examination of this dissertation today.

The series of economic evolutions of the eternal reason begins with division of labour. To M. Proudhon division of labour is a perfectly simple thing. But was not the caste regime also a particular division of labour? Was not the regime of the corporations another division of labour? And is not the division of labour under the system of manufacture, which in England begins in the middle of the seventeenth century and comes to an end in the last part of the eighteenth, also totally different from the division of labour in large-scale, modern industry?

M. Proudhon is so far from the truth that he neglects what even the profane economists attend to. When he talks about division of labour he does not feel it necessary to mention the world market. Good. Yet must not the division of labour in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when there were still no colonies, when America did not as yet exist for Europe, and Eastern Asia only existed for her through the medium of Constantinople, have been fundamentally different from what it was in the seventeenth century when colonies were already developed.

And that is not all. Is the whole inner organisation of nations, are all their international relations anything else than the expression of a particular division of labour? And must not these change when the division of labour changes?

M. Proudhon has so little understood the problem of the division of labour that he never even mentions the separation of town and country, which took place in Germany, for instance, from the ninth to the twelfth century. Thus, to M. Proudhon, this separation is an eternal law since he knows neither its origin nor its development. All through his book he speaks as if this creation of a particular mode of production would endure until the end of time. All that M. Proudhon says about the division of labour is only a summary, and moreover a very superficial and incomplete summary, of what Adam Smith and a thousand others have said before him.

The second evolution is machinery. The connection between the division of labour and machinery is entirely mystical to M. Proudhon. Each kind of division of labour had its specific instruments of production. Between the middle of the seventeenth and the middle of the eighteenth century, for instance, people did not make everything by hand. They had instruments, and very complicated ones at that, such as looms, ships, levers, etc.
Thus there is nothing more absurd than to derive machinery from division of labour in general.

I may also remark, by the way, that M. Proudhon has understood very little the historical origin of machinery, but has still less understood its development. One can say that up to the year 1825—the period of the first general crisis—the demands of consumption in general increased more rapidly than production, and the development of machinery was a necessary consequence of the needs of the market. Since 1825, the invention and application of machinery has been simply the result of the war between workers and employers. But this is only true of England. As for the European nations, they were driven to adopt machinery owing to English competition both in their home markets and on the world market. Finally, in North America the introduction of machinery was due both to competition with other countries and to lack of hands, that is, to the disproportion between the population of North America and its industrial needs. From these facts you can see what sagacity Monsieur Proudhon develops when he conjures up the spectre of competition as the third evolution, the antithesis to machinery!

Lastly and in general, it is altogether absurd to make machinery an economic category alongside with division of labour, competition, credit, etc.

Machinery is no more an economic category than the ox which draws the plough. The application of machinery in the present day is one of the relations of our present economic system, but the way in which machinery is utilised is totally distinct from the machinery itself. Powder is powder whether used to wound a man or to dress his wounds.

M. Proudhon surpasses himself when he allows competition, monopoly, taxes or police, balance of trade, credit and property to develop inside his head in the order in which I have mentioned them. Nearly all credit institutions had been developed in England by the beginning of the eighteenth century, before the invention of machinery. Public credit was only a fresh method of increasing taxation and satisfying the new demands created by the rise of the bourgeoisie to power.

Finally, the last category in M. Proudhon's system is constituted by property. In the real world, on the other hand, the division of labour and all M. Proudhon's other categories are social relations forming in their entirety what is today known as property; outside these relations bourgeois property is nothing but a metaphysical or juristic illusion. The property of a different epoch, feudal property, develops in a series of entirely different social relations. M. Proudhon, by establishing property as an in-
dependent relation, commits more than a mistake in method: he clearly shows that he has not grasped the bond which holds together all forms of bourgeois production, that he has not understood the historical and transitory character of the forms of production in a particular epoch. M. Proudhon, who does not regard our social institutions as historical products, who can understand neither their origin nor their development, can only produce dogmatic criticism of them.

M. Proudhon is therefore obliged to take refuge in a fiction in order to explain development. He imagines that division of labour, credit, machinery, etc., were all invented to serve his fixed idea, the idea of equality. His explanation is sublimely naive. These things were invented in the interests of equality but unfortunately they turned against equality. This constitutes his whole argument. In other words, he makes a gratuitous assumption and then, as the actual development contradicts his fiction at every step, he concludes that there is a contradiction. He conceals from you the fact that the contradiction exists solely between his fixed ideas and the real movement.

Thus, M. Proudhon, mainly because he lacks the historical knowledge, has not perceived that as men develop their productive faculties, that is, as they live, they develop certain relations with one another and that the nature of these relations must necessarily change with the change and growth of the productive faculties. He has not perceived that economic categories are only abstract expressions of these actual relations and only remain true while these relations exist. He therefore falls into the error of the bourgeois economists, who regard these economic categories as eternal and not as historical laws which are only laws for a particular historical development, for a definite development of the productive forces. Instead, therefore, of regarding the political-economic categories as abstract expressions of the real, transitory, historic social relations, Monsieur Proudhon, thanks to a mystic inversion, sees in the real relations only embodiments of these abstractions. These abstractions themselves are formulas which have been slumbering in the heart of God the Father since the beginning of the world.

But here our good M. Proudhon falls into severe intellectual convulsions. If all these economic categories are emanations from the heart of God, are the hidden and eternal life of man, how does it come about, first, that there is such a thing as development, and secondly, that M. Proudhon is not a conservative? He explains these evident contradictions by a whole system of antagonisms.
To throw light on this system of antagonisms let us take an example.

Monopoly is a good thing, because it is an economic category and therefore an emanation of God. Competition is a good thing because it is also an economic category. But what is not good is the reality of monopoly and the reality of competition. What is still worse is the fact that competition and monopoly devour each other. What is to be done? As these two eternal ideas of God contradict each other, it seems obvious to him that there is also within the bosom of God a synthesis of them both, in which the evils of monopoly are balanced by competition and vice versa. As a result of the struggle between the two ideas only their good side will come into view. One must snatch this secret idea from God and then apply it and everything will be for the best; the synthetic formula which lies hidden in the darkness of the impersonal reason of man must be revealed. M. Proudhon does not hesitate for a moment to come forward as the revealer.

But look for a moment at real life. In the economic life of the present time you find not only competition and monopoly but also their synthesis, which is not a formula but a movement. Monopoly produces competition, competition produces monopoly. But this equation, far from removing the difficulties of the present situation, as the bourgeois economists imagine it does, results in a situation still more difficult and confused. If therefore you alter the basis on which present-day economic relations rest, if you destroy the present mode of production, then you will not only destroy competition, monopoly and their antagonism, but also their unity, their synthesis, the movement which is the real equilibrium of competition and monopoly.

Now I will give you an example of Monsieur Proudhon's dialectics.

Freedom and slavery constitute an antagonism. I need not speak of the good and bad sides of freedom nor, speaking of slavery, need I dwell on its bad sides. The only thing that has to be explained is its good side. We are not dealing with indirect slavery, the slavery of the proletariat, but with direct slavery, the slavery of the black races in Surinam, in Brazil, in the Southern States of North America.

Direct slavery is as much the pivot of our industrialism today as machinery, credit, etc. Without slavery no cotton; without cotton no modern industry. Slavery has given value to the colonies; the colonies have created world trade; world trade is the necessary condition of large-scale machine industry. Thus, before the traffic in Negroes began, the colonies supplied the Old
World with only very few products and made no visible change in the face of the earth. Slavery is therefore an economic category of the highest importance. Without slavery North America, the most progressive country, would be transformed into a patriarchal land. You have only to wipe North America off the map of the nations and you get anarchy, the total decay of trade and of modern civilisation. But to let slavery disappear is to wipe North America off the map of the nations. And therefore, because it is an economic category, we find slavery in every nation since the world began. Modern nations have merely known how to disguise slavery of their own countries while they openly imported it into the New World. After these observations on slavery, how will our worthy M. Proudhon proceed? He will look for the synthesis between freedom and slavery, the golden mean or equilibrium between slavery and freedom.

Monsieur Proudhon has very well grasped the fact that men produce cloth, linen, silks, and it is a great merit on his part to have grasped this small amount! What he has not grasped is that these men, according to their abilities, also produce the social relations amid which they prepare cloth and linen. Still less has he understood that men, who produce their social relations in accordance with their material productivity, also produce ideas, categories, that is to say, the abstract, ideal expressions of these same social relations. Thus the categories are no more eternal than the relations they express. They are historical and transitory products. To M. Proudhon, on the contrary, abstractions, categories are the primordial cause. According to him they, and not men, make history. The abstraction, the category taken as such, i.e., apart from men and their material activities, is of course immortal, unchangeable, unmoved; it is only one form of the being of pure reason; which is only another way of saying that the abstraction as such is abstract. An admirable tautology!

Thus, regarded as categories, economic relations for M. Proudhon are eternal formulas without origin or progress.

Let us put it in another way: M. Proudhon does not directly state that bourgeois life is for him an eternal verity; he states it indirectly by deifying the categories which express bourgeois relations in the form of thought. He takes the products of bourgeois society for spontaneously arisen eternal beings, endowed with lives of their own, as soon as they present themselves to his mind in the form of categories, in the form of thought. So he does not rise above the bourgeois horizon. As he is operating with bourgeois ideas, the eternal truth of which he presupposes, he seeks a synthesis, an equilibrium of these ideas, and does not
see that the present method by which they reach equilibrium is the only possible one.

Indeed he does what all good bourgeois do. They all tell you that in principle, that is, considered as abstract ideas, competition, monopoly, etc., are the only basis of life, but that in practice they leave much to be desired. They all want competition without the lethal effects of competition. They all want the impossible, namely, the conditions of bourgeois existence without the necessary consequences of those conditions. None of them understands that the bourgeois form of production is historical and transitory, just as the feudal form was. This mistake arises from the fact that the bourgeois man is to them the only possible basis of every society; they cannot imagine a society in which men have ceased to be bourgeois.

M. Proudhon is therefore necessarily doctrinaire. To him the historical movement, which is turning the present-day world upside down, reduces itself to the problem of discovering the correct equilibrium, the synthesis, of two bourgeois thoughts. And so the clever fellow by virtue of his subtlety discovers the hidden thought of God, the unity of two isolated thoughts—which are only isolated because M. Proudhon has isolated them from practical life, from present-day production, which is the combination of the realities which they express. In place of the great historical movement arising from the conflict between the productive forces already acquired by men and their social relations, which no longer correspond to these productive forces; in place of the terrible wars which are being prepared between the different classes within each nation and between different nations; in place of the practical and violent action of the masses by which alone these conflicts can be resolved—in place of this vast, prolonged and complicated movement, Monsieur Proudhon supplies the whimsical motion of his own head. So it is the men of learning that make history, the men who know how to purloin God's secret thoughts. The common people have only to apply their revelations.

You will now understand why M. Proudhon is the declared enemy of every political movement. The solution of present problems does not lie for him in public action but in the dialectical rotations of his own head. Since to him the categories are the motive force, it is not necessary to change practical life in order to change the categories. Quite the contrary. One must change the categories and the consequence will be a change in the existing society.

In his desire to reconcile the contradictions Monsieur Proudhon does not even ask if the very basis of those contradictions
must not be overthrown. He is exactly like the political doctrinaire who wants to have the king and the chamber of deputies and the chamber of peers as integral parts of social life, as eternal categories. All he is looking for is a new formula by which to establish an equilibrium between these powers whose equilibrium consists precisely in the actual movement in which one power is now the conqueror and now the slave of the other. Thus in the eighteenth century a number of mediocre minds were busy finding the true formula which would bring the social estates, nobility, king, parliament, etc., into equilibrium, and they woke up one morning to find that there was in fact no longer any king, parliament or nobility. The true equilibrium in this antagonism was the overthrow of all the social relations which served as a basis for these feudal existences and for the antagonisms of these feudal existences.

Because M. Proudhon places eternal ideas, the categories of pure reason, on the one side and human beings and their practical life, which, according to him, is the application of these categories, on the other, one finds with him from the beginning a dualism between life and ideas, between soul and body, a dualism which recurs in many forms. You can see now that this antagonism is nothing but the incapacity of M. Proudhon to understand the profane origin and the profane history of the categories which he deifies.

My letter is already too long for me to speak of the absurd case which M. Proudhon puts up against communism. For the moment you will grant me that a man who has not understood the present state of society may be expected to understand still less the movement which is tending to overthrow it, and the literary expressions of this revolutionary movement.

The sole point on which I am in complete agreement with Monsieur Proudhon is his dislike for sentimental socialistic day-dreams. I had already, before him, drawn much enmity upon myself by ridiculing this sentimental, utopian, mutton-headed socialism. But is not M. Proudhon strangely deluding himself when he sets up his petty-bourgeois sentimentalities—I am referring to his declamations about home, conjugal love and all such banalities—in opposition to socialist sentimentality, which in Fourier, for example, goes much deeper than the pretentious platitudes of our worthy Proudhon? He himself is so thoroughly conscious of the emptiness of his arguments, of his utter incapacity to speak about these things, that he bursts into violent explosions of rage, vociferation and righteous wrath, foams at the mouth, curses, denounces, cries shame and murder, beats his breast and boasts before God and man that he is not defiled
by the socialist infamies! He does not seriously criticise socialist sentimentalities, or what he regards as such. Like a holy man, a pope, he excommunicates poor sinners and sings the glories of the petty bourgeoisie and of the miserable patriarchal and amorous illusions of the domestic hearth. And this is no accident. From head to foot M. Proudhon is the philosopher and economist of the petty bourgeoisie. In an advanced society the petty bourgeoisie necessarily becomes from his very position a Socialist on the one side and an economist on the other; that is to say, he is dazed by the magnificence of the big bourgeoisie and has sympathy for the sufferings of the people. He is at once both bourgeois and man of the people. Deep down in his heart he flatters himself that he is impartial and has found the right equilibrium, which claims to be something different from the golden mean. A petty bourgeois of this type glorifies contradiction because contradiction is the basis of his existence. He is himself nothing but social contradiction in action. He must justify in theory what he is in practice, and M. Proudhon has the merit of being the scientific interpreter of the French petty bourgeoisie—a genuine merit, because the petty bourgeoisie will form an integral part of all the impending social revolutions.

I wish I could send you my book on political economy with this letter, but it has so far been impossible for me to get this work, and the criticism of the German philosophers and Socialists of which I spoke to you in Brussels, printed. You would never believe the difficulties which a publication of this kind comes up against in Germany, from the police on the one hand and from the booksellers, who are themselves the interested representatives of all tendencies I am attacking, on the other. And as for our own Party, it is not merely that it is poor, but a large section of the German Communist Party is also angry with me for opposing their utopias and declamations....

First published in the original French in the book:
M. M. Stasyulevich and His Contemporaries in Their Correspondence, Vol. III, St. Petersburg, 1912
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* Marx and Engels, The German Ideology.—Ed.
...And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production, 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society....

First published in full in the journal Jungsozialistische Blätter, 1930
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MARX TO ENGELS IN MANCHESTER

London, April 16, 1856

...The day before yesterday there was a little banquet to celebrate the anniversary of the People's Paper. On this occasion I accepted the invitation, as the times seemed to demand it, and all the more so since I alone (as announced in the paper) of all the refugees had been invited and the first toast also fell to me, in which I was to hail the sovereignty of the proletariat in all countries. So I made a little English speech which I, however, shall not have printed.* The aim which I had in mind was achieved. M. Talandier, who had to buy his ticket for 2s. 6d., and the rest of the gang of French and other refugees have convinced themselves that we are the only "intimate" allies of the Chartists and that though we refrain from public demonstrations and leave open flirtation with Chartism to the Frenchmen, we have it in our power to reoccupy at any time the position already historically due us. This has become all the more necessary because at the meeting of February 25, under Pyat's chairmanship, that German ignoramus Scherzer (old boy) came forward and in truly awful Straubinger style denounced the German "men of learning," the "intellectual workers" who had

* See pp. 500-01 of this volume.—Ed.
left them (the ignoramuses) in the lurch and thus forced them
to discredit themselves in front of the other nations. You know
this Scherzer from Paris days. I have had some more meetings
with friend Schapper and have found him a very repentant sinner. The retirement in which he has lived for the last two years
seems rather to have sharpened his mental powers. You will
understand that in any eventuality it may always be good to
have the man at hand, and still more out of Willich’s hands.
Schapper is now furious with the ignoramuses at Windmill
Street.264

I’ll attend to your letter to Steffen. You should have kept
Levy’s letter there in your possession. Do that in general with
all letters I don’t ask you to send back to me. The less they
are mailed the better. I fully agree with you about the Rhine
Province. The fatal thing for us is that I see something looming
in the future which will smack of “treason to the fatherland.”
It will depend very much on the turn of things in Berlin whether
we are not forced into a position similar to that of the
Mayence Clubbists265 in the old revolution. That would be hard.
We who are so enlightened about our worthy brothers on the
other side of the Rhine! The whole thing in Germany will de-
pend on the possibility of backing the proletarian revolution by
some second edition of the Peasant War. Then the affair will
be splendid....

First published in full in Russian
in the Works by K. Marx and
F. Engels, First Edition,
Vol. XXII, 1929
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MARX TO ENGELS IN RYDE

[London.] September 25, 1857

...Your “Army” is very well done; only its size made me feel
as if I had been hit over the head, for it must do you a lot of
harm to work so much. If I had known that you were going
to work far into the night, I would rather have let the whole
matter go hang.

The history of the army brings out more clearly than any-
thing else the correctness of our conception of the connection
between the productive forces and social relations. In general,
the army is important for economic development. For instance,

* Marx is referring to Engels’s essay on the “Army” published in the
New American Cyclopedia, Vol. II, 1858.—Ed.
it was in the army that the ancients first fully developed a wage system. Similarly among the Romans the peculium castrense was the first legal form in which the right of others than fathers of families to moveable property was recognised. So also the guild system among the corporation of fabri. Here too the first use of machinery on a large scale. Even the special value of metals and their use as money appears to have been originally based—as soon as Grimm's stone age was passed—on their military significance. The division of labour within one branch was also first carried out in the armies. The whole history of the forms of bourgeois society is very strikingly epitomised here. If some day you can find time you must work the thing out from this point of view.

