

# *The Life and Teachings of*



169

X:3MwM20

H5

24904

X:3MwM20

H5

024904

**FRIEDRICH ENGELS**

Coates



## *The Life and Teachings of* **FRIEDRICH ENGELS**

The author and the publishers offer this short "Life" of Engels as a tribute on the fiftieth anniversary of his death which occurred on August 5th, 1895.

For many years there has been no "Life" of Engels available in English and, although his writings have now become classics of socialist thought throughout the world, very little is known of the active part he played in organising and leading the working-class movement in England. The author, while giving a vivid picture of Engels the man, his warmth and vitality, explains in very simple and straightforward language, the main basis of Marxist theory and shows Marx and Engels in close collaboration and intimate friendship working out their theories in the light of their ever-growing knowledge and experience gained in the working-class movement.

Mrs. Coates is well known as one of the joint-authors of a number of the most authoritative books on the Soviet Union in the English language, among which *Armed Intervention in Russia*, 1918-1920; *From Tsardom to the Stalin Constitution; Russia, Finland and the Baltic; Soviet-Finnish Campaign*, 1939-1940; *Why Russia Will Win* and *A History of Anglo-Soviet Relations* were notable successes. Born of Russian parentage Mrs. Coates was brought up in England, has worked in England all her life and has been a member of the Labour Party since the institution of individual membership in 1918.

**THE LIFE AND  
TEACHINGS OF FRIEDRICH ENGELS**

THE LIFE  
AND TEACHINGS OF  
FRIEDRICH ENGELS

ZELDA K. COATES

LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD.  
LONDON



**THIS BOOK IS PRODUCED IN COMPLETE CONFORMITY  
WITH THE AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS**

## CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	6
I EARLY YEARS . . . . .	11
II FIRST VISIT TO MANCHESTER . . . . .	13
III MEETING AND COMPLETE AGREEMENT WITH MARX . . . . .	15
IV THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES IN ENGLAND IN 1844 . . . . .	17
V HOME LIFE AND EARLY COMMUNIST ACTIVI- TIES . . . . .	22
VI THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO . . . . .	26
VII BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY . . . . .	34
VIII CONSTITUTIONAL RISINGS IN GERMANY . . . . .	38
IX FIGHTING ILLUSIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC REFUGEES . . . . .	40
X BACK TO MANCHESTER . . . . .	42
XI ENGELS' DEVOTION TO MARX . . . . .	45
XII TEMPORARY ESTRANGEMENT FROM MARX . . . . .	50
XIII AN END TO "SWEET COMMERCE" . . . . .	52
XIV IN LONDON AGAIN . . . . .	54
XV ANTI-DÜHRING <i>or</i> THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF SOCIALISM . . . . .	56
XVI AFTER SPLIT IN FIRST INTERNATIONAL AND DEATH OF MARX . . . . .	67
XVII "THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY" . . . . .	71
XVIII THE POSITION OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY . . . . .	75
XIX THE STATE . . . . .	78
XX THE NATURE OF THE PROLETARIAN TRAN- SITION STATE . . . . .	84
XXI LAST YEARS . . . . .	89
XXII FAILURE OF SECOND INTERNATIONAL . . . . .	90
XXIII ENGELS—THE MAN . . . . .	93

## INTRODUCTION

THE main sections of this book were written in 1920 as a contribution to the centenary celebrations of the birth of Friedrich Engels. In preparing the present edition for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of his death it was felt that in the main the material did not require any great revision. Nevertheless, a number of important corrections and additions have been made.

The last 25 years has seen changes and movements of the greatest world historical importance. First and foremost is, of course, the rise and striking success of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, second has been the rise and fall of Fascism or Nazism.

To deal with the latter first. Without going into all the immediate causes of the rise of Nazism, there can be no doubt that in the last analysis Fascism or Nazism is but an extreme manifestation of the struggle of the ruling classes to maintain their power. Nazism or Fascism is by no means a peculiarly German phenomenon, but the Germans, with the thoroughness and organisational ability for which they are noted, "perfected" it to a fine art.

Frightened by the spectre of the possible rise of the working class to power, the big industrialists and landowners made extremely clever use of the demagogue and megalomaniac, Hitler, and his ruthless colleagues. By a mixture of systematic bribery, unprincipled but lavish and skilful propaganda and terror they succeeded in roping in the riff-raff of all classes, including, of course, what Marx and Engels called the *lumpen-proletariat*, to form a movement to which the then weak-spirited democratic forces and the disunited Labour, Socialist and Communist movements in Germany fell an easy prey.