In my opinion, the only points which have been overlooked in your account are: 1) The first appearance of mercenary troops, ready for use on a large scale and at once, among the Carthaginians (for our private use I will look up a book on the Carthaginian armies written by a Berlin man, W. Boetticher, which I came to know only later). 2) The development of the army system in Italy in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Tactical tricks, at any rate, were developed here. Extremely humorous is Machiavelli's description (which I will copy out for you) in his history of Florence of the way the Condottieri fought one another. (No, when I come to see you in Brighton—when?—I would rather bring the volume of Machiavelli with me. His history of Florence is a masterpiece.) And, finally, 3) the Asiatic military system as it first appeared among the Persians and then, though modified in a great variety of ways, among the Mongols, Turks, etc. ...
NOTES
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1 "Theses on Feuerbach" were written by Marx in Brussels in the spring of 1845, when he had already completed, in the main, the development of his materialistic theory of history, and had extended materialism to the understanding of human society. According to Engels, this was "the first document in which is deposited the brilliant germ of a new world outlook" (see present edition, Vol. 3, preface to Ludwig Feuerbach).

In his "Theses on Feuerbach" Marx reveals the basic shortcomings of the materialism of Feuerbach and of all his forerunners—its passive, contemplative approach and its failure to understand the importance of man's revolutionary, "practical-critical" activity. He emphasises the decisive role of revolutionary practice in the cognition and remaking of the world.

The "Theses" are contained in Marx's "Notebook" of 1844-47 under the heading "Concerning Feuerbach". When Engels published the "Theses" in 1888, he made certain editorial changes to render the document, which Marx had not intended for publication, more comprehensible to the reader. This volume includes Engels's version of the "Theses", with the addition—on the basis of Marx's manuscript—of italics and inverted commas which are not contained in the 1888 edition. The title "Theses. on Feuerbach" has been supplied by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism.—13.

2 The German Ideology (Die deutsche Ideologie. Kritik der neuesten deutschen Philosophie in ihren Repräsentanten Feuerbach, B. Bauer und Stirner, und des deutschen Sozialismus in seinen verschiedenen Propheten) was written jointly by Marx and Engels in Brussels in 1845-46. In this work Marx and Engels initially elaborated the materialistic conception of history as the philosophical basis of the theory of scientific communism.

The manuscript of The German Ideology consisted of two volumes, the first being a critique of post-Hegelian philosophy and the second a criticism of "true" socialism.

Chapter I of the first volume sets forth the main positive content of The German Ideology. That is why it is the most important chapter of the whole work and is important in itself.

The manuscript of Chapter I consists of three parts of the rough manuscript and two clean copies of the beginning of the chapter. Accordingly, the text of the chapter is divided into four parts.

Part I of Chapter I is the second version of the clean copy with additions from the first version of the omissions in the second version. Part II presents the original kernel of the entire chapter. Parts III and IV are theoretical digressions taken from the chapter dealing with Stirner (Chapter III of Volume 1).

In this volume the material is arranged according to the Russian pamphlet: K. Marx and F. Engels, Feuerbach. Opposition of the Materialistic
and Idealistic Outlook (new publication of Chapter I of The German Ideology), Moscow, 1966.

All editorial headings and necessary insertions, as well the pages of the manuscript, are given in square brackets. The numeration of the sheets of the main, second, clean copy by Marx and Engels is indicated by the letter “s” and the corresponding figure, for example, [s. 1], [s. 2], etc. The first clean copy is not paged by the authors; the pages are indicated by the letter “p” and the corresponding figure: [p. 1], [p. 2], etc. The pages of the three rough parts of the MS., numbered by Marx, are indicated only by figures: [1], [2], etc.—16.

3 The reference is to David Strauss’s main work (D. F. Strauss, Das Leben Jesu, Bd. 1-2, Tübingen, 1835-1836) which laid the beginning to the philosophical criticism of religion and the split of the Hegelian school into Old Hegelians and Young Hegelians.—16.

4 Diadochi—generals of Alexander the Great, who, in their struggle for power after Alexander’s death, fiercely fought each other. In the course of this struggle (end of the fourth century B.C. to the beginning of the third) the unstable military and administrative union, that was Alexander’s Empire, disintegrated into several independent states.—16.

5 The expression is from an anonymous article published in Wigand’s Vierteljahresschrift, Bd. IV. 1845 S. 327

Wigand’s Vierteljahresschrift (Wigand’s Quarterly)—philosophical journal of the Young Hegelians published by Otto Wigand in Leipzig in 1844-45. Among its contributors were Bruno Bauer, Max Stirner and Ludwig Feuerbach.—19.

6 In The German Ideology the word “Verkehr” is used in a very wide sense, encompassing the material and spiritual intercourse of individuals, social groups and entire countries. Marx and Engels show that material intercourse, and above all the intercourse of men with each other in the production process, is the basis of every other form of intercourse. The terms “Verkehrsform” (form of intercourse), “Verkehrweise” (mode of intercourse), “Verkehrverhältnisse” (relations, or conditions, of intercourse) and “Produktions- und Verkehrverhältnisse” (relations of production and intercourse) which we encounter in The German Ideology are used by Marx and Engels to express the concept “relations of production” which during that period was taking shape in their mind.—20.

7 The term “Stamm”—rendered in this volume by the word “tribe”—played a considerably greater part in the historical works written in the forties of the last century, than it does at present. It was used to denote a community of people descended from a common ancestor, and comprised the modern concepts of “gens” and “tribe”. The first to define and differentiate these concepts was Lewis Henry Morgan in his main work Ancient Society (1877). This outstanding American ethnographer and historian showed, for the first time, the significance of the gens as the nucleus of the primitive communal system and thereby laid the scientific foundations for the history of primitive society as a whole. Engels drew the general conclusions from Morgan’s discoveries and made a comprehensive analysis of the meaning of the concepts “gens” and “tribe” in his work The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (1884) (see present edition, Vol. 3).—21.

8 The agrarian law of Licinius and Sextius, Roman tribunes of the people, was passed in 367 B.C. as a result of the struggle which the plebeians waged against the patricians. According to this law, a Roman citizen
could not hold more than 500 Yugera (approximately 309 acres) of common land (ager publicus.)—22.

This refers to Bruno Bauer's article "Charakteristik Ludwig Feuerbachs" in Wigand's Vierteljahresschrift, Bd. III, 1845, S. 86-146.—28, 41.

See G. W. F. Hegel, Die Philosophie der Geschichte, Einleitung, Geographische Grundlage der Weltgeschichte (The Philosophy of History, Introduction, Geographical Foundation of World History).—30

The reference is to Bruno Bauer's words uttered by him in the article "Charakteristik Ludwig Feuerbachs" in Wigand's Vierteljahresschrift, Bd. III, 1845, S. 130).—30.

Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher (German-French Annals)—a magazine edited by Karl Marx and Arnold Ruge and published in German in Paris. Only the first issue, a double one, appeared (in February 1844). It included two articles by Karl Marx—"Zur Judenfrage" ("On the Jewish Question") and "Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie. Einleitung" ("Contribution to a Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law. Introduction")—and two by Frederick Engels—"Umriss zu einer Kritik der Nationalökonomie" ("Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy") and "Die Lage Englands. 'Past and Present' by Thomas Carlyle, London, 1843" ("The Position of England. 'Past and Present' by Thomas Carlyle, London, 1843"). These works mark the final transition of Marx and Engels to materialism and communism. Publication of the periodical was discontinued mainly as a result of basic differences of opinion between Marx and Ruge, who was a bourgeois radical.—35, 503.

The conclusion that the proletarian revolution could only be carried through in all the advanced capitalist countries simultaneously, and hence that the victory of the revolution in a single country was impossible, which received its final expression in Engels's essay Grundsätze des Kommunismus (Principles of Communism) (1847) (see pp. 91-92 of this volume), was correct for the period of pre-monopoly capitalism.

Lenin, who took as his starting-point the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism discovered by him, came to a new conclusion. He pointed out that in the new historical conditions, in the period of monopoly capitalism, the socialist revolution could be victorious at first in a few countries, or even in a single country, and that the victory of the revolution in all or in most countries simultaneously was impossible. This thesis was for the first time set forth in Lenin's article "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe" (1915).—37, 92, 271.

The Continental System, or continental blockade, proclaimed by Napoleon I in 1806, prohibited trade between the countries of the European continent and Great Britain. It was annulled after Napoleon's defeat in Russia.—39, 302, 508.

Marseillaise, Carmagnole, Ça ira—revolutionary songs of the period of the French bourgeois revolution of the late eighteenth century. The refrain of the last song was: "Ah! ça ira, ça ira, ça ira. Les aristocrates à la lanterne!"—41.

The expression is from Max Stirner's book Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum (The Unique and His Property), Leipzig, 1845.—42.
The expression is taken from Bruno Bauer’s article “Charakteristik Ludwig Feuerbachs (see Wigand’s Vierteljahresschrift, Bd. III, 1845, S. 139).—44.

The expression is from Max Stirner’s book Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum.—45.

Hallische Jahrbücher and Deutsche Jahrbücher—abbreviated title of a Young-Hegelian literary and philosophical periodical published in Leipzig in the form of sheets, which were issued daily, under the title Hallische Jahrbücher für deutsche Wissenschaft und Kunst (Halle Annals on German Science and Art) from January 1838 to June 1841, and under the title Deutsche Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst (German Annals on Science and Art) from July 1841 to January 1843. In January 1843 the periodical was banned by the government.—45.

B. Bauer, Geschichte der Politik, Cultur und Aufklärung des achzehnten Jahrhunderts (The History of Politics, Culture and Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century), Bd. 1-2, Charlottenburg, 1843-1845.—45.

Rhine-song—the poem “Der deutsche Rhein” (“The German Rhine”) by Nicolas Becker, a German petty-bourgeois poet, was widely used by nationalists. It was written in 1840 and set to music by various composers during the following years.—45.

The reference is to Ludwig Feuerbach’s article “Über das ‘Wesen des Christenthums’ in Beziehung auf den ‘Einzigen und sein Eigenthum’” (“On the ‘Essence of Christianity’ in Relation to ‘The Unique and His Property’”) published in Wigand’s Vierteljahresschrift, Bd. II, 1845, S. 193-205. The article ends as follows: “Hence, Feuerbach cannot be called either a materialist or an idealist or a philosopher of identity. What is he then? He is in thoughts what he is in reality, in spirit what he is in the flesh, in essence what he is in the senses—he is Man or, rather—since Feuerbach transports the essence of Man only into his community—he is social Man, communist.”—45.

L. Feuerbach, Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft (Principles of the Philosophy of the Future), Zürich und Winterthur, 1843, S. 47.

In his notes entitled “Feuerbach” and probably intended for Chapter I, Volume 1 of The German Ideology, Engels quotes and comments on the following passage from Feuerbach’s book:

“Existence is not a general concept which can be separated from things. It forms a unit with the things that exist.... Existence is the position of essence. My essence is my existence. The fish is in the water, but its essence cannot be separated from this existence. Even language identifies existence and essence. Only in human life is existence divorced from essence—but only in exceptional, unhappy cases; it happens that a person’s essence is not in the place where he exists, but just because of this division his soul is not truly in the place where his body really is. Only where your heart is, there you are. But all things—apart from abnormal cases—are glad to be in the place where they are, and are glad to be what they are” (p. 47).

“A fine panegyric upon the existing state of things. Exceptional cases and a few abnormal cases apart, when you are seven years old you are glad to become a door-keeper in a coalmine and to remain alone in the dark for fourteen hours a day, and because it is your existence, therefore it is also your essence. The same applies to a piece at a self-actor. It is your ‘essence’ to be subservient to a branch

24 Marx and Engels are referring to Chapter III of Volume I of *The German Ideology*. This part of the chapter on Feuerbach was originally included in Chapter III and immediately followed the text to which Marx and Engels are referring. In the mentioned passage from Chapter III they quote Hegel's work *Die Philosophie der Geschichte* (*The Philosophy of History*), etc.—50.

25 *The Anti-Corn Law League*, an organisation of the English industrial bourgeoisie, was founded in 1838 by the Manchester factory-owners Cobden and Bright. The so-called Corn Laws, aimed at restricting or prohibiting the import of grain from abroad, were introduced in England to safeguard the interests of the big landlords. By putting forth the demand for unrestricted Free Trade, the League fought for the abolition of the Corn Laws for the purpose of reducing workers' wages and weakening the economic and political position of the landed aristocracy. As a result of this struggle the Corn Laws were abolished in 1846, which signified the victory of the industrial bourgeoisie over the landed aristocracy.—52.

26 *Verein* (association), according to Max Stirner, was a voluntary union of egoists.—53.


30 See Jean Jacques Rousseau's book *Du Contrat social; ou principes du droit politique* (*The Social Contract; or the Principles of Political Law*) published in Amsterdam in 1762.—68.

31 The reference is to Max Stirner's views expressed by him in the article "Rezensenten Stirners" ("Stirner's Critics") published in *Wigand's Vierteljahresschrift*, Bd. III, 1845, p. 187.—69.

32 England was conquered by the Normans in 1066; Naples—in 1130.—71.

33 *The Eastern Roman Empire*—a state that separated from the slave-owning Roman Empire in 395, its centre being Constantinople; later it took the name of Byzantium. The Eastern Empire existed until the Turkish conquest in 1453.—71, 369.

34 The Italian city Amalfi was a flourishing trading centre in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Its maritime law (*Tabula Amalphitana*) was valid throughout the country and was widespread in the Mediterranean countries.—78.

35 The work *Principles of Communism* (*Grundsätze des Kommunismus*) is the draft programme of the Communist League drawn up by Engels on instructions from the League's District Committee in Paris. Considering it a preliminary draft, Engels suggested, in a letter to Marx written on November 23-24, 1847, that they should give up the catechistical form and draw up the League's programme as the "Communist Manifesto".
At the second congress of the Communist League, held from November 29 to December 8, Marx's and Engels's views were given full support and they were charged with writing the League's programme—"Manifesto of the Communist Party". When writing the Manifesto, the founders of Marxism made use of some of the propositions put forward in the Principles of Communism.

In the Principles of Communism Engels theoretically substantiated some most important programme and tactical principles of the proletarian party, and indicated measures that would enable the victorious proletariat to prepare for a transition from capitalism to socialism.—81.

Instead of an answer to questions 22 and 23 the manuscript has the word "remains", which apparently means that the answer was to remain as formulated in one of the preliminary draft programmes of the Communist League, which has not come down to us.—94.

Chartism—a mass revolutionary movement of the British workers in the 1830s and 1840s. In 1838 the Chartists drew up a petition (People's Charter) to be presented to Parliament, demanding universal franchise for men over 21, a secret ballot, repeal of the property qualifications for parliamentary candidates, etc. The movement began with big meetings and demonstrations, its slogan being the struggle for the implementation of the People's Charter. On May 2, 1842 the Chartists sent a second petition to Parliament, which this time contained a number of social demands (a shorter working day, higher wages, and the like). The petition was rejected by Parliament. In reply the Chartists organised a general strike. In 1848 they planned a mass march to Parliament with a third petition, but the government brought in the troops and prevented it. The petition was examined many months after this and rejected. After 1848 the Chartist movement began to decline.

The main reason for the failure of the Chartist movement was the absence of a clear programme and tactics and the lack of consistently revolutionary proletarian leadership. However, the Chartists had a tremendous influence on the political history of Britain and on the international working-class movement.—96.

Manifesto of the Communist Party—the first programme document of scientific communism which provides an integral and well-composed exposition of the fundamental principles of the great teachings of Marx and Engels. "With the clarity and brilliance of genius, this work outlines a new world-conception, consistent materialism, which also embraces the realm of social life; dialectics, as the most comprehensive and profound doctrine of development; the theory of the class struggle and of the world-historic revolutionary role of the proletariat—the creator of a new, communist society" (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, Moscow, p. 48).

The Manifesto of the Communist Party armed the proletariat with scientific proofs of the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism and the triumph of the proletarian revolution and defined the tasks and aims of the revolutionary working-class movement.

Written by Marx and Engels as the programme of the Communist League, the Manifesto was first published in London in February 1848.—98, 108.

The Communist League—the first international communist organisation of the proletariat founded by Marx and Engels; it existed from 1847 to 1852. See F. Engels's article "On the History of the Communist League" (present edition, Vol. 3).—98, 175, 389.
NOTES

40 This refers to the February Revolution of 1848 in France.—98, 407.

41 The Red Republican—a Chartist weekly published in London by George Julian Harney from June to November 1850. It carried an abridged version of the Manifesto in Nos. 21-24, November 1850.—98.

42 The reference is to the heroic uprising of the Paris workers of June 23-26, 1848, which was suppressed by the French bourgeoisie with extreme brutality. This insurrection was the first great civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.—98, 102, 214, 345, 404.

43 Le Socialiste—a weekly newspaper published in New York from October 1871 till May 1873 in French. It was an organ of the French sections of the North-American Federation of the International; after the Hague Congress it broke away from the International.

The French translation of the Manifesto of the Communist Party referred to in the text was published in Le Socialiste in January-March 1872.—98.

44 The reference is to the first Russian edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party published in Geneva in 1869 in Bakunin's translation. In translating it, Bakunin distorted certain passages. The shortcomings of the first edition were removed in the edition that appeared in Geneva in 1882 in Plekhanov's translation. The latter laid the beginning of the wide spread of the ideas contained in the Manifesto in Russia.—98, 99.

45 This refers to the "Free Russian Printing-House" that printed Kolokol (The Bell)—a revolutionary-democratic newspaper published by Alexander Herzen and Nikolai Ogaryov. Founded by Herzen, the printing-house was located in London until 1865; then it was shifted to Geneva. In 1869 the house printed the first Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto. See Note 44.—99.

46 The authors refer to the situation that set in in Russia after the assassination, on March 1, 1881, of Emperor Alexander II by Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) members. Alexander III, his successor, was sitting snug in Gatchina for fear of further terroristic acts by the secret Executive Committee of the Narodnaya Volya.—100.

47 The Cologne Communist Trial (October 4-November 12, 1852)—trial of 11 members of the Communist League, framed by the Prussian Government. Charged with high treason on the basis of faked documents and false evidence, seven of the accused were sentenced to imprisonment in a fortress for terms from three to six years. The vile provocations of the Russian police state against the international working-class movement were exposed by Marx and Engels (see Engels's article "The Late Trial at Cologne", on pp. 388-93 of this volume, and also Marx's pamphlet Revelations about the Cologne Communist Trial).—102, 388.

48 Marx and Engels expounded this theoretical proposition in a series of their works beginning from the 1840s; as formulated here it can be found in the Rules of the International Working Men's Association (see present edition, Vol. 2).—104.

49 This preface was written by Engels on May 1, 1890, the day when, in accordance with the decision of the Paris Congress of the Second International (July 1889), mass demonstrations, strikes and meetings were held in a number of European and American countries. The workers put forward the demand for an 8-hour working day and other demands set forth by the Congress. From that time onwards workers of all countries
celebrate the First of May every year as the day of the international solidarity of the proletariat.—104.

50 Congress Poland—part of Poland which under the name of Polish Kingdom was annexed to Russia in accordance with the decision of the Vienna Congress of 1814-15.—105.

51 Engels also included this note in the 1890 German edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, omitting only the last sentence.—109.

52 In their later works Marx and Engels used the more exact terms "the value of labour power" and "the price of labour power" introduced by Marx instead of "the value of labour" and "the price of labour" (see in this connection Engels’s introduction to Marx’s Wage Labour and Capital, pp. 142-49 of this volume).—115.

53 This refers to the movement for a reform of the electoral law which, under pressure from the people, was passed by the House of Commons in 1831 and was finally endorsed by the House of Lords in June 1832. This reform was directed against the monopoly rule of the landed and finance aristocracy and opened the way to Parliament for the representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie who were the main force in the struggle for the reform were deceived by the liberal bourgeoisie and were not granted electoral rights. —127.

54 The Legitimists—the adherents of the "legitimate" Bourbon dynasty overthrown in 1830, which represented the interests of the big landed nobility. In their struggle against the reigning Orleans dynasty (1830-48), which relied on the finance aristocracy and big bourgeoisie, a section of the Legitimists resorted to social demagogoy and projected themselves as defenders of the working people against the exploitation by the bourgeoisie.—128, 212, 311.

55 "Young England"—a group of British men of politics and literature belonging to the Tory Party; it was formed in the early 1840s. While expressing the dissatisfaction of the landed aristocracy with the growing economic and political might of the bourgeoisie, the "Young England" leaders resorted to demagogic ruses in order to subjugate the working class to their influence and to turn it into a tool in their struggle against the bourgeoisie.—128.

56 This refers to petty-bourgeois republican democrats and petty-bourgeois socialists who were adherents of the French newspaper La Réforme (published in Paris from 1843 to 1850). They came out for a republic and democratic and social reforms.—136.

57 Concerning the newspaper La Réforme see Note 56.—136, 228.

58 In February 1846 preparations were made for an insurrection throughout the Polish territories with the aim of achieving national liberation. Polish revolutionary democrats (Dembowski and others) were the main inspirers of the insurrection. However, as a result of the betrayal by a section of the Polish gentry and the arrest of the leaders of the insurrection by the Prussian police, only isolated risings broke out. Only in Cracow, which from 1815 onwards was jointly controlled by Austria, Russia and Prussia, did the insurgents gain a victory on February 22 and establish a national government, which issued a manifesto repealing obligatory services to the feudal lords. The Cracow uprising was crushed early in March 1846. In November 1846 Austria, Prussia and Russia signed a
treaty according to which Cracow was annexed to the Austrian Empire. —137, 209.

59 This article is part of Marx's work *The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution* written in December 1848. In it Marx analyses the causes of the victory of the Prussian counter-revolution from a historico-materialistic viewpoint and reveals the character and specific features of the March Revolution in Germany.—138.

60 This refers to a social-estate body composed of representatives from all provincial Landtags of Prussia. In this case, Marx refers to the *Second United Landtag* convened on April 2, 1848, under Camphausen's government. It adopted a law on elections to the Prussian National Assembly and agreed to grant the loan to the government which the United Landtag of 1847 had refused. Following this, the Landtag was dissolved on April 10, 1848.—138.

61 The reference is to the bourgeois revolution of 1566-1609 in the Netherlands (present-day Belgium and Holland) which were part of the Spanish Empire. The revolution combined in one the anti-feudal struggle of the bourgeoisie and the mass of the people and the national liberation war against the Spanish rule. In 1609, following a series of defeats, Spain was compelled to acknowledge the independence of the Dutch bourgeois republic. The sixteenth-century bourgeois revolution in the Netherlands ushered in an epoch of victorious bourgeois revolutions in Europe. The territory of present-day Belgium remained a Spanish possession until 1714.—139.

62 In preparing this work for the press, Marx set himself the task of providing a popular outline of the economic relations forming the material basis for the class struggle in capitalist society. His purpose was to arm the proletariat with a theoretical weapon—a profound scientific understanding of the basis on which rest the class rule of the bourgeoisie and wage slavery of the workers in capitalist society. In elaborating the postulates of his theory of surplus value, Marx formulated a general thesis on the relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class under capitalism.—142, 150.

63 *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie*—daily newspaper published in Cologne from June 1, 1848 to May 19, 1849; Marx was its editor-in-chief, Engels—a member of the editorial board.—142, 186, 225, 356, 505.

64 *The German Workers' Society* in Brussels was founded by Marx and Engels at the end of August 1847 to further the political enlightenment of German workers residing in Belgium and the dissemination of the ideas of scientific communism among them. The Society, guided by Marx and Engels and their associates became the legal rallying centre for German revolutionary workers in Belgium. The most prominent members of the Society were at the same time members of the Brussels branch of the Communist League. The activities of the German Workers' Society in Brussels ceased soon after the February bourgeois revolution of 1848 in France because of the arrest and deportation of its members by the Belgian police.—142, 505.

65 This refers to the invasion of Hungary by tsarist troops in 1849 for the purpose of suppressing the Hungarian bourgeois revolution and restoring the Austrian Hapsburg dynasty.—142

66 This refers to the people's uprisings in Germany in May-July 1849 in
support of the Imperial Constitution (adopted by the Frankfort National Assembly on March 28, 1849, but rejected by a number of German states). These uprisings were spontaneous and disunited, and were crushed in mid-July 1849.—142, 175.

67 A rough outline of the concluding lecture or a series of final lectures on the subject of wage labour and capital, bearing the heading “Wages” and a note on the cover “Brussels, December 1847” was later found among Marx’s manuscripts. As regards its contents, the manuscript represents, in some respects, a continuation of the unfinished work Wage Labour and Capital. The final chapters of this work in a condition ready for the press were not discovered among Marx’s manuscripts.—142.

68 Marx wrote in Capital: “...By classical Political Economy, I understand that economy which, since the time of W. Petty, has investigated the real relations of production in bourgeois society.” (Karl Marx, Capital Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, p. 81.) The most prominent representatives of classical political economy in Britain were Adam Smith and David Ricardo.—143.

Engels wrote in Anti-Dühring: “Although it first took shape in the minds of a few men of genius towards the end of the seventeenth century, political economy in the narrower sense, in its positive formulation by the physiocrats and Adam Smith, is nevertheless essentially a child of the eighteenth century.” (F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, Moscow, 1962, p. 209.)—143.

Engels is referring to the celebration of May Day in 1891. In some countries (Britain and Germany) May Day was celebrated on the first Sunday after May 1, which in 1891 fell on May 3.—149.

71 As Engels points out (see p. 142 of this volume), the work remained unfinished. The publication of articles was interrupted because of Marx’s temporary departure from Cologne and owing to the aggravation of the political situation in Germany and to the termination of the publication of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. See also Note 67.—174.

72 “Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League” was written by Marx and Engels late in March 1850, when they still hoped that there would be a new revolutionary upsurge. Working out the theory and tactics of the proletariat in the coming revolution, Marx and Engels lay special stress on the need for the setting up of an independent proletarian party, for isolation from the petty-bourgeois democrats. The main, guiding idea of the “Address” is the idea of “revolution in permanence” which is to put an end to private property and classes and to establish a new society.

The “Address of the Central Committee” was secretly distributed among members of the Communist League. In 1851 this document, seized by the police from some arrested members of the League, was published in German bourgeois newspapers and in a book written by police officials Wermuth and Stieber.—175.

73 The Holy Alliance—a reactionary association of European monarchs founded in 1815 by tsarist Russia, Austria and Prussia to suppress revolutionary movements in separate countries and to preserve there the feudal monarchies.—176, 209, 310.

74 This refers to Paris, France’s capital, which ever since the French bourgeois revolution of the end of the eighteenth century was considered the hotbed of the revolution.—176.

75 The reference is to the petty-bourgeois Left wing of the National Assembly which was convened after the March Revolution in Germany
and which began its sessions in Frankfort on the Main on May 18, 1848. Its chief task was to put an end to the political disunity of Germany and to work out an Imperial Constitution. However, because of the cowardice and vacillation of its liberal majority, and the indecision and inconsistency of its Left wing, the National Assembly failed to seize supreme power and was unable to take a resolute stand on the principal questions of the German revolution of 1848-49. On May 30, 1849, the Assembly had to move to Stuttgart. On June 18, 1849, it was dispersed by troops. —177, 358.

76 Neue Oder-Zeitung (New Oder Gazette)—German bourgeois-democratic daily published under this title in Breslau (Wroclaw) from 1849 to 1855. In 1855 Marx was its London correspondent.—180.

77 Marx's and Engels's views on the agrarian question expressed herein are closely connected with their general appraisal of the prospects of revolution made in the 1840s and 1850s. At that time the founders of Marxism maintained, as pointed out by Lenin, that capitalism was already senile, and socialism close at hand. Proceeding from this assumption, they oppose in the "Address" the transfer of confiscated land into the hands of the peasants, advocate that it be converted into state property and placed at the disposal of workers' colonies of the associated rural proletariat.

Drawing on the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and the revolutionary movement in other countries, Lenin developed Marxist views on the agrarian question. Recognising the expediency of keeping most of the big agricultural enterprises intact after the victory of the proletarian revolution in advanced capitalist countries, Lenin wrote: "It would, however, be grossly erroneous to exaggerate or to stereotype this rule and never to permit the free grant of part of the land that belonged to the expropriated expropriators to the neighbouring small and sometimes middle peasants." (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 160.)—183.

78 Marx's The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 consists of a series of articles entitles "From 1848 to 1849". It explains from materialist positions a whole period of France's history and sets forth the most important principles of the proletariat's revolutionary tactics. Drawing on the practical experience of the mass revolutionary struggle, Marx developed his own theory of revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Demonstrating that it is necessary for the working class to win political power, Marx uses here, for the first time, the term "the dictatorship of the proletariat" and reveals the political, economic and ideological tasks of this dictatorship. He formulates the idea of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, with the leading role of the former. According to the original plan The Class Struggles in France was to include four articles: "The Defeat of June 1848", "June 13, 1849", "Consequences of June 13 on the Continent" and "The Current Situation in England". However, only three articles appeared. Questions of the influence exerted by the June 1849 events on the Continent and the situation in England were illuminated in other items in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, particularly in the international reviews written jointly by Marx and Engels. When Engels prepared the work for publication in 1895 he also added the fourth chapter which included the sections of "The Third International Review" dealing with the French events. Engels entitled this chapter "The Abolition of Universal Suffrage in 1850". In this volume the headings of the first three chapters are given according
to the journal, while the heading of the fourth chapter is given in accordance with the 1895 edition.—186, 205.

Engels's introduction to The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 by Marx was written for a separate publication of the work in Berlin in 1895.

Having demonstrated the vast importance of the analysis of the revolution of 1848-49 and of its lessons contained in Marx's work, Engels devotes a great part of his introduction to the synthesis of the experience gleaned in the class struggle of the proletariat, chiefly in Germany. Engels underlines the necessity of revolutionary utilisation of all the legal means for the sake of preparing the proletariat for a socialist revolution, of skilfully combining the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialist revolution and of subordinating the first task to the second. In his introduction Engels once again demonstrates the fundamental Marxist principles of using tactical methods and forms of struggle appropriate to concrete historical conditions and of the need to replace the peaceful forms of revolutionary struggle, which the proletariat prefers, by non-peaceful forms in cases when the ruling reactionary classes resort to violence.

Before the introduction was published, the Executive of the German Social-Democratic Party insistently urged Engels to tone down the "over-revolutionary" spirit of the work and make it more prudent. Engels subjected the indecisive position of the party's leadership and its efforts to "act exclusively within the framework of legality" to scathing criticism. However, under pressure from the Executive Engels was compelled to delete some passages in the proofs and change some formulations. (Details on these changes and deletions are given in footnotes. The proofs that have been handed down to us and reference to the actual manuscript make it possible to restore the original text.)

At the same time, relying on this abridged introduction, some leaders of Social-Democracy made an attempt to present Engels as a defender only of a peaceful assumption of power by the working class, peaceful under any circumstances, as a worshipper of "legality quand même". Filled with indignation, Engels insisted on the publication of his introduction in the Neue Zeit in full. However, it was published in that journal with the cuts the author had been compelled to make for the above-mentioned separate edition. Yet, even the abridged introduction retains its revolutionary character.

The unabridged text of Engels's introduction was published for the first time in the Soviet Union in the 1930 edition of The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850.—186.

Newe Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue (New Rhenish Gazette. Politico-Economic Review)—a journal founded by Marx and Engels in December 1849 and published by them until November 1850; the theoretical and political organ of the Communist League. It was printed in Hamburg. Six issues appeared in all. The journal ceased to exist because of police persecutions in Germany and due to lack of funds.—187, 286.

The reference is to government subsidies which Engels ironically names after the estate in Sachsenwald (Saxon Wood) near Hamburg, granted to Bismarck by Emperor Wilhelm I.—189.

In partibus infidelium (liberally, in the country of the infidels)—an addition to the title of Catholic bishops appointed to a purely nominal diocese in non-Christian countries. This expression is frequently used in
Marx’s and Engels’s writings to describe émigré governments formed abroad ignoring the real situation in a country.—189, 295, 300, 402, 427, 469.

63 The reference is to the two monarchist parties of the French bourgeoisie of the first part of the nineteenth century, to the Legitimists (see Note 54) and Orleanists.

Orleanists—supporters of the House of Orleans, a cadet branch of the Bourbon dynasty that came to power during the July revolution of 1830 and was overthrown by the revolution of 1848. They represented the interests of the finance aristocracy and the big bourgeoisie.

During the Second Republic (1848-1851) the Legitimists and Orleanists formed the nucleus of the united conservative “party of Order”.—192, 223, 414.

64 During the reign of Napoleon III, France took part in the Crimean war (1854-55), waged war with Austria on account of Italy (1859), participated together with Britain in the wars against China (1856-58 and 1860), began the conquest of Indo-China (1860-61), organised an expedition to Syria (1860-61) and Mexico (1862-67), and finally, in 1870-71, fought Prussia.—192.

65 The term applied by Engels expressed one of the principles of the foreign policy conducted by the ruling circles of the Bonapartist Second Empire (1852-70). This so-called principle of nationality was widely used by the ruling classes of big powers as an ideological mask for their plans of conquest and adventures abroad. It had nothing in common with the recognition of the right to national self-determination and was used to stir up national hatred and transform the national movements, especially of minor peoples, into an instrument of counter-revolutionary policies pursued by the warring powers.—193.

66 The German Confederation, formed by the Vienna Congress on June 8, 1815, was an association of feudal-absolutist German states; it helped to prolong the political and economic disunity of Germany.—193, 307.

67 As a result of Prussia’s victory in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, there appeared a German Empire, which did not include Austria—hence the name “little German empire”. Napoleon’s defeat served as an impetus for a revolution in France which overthrew Louis Bonaparte and established a republic on September 4, 1870.—193, 369.

68 The National Guard—armed civil volunteer corps with elected commanders; it existed in France and other West-European countries. First formed in France in 1789, at the beginning of the bourgeois revolution, it existed with intervals until 1871. In 1870-71 the Paris National Guard, which was reinforced by broad democratic masses during the Franco-Prussian war, played a major revolutionary role. The Central Committee of the National Guard, set up in February 1871, headed the proletarian insurrection of March 18, 1871, and in the initial period of the Paris Commune of 1871 functioned (until March 28) as the world’s first proletarian government. After the suppression of the Paris Commune the National Guard was disbanded.—193, 210, 403.

69 The reference is to the 5,000,000,000-franc indemnity to be paid to Germany by France after her defeat in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.—194.

70 The Anti-Socialist Law was introduced in Germany on October 21, 1878. According to it, all organisations of the Social-Democratic Party, mass workers’ organisations and workers’ press were prohibited, socialist
publications were made subject to confiscation and Social-Democrats were persecuted. Under pressure from the mass working-class movement the law was repealed on October 1, 1890.—194.

91 The franchise was introduced by Bismarck in 1866 for the elections to the North-German Reichstag and in 1871 for the elections to the Reichstag of the united German Empire.—195.

92 Engels is quoting the preamble, written by Marx, to the programme of the French Workers’ Party adopted at a congress in Havre in 1880. —195.

93 On September 4, 1870, the government of Louis Bonaparte was overthrown by the revolutionary masses and a republic proclaimed, and October 31 of the same year saw the unsuccessful attempt at an insurrection against the Government of National Defence by the Blanquists.—199.