Then followed an orgy of terror against those who dared to stand up against the Nazis, unparalleled in world history—a vivid illustration of the view promulgated by Marx and Engels that in order to retain power the ruling classes would stop at nothing.

The ruling classes of other countries met the Nazi brutalities, to put it mildly, with great tolerance; many of their representatives in Britain, France and other countries not only welcomed the rise of the Nazis and Fascists as a bulwark against the growing might of the U.S.S.R., but even played with the idea that the Nazi system would not be at all a bad idea if introduced in their own country with perhaps a few modifications to suit their respective national temperaments.

But Fascism or Nazism is in its very nature predatory, it could not rest content with its triumphs at home. Based on robbery, loot and exploitation, it quite naturally sought to carry these principles to the conquest and enslavement of the world.

But this aim, which was of the very essence of Fascism or Nazism, ultimately led to its own undoing, for not only did the Nazi and Fascist systems arouse the fierce opposition of the working class movements of other countries, but it also aroused the national patriotic sentiments of all classes of the population in the non-Fascist countries, including the most far-seeing and best elements of the ruling classes of these countries. These elements realised that a Fascist world could never be a world at peace and that the triumph of the Nazi and Fascist countries would mean their own extinction, and that the most they could hope for was to become gauleiters in their own countries, in other words, slave overseers for German masters.

Fascism was thus bound and did indeed lead to a mighty world clash of arms in which the working class and the ruling classes of the other Capitalist countries

ultimately joined hands with the U.S.S.R. to rout Fascism, and in the course of this tremendous struggle the young multi-national Socialist State—the U.S.S.R., the new civilisation—not only manifested its strength and vitality, but also proved its great superiority—economically and militarily—over the totalitarian ruthless Fascist States.

It is true that in this struggle class antagonisms in the Western countries and the U.S.A. gave way to a united national effort against Fascism; all classes fought for survival, but the working and the master classes were only fellow travellers up to a point; the causes for which the working class and the democratic elements of the other classes fought Fascism differed as the poles asunder from those for which the propertied classes—the big industrialists, merchants and landowners—fought by their side.

The former really hated all the exploitation, brutality and barbarism for which Fascism and Nazism stood; the latter only fought to protect their property, for their right to rule, in their own way, in their own countries. They fought not so much the Nazis as such, but Germany, and once full victory was won these same powerful elements were ready enough to permit the survival of Fascism in various forms, and were even prepared to deal with Fascist and semi-Fascist agents in Germany, Italy and other countries.

The national unity reached in the fight against Nazi Germany has not put an end to class antagonisms, and it still rests with the workers (by hand and brain) to stamp out this evil thing—Nazism or Fascism—their greatest enemy, and thus to justify all the oceans of blood shed in this titanic second world war.

Of a very different order from the rise of Nazism has been the rise and development of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In 1920, the young Soviet Republic was still struggling with many internal and, what was far

more dangerous to it, external enemies. Its fate was then still in the balance.

But Soviet Russia, and later, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, led by convinced Marxists, who had the courage of their convictions and knew how to wield Marxism as a method of dealing with social, economic and political problems, overcame every difficulty, every obstacle placed in their path by their home-grown and foreign class enemies.

The new civilisation based on the theories of Marx and Engels has made good over a sixth of the world's surface; the final triumph which has convinced even those who, before the Second World War, had resolutely refused to recognise the patent facts of the success of the planned Socialist Soviet system was the way in which the Soviet Union, her national economy, her national policy and her armed forces have stood the test of war against the most ruthless and efficient enemy the world had ever known. On all hands now the U.S.S.R. is recognised as a decisive factor in world progress.

The rise, organisation and triumph of the U.S.S.R. is, of course, a living illustration of the vitality and truth of the teachings of Marx and Engels; accordingly, in revising the original text, I have made a number of additions illustrating the truth of these teachings by examples of their successful application in the U.S.S.R.

Finally, I should like to draw attention to another point regarding the revision of the original text. It is, of course, impossible to deal with the life and teachings of Engels apart from that of Marx, but when the book was first written it was intended as a companion volume to a pamphlet on the *Life and Teaching of Marx* which I had written in 1918 on the centenary of the birth of the latter, accordingly matter which had already been dealt with in this pamphlet was not included in the book on Engels. In order to give a more complete picture of the teachings

of Marx and Engels I have therefore included in the present volume the discussion of the materialist conception of history and the *Communist Manifesto* which originally appeared only in the Marx pamphlet.