94 The battle of Wagram took place on July 5-6, 1809, during the Austro-French war of 1809. The French troops led by Napoleon Bonaparte defeated the Austrian army of Archduke Charles.

95 The battle of Waterloo took place on June 18, 1815. Napoleon was defeated. The battle was of decisive importance in the 1815 campaign; it predestined the final victory of the anti-Napoleonic coalition of European Powers and the fall of the empire of Napoleon Bonaparte.—199, 204.

96 Engels refers here to the long struggle that was waged between the Dukes and nobility in Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz, which culminated in the signing of a Constitutional Treaty on the hereditary rights of the nobility in Rostock in 1755. The treaty confirmed the nobility’s former freedoms and privileges and secured their leading role in the Landtags, which were organised on the social estate principle. It also exempted half of their land from taxes, fixed taxes on trade and handicrafts, and determined their contribution to state expenditure.—201.

97 A new Anti-Socialist Bill, introduced in the German Reichstag on December 5, 1894, was rejected by the legislature on May 11, 1895.—203.

98 On June 5-6, 1832 there was an uprising in Paris. The workers who took part in it erected barricades and defended themselves with great courage and determination.

In April 1834 Lyons was the scene of a workers’ uprising, one of the first mass actions of the French proletariat. This uprising, supported by republicans in other towns, especially in Paris, was cruelly put down.

The Paris uprising of May 12, 1839, the motive force of which were revolutionary workers, was prepared by the Society of the Seasons (Société de saisons), a secret republican-socialist society headed by Auguste Blanqui and Armand Barbès. The uprising was put down by government troops and the National Guard.—206.

99 The July monarchy—a period of the reign of Louis Philippe (1830-48) —derived its name from the July Revolution.—206, 404.

100 Sonderbund—a separate treaty of seven economically backward Catholic Swiss cantons concluded in 1843 with a view to resisting progressive bourgeois reforms in Switzerland and protecting the privileges of the church and Jesuits. The decision of the Swiss Diet of July 1847 dissolving the Sonderbund served as a pretext for the Sonderbund to start, early
in November, military operations against the other cantons. On November 23, 1847, the Sonderbund army was routed by Federal Government troops. During the war, the reactionary West-European countries, former members of the Holy Alliance—Austria and Prussia—made an attempt to interfere in Swiss affairs in favour of the Sonderbund. Guizot actually supported these countries, thus taking the Sonderbund under his protection.—209.

101 At Buzançais (dept. Indre), the famine-stricken workers of neighbouring villages raided, in the spring of 1847, the food storehouses of local profiteers, which led to a clash between the population and troops resulting in bloodshed. The Buzançais events were responsible for severe repressive measures by the government: four participants in the riot were executed on April 16, 1847, and many others were sentenced to hard labour.—209.

102 Le National—a French daily published in Paris from 1830 to 1851; the organ of moderate bourgeois republicans. Their main representatives in the Provisional Government were Marrast, Bastide and Garnier Pagès. —210, 407.

103 La Gazette de France—a daily published in Paris from 1631; in the 1840s it was the organ of the Legitimists, supporters of the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty.—212.

104 The question of choosing the French national standard arose in the first days of the French Republic. The revolutionary workers of Paris demanded that it should be red, the colour of the flag that was hoisted in the workers’ suburbs of Paris during the June uprising of 1832. Bourgeois representatives insisted on the tricolour (a standard of blue, white and red vertical bands) which was the French national standard during the bourgeois revolution of the end of the eighteenth century and during Napoleon’s empire. Even before the revolution of 1848 the tricolour was the emblem of the bourgeois republicans grouped around the newspaper National. The workers’ representatives had to agree to the tricolour becoming the national standard; however, at their insistence a red rosette was fixed to the flagstaff.—214, 412.

105 Le Moniteur universel (Universal Herald)—a French daily, official government organ, came out in Paris between 1789 and 1901. It necessarily published government decrees, parliamentary reports and other official documents. In 1848 the newspaper also printed the reports on the sittings of the Luxembourg Commission.—214, 416.

106 The reference is to the sum assigned by the French king in 1825 to compensate the aristocrats whose property had been confiscated during the French bourgeois revolution of the end of the eighteenth century—218.

107 Lazzaroni—the name applied in Italy to the declassed, lumpenproletarian elements; the lazzaroni were repeatedly used by the reactionary-monarchist circles in their struggle against the liberal and democratic movements.—220, 442.

108 The Poor Law adopted in England in 1834 provided for only one form of relief: placing the poor in workhouses in which the regime was similar to that of prisons. The workers were engaged in unproductive, monotonous and exhaustive labour. These workhouses were nicknamed by the people “Bastilles for the poor”.—220.
On May 15, 1848, during a people's demonstration, Paris workers and handicraftsmen burst into the hall where the Constituent Assembly was in session, declared it dissolved and formed a revolutionary government. But the demonstrators were soon dispersed by the National Guard and the troops. Blanqui, Barbès, Albert, Raspail, Sobrier and other leaders of the workers were arrested.—224, 344, 404.

On April 16, 1848, in Paris a peaceful demonstration of workers, carrying a petition to the Provisional Government demanding the "organisation of labour" and the "abolition of exploitation of man by man", was stopped by the bourgeois National Guard specially mobilised for the purpose.—228, 344, 417.

This refers to the leading article in Journal des Débats, of August 28, 1848.

Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires—a French bourgeois daily founded in Paris in 1789. During the July monarchy it was the government paper, organ of the Orleanist bourgeoisie. During the revolution of 1848 the newspaper expressed the views of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, the so-called party of Order.—230, 407.

The first draft of the constitution was submitted to the National Assembly on June 19, 1848.—234.

According to the Bible Saul, the first king of Israel, killed thousands of his enemies in the war against the Philistines, while David, his armur-bearer, whom Saul befriended, killed tens of thousands of them. After Saul's death David became king of Israel.—296.

Lily—a heraldic emblem of the Bourbon dynasty; violets—an emblem of the Bonapartists.—237, 421.

Marx refers to the report from Paris, dated December 18, appearing in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 174, December 21, 1848 and signed with Ferdinand Wolff's pen-name. These words may belong to Marx himself who subjected the material sent to the newspaper to thorough editing.—237.

The party of Order—a party of the conservative big bourgeoisie founded in 1848. It was a coalition of the two French monarchist factions—the Legitimists and the Orleanists (see Notes 54 and 83); from 1849 till the coup d'etat of December 2, 1851, it held the leading position in the Legislative Assembly of the Second Republic.—251, 414.

The Restoration of 1814-30—a period of the second reign in France of the Bourbon dynasty. The reactionary regime of the Bourbons which supported the interests of the nobles and the clericals was overthrown by the July revolution of 1830.—251, 413.

From March 7 to April 3, 1849, Bourges was the scene of the trial of those who had taken part in the events of May 15, 1848 (see Note 109). Barbès was sentenced to life imprisonment, Blanqui—to ten years in prison, while Albert, De Flotte, Sobrier, Raspail and others were sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment and exile.—253, 425.

General Bréa, who was in command of part of the troops which suppressed the June rising of the Paris proletariat, was killed by the insurgents at the gates of Fontainebleau on June 25, 1848. In connection with this, two of the participants in the rising were executed.—253.

La Démocratie pacifique—daily newspaper of the Fourierists published in Paris in 1843-51 under the editorship of Victor Considérant.
In the evening of June 12, 1849, the deputies of the Montagne held a meeting on the premises of the newspaper. The participants refused to resort to force of arms and decided to confine themselves to a peaceful demonstration.—259.

124 In its manifesto published in Le Peuple (The People) No. 206, June 13, 1849, the “Democratic Association of the Friends of the Constitution” called upon the citizens of Paris to participate in a peaceful demonstration in protest of the “presumptuous pretensions” of the executive authorities.—260.

122 The proclamation was published in the Réforme, Démocratie pacifique and in Proudhon’s Peuple on June 13, 1849.—260.

123 Marx is referring to the commission of Pope Pius IX, made up of three cardinals, who, relying on support from the French army, after the suppression of the Roman Republic restored the reactionary regime in Rome. The cardinals wore red mantles.—264.

126 Le Siècle (Age)—a French daily published in Paris from 1836 to 1939; in the 1840s it expressed the views of that part of the petty bourgeoisie whose demands were confined to moderate constitutional reforms; in the 1850s it was the newspaper of moderate republicans.—265.

125 La Presse—a daily newspaper that came out in Paris from 1836; during the July monarchy it was oppositional in character; in 1848-49 it was the organ of bourgeois republicans and later on that of the Bonapartists. —265, 439.

126 The reference is to Count Chambord (who called himself Henry V), the pretender to the French throne from the oldest line of the Bourbons. Alongside with Wiesbaden, Ems was one of his residences in West Germany.—265, 422.

127 Louis Philippe, who had fled from France after the February Revolution of 1848, lived in Claremont (the environs of London).—266, 422.

128 “Motu proprio” (“of his own motion”)—initial words of a special kind of Papal encyclicals adopted without the preliminary approval by the cardinals and usually concerning the internal political and administrative affairs of the Papal Region. This particular case refers to the address of Pope Pius IX of September 12, 1849.—267.

129 The figures given by Marx do not tally. Presumably due to a misprint, the text reads 538,000,000 instead of 578,178,000. However, Marx’s general conclusion is not affected by the misprint, for in either case the net per capita income is less than 25 francs.—276.

130 Following the death of De Beaune, a Legitimist deputy, additional elections were held in the Department du Gard, as a result of which Favaune, a candidate of the Montagne’s supporters, was elected deputy by a majority vote of 20,000 (out of 36,000).—277.

131 In 1850, the government divided the territory of France into five big military districts, as a result of which Paris and the adjacent departments were encircled by four districts headed by ultra-reactionary generals. Drawing a parallel between the unlimited power of these reactionary generals and the despotic rule of the Turkish Pashas, the Republican press christened these districts pashalics.—278.

132 The reference is to the message President Louis Bonaparte sent to the
Legislative Assembly on October 31, 1849, in which he stated that he had dismissed the Barrot ministry and formed a new one.—278.

133 In his message of November 10, 1849, Carlier, the newly appointed Prefect of the Paris police, urged to set up a "social anti-Socialist league" ("une ligue sociale contre le socialisme") for the protection of "religion, labour, the family, property and loyalty".—278.

134 Le Napoléon—a weekly published in Paris from January 6 to May 19, 1850.—279.

135 The trees of liberty were planted in the streets of Paris following the victory of the February Revolution of 1848. The planting of the trees of liberty—usually oaks or poplars—became a tradition in France ever since the French bourgeois revolution of the end of the eighteenth century and was given recognition in its time by a decision of the Convention.—282.

136 The July column, erected in Paris in 1840 on the Bastille Square in memory of those who perished during the July Revolution of 1830, has been decorated with wreaths of immortelles ever since the February Revolution of 1848.—283.

137 De Flotte, a supporter of Blanqui and representative of the Paris revolutionary proletariat, polled 126,643 votes at the elections held on March 15, 1850.—284.

138 Coblenz—a city in West Germany; during the French bourgeois revolution of the end of the eighteenth century it was the centre of counter-revolutionary émigrés.—286.

139 In 1797 the English Government passed a special act restricting the Bank of England; it made banknotes legal tender and suspended the payment of gold for them. In 1819 gold payment was resumed.—288.

140 Burggraves was the name given to the 17 leading Orleanist and Legitimist members of the Legislative Assembly's committee for drafting a new electoral law, for their unwarranted claim to power and their reactionary aspirations. The name was taken from the title of Victor Hugo's historical drama. Its action is set in medieval Germany where Burg-Graf was the title of the ruler of a "burg" (fortified town or castle), who was appointed by the emperor.—290, 457.

141 L'Assemblée nationale—a French daily of a monarchist Legitimist trend; it appeared in Paris from 1848 to 1857. Between 1848 and 1851 it supported the fusion of the two dynastic parties—the Legitimists and the Orleanists.—292, 459.

142 Le Constitutionnel—French bourgeois daily published in Paris from 1815 to 1870; in the 1840s, organ of the moderate wing of the Orleanists; during the revolution of 1848 it expressed the views of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie grouped around Thiers; following the coup d'état of 1851—a Bonapartist paper.—292.

143 "Baiser Lamourette" (Lamourette's kiss)—the reference is to a famous incident that occurred during the French revolution of the end of the eighteenth century. On July 7, 1792, Lamourette, deputy in the Legislative Assembly, proposed to end all party dissension with a fraternal kiss. Under the influence of his proposal, the representatives of the hostile parties heartily embraced one another but, as might have been expected, on the following day this hypocritical "fraternal kiss" was forgotten.—293.
Le Pouvoir (Government)—Bonapartist newspaper founded in Paris in 1849; under this title the newspaper was published from June 1850 to January 1851.—294.

Article 32 of the Constitution of the French Republic provided for the formation between sessions of the Legislative Assembly of a permanent commission composed of 25 elected members and the Assembly’s Bureau. In case of need the commission could convene the Legislative Assembly. In 1850 the commission was in fact made up of 39 members: 11 Bureau members, 3 questors and 25 elected members.—295.

The reference is to a new cabinet to be appointed by the Legitimists in case of Count Chambord’s advent to power. It was to consist of De Lévis, Saint-Priest, Berryer, Pastoret and D’Escars.—295.

This refers to the so-called Wiesbaden Manifesto—a circular drawn up in Wiesbaden on August 30, 1850, by De Barthelemy, secretary of the Legitimist faction in the Legislative Assembly, on the instruction of Count Chambord. The circular was a policy statement of the Legitimists in the case of their advent to power. Count Chambord declared that he “officially and categorically condemns any appeal to the people, because such an appeal signifies a rejection of the great national principle of hereditary monarchy”. This statement evoked debates in the press in connection with protests from some monarchists headed by Deputy La Rochejaquelein.—295.

In his work Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany Engels reviews the results of the German Revolution of 1848-49 and deeply analyses its premises, basic stages of development and the stand taken by various classes and parties from historico-materialist positions. He elaborates the tactical principles of the proletarian revolutionary struggle and lays the foundations for the Marxist teaching on armed insurrection.

This work consists of a series of articles which were published in The New-York Daily Tribune in 1851-52. They were written by Engels at the request of Marx who at that time was engaged in economic research. They carried the signature of Marx, the newspaper’s official correspondent. It was only in 1913, when the correspondence between Marx and Engels was published, that it became known that they were written by Engels.

In The New-York Daily Tribune these articles were printed without subheadings. In the English edition of 1896, the first separate English edition of this work, prepared for publication by Marx’s daughter, Eleanor Marx-Aveling, the articles were provided by her with the subheadings given in this volume.—300.


The Protective Tariff of 1818—abolition of internal duties on the territory of Prussia.—303.

Zollverein (Customs Union), founded in 1834 under Prussia’s hegemony, comprised almost all German states; by establishing a common customs-boundary it helped to bring about Germany’s political unification.—303, 507.

Insurrection of Silesian weavers on June 4-6, 1844—the first big class battle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Germany—and the
uprising of Czech workers in the latter half of June 1844 were vigorously put down by government troops.—306.

153 *The Diet*, the central body of the German Confederation, which held its sessions in Frankfort on the Main, was used by German Government as a reactionary political instrument.—307.

154 The so-called *Customs Union* (*Steuerverein*) was formed in May 1834; it included the German states Hanover, Braunschweig, Oldenburg and Schaumburg-Lippe which were interested in commerce with England. By 1854, this separatist union disintegrated and its participants joined the *Zollverein* (see Note 151).—307.

155 At the Congress of Vienna in 1814-15 Austria, England and tsarist Russia, who headed European reaction, recarved the map of Europe with a view to restoring Legitimist monarchies, disregarding the interests of the national unification and independence of the peoples.—308.

156 In July 1830 a bourgeois revolution took place in France which was followed by uprisings in Belgium, Poland, Germany and Italy.—309.

157 *"Young Germany"* ("Junges Deutschland")—a literary group that emerged in Germany in the 1830s; its literary and journalistic works reflected the spirit of opposition among the petty bourgeoisie and advocated freedom of faith and the press.—309.

158 The reference is to the *Berliner politisches Wochenblatt* (Berlin Political Weekly)—an extremely reactionary periodical published in 1831-41 with the participation of followers of the Historical School.—311.

159 *The Historical School*—a reactionary trend in the science of history and law that appeared in Germany late in the eighteenth century.—311.

160 *Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe* (Rhenish Gazette for Politics, Commerce and Industry)—a German daily published in Cologne from January 1, 1842 to March 31, 1843. In April 1842 Marx began to contribute to the newspaper and in October of the same year he became one of its editors.—312, 502.

161 *United Committees*—consultative estate bodies in Prussia elected by provincial diets from among its members.—313.

162 *Seehandlung*—the abbreviated name of "Preussische Seehandlungsgesellschaft" (Prussian Overseas Trading Company), a commercial and banking society founded in Prussia in 1772 and endowed by the state with a number of important privileges; it gave big loans to the government.—313.

163 *The United Landtag* (Diet)—the united assembly of provincial estate Landtags convened in Berlin in April 1847 to guarantee a foreign loan negotiated by the king. Since the king refused to meet even the most moderate political demands of the Landtag's bourgeois majority, the latter refused to guarantee the loan, for which the Landtag was dissolved by the king in June of the same year.—314.

164 An allusion to the works by representatives of German or "true socialism", a reactionary trend current in Germany in the 1840s primarily among the petty-bourgeois intellectuals.—315, 485.

165 The *Gotha party* founded in June 1849 by the Right-wing liberals, representatives of the counter-revolutionary big bourgeoisie, aimed at uniting the whole of Germany, except Austria, under the hegemony of Hohenzollern Prussia.—317,
German Catholicism—a religious movement that arose in 1844 and embraced big strata of the middle and petty bourgeoisie; it was directed against extreme manifestations of mysticism and hypocrisy in the Catholic Church. The “German Catholics” rejected the supremacy of the Pope and many Catholic dogmas and rites and sought to adapt Catholicism to the needs of the German bourgeoisie.

Free Congregations—congregations that split away from the official Protestant Church in 1846. This religious opposition was a form in which the German bourgeoisie of the 1840s expressed its discontent with the reactionary system in Germany. In 1859 they merged with the “German Catholics”.—318.

Unitarians, or anti-Trinitarians, were representatives of a religious trend that came into being in Germany in the sixteenth century and expressed the struggle of the masses and radical bourgeoisie against the feudal system and the feudal church. Unitarism penetrated into England and America in the seventeenth century. The nineteenth-century unitarian doctrine stressed the moral and ethical aspects of religion, opposing the external, ritual aspect.—318.

Until August 1806 Germany was part of the so-called Holy Roman Empire of the German nation. Founded in the tenth century, the empire was an association of feudal principalities and free cities that recognised the supreme power of the emperor.—319.

The slogan of a single and indivisible German Republis was advanced by Marx and Engels when the revolution was only in the offing. —319.

The reference is to the so-called First Opium War (1839-42)—a war of conquest waged by Britain against China that started China’s conversion into a semi-colony.—320.

In February-March 1846, simultaneously with the national liberation insurrection in Cracow, a big peasant uprising flared up in Galicia which the Austrian Government used as a pretext to crush the insurgent movement of the Polish nobility. Having put down the Cracow insurrection, the Austrian Government also suppressed the Galician peasant uprising. —321.

This refers to the national liberation struggle waged by the Italian people against the Austrian rule in 1848-49. The treachery of the Italian ruling classes who feared Italy’s revolutionary unification led to the defeat of the struggle.—328.

On August 26, 1848, an armistice was concluded in Malmoe between Denmark and Prussia, which under pressure from the masses, was compelled to participate in the war on the side of the insurgents of Schleswig and Holstein, who fought for a union with Germany and against Danish rule. Waging a sham war against Denmark, Prussia concluded with her a shameful armistice for a term of seven months which was ratified by the Frankfort National Assembly in September. The war was resumed in March 1849. But in July 1850, Prussia signed a peace treaty with Denmark, enabling the latter to put down the insurgents. —337.

The reference is to the boundaries of Poland before the first division in 1772, when a considerable part of her territory was divided between Russia, Prussia and Austria-Hungary.—339.
Wars of the Hussites—national liberation wars of the Czech people waged in 1419-37 against German feudals and the Catholic Church. They were named so after Jan Huss (1369-1415), leader of the Czech Reformation.—340.

In this article Engels touches upon the national movement of peoples, who were at that time members of the Austrian Empire (Czechs, Slavs, Croatians, and others). Marx and Engels to whom the interests of the revolution always served as the criterion in their approach to the national question, wholeheartedly supported their struggle while revolutionary and democratic tendencies were still strong in it. But when Right-wing bourgeois-landlord elements became prevalent in it and the reactionary monarchist forces succeeded in using the national liberation movement of these peoples against the German and Hungarian revolutions, Marx and Engels changed their attitude towards it. “It was for this reason, and exclusively for this reason, that Marx and Engels were opposed to the national movement of the Czechs and South Slavs,” V. I. Lenin wrote in this connection (see Collected Works, Vol. 22, p. 340).

In addition to the correct assessment of the objective role played by the national movements of the Slav peoples of Austria in the concrete conditions of 1848-49, Engels’s work also contains some erroneous statements as regards the historical destiny of these peoples. Engels develops the idea that these peoples are no longer able to exist independently as nations and that they would be inevitably swallowed up by a stronger neighbour. Engels’s conclusion can be explained mainly by the ideas about the historical destiny of small peoples he held in those days. Engels maintained that the course of historical development, whose basic tendency under capitalism was centralisation, the formation of large states, would lead to the absorption of small peoples by big nations. While correctly noticing capitalism’s tendency towards concentration, Engels failed to take into account the opposing tendency—the struggle of small peoples against national oppression, for independence, their striving for independent statehood. As the broad masses were drawn into the national liberation struggle and their national consciousness and organisation grew, the national liberation movements of the small peoples, including that of the Slavs in Austria, acquired an increasingly democratic, progressive character and this extended the front of the revolutionary struggle. History has shown that the small Slav peoples, which formerly were incorporated in the Austrian Empire, revealed not only their ability for independent national development, for the formation of their own states, but created the most progressive social system. —340.

The Slavonic Congress, which was held in Prague on June 2, 1848, showed that there were two tendencies in the national movement of the Slav peoples oppressed by the Hapsburgs’ empire. It failed to work out a single standpoint on the national question. Some congress delegates who belonged to the radical wing and took an active part in the Prague uprising of June 1848 were subjected to severe repression. On June 16 the representatives of the moderate liberal wing who remained in Prague declared the adjournment of the Congress for an indefinite period —342.

The mass demonstration in London, called by the Chartists for April 10, 1848, in order to present a petition to Parliament concerning the adoption of the People’s Charter, ended in failure. This was used by reac-
tionaries to launch an onslaught on the workers and initiate repressions against the Chartists.—344.

179 On May 15, 1848, Ferdinand II, King of Naples, suppressed a popular insurrection, disbanded the National Guard, dissolved Parliament and abolished the reforms that had been introduced under pressure from the masses in February 1848.—344.

180 The temporary press laws, issued by the Austrian Government on April 1, 1848, provided for the putting up of large sums as security before the right to publish a newspaper was conceded.—348.

181 The Constitution of April 25, 1848, introduced qualifications according to which the right to vote in the Reichstag elections was enjoyed only by people possessing property of a definite value and in permanent residence over a definite period, instituted two chambers—the Lower Chamber and the Senate, preserved the provincial estate representative bodies and granted the emperor the right to reject laws passed by the Chambers.—348.

182 The Electoral Law of May 8, 1848, deprived the workers, day labourers and servants of election rights. Some senators were appointed by the emperor, others were elected on the basis of the two-stage elections from among persons paying the highest taxes. Elections to the Lower Chamber were also held in two stages.—348.

183 The Academic Legion—a civil militarised organisation consisting of radically-minded students of the Vienna University.—348.

184 This refers to the Österreichische Kaiserische Wiener Zeitung (Austrian Imperial Vienna Gazzette)—the official government newspaper which began to appear under this title in 1780.—350.

185 Free traders—supporters of free trade and non-intervention by the state in the economy. In the 1840s and 1850s the free traders constituted a special political grouping which later joined the Liberal Party.—356, 508.

186 On August 13, 1849, at Vilagos, the Hungarian army commanded by Görgey surrendered to the tsarist troops sent to Hungary to put down the insurrection.—356.

187 Lancastrian schools—primary schools for children of propertied parents where a system of mutual instruction was employed, the system being called after Joseph Lancaster (1778-1831), an English pedagogue.—358.

188 In 1636, John Hampden, who later became a prominent figure in the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century, refused to pay the “ship money” tax, which had not been approved by the House of Commons. Hampden's trial fanned up opposition to absolutism in English society.

The refusal of the Americans, in 1766, to pay the stamp-duty introduced by the British Government, and the boycott of English goods launched early in the 1770s were a prelude to the American War of Independence (1775-83).—361.

189 An allusion to the counter-revolutionary revolt in Vendée (a Western province of France) initiated in 1793 by the French royalists who drew the backward peasants of this province into the struggle against the French revolution.—365, 480.

190 On March 21, 1848, was staged a pompous royal appearance in Berlin,
on the initiative of Prussian bourgeois ministers. It was accompanied by manifestations in favour of Germany's unification. Friedrich Wilhelm IV drove along the streets wearing a black-red-golden armband—a symbol of united Germany—and held pseudo-patriotic speeches.—371.

191 The reference is to the conference convened for the purpose of revising the so-called Imperial Constitution. As a result of it, an agreement (the "Union of Three Kings") was concluded on May 26, 1849, between the kings of Prussia, Saxony and Hanover. This "Union" was an attempt of the Prussian monarchy to gain hegemony in Germany since the king of Prussia was to become the regent of the empire. But under pressure from Austria and Russia, Prussia was forced already in November 1850 to give up the "Union".—374.

192 In St. Paul's Church, Frankfort on the Main, the all-German National Assembly held its sessions from May 18, 1848 to May 30, 1849.—384.

193 The last article of this series did not appear in The New-York Daily Tribune. The English edition of 1896, prepared for publication by Eleanor Marx-Aveling, Marx's daughter, and a number of later editions appended Engels's "The Late Trial at Cologne" (see pp. 388-93 of this volume), which did not belong to this series, as the last article.—387.

194 In September 1851, in France, there were arrests among members of local communities belonging to the Willich-Schapper group, which had seceded from the Communist League in September 1850. By its petty-bourgeois conspiratorial tactics, the group enabled the French and Prussian police, with the help of Cherval, the agent-provocateur who headed a Paris community, to trump up the so-called German-French conspiracy case. In February 1852 the arrested were convicted of preparing a coup d'état. The attempt of the Prussian police to prefer charges of participating in the German-French conspiracy against the Communist League, led by Marx and Engels, fell through.—390.

195 This work, written on the basis of a concrete analysis of the revolutionary events in France from 1848 to 1851, is one of the most important Marxist writings. In it Marx gives a further elaboration of all the basic tenets of historical materialism—the theory of the class struggle and proletarian revolution, the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Of crucial importance is Marx's conclusion on the attitude of the proletariat to the bourgeois state. He says, "All revolutions perfected this machine instead of smashing it" (see p. 477 of this volume). Lenin described it as one of the most important propositions in the Marxist teaching on the state.

In The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte Marx continued his analysis of the question of the peasantry as a potential ally of the working class in the coming revolution, outlined the role of the political parties in the life of society and exposed for what they were the essential features of Bonapartism.—394, 398.

196 The Vendôme Column was erected between 1806 and 1810 in Paris in tribute to the victories of Napoleonic France; it was made of bronze from captured enemy guns and crowned by a statue of Napoleon. On May 16, 1871, by order of the Paris Commune, the Vendôme Column was destroyed, but in 1875 it was restored by the reactionaries.—395, 487.


198 December 2, 1851—the day of the counter-revolutionary coup d'état in France effected by Louis Bonaparte and his supporters.—396, 400.
199 *Brumaire*—a month in the French republican calendar.

*The Eighteenth Brumaire* (November 9, 1799)—the day on which a coup d’état took place which resulted in the establishment of Napoleon Bonaparte’s military dictatorship. By “the second edition of the eighteenth Brumaire” Marx means the coup d’état of December 2, 1851.—398.

200 *Bedlam*—a lunatic asylum in London.—400.

201 *On December 10, 1848*, Louis Bonaparte was elected President of the French Republic by plebiscite.—400.

202 The expression “to sigh for the flesh-pots of Egypt” is taken from the biblical legend, according to which during the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt the faint-hearted among them wished that they had died when they sat by the flesh-pots of Egypt, rather than undergo their present trials in the dreary wastes.—400.

203 *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!* (Here is Rhodes, leap here!)—the words taken from a fable by Aesop about a swaggerer who claimed to be able to produce witnesses to prove that he had once made a remarkable leap in Rhodes, to which he received the reply: “Why cite witnesses if it is true? Here is Rhodes, leap here!” In other words, “Show us right here what you can do!”

*Here is the rose, here dance!*—the paraphrase of the preceding quotation (in Greek Rhodes, the name of the island, also means “rose”) used by Hegel in the preface to his work *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* (Principles of the Philosophy of Right).—401.

204 According to the French Constitution of 1848 presidential elections were to be held every four years on the second Sunday in May. In May 1852 Louis Bonaparte’s term as President expired.—401.

205 *Chiliasts* (from the Greek word *chilies*, a thousand)—preachers of a mystical religious doctrine concerning the second coming of Christ and the establishment of the millennium, when justice, universal equality and prosperity will be triumphant.—402.

206 *Capitol*—a hill in Rome, a fortified citadel where the temples of Jupiter, Juno and other gods were built. According to a legend Rome was saved in 390 B.C., from an invasion of the Gauls, only thanks to the cackling of geese from Juno’s temple which awakened the sleeping guards of the Capitol.—402.

207 According to the Roman historian Eusebius, Emperor Constantine I in 312, on the eve of a victory over his rival Maxentius, beheld in the sky the sign of the Cross with the words on it: “By this sign thou shalt conquer!”—406.

208 This refers to treaties signed in Vienna in May and June 1815 by the countries who took part in the Napoleonic wars (see Note 155).—407.

209 *The Constitutional Charter*, adopted after the bourgeois revolution of 1830 in France, was the basic law of the July monarchy. Nominally the Charter proclaimed the sovereign rights of the nation and restricted somewhat the king’s power.—408.

210 *Clichy*—from 1826 to 1867 a debtors’ prison in Paris.—410, 447.

211 *Praetorians*—in ancient Rome the life-guards of the general or emperor, maintained by him and enjoying various privileges. They constantly took part in internal disturbances and not infrequently enthroned their
henchmen. The allusion here is to the Society of December 10 (for this see pp. 442-44 of this volume).—413.

212 This refers to the joint participation of the Kingdom of Naples and Austria in the intervention against the Roman Republic from May to July 1849.—413.

213 Marx is referring to the following events in Louis Bonaparte's life: in 1832 Louis Bonaparte became a Swiss citizen in the canton Thurgau; in 1848, during his stay in Britain, he voluntarily joined the special constabulary (a police reserve comprised of civilians).—413.

214 Caligula, a Roman emperor (37-41 A.D.), who was enthroned by the Praetorian Guard.—416.

215 Questor of the Legislative Assembly is the name given to every deputy charged by the Assembly with handling economic and financial matters and safeguarding its security (by analogy with Roman questors). The reference is to the bill granting the President of the National Assembly the right to direct requisition of troops which was tabled on November 6, 1851 by the royalist questors Le Fiô, Baze and Panat, and rejected after a heated debate on November 17.—417.

216 The Fronde—a movement against absolutism among the French nobility and bourgeoisie which was active between 1648 and 1653. Its leaders from among the aristocracy relied on the support of their vassals and foreign troops and utilised peasant revolts and the democratic movement in the cities to further their own objectives.—419.

217 An allusion to the plans of Louis Bonaparte, who expected that Pope Pius IX would crown him King of France. According to biblical tradition David, the king of Israel, was anointed king by the prophet Samuel. —429.

218 The battle of Austerlitz (in Moravia) on December 2 (November 20), 1805 ended in a victory of Napoleon I over the Russo-Austrian troops.—429.


220 The press law passed by the Legislative Assembly in July 1850 considerably increased the deposits which newspaper publishers had to pay, and introduced a stamp duty applicable to pamphlets as well.—439.

221 This refers to the following two incidents in the life of Louis Bonaparte: on October 30, 1836, he attempted to stir up a revolt in Strasbourg with the help of two artillery regiments, but the insurgents were disarmed and Louis Bonaparte was arrested and deported to America. On August 6, 1840, he again attempted to instigate a rebellion among the troops of the local garrison in Boulogne. This attempt also proved a failure. He was sentenced to life imprisonment, but escaped to England in 1846. —443.

222 Elysée newspapers—newspapers of a Bonapartist trend; the name is taken from the Elysée Palace, the residence of Louis Bonaparte in Paris while President.—445.

223 In his play on words Marx cites a line from Schiller's Lied an die Freude (Ode to Joy), in which the poet sings of joy as the "daughter of Elysium". In classical mythology Elysium or the Elysian fields is the equivalent of paradise. Champs Elysées (Elysian Fields) is also the name of the Paris avenue, where Louis Bonaparte's residence stood.—449.
224 Parliaments were the supreme judicial bodies in France before the bourgeois revolution of the end of the 18th century. They registered the royal decrees and possessed the so-called right of remonstrance, i.e., the right to protest against decrees which infringed upon the customs and legislation of the country. — 453.

225 Belle Isle — an island in the Bay of Biscay; a place of detention for political prisoners. — 455.

226 Here Marx is paraphrasing a story which the Greek writer Athenaeus (2nd-3rd centuries A.D.) recounts in his book Deipnosophistae (Dinner-Table Philosophers). The Egyptian Pharaoh Tachos, alluding to the small stature of the Spartan King Agesilaus who had come with his troops to Pharaoh's assistance, said: "The mountain was in labour. Zeus was scared. But the mountain has brought forth a mouse." Agesilaus replied: "I seem to thee now but a mouse, but the time will come when I will appear to thee as a lion." — 457.

227 In the 1850s the Count of Chambord, the Legitimist pretender to the French throne, lived in Venice. — 460.

228 This is a reference to the tactical disagreements in the camp of the Legitimists during the Restoration period from 1814 to 1830. Villèle (supporter of Louis XVIII) favoured a more cautious introduction of reactionary measures, while Polignac (adherent of the Comte d'Artois—King Charles X from 1824) advocated the unqualified restoration of the pre-revolutionary regime.

The Palace of the Tuileries in Paris was Louis XVIII's residence; during the Restoration the Comte d'Artois lived in the Pavillon Marsan, one of the wings of the palace. — 461.

229 The Economist — an English economic and political weekly journal, organ of the big industrial bourgeoisie; it has been published in London ever since 1843. — 463.

230 The first international trade and industrial exhibition was held in London from May to October 1851. — 467.

231 Le Messager de l'Assemblée — French anti-Bonapartist daily published in Paris from February 16 to December 2, 1851. — 469.

232 The Long Parliament (1640-53) — English parliament convened by King Charles I at the outbreak of the bourgeois revolution; it became its constituent body. In 1649 the parliament passed a death sentence on Charles I and proclaimed England a republic. The parliament was dissolved by Cromwell in 1653. — 472.

233 Cévennes — a mountainous region of the Languedoc Province in France where an uprising of peasants took place from 1702 to 1705. The revolt, which began as a protest against the persecution of Protestants, assumed an openly anti-feudal character. — 480.

234 The Council of Constance (1414-18) was convened in order to strengthen the weakened position of the Catholic Church during the rise of the Reformation movement. — 484.