The present volume is, of course, only an introduction to the teachings of Marx and Engels, and if some of the readers of this volume gain thereby an appetite for the study of the profound, epoch-making works of Marx and Engels, my purpose in writing it will have been fulfilled.

ZELDA K. COATES.

May, 1945.

## Chapter I

### EARLY YEARS

**F**RIEDRICH ENGELS was born in Barmen, November 28, 1820, thus being two and a half years younger than Karl Marx. He was the son of a wealthy manufacturer and was brought up in a very conservative and orthodox religious atmosphere. After finishing the Realschule\* at Barmen, he went to the Gymnasium† of Elberfeld, but a year before the final examination he entered his father's business. It is interesting to note that the Rhine province, the birthplace and home of Engels, was the most industrially and politically developed district of Germany, owing to its geographical position and to its wealth in coal and metals. Consequently, earlier than elsewhere in Germany there had arisen a powerful capitalist industry, a revolutionary bourgeoisie, the sworn enemy of the still existing feudalism, and the necessary complement of the capitalist bourgeoisie, a strong proletarian class. At the same time, Germany generally was undergoing a revolution in philosophy, the highwater mark of which was the Hegelian philosophy. Like Marx, and like the progressive intellectual German youth of the time, Engels too, was deeply influenced by this philosophic revival, and became an enthusiastic young Hegelian.

Although he showed himself to be a good business man whilst working in mercantile houses, first in Barmen and then in Bremen, yet his heart was never in it, and all his spare time and thoughts were given over to the study of

\* Realschule—a Secondary School where special stress is laid on the physical and natural sciences.

† Gymnasium—a Secondary School in which special stress is laid on the classics.

philosophy. In letters written to school friends when he was about eighteen years old, he jokes about his vain poetic efforts, criticises literature, but not a word of business affairs. In these letters he also speaks feelingly of his religious doubts, and of his yearning to get back again to the faith in the God of his childhood. Finally, he broke through his religious fetters and embraced definitely the Hegelian philosophy.

From October, 1841, to October, 1842, Engels served in the Guard Artillery in Berlin, and, just as in his office he was a good business man, so in barracks he became a very good soldier. He studied military science, and subsequently this became one of his favourite studies, so much so that, much later, on the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, Engels wrote a series of articles for the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in which he made some very apt and true forecasts as to the course of the war. Thus he prophesied that in the event of General MacMahon failing to break through with his army to Belgium, he would be forced to capitulate in the plain of Sedan—and two weeks later this really happened. These articles procured him henceforth the nickname of "General" amongst his friends.

During this year of military service he also worked on the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* and the *Rheinische Zeitung*, under the nom-de-plume F. Oswald. At the same time he published some satirical verses in a Swiss paper, and a poem, describing himself and Marx, with whom he was as yet personally unacquainted.

## Chapter II

## FIRST VISIT TO MANCHESTER

ON the conclusion of his military service he returned to Barmen, and, in October, 1842, he went to Manchester as agent to the spinning factory of Ermen and Engels, of which his father was partner. On this journey Engels called at the editorial offices of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, in Cologne, and there met Marx for the first time. But this first meeting between them was very cool. Engels had been influenced against Marx by the brothers Bauer, with whom he was still intimate, whilst Marx had already fallen out with them and was then finally breaking his connection with the Berlin "free" school of philosophers, to whom Engels still paid allegiance.

In addition to philosophy, Engels was, even then, keenly interested in economics, and here in Manchester, the industrial capital of the motherland of capitalism, he had a unique opportunity of studying economics and economic conditions at first hand, of which he was not slow to make use. The twenty-one months he spent in England on this occasion were of supreme importance to his and Marx's future life's work. Studying at first hand the relations between employer and employed, observing the actual miserable conditions of the working class in a system of almost fully-fledged capitalism, his interest in the proletarian movement grew rapidly, and we soon find him taking an active part in the agitation of the Utopian Socialists, as also of the purely Labour and Chartist movement. Thus he was associated with both the Owenite paper, the *New Moral World*, and with the Chartist organ, the *Northern Star*.