235 This refers to the regency of Philippe d'Orléans in France from 1715 to 1723 during the infancy of Louis XV. — 487.

236 The Holy Tunic of Treves — one of the "sacred" relics (alleged to be a garment of Christ, doffed at the time of the crucifixion) exhibited in
the Catholic Cathedral at Trier. Generations of pilgrims came to pay homage to it.—487.

237 The articles "The British Rule in India" and "The Future Results of British Rule in India" are among Marx's best works on the national-colonial question. By the example of British rule in India, a country with enormous natural resources and an ancient civilisation, Marx reveals the characteristic features of the system of colonial domination by the capitalist states over the economically backward countries of the East. He traces the main stages in Britain's conquest and enslavement of India and shows that the plunder of the British in India was a source of the enrichment and strengthening of the oligarchy of land magnates and financial tycoons in England itself. Marx arrives at the revolutionary conclusion that India can be freed either as a result of a proletarian revolution in the metropolis or of the liberation struggle of the Indian people themselves against their colonialists.—488.

238 Moguls—tribes of Turkic descent from the eastern part of Central Asia, who invaded India in the early 16th century and, in 1526, founded the Great Mogul empire (the name of the ruling dynasty of that empire) in Northern India. This empire disintegrated in the first half of the 18th century due to continuous internecine wars and growing feudal-separatist tendencies.—488.

239 Lingam religion—the cult of the deity Siva which was widespread among the South-Indian sect of the Lingayat (from "linga", the symbol of Siva); it recognises no caste differences and rejects fasts, sacrifices and pilgrimages.—488.

240 Juggernaut (Jagannath)—one of the titles of the Hindu god Krishna or Vishnu. The priests of the Temple of Juggernaut derived huge profits from mass pilgrimages, and encouraged the prostitution of bayaderes, women living in the temple. The cult of Juggernaut was marked by pompous ritual and extreme fanaticism expressed in self-torture and the suicide of devotees. At the principal annual festival in honour of Juggernaut some of the pilgrims threw themselves under the wheels of the great car containing the idol.—488, 498.

241 The Heptarchy (government by seven rulers)—the conventional designation adopted in English history for the political system of England of the early Middle Ages when the country was divided into seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms (6th-8th centuries). Marx by analogy uses this term to denote the feudal dismemberment of the Deccan (Central and South India) before its conquest by the Mussulmans.—488.

242 Brahmins, Brahmans—one of the four ancient Indian castes whose members originally were mainly made up of the privileged estate of priests. Like the other Indian castes, it later came to embrace also people of various trades and social standing, including impoverished peasants and handicraftsmen.—488, 498.

243 The East India Company—the English trading company, which was an instrument of the British colonial policy in India, China and other Asian countries, was founded in 1600. The law on the Charter, adopted in 1853, curtailed the Company's monopoly right to the administration of India. The Company was liquidated in 1858.—488, 497.

244 The Island of Salsette, situated to the north of Bombay, was famous for its 109 Buddhist cave temples.—489.
Great Mogul—the title given by the Europeans to the rulers of the Mogul empire (see Note 238) who called themselves Padishahs.—494.

Maharattas—a group of Indian people in the North-Western part of the Deccan. In the mid-17th century the Maharattas dealt a serious blow to the empire of the Great Moguls and formed an independent state whose feudal élite soon began to pursue wars of conquest. By the end of the 17th century the Maharatta principalities had been weakened by internecine wars. Enfeebled by the struggle for the rule over India and internal strife, they fell prey to the English East India Company which subjugated them as a result of the victory in the Anglo-Mahratta war of 1803-05.—494.

The Zeminadar and Ryotwar systems—two land-tax systems introduced by the British rulers in India at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century.—495.


Jats—a caste group in North India; the bulk of it were peasants but It also included members of the military-feudal estate.—498.

On April 14, 1856, at the banquet arranged in honour of the fourth anniversary of the Chartist People’s Paper, Marx availed himself of the right to speak first and delivered a speech on the proletariat’s world-historical role. Marx’s participation in the jubilee is a striking evidence of the association of the founders of scientific communism with the Chartists, of their desire to exert an ideological influence on the British proletariat and to help the Chartist leaders with a view to reviving the working-class movement in Britain on a new, socialist basis.

The People’s Paper—the Chartist weekly published in London from May 1852 to June 1858. From October 1852 until December 1856 Marx and Engels contributed to the paper and also helped with the editorial work. In June 1858 it was seized by bourgeois businessmen. —500, 528.

Marx’s book A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy represents an important stage in the creation of Marxist political economy. Before setting out to write this book Marx spent fifteen years on research in the course of which he studied a vast amount of literature and worked out the basis of his economic doctrine. Marx planned to set forth the results of his investigation in a major work devoted to economics. In August and September 1857 he started to systematise his material and make the first rough draft of his work. During the ensuing months Marx made a detailed plan and decided to publish his future work in parts, in separate issues. Having concluded a preliminary contract with F. Duncker, a Berlin publisher, he began to work on the first part, which was printed in June 1859.

Soon after the first part Marx planned to publish a second, which was to deal with the problems of capital. His subsequent studies, however, prompted Marx to change his original plan. Instead of the planned articles he wrote Capital in which he included, in a revised form, the main ideas contained in his book A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.—502.
This is a reference to the unfinished Introduction which Marx had planned to write for his major work on economics (see Note 252).—502.

Allgemeine Zeitung (General Journal)—a German reactionary daily; it started publication in 1798. From 1810 to 1882 it was published in Augsburg. In 1842 it carried an article distorting the ideas of utopian communism and socialism. This attempt was exposed by Marx in his article, “Der Kommunismus und die Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung” (Communism and the Augsburg General Journal).—503.

This article is a review of Marx’s book A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Engels describes it as an outstanding scientific achievement of the proletarian party and as an important stage in the working out of the proletariat’s scientific world outlook. The review was not completed. Only the first two parts were published. The third part, in which Engels wanted to deal with the economic content of the book, did not appear in the press due to the fact that the newspaper ceased publication; the manuscript of the third part has not been found. —507, 516.

Reformation—mass social movement against the Catholics which in the 16th century involved many European countries. In most of them it was paralleled by intense class struggle. The Peasant War of 1524-25 in Germany was waged under the ideological banner of the Reformation.—507.

Thirty Years’ War (1618-48)—a general European war, caused by the feud between Protestants and Catholics. Germany was the chief scene of the fighting and was made the object of much military plunder and the expansionist ambitions of belligerent powers.—507.

Between 1477 and 1555, Holland was part of the Holy Roman Empire. After the Empire broke up the country was annexed to Spain. Towards the end of the 16th-century bourgeois revolution Holland freed herself from Spanish rule and became an independent bourgeois republic. —507.

Cameralistics (or cameral sciences)—a course of administrative, financial, economic and other sciences taught in the medieval and later also in the bourgeois universities of some European countries.—508.

Das Volk (The People)—weekly published in German in London from May 7 to August 20, 1859, with Marx’s close collaboration; early in July he became its de facto editor.—508.

An ironical allusion to the Right-wing Hegelians who in the 1830s and 1840s held many chairs in the German universities and who took advantage of their position to attack representatives of a more radical trend in philosophy. For the Diadochi see Note 4.—511.


The reference is to Critique of Politics and Economics, a work Marx planned to write.—527.

The reference is to the London German Workers’ Educational Association which in the 1850s had offices in Great Windmill Street. It was founded in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Josef Moll and other members of the League of the Just. Marx and Engels took an active part in its activities in 1849 and 1850. On September 17, 1850, Marx, Engels and a number of their supporters withdrew from the Association because
many of its members had sided with the sectarian-adventurist Willich-Schapper faction. When the International was founded in 1864 the Association became a German section of the International in London. The London Educational Association existed until 1918, when it was closed down by the government.—529.

265 After the seizure of Mainz (Mayence) by the revolutionary French army, the German republican democrats founded, in October 1792, the so-called Club of the Friends of Equality and Brotherhood. The Mainz Clubbists advocated the abolition of the feudal system, the establishment of a republic and the annexation of the left bank of the Rhine to revolutionary France. Their views were supported neither by the urban population nor by the peasants. In July 1793, when the Prussians took Mainz, the Clubbists ceased their activities.—529.

266 Condottieri—leaders of troops of mercenaries in Italy in the 14th and 15th centuries.—530.
NAME INDEX

A

Agesilaus (c. 442-c. 358 B.C.)—King of Sparta (c. 399-c. 358 B.C.)—457
Agis I (died c. 399 B.C.)—King of Sparta (c. 426-c. 399 B.C.)—457
Aikin, John (1747-1822)—English physician, radical publicist—59
Ailly, Pierre d'(1350-1420 or 1425)—French cardinal; played an important role at the Constance Council—484
Alais, Louis Pierre Constant (born c. 1821)—French police agent—444, 447
Albert (real name Alexandre Martin) (1815-1895)—French worker, socialist; in 1848, member of the Provisional Government—210, 212, 224
Alexander of Macedon (356-323 B. C.)—great soldier and statesman—55, 156, 297, 444
Alexander I (1777-1825)—Russian Emperor (1801-25)—307
Alexander III (1845-1894)—Russian Emperor (1881-94)—100
Anglès, François Ernest (1807-1861)—French landowner, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1850-51), member of the party of Order—464
Annenkov, Pavel Vasilyevich (1812-1887)—Russian liberal landowner and man of letters—517-27
Auerswald, Rudolf (1795-1866)—Prussian statesman, Minister-President and Minister for Foreign Affairs (June-September 1848)—360
Augustus (63 B. C.-14 A. D.)—first Roman Emperor (27 B. C.-14 A. D.)—28
Aurung-Zebe (Aurangzeb) (1618-1707)—padishah (1658-1707) from the Great Mogul dynasty in India—488

B

Babeuf, Gracchus (real name François Noël) (1760-1797)—French revolutionary, outstanding representative of utopian equalitarian communism, organiser of conspiracy of “equals”—134
Bailly, Jean Sylvain (1736-1793)—prominent figure in the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century and a leader of the liberal constitutional bourgeoisie—399
Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich (1814-1876)—Russian democrat and publicist, one of the ideologists of anarchism; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; being member of the First International, revealed himself as a sworn enemy of Marxism; in 1872, at the Hague Congress, was expelled from the International for schismatic activities—99, 102, 381
Balzac, Honoré de (1799-1850)—great French realist writer—487
Baraguey d'Hilliers, Achille (1795-1878)—French Bonapartist general; during the Second Republic was deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies; in
Beaumarchais, Pierre Augustin (1732-1799)—outstanding French playwright—245

Bebel, August (1840-1913)—outstanding figure in the German and international working-class movement, leader of the League of German Workers’ Associations from 1867, member of the First International, deputy of the Reichstag from 1867, one of the founders and leaders of German Social-Democracy; friend and comrade-in-arms of Marx and Engels; prominent figure of the Second International—195

Bedeau, Marie Alphonse (1804-1863)—French general and politician, moderate bourgeois republican; during the Second Republic, Vice-President of the Legislative and Constituent Assemblies—420, 453

Bem, Josef (1795-1850)—Polish general, participant in the 1830-31 uprising; in 1848, took part in the revolutionary struggle in Vienna; one of the leaders of the revolutionary army in Hungary—353, 354

Benoist d’Azy, Denis (1796-1880)—French financier and political figure; Vice-President of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51), Legitimist—456, 460

Bernard—French colonel, headed military commissions which carried out a campaign of reprisals against the participants in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; after the coup d’état on December 2, 1851, took part in organising trials of anti-Bonapartists who favoured the republic—412

Berruyer, Pierre Antoine (1790-1868)—French lawyer and political figure, Legitimist—267, 423, 437, 454, 460, 461, 463, 466

Bevan, W.—President of the Trades Union Council in Swansea; Chairman of the trade union congress held in Swansea in 1887—103

Billault, Auguste Adolphe Marie (1805-1863)—French politician,
Orléanist; from 1849, Bonapartist; member of the Constituent Assembly (1848-49); Minister of the Interior (1854-58)—456

Bismarck, Otto, Prince (1815-1898)—Prussian statesman and diplomat, championed the interests of Prussian Junkers; Minister-President of Prussia (1862-71), Chancellor of the German Empire (1871-90)—105, 190, 193, 195, 202, 203

Blanc, Louis (1811-1882)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian; in 1848, member of the Provisional Government and Chairman of the Luxembourg Commission; since August 1848, one of the leaders of petty-bourgeois émigrés in London—136, 210, 212, 216, 220, 222, 224, 229, 230, 241, 253, 283, 301, 398

Blanqui, Louis Auguste (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian communist; during the 1848 revolution adhered to the extreme Left of the democratic and proletarian movement in France; was several times sentenced to imprisonment—222, 245, 282, 283, 284, 404, 500

Blum, Robert (1807-1848)—German petty-bourgeois democrat, leader of the Left wing in the Frankfort National Assembly; in October 1848, took part in the defence of Vienna and was shot after the city was occupied by the counter-revolutionary troops—358, 359, 366

Boetticher, Karl Wilhelm (d. 1868)—Prussian official; in the 30s, Lord-President of the Prussian Province—530

Boguslawski, Albert (1834-1905)—German general and writer on war—201, 202

Boisguillebert, Pierre (1646-1714)—French economist, predecessor of physiocrats, father of classical bourgeois political economy in France—274

Bonald, Louis Gabriel Ambroise (1754-1840)—French politician and publicist, monarchist—311

Bonaparte. See Napoleon III.

Bonaparte, Jérôme (1784-1860)—junior brother of Napoleon I, King of Westphalia (1807-13)—267

Bonaparte, Napoleon Joseph Charles Paul (1822-1891)—son of Jérôme Bonaparte and cousin of Louis Bonaparte, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic—267

Bonapartes—dynasty of emperors in France (1804-14, 1815, 1832-70)—478, 479

Bourbons—French royal dynasty (1589-1792, 1814-15 and 1815-30)—251, 267, 414, 421, 457, 458, 460, 478

Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm, Count (1792-1850)—Prussian general and statesman, headed a counter-revolutionary ministry (November 1848-November 1850)—138

Bréa, Jean Baptiste Fidèle (1790-1848)—French reactionary general, took part in suppressing the June uprising of 1848, was shot by the rebels—253

Brentano, Lorenz (1813-1891)—Baden petty-bourgeois democrat; in 1848, was deputy of the Frankfort National Assembly, belonged to the Left wing; in 1849, headed the Baden Provisional Government; emigrated after the defeat of the uprising—381, 382

Bright, John (1811-1889)—English manufacturer, one of the founders of the Anti-Corn Law League; since the end of the 60s, a leader of the Liberal Party; minister in several Liberal governments—271
Broglie, Achille Charles (1785-1870) —French statesman, Prime Minister (1835-36), deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51), Orleanist—437, 461

Brutus, Marcus Junius (c. 85-42 B. C.)—Roman political figure, headed conspiracy against Caesar—399

Bäckner, Ludwig (1824-1899)—German bourgeois physician and philosopher, vulgar materialist—511

Bugeaud de la Piconnerie, Thomas Robert (1784-1849)—French marshal; member of the Chamber of Deputies during the July monarchy, Orleanist; in 1848-49, Commander-in-Chief of the Alpine Army, deputy of the Legislative Assembly—240

C

Cabet, Etienne (1788-1856)—French publicist, took part in the political movement of the proletariat in the 30s-40s, prominent representative of peaceful utopian communism, author of Travels in Icaria—103, 136, 222

Caesar, Caius Julius (c. 100-44 B. C.)—famous Roman soldier and statesman—266, 399

Caligula (12-41)—Roman Emperor (37-41)—416

Campbell, George (1824-1892)—British colonial official in India; author of many works on India; Member of Parliament, Liberal—497

Camphausen, Ludolf (1803-1890)—German banker, one of the leaders of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Minister-President of Prussia, March-June 1848—139, 330, 333, 340, 360

Capefigue, Jean Baptiste (1802-1872) —French publicist and historian, monarchist—292

Carlier, Pierre (1799-1858)—President of the Paris police (1849-51), Bonapartist—278, 279, 433, 444, 449, 470

Carnot, Lazare Hippolyte (1801-1888)—French publicist and political figure, bourgeois republican; member of the Provisional Government (1848); during the Second Republic, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies; after 1851, one of the leaders of the republican opposition to the Bonapartist regime—283, 284

Carnot, Lazare Nicolas (1753-1823) —French mathematician and physicist, political and military leader, bourgeois republican; during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century sided with the Jacobins, one of the organisers of France's defence against the coalition of European powers—283

Cato (Marcus Porcius Cato Senior) (234-149 B. C.)—Roman political figure and writer—233

Caussidière, Marc (1808-1861)—French petty-bourgeois democrat, participant in the Lyons 1834 uprising; Prefect of the Paris police (February-June 1848), deputy of the Constituent Assembly; in June 1848 emigrated to England—216, 229, 230, 253, 398

Cavaignac, Louis Eugène (1802-1857)—French general and politician; War Minister since May 1848; displayed great cruelty in suppressing the June uprising of Paris workers; head of executive power (June-December 1848)—225, 226, 228, 229, 232, 233, 234-39, 242, 243, 247-49, 255, 260, 345, 408, 412, 413, 420, 454, 465, 473

Chambord, Henri Charles, Count (1820-1883)—last representative of the elder Bourbon line, grandson of Charles X, pretender to the French throne under the name of Henry V—265, 295, 423, 442, 459, 460, 463

Champan, John (1801-1854)—English publicist, bourgeois radical, advocated reforms in India—497

Charles X (1757-1836)—King of France (1824-30)—284

Charles-Albert (1798-1849)—King of Piedmont (1831-49)—249

Charles the Great (Charlemagne) (c. 742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800) and Emperor (800-14)—73, 338

Charras, Jean Baptiste Adolphe (1810-1865)—French military and political figure, moderate bourgeois republican; took part in suppressing the June uprising of Paris workers in 1848; opposed Louis Bonaparte; expelled from France—395, 473

Cherbuliez, Antoine Elisée (1797-1869)—Swiss economist, follower of Sismondi—73

Cherval, Julien (real name Joseph Cremer)—Prussian police agent-provocateur who wormed his way into the Communist League; one of the accused in the trial on the so-called German-French conspiracy in Paris in February 1852; escaped from prison with the help of the police—390

Clive, Robert (1725-1774)—Governor of Bengal (1757-60 and 1765-67), initiator of a predatory British colonial rule in India—498

Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—English manufacturer and bourgeois politician, a leader of free traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League—271

Constant, Benjamin (1767-1830)—French author, liberal political figure—399

Constantine (c. 274-337)—Roman Emperor (306-37)—204

Cousin, Victor (1792-1867)—French idealist philosopher, eclectic—399

Crémieux, Adolphe (1796-1880)—French lawyer and politician; in the 40s, bourgeois liberal—210, 248

Creton, Nicolas Joseph (1798-1864)—French lawyer; during the Second Republic, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, Orleanist—273, 458

Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658)—leader of the bourgeoisie and the nobility that joined the ranks of the bourgeoisie in the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century; from 1653, Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland—399, 472, 473

Cubières, Amédée Louis (1786-1853)—French general and statesman, Orleanist; in 1847, was degraded for bribery and embezzlement—272

D

Dahlmann, Friedrich Christoph (1785-1860)—German historian and politician, liberal; in 1848-49, deputy of the Frankfort National Assembly, belonged to the Right Centre—317

Dante, Alighieri (1265-1321)—great Italian poet—107, 506

Danton, Georges Jacques (1759-1794)—prominent figure in the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century; leader of the Right wing of Jacobins—377, 398

Darwin, Charles Robert (1809-1882)—great English naturalist, founder of scientific evolutionary biology—101

De Flotte, Paul (1817-1860)—French
De Maistre, Joseph (1753-1821)—French author, ideologist of aristocratic and clerical reaction, bitter enemy of the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century—311

Desmoulins, Camille (1760-1794)—French publicist, prominent figure in the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, belonged to the Right wing of Jacobins—398

Dietz, Oswald (c. 1824-1864)—German architect, participant in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to London, member of the Central Committee of the Communist League, after the split of the League belonged to the sectarian-adventurist Willich-Schapper group, subsequently took part in the American Civil War on the side of the North—390

Dioecletian (c. 245-313)—Roman Emperor (284-305) —203

Doblhoff, Anton (1800-1872)—Austrian statesman, moderate liberal; in 1848, Minister of Trade (May) and Minister of the Interior (July-October) —349

Duchâtel, Charles (1803-1867)—French statesman, Orleanist, Minister of the Interior (1839-40, 1840-February 1848) —460

Duclerc, Charles Théodor Eugène (1812-1888)—French political figure, editor of the newspaper National (1840-46) —247

Dufaure, Jules Armand Stanislas (1798-1881)—French bourgeois politician, Orleanist; in 1848, deputy of the Constituent Assembly, Minister of the Interior in the Cavaignac government (October-December 1848) —235, 238, 272

Duncker, Franz (1822-1888)—German bourgeois politician and publisher—507

Dupin, André Marie Jean Jacques (1783-1865)—French jurist and politician, Orleanist, Chairman of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51), subsequently Bonapartist—291, 444, 447, 448

Duprat, Pascal (1815-1885)—French journalist, bourgeois republican; deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies under the Second Republic, was opposed to Louis Bonaparte—449, 450

E

Eichhorn, Johann Albrecht Friedrich (1779-1856)—Prussian statesman, Minister of Religious Worship, Education and Medicine in Prussia (1840-48) —319

Eisenmann, Gottfried (1795-1867)—German publicist, deputy of the Frankfort National Assembly, belonged to the Centre, subsequently to the Left wing—308

Engels, Friedrich (1820-1895) (biographical data) —101, 102, 104, 108, 142, 143, 186, 187, 504, 528, 529, 530

F

Falloux, Alfred (1811-1886)—French politician, Legitimist and clerical; in 1848, initiated the dissolution of the National ateliers and inspired the suppression of the June uprising in Paris; Minister of Education (1848-49) —239, 248, 258, 268, 419, 431, 432, 461, 463
Faucher, Léon (1803-1854)—French bourgeois politician, Orleanist, economist (follower of Malthus), Minister of the Interior (December 1848-May 1849, 1851); later on, Bonapartist—206, 240, 244, 247, 438, 456, 461

Ferdinand I (1793-1875)—Austrian Emperor (1835-48)—348, 350, 351, 358

Ferdinand II (1810-1859)—King of Naples (1830-59), nicknamed "King Bomba" for bombarding Messina in 1848—344

Ferrier, François Louis Auguste (1777-1861)—French vulgar bourgeois economist—508

Feuerbach, Ludwig (1804-1872)—great German materialist philosopher of the pre-Marxian period—13-19, 45, 46, 65, 511

Fleury, Charles (real name Krause, Karl Friedrich August) (b. 1824)—London merchant, Prussian spy and police agent—390-92

Flocon, Ferdinand (1800-1866)—French politician, petty-bourgeois democrat, an editor of the newspaper Réforme; in 1848, member of the Provisional Government—210

Fouché, Joseph (1759-1820)—prominent figure in the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, Jacobin, Minister of Police under Napoleon I; notorious for his extreme unscrupulousness—278

Fould, Achille (1800-1887)—French banker, Orleanist, later Bonapartist; in 1849-67, repeatedly held the post of Finance Minister—219, 232, 243, 269, 272, 273, 433, 452, 456, 463

Fouquier-Tinville, Antoine Quentin (1746-1795)—prominent figure in the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century; in 1793, public prosecutor of the Revolutionary Tribunal—250

Fourier, Charles (1772-1837)—great French utopian socialist—134, 136, 517, 526

Franz I (1768-1835)—Austrian Emperor (1804-35)—324, 326

Franz-Joseph I (1830-1916)—Austrian Emperor (1848-1916)—365

Friedrich II (the Great) (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86)—199

Friedrich-August II (1797-1854)—King of Saxony (1836-54)—376

Friedrich-Wilhelm III (1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840)—310, 312

Friedrich-Wilhelm IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61)—310-14, 330, 331, 360 371

Fröbel, Julius (1805-1899)—German publicist and publisher of progressive literature, petty-bourgeois radical; later, liberal; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany, deputy of the Frankfort National Assembly, belonged to the Left wing—358

G

Gervinus, Georg Gottfried (1805-1871)—German bourgeois historian, liberal; in 1848, deputy of the Frankfort National Assembly—317

Girardin, Delphine de (1804-1855)—French authoress, wife of Emile de Girardin—487

Girardin, Emile de (1806-1881)—French bourgeois publicist and politician, editor of the newspaper Presse; before the revolution of 1848 was in opposition to the Guizot government; during the revolution, bourgeois republican; deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1850-51); later, Bonapartist—291, 450

Giraud, Charles Joseph Barthélemy (1802-1881)—French jurist, monarchist, Minister of Education (1851)—470

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang (1749-
directed French home and foreign policy from 1840 to 1848—108, 206, 209, 210, 226, 233, 239, 246, 264, 268, 399, 410, 460, 461, 476, 487, 503

H

Hampden, John (1594-1643)—prominent figure in the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century, expressed the interests of the bourgeoisie and the nobility which became bourgeois—361

Hansemann, David (1790-1864)—big capitalist, one of the leaders of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; in March-September 1848, Prussian Minister of Finance—138, 139, 330, 333, 340, 360

Haussez, Charles (1778-1854)—French reactionary politician; Minister of the Navy (1829)—284

Hautpoul, Alphonse Henri (1789-1865)—French general, Legitimist; later, Bonapartist; War Minister (1849-50)—268, 278, 283, 291, 297, 298, 433, 438, 444-46

Haxthausen, August (1792-1866)—Prussian official and writer, author of a book describing vestiges of communal system in Russia's agrarian relations—108

Haynau, Julius Jacob (1786-1853)—Austrian general, brutally suppressed the revolutionary movement in Italy and Hungary in 1848-49—265, 340

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—great classical German philosopher, objective idealist—16, 17, 18, 19, 30, 43, 45, 47, 49, 50, 309, 310, 398, 503, 508, 511-13, 519

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)—great German revolutionary poet—336, 343

Helvétius, Claude Adrien (1715-1771)—outstanding French materialist philosopher, mechanist, atheist—265

Henry II of Lorraine, Duke Guise
(1614-1664)—one of the leaders of the Fronde—486

* Henry V. See Chambord, Henri Charles.

Henry VI (1421-1471)—King of England (1422-61)—459

Henry VIII (1491-1547)—King of England (1509-47)—57

Henry LXXII Reuss-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf (1797-1853)—influential prince (1822-48) of a dwarf German state Reuss of the junior line —368

Herwegh, Georg (1817-1875)—well-known German poet, petty-bourgeois democrat—267

Heydt, August, Baron von der (1801-1874)—Prussian statesman, Minister of Trade, Industry and Public Works (1848-58)—138

Hirsch, Wilhelm—shop-assistant from Hamburg; in the early 1850s, Prussian police agent in London —390-92

Hugo, Victor (1802-1885)—great French writer, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic—267, 292, 394, 432

* J

Jellachich, Josef, Count (1801-1859) —Austrian general, Ban of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia (1848-59), took an active part in suppressing the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary and Austria—349, 350, 351, 353, 354, 355

Johann (1782-1859)—Austrian Archduke, from June 1848 to December 1849, Regent-Emperor of Germany—335, 378, 384

Johnville, Francois Ferdinand Philippe Louis Marie, Duke of Orleans, Prince (1818-1900)—son of Louis Philippe; after the victory of the 1848 February revolution emigrated to England—460, 461, 469

Jordan, Silvester (1792-1861)—German jurist and political figure; in 1848-49, deputy of the Frankfurt National Assembly—308

Joseph II (1741-1790)—Emperor of the so-called Holy Roman Empire (1765-90)—323, 324

Juvenal (Decim Juni Juvenalis) (born c. 60-died after 127)—famous Roman satirical poet—202

K

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804)—outstanding German philosopher, founder of German idealism of the late 18th-early 19th centuries —269, 511, 512

Koller, Ernst Matthias (1841-1928) —German reactionary statesman, deputy of the Reichstag (1881-88) and Prussian Minister of the Interior (1894-95); persecuted the Social-Democratic Party—203

Khuli-Khan. See Nadir-shah.

L

Lacrosse, Bertrand Theobalde Joseph (1796-1865)—French politician, Orleanist, Minister of Public Works; since 1850, Bonapartist —259

Laffitte, Jacques (1767-1844)—big French banker and politician, Orleanist—206

La Hitte, Jean Ernest (1789-1878) —French general, Bonapartist, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1850-51), Minister for Foreign Affairs (1849-51)—284, 437

Lamartine, Alphonse (1790-1869) —French poet, historian and politician; in 1848 Minister for Foreign Affairs and virtually head of the Provisional Government—210, 211, 215, 222, 225, 456

Lamoricière, Christophe Louis Léon (1805-1865)—French general, moderate bourgeois republican; in 1848, participated in suppressing the June uprising; later, War
Minister in the Cavaignac government (June-December)—420, 473

La Rochefoucault, Henri Auguste Georges, Marquis (1805-1867)—French politician, one of the leaders of the Legitimist Party, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic—212, 461

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German petty-bourgeois publicist and lawyer; in 1848-49, participated in the democratic movement in Rhenish Province; early in the 1860s, joined the working-class movement, one of the founders of the General Association of German Workers (1863); supported the unification of Germany “from above” under the hegemony of Prussia, laid the beginning of an opportunist trend in the German working-class movement—103, 195

Latour, Theodore, Count (1780-1848)—Austrian statesman, monarchist; in 1848, War Minister; in October 1848, killed by the insurgents of Vienna—350

Leclerc, Alexandre—Paris merchant, supported the party of Order, took part in suppressing the 1848 June uprising of workers—290

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French publicist, one of the leaders of the petty-bourgeois democrats, editor of the newspaper Réforme; deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, where he headed the Montagne; subsequently, emigrated—136, 210, 219, 221, 222, 228, 229, 238, 245, 247-49, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 261, 272, 284, 290, 301, 340, 408, 420, 425, 427

Le Flo, Adolphe Emmanuel Charles (1804-1887)—French general and politician; representative of the party of Order; deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic—417, 473

Lemoine, John (1814-1892)—English correspondent of the newspaper Journal des Débats—292

Leopold (1790-1852)—Archduke of Baden (1830-52)—376

Lerminier, Jean Louis Eugène (1803-1857)—French publicist, Orleanist, professor of comparative law in the Collège de France (1831-39); left the Collège after the students’ protest—246

Levy, Gustave—German socialist, an active figure in the General Association of German Workers —529

Licinius (Gaius Licinius Stolo)—Roman statesman of the first half of the 4th century B.C.; being a people’s tribune, together with Sextius, carried out laws in the interests of plebeians—22

List, Friedrich (1789-1846)—German bourgeois vulgar economist, advocate of extreme protectionism—508

Locke, John (1632-1704)—great English dualist philosopher, sensualist—399

Louis Bonaparte. See Napoleon III.

Louis Napoleon. See Napoleon III.

Louis IX “Saint” (1215-1270)—King of France (1226-70)—265

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715)—273, 479

Louis XV (1710-1774)—King of France (1715-74)—286, 487

Louis XVI (1754-1793)—King of France (1774-92), executed during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century—310, 311

Louis XVIII (1755-1824)—King of France (1814-15 and 1815-24)—399

Louis Philippe (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of France (1830-48)—206-08, 210, 233, 235, 239, 263, 266, 269-72, 295, 326, 403, 404, 406-08, 413, 414, 419, 429,
Louis-Philippe-Albert of Orleans, Count of Paris (1838-1894)—grandson of Louis Philippe, pretender to the French throne—295, 459

Louverture, dit Toussaint, Francois Dominik (1743-1803)—leader of the revolutionary Negro movement in Haiti, which was aimed against the Spanish and British rule at the end of the 18th century—240

Luther, Martin (1483-1546)—prominent figure in the Reformation period, founder of Protestantism (Lutheranism) in Germany; ideologist of German burghers—398

Macfarlane, Helen—active correspondent of Chartist newspapers in 1849-50, translated the Manifesto of the Communist Party into English—98

Machiavelli, Niccolò (1469-1527)—Italian politician, historian and author—530

MacMahon, Marie Edme Patrice Maurice (1808-1893)—French reactionary military and politician; Bonapartist; one of the hangmen of the Paris Commune; President of the Third Republic (1873-79)—193

Magnan, Bernard Pierre (1791-1865)—French marshal, Bonapartist, one of the organisers of the coup d'état on December 2, 1851—462, 470, 473

Mallet, Léon (1803-1879)—French politician, Orleanist, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Minister of the Interior (late December 1848)—456

Manteuffel, Otto Theodore, Baron (1805-1882)—Prussian statesman, Minister of the Interior (1848-50), Minister-President (1850-58)—360

Marche—French worker who on behalf of the people demanded that the Provisional Government in 1848 declare the right to labour—212

Marie, Alexandre (1795-1870)—French politician, moderate bourgeois republican; in 1848, Minister of Public Works; later Minister of Justice in the Cavaignac government—220

Marrast, Armand (1801-1852)—French publicist, one of the leaders of moderate bourgeois republicans, editor of the newspaper National; in 1849, was a member of the Provisional Government and Mayor of Paris; President of the Constituent Assembly (1848-49)—222, 229, 232, 234, 235, 247, 255, 301, 399, 408, 417


Masaniello (nicknamed Tommaso Aniello) (1620-1647)—fisherman, leader of a popular uprising in Naples in 1647 against the Spanish rule—472

Mathieu de la Drôme, Philippe Antoine (1808-1885)—French petty-bourgeois democrat; during the Second Republic, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, where he belonged to the Montagne; since 1851, émigré—246

Maquin, François (1785-1854)—French lawyer, a leader of the liberal dynastic opposition until 1848; during the Second Republic, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies—447, 448

Maupas, Charlemagne Émile de (1818-1888)—French lawyer, Bonapartist, Prefect of the Paris police (1851), an organiser of the coup d'état on December 2, 1851, Minister of the Police (1852-53)—470
Maurer, Georg Ludwig (1790-1872)—prominent German bourgeois historian, researcher into the social system of ancient and medieval Germany—109

Miximilian II (1811-1864)—King of Bavaria (1848-64)—368

Meissner, Otto Karl (1819-1902)—Hamburg publisher, printed Capital and other works by Marx and Engels—188

Messenhauser, Caesar Wentzel (1813-1848)—Austrian officer, commander of the National Guard and Commandant of Vienna during the 1848 October uprising; shot after the capture of the city by the counter-revolutionary troops—353

Metternich, Klemens, Prince (1773-1859)—reactionary Austrian statesman; Foreign Minister (1809-21) and Chancellor (1821-48), an organiser of the Holy Alliance—108, 310, 321, 322, 323-28, 330

Mieroslawski, Ludwik (1814-1878)—Polish politician and military leader, participant in the 1830-31 Polish uprising; headed the Poznan insurrection in 1848, subsequently led the insurgents of Sicily; during the Baden-Pfalz uprising of 1849, commanded the revolutionary army; during the Polish insurrection of 1863 was declared dictator; after the defeat of the insurrection emigrated to France—382

Moliére, Jean Baptiste (real name Poquelin) (1622-1673)—great French playwright—293

Moll, Josef (1813-1849)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, a leader of the League of the Just; member of the Central Committee of the Communist League; participant in the Baden-Pfalz uprising in 1849, killed in the battle on the Murg—175

Mone, George (1608-1670)—English general; actively helped to restore the monarchy in England in 1660—246, 444

Montalembert, Charles (1810-1870)—French publicist; during the Second Republic, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, Orleanist, head of the Catholic Party—273, 291, 454, 461, 483

Morgan, Lewis Henry (1818-1881)—famous American scientist, historian of primitive society, spontaneous materialist—109

Morny, Charles Auguste Louis Joseph, Duc de (1811-1865)—French politician, Bonapartist, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51), an organiser of the coup d'état on December 2, 1851, Minister of the Interior (December 1851-January 1852)—486

Mosle, Johann Ludwig (1794-1877)—German officer; in 1848 was sent to Vienna as an imperial commissar—358

N

Nadir-shah (Khuli-Khan) (1688-1747)—Shah of Iran (1736-47); in 1738-39 conducted a predatory campaign against India—488


Neumayer, Maximilian Georges Joseph (1789-1866)—French general, supporter of the party of Order—298, 445

Newton, Isaac (1642-1727)—great English physicist, astronomer and mathematician, founder of classic mechanics—60

Ney, Édgar (1812-1882)—French officer, Bonapartist, aide-de-camp of President Louis Bonaparte—266, 431

Nicholas II (1868-1918)—Russian Emperor (1894-1917)—200

Nonthjung, Peter (1821-1866)—German tailor, member of the Cologne Workers’ Union and of the Communist League; was involved in the Cologne Communist trial (1852)—390

O

Orleans—royal dynasty in France (1830-48)—251, 267, 414, 421, 457, 459, 460, 478, 486


Orleans, Hélène (née Mecklenburg), Duchess (1814-1858)—widow of Ferdinand, Louis Philippe’s eldest son—266, 407, 432

Oudinot, Nicolas Charles Victor (1791-1863)—French general, Orleanist; in 1849, commanded the troops sent against the Roman Republic; tried to organise opposition to the coup d’état of December 2, 1851—250, 256, 257, 416, 428, 432

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—famous English utopian socialist—13, 134, 136

P

Pagnerre, Laurent Antoine (1805-1854)—French publisher, bourgeois republican; in 1848, deputy of the Constituent Assembly—247

Palacky, František (1798-1876)—prominent Czech historian, bourgeois political figure, liberal; pursued the policy of the preservation of the Hapsburg monarchy—340


Passy, Hippolyte Philibert (1793-1880)—French economist, Orleanist, repeatedly was a member of the government during the July monarchy; Minister of Finance during the Second Republic—266, 272

Perczel, Moritz (1811-1899)—Hungarian general, participant in the 1848-49 Hungarian revolution; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated to Turkey and, later, to England—350, 353, 355

Perrot, Benjamin Pierre (1791-1865)—French general who, in 1848, took part in suppressing the June uprising; in 1849, commander of the Paris National Guard—452

Persigny, Jean Gilbert Victor, Count (1808-1872)—French statesman, Bonapartist, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51), one of the organisers of the coup d’état on December 2, 1851; Minister of the Interior (1852-54 and 1860-63)—457, 469

Pinto, Isaac (1715-1787)—big Dutch stockjobber, economist—60

Pius IX (1792-1878)—Pope of Rome (1846-78)—249, 267, 432

Plato (c. 427-c. 347 B.C.)—ancient Greek idealist philosopher—235

Polignac, Auguste Jules Armand Marie, Prince (1780-1847)—French statesman, Legitimist and
Raffles, Colonial Minister and Prime Minister (1829-30)—461

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French publicist, economist and sociologist, ideologist of the petty bourgeoisie and one of the founders of anarchism; in 1848, deputy of the Constituent Assembly—133, 288, 394, 428, 505, 517-27

Publicola (Publius Valerius Publicola) (d. 503 B.C.)—semi-legendary statesman of the Roman Republic—399

Pyat, Félix (1810-1889)—French publicist and petty-bourgeois democrat, participant in the revolution of 1848, émigré (from 1849); for a number of years carried on a slander campaign against Marx and the International using for this end the French section in London; member of the Paris Commune—528

Radetzky, Josef, Count (1766-1858) —Austrian field-marshall, since 1831, commander of the Austrian troops in North Italy; in 1848-49, brutally suppressed revolutionary and national liberation movement in Italy—344, 349, 352

Raffles, Thomas Stamford (1781-1826) —British colonial officer, Governor of Java (1811-16), author of History of Java—489

Raspail, François (1794-1878)—prominent French naturalist; socialist, close to the revolutionary proletariat; participant in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; deputy of the Constituent Assembly—211, 222, 232, 238, 245, 500

Rateau, Jean Pierre (1800-1887) —French lawyer, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Bonapartist—242, 243, 246, 415

Rau, Karl Heinrich (1792-1870) —German vulgar bourgeois economist—508

Regnaud de Saint-Jean d'Angély, Auguste Michel Étienne, Count (1794-1870)—French general, Bonapartist, War Minister (January 1851)—452

Rémy, Charles François Marie, Count (1797-1875)—French statesman and writer, Orleanist, Minister of the Interior (1840) and Foreign Minister (1871-73)—453

Reuter, Max—in the early 1850s, Prussian police agent in London—390, 392

Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—English economist, representative of classical bourgeois political economy—144, 146

Richard III (1452-1485)—King of England (1483-85)—459

Riehl, Wilhelm Heinrich (1823-1897) —German reactionary researcher in the history of literature—508

Robespierre, Maximilien (1758-1794) —outstanding leader of the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, Jacobin leader, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94)—233, 398

Roemer, Friedrich (1794-1864) —Württemberg statesman; in 1848-49, Minister of Justice and Prime Minister, member of the Frankfort National Assembly—308

Roesler, Gustav Adolf (1818-1855) —German journalist, member of the Frankfort National Assembly (1848-49); since 1850, émigré in America—385, 386

Rössler, Konstantin (1820-1896) —German publicist; as the leader of the semi-official literary bureau in Berlin (1877-92) he supported Bismarck’s policy—202

Rothschild, Anselm (1773-1855) —head of the Rothschild banking house in Frankfort on the Main—314

Rothschild, James (1792-1868)—head of the Rothschild banking house in Paris—208

Rothschilds—dynasty of bankers
who had banks in many European countries—209

Rotteck, Karl (1775-1840)—German bourgeois historian and politician, liberal—308, 317

Rouher, Eugène (1814-1884)—French statesman, Bonapartist, Minister of Justice in 1849-52 (with intervals)—447, 456

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—outstanding French Enlightener, democrat, ideologist of the petty bourgeoisie—68

Royer-Collard, Pierre Paul (1763-1845)—French philosopher and political figure, monarchist—399

Saint-Arnaud, Armand Jacques Achille Leroy de (1801-1854)—French marshal, Bonapartist; an organiser of the coup d’État on December 2, 1851, War Minister (1851-54)—417

Sainte-Beuve, Pierre Henri (1819-1855)—French manufacturer and landowner, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, representative of the party of Order—464

Saint-Jean d’Angély. See Regnaud de Saint-Jean d’Angély, Auguste Michel Étienne.

Saint-Just, Louis Antoine (1767-1794)—prominent leader of the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, a Jacobin leader—398

Saint-Priest, Emmanuel Louis Marie, Viscount (1789-1881)—French general and diplomat, Legitimist, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51)—460

Saint-Simon, Henri (1760-1825)—great French utopian socialist—134, 265

Sallandrouze, Charles Jean (1808-1867)—French manufacturer, dep-

uty of the Constituent Assembly (1848-49); Bonapartist—472

Saltykov, Alexei Dmitrievich, Prince (1806-1859)—Russian traveller, writer and artist—498

Salvandy, Narcisse Achille, Count (1795-1856)—French writer and statesman, Orléanist, Minister of Education (1837-39 and 1845-48)—460

Say, Jean Baptiste (1767-1832)—French bourgeois economist, representative of vulgar political economy—399

Schaper, voh—representative of the Prussian reactionary bureaucracy; Lord-Lieutenant of the Rhine Province (1842-45)—502

Schapper, Karl (1812-1870)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, one of the leaders of the League of the Just, member of the Central Committee of the Communist League, participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; in 1850, was among the leaders of the sectarian-adventurist group during the split in the Communist League; in 1856, again joined Marx; member of the General Council of the First International—529

Scherzer, Andreas (1807-1879)—German tailor, member of a Paris community, which after the split in the Communist League in 1850 went over to the sectarian-adventurist group of Willich-Schapper; one of the accused in the trial on the so-called German-French conspiracy in Paris in February 1852; subsequently emigrated to England—528, 529

Schramm, Jean Paul Adam (1789-1884)—French general and politician, Bonapartist, War Minister (1850-51)—445

Schwarzenberg, Félix, Prince (1800-1852)—Austrian reactionary statesman and diplomat; after the suppression of the Vienna
revolution in October 1848. Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs—328

Schwarzer, Ernst (1808-1860)—Austrian official and publicist, Minister of Public Works (July-September 1848)—350

Sébastiani, Horace, Count (1772-1851)—French marshal, Minister for Foreign Affairs (1830-32), Ambassador in London (1835-40)—226

Ségur d'Aguessel, Raimond Paul (1803-1889)—French politician; belonged, in turn, to all parties in power—284

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616)—great English writer—477

Sigel, Franz (1824-1902)—Baden officer, petty-bourgeois democrat, Commander-in-Chief and later deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Baden revolutionary army during the Baden-Pfalz uprising in 1849; in 1852, emigrated to the U.S.A., active participant in the Civil War for the North—382

Sismondi, Jean Charles Leonard Simond de (1773-1842)—Swiss economist, petty-bourgeois critic of capitalism—73, 130, 395

Smith, Adam (1723-1790)—English economist, one of the great representatives of classical bourgeois political economy—60, 515, 520

Souloque, Faustin (c. 1782-1867)—President of the Negro Republic of Haiti; in 1849, proclaimed himself Emperor, assuming the name of Faustin I—240, 278, 282, 487

Stadian, Franz, Count (1806-1853)—Austrian statesman, one of the organisers of the struggle against the national liberation movement in Galicia and Bohemia, Minister of the Interior (1848-49)—358

Steffen, Wilhelm—former Prussian officer, witness of the defence at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); in 1853, emigrated to England, then to the U.S.A.; in the 1850s, was close to Marx and Engels—529

Stein, Lorenz (1815-1890)—German lawyer, vulgar economist—508

Stieber, Wilhelm (1818-1882)—Prussian police officer, director of the Prussian political police (1850-60), organiser of the Cologne Communist trial and its main witness (1852)—390, 391, 392

Stirner, Max (literary pseudonym of Kaspar Schmidt) (1806-1856)—German philosopher, Young Hegelian, one of the ideologists of bourgeois individualism and anarchism—18, 19, 44-47, 50, 64, 69

Strauss, David Friedrich (1808-1874)—German philosopher, prominent Young Hegelian; National-Liberal (after 1860)—16, 18

Stäve, Johann Karl Bertram (1798-1872)—German politician, liberal; Minister of the Interior of Hanover (1848-50)—308

Sue, Eugène (1804-1857)—French writer, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1850-51)—279, 290, 292, 438

T

Talandier, Pierre Theodore Alfred (1822-1890)—French journalist, petty-bourgeois democrat, participant in the 1848 revolution; from 1851, émigré; member of the General Council of the International (1864); deputy of the French Parliament (1876-80, 1881-85)—528

Tamerlane (Timur) (1336-1405)—Central Asian general and conqueror—493

Teste, Jean Baptiste (1780-1852)—French statesman, Orleanist, Minister of Trade, Justice and Public Works during the July monarchy, was brought to trial for bribery and embezzlement—272

Thiers, Adolphe (1797-1877)—
French bourgeois historian and statesman, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51), Orleanist; President of the Republic (1871-73); hangman of the Paris Commune—193, 263, 264, 267, 269, 279, 291, 293, 417, 423, 425, 428, 437, 434, 460, 461, 462, 464, 466, 469, 471, 473

Thorigny, Pierre François Elizabeth (1798-1869)—French lawyer; in 1834, conducted judicial investigation into the April uprising in Lyons; Bonapartist, Minister of the Interior (1851)—470

Tocqueville, Alexis (1805-1859)—French bourgeois historian and politician, Legitimist, deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Foreign Minister (June-October 1849)—461

Trélat, Ulysse (1795-1879)—French politician, bourgeois republican, Minister of Public Works (May-June 1848)—224

Vaisse, Claude Marius (1799-1864)—French statesman, Bonapartist; Minister of the Interior (January-April 1851)—455

Vatimesnil, Antoine (1789-1860)—French political figure, Legitimist, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51)—456

Vauban, Sebastien (1633-1707)—French marshal, military engineer and writer—274

Venedey, Jacob (1805-1871)—German radical publicist and politician, liberal—45

Veron, Louis Désiré (1798-1867)—French journalist and politician, Bonapartist; owner of the newspaper Constitutionnel—487

Vidal, François (1814-1872)—French economist, petty-bourgeois socialist; in 1848, Secretary of the Luxembourg Commission, deputy of the Legislative Assembly (1850-51)—283, 284, 289, 438

Vieyra—French colonel, Bonapartist, active in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851—428

Villèle, Jean Baptiste Séraphin Joseph (1773-1854)—French statesman, Legitimist, Prime Minister (1822-28)—461

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70-19 B.C.)—outstanding Roman poet—260

Vivien, Alexandre François (1799-1854)—French lawyer and political figure, Orleanist; in 1848, Minister of Public Works in the Cavaignac government—255

Vogt, Karl (1817-1895)—German naturalist, vulgar materialist, petty-bourgeois democrat; in 1848-49, deputy of the Frankfort National Assembly, belonged to the Left wing—378, 511

Voltaire, François Marie (real name Arouet) (1694-1778)—great French Enlightener, deist philosopher, satirist and historian—265

V

Warren, Charles (1798-1866)—British officer; from 1858, general; in 1816-19 and 1830-38 served in India; participant in the Crimean war—496

Weitling, Wilhelm (1808-1871)—prominent figure in the early period of the German working-class movement, a theoretician of utopian equalitarian communism—103

Weydemeyer, Joseph (1818-1866)—prominent figure in the German and American working-class movement, member of the Communist League, participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany and the American Civil War for the North; was the first to propagate Marxism in the U.S.A.; friend and comrade-in-arms of Marx and Engels—394, 528
Wolff, Christian (1679-1754)—German idealist philosopher, metaphysic—511

Wolff, Wilhelm (1809-1864)—German proletarian revolutionary, member of the Communist League Central Committee from March 1848; in 1848-49, editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, deputy of the Frankfort National Assembly; emigrated to England; comrade-in-arms and friend of Marx and Engels—378, 384

Wood, Charles (1800-1885)—British statesman, Whig, Chairman of the Control Council for India (1852-55) and Minister for India (1859-66)—488

Wrangel, Friedrich Heinrich Ernst (1784-1877)—Prussian general—360, 361

Y

Yon—French police officer; in 1850, was in charge of guarding the Legislative Assembly—444, 447, 448
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antaeus (Greek myth.)</td>
<td>Hero who proved invincible as long as he touched the earth; he derived fresh strength from which he was proved invincible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilles (Greek myth.)</td>
<td>Bravest of heroes who besieged Troy; a hero in Homer's <em>Iliad</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchus (Roman god)</td>
<td>Roman god of wine and mirth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew (Bible)</td>
<td>Character from group of apostles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom (Shakespeare)</td>
<td>Character from <em>A Midsummer Night's Dream</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circe (Goddess)</td>
<td>Enchantress of the island of Alba; transformed the companions of Ulysses into swine and held them figuratively as a temptress for a year; used her powers of transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crevel</td>
<td>Character from Balzac's novel <em>La Cousine Bette</em>, an upshot in the novel of a money-grubber and libertine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damocles (Greek myth.)</td>
<td>Courtier of the Macedonian king Dionysius, who placed a sword over his head on a single horse hair to learn the insecurity of a man's happiness. The expression &quot;sword of Damocles&quot; is synonym of constant, immediate and serious threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordius (King of Phrygia)</td>
<td>King of Phrygia; as the legend has it, he tied the yoke to the pole of a chariot with an extremely intricate knot (hence, Gordian knot). Figuratively, an intricate, complicated case; according to the oracle's prediction, the man who untangled this knot would become the ruler of Asia. Alexander of Macedon, instead of untangling, cut the knot with his sword.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional entries:
- **Habakkuk**: Prophet.
- **Hanuman/Hanuman**: Monkey god of ancient Hindu legend, also known as *Juggernaut*.
- **Janus**: Roman deity; two-faced, representing change and transition.
- **Joseph**: Son of the Hebrew Patriarch Jacob; sold to Egypt, became famous later.
- **Midas**: King of Phrygia; legend of his ears changing into ass's ears.
- **Moses**: Prophet who freed the Jews from persecution by Pharaoh.
Egyptian pharaohs ("Exodus")—272

Nemesis (Greek myth.)—goddess of retribution—256

Orlando (or Roland) Furioso—the hero of Ariosto’s epic—243

Orpheus (Greek myth.)—Thracian poet and musician, whose lyre could charm beasts and make even rocks move—255

Paul (Bible)—one of the Christian apostles—398

Pentephri (Potiphar) (Bible)—Egyptian official to whom Joseph, Jacob’s son, was sold as a slave—265

Robert Macaire—a brigand character in French drama, created by the well-known French actor Frederic Lemaitre and immortalised by Honore Domier in his cartoons—208

Robin Goodfellow—a tricky house sprite in the popular fairy mythology of England; one of the main characters in Shakespeare’s A Midsummer Night’s Dream—501

Sabbala—Hindu deity, represented as a cow—493

Samson (Bible)—hero distinguished for his great strength—259

Samuel (Bible)—Hebrew prophet—395, 429

Schlemihl, Peter—character from Chamisso’s Wonderful Story of Peter Schlemihl who exchanged his shadow for a magic purse—419

Schufterle and Spiegelberg—characters from Shiller’s drama Die Räuber (The Robbers), images of murderers and robbers devoid of any morality—443

Thetis (Greek myth.)—goddess of the sea, mother of Achilles, who warned him not to land first on the Trojan shore (death awaited the man who was the first to land)—411
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<table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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