His philosophic insight and keen intellect very soon

appreciated the true tendencies of capitalist production and the present rôle of the workers as well as the great historic future before the working class. In the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, he published a criticism of national economy which Marx characterised as a sketch of true genius, not because it did not contain many mistakes in detail and some errors in judgment, but because of the way in which he treated the feverish acceleration of capitalist production and the dehumanising effect of capitalist competition. This, and his views on Malthus's theory of population, commercial crises, the wage laws, the progress of science, and so forth, already contained the fruitful germs of scientific communism.

Already in this small sketch he showed that he had grasped what was best, what was most revolutionary in the Hegelian philosophy, and was using it as the master key for unravelling the mysteries of historic and economic development. In the same journal he published an interesting criticism of Carlyle's *Past and Present*, which he characterised as the only book in the English literature of the year 1843 that was worth reading.

Considering that he was then only twenty-two years old, that he himself was suffering from none of the disabilities of the workers' life, that he himself belonged by family, education and profession to the bourgeoisie, it is not without interest to note the judgment he passed on the classes and parties of that time in England.

After describing in vigorous language the spiritual emptiness of the English aristocracy and bourgeoisie, he characterises the educated Englishman, according to whom the English national character has generally been judged on the Continent, as the "most abject slave under the sun," and then continues: "Only the section of the English nation hitherto unknown on the Continent, only the workers, the pariahs of England, the poor, are really

respectable, in spite of all their rawness and all, their demoralisation. It is they who will save England, they still present educational material. They have no education, but neither have they narrow prejudices. They still possess power for great national work, they still have a future before them." Of the two parties into which the educated classes were split, Engels finds the Tories, bad as they are, less objectionable than the Whigs, who looked upon everything in industry, which had given them power and wealth, as quite faultless, and regarded its extension as the only aim of all legislation.

### Chapter III

#### MEETING AND COMPLETE AGREEMENT WITH MARX

It is remarkable how Marx and Engels—quite independently, the one basing himself on a study of the French Revolution and on philosophy, the other, on the study of English industrial conditions—came to practically the same conclusions regarding the nature of bourgeois society. The materialist conception of history was already colouring both their writings, although at that time, perhaps, in a more finished form in Marx than in Engels.

Their writings in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* led to an exchange of correspondence between them, and in September, 1844, on his way back to Germany, Engels went to Paris for a few days to visit Marx. So complete was their agreement in their outlook upon philosophic and economic questions that they at once began a work in common—*The Holy Family: or, a Review of the Critical Critique Against Bruno Bauer and his Followers.*

It was published in 1845, and its aim was, according to the authors, to make plain to the larger public the illusions of speculative philosophy. In it they already adopt the proletarian standpoint, although it deals very little with the economic sphere direct.

Engels had written only a few sheets (printer's), but Marx expanded them to many times their number. When Engels received his copy of the whole book he was astounded at its length, but he was delighted with the way in which Marx had treated the subject—only he thought the whole book too big; the subject matter was not worth it; still, he consoled himself that it was better so, for at least it was coming out straight away, whereas otherwise “who knows how long the material might have still lain in your desk?”

Although himself a very careful and painstaking writer, many were the occasions when Engels urged Marx to hurry up with his work, and not to allow the possibility of making his work a little more perfect to interfere with rapid publication. We shall see later that this feverish haste of his to get things published was due to his belief in the imminence of the revolution. Thus he writes to Marx, January, 1845: “See to it that you complete quickly your work on national economy. Even if you yourself are not quite satisfied with much of it—that is no matter. The time is ripe and we must strike the iron while it is hot . . . it is now high time. So see that you are ready by April. Do as I do; give yourself a definite date by which you absolutely must finish and see about the immediate printing of it . . . It must come out at once.”

With their meeting at Paris, and their joint writing of *The Holy Family*, there commenced a loyal friendship, such as is rarely met with in history between two great men, and which lasted to the end of their days. We shall have occasion to speak of this friendship many times again.

## Chapter IV

THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES IN  
ENGLAND IN 1844

AFTER their meeting and complete understanding in Paris, Engels went back to Barmen, there to complete and publish the results of his economic investigations in England—his historic *Condition of the Working Classes in England in 1844*.

The first edition was published in German in the summer of 1845, and was very widely read and criticised. Its chief merit was not so much the actual description of the conditions of life of the English workers, good as it was, for this had to some extent also been done by others, but the marvellous acuteness with which the young author (Engels was then only twenty-four years old) grasped the true inwardness of capitalist production and the contradictions inherent in bourgeois society.

The central idea of the book was to show how capitalist industry produced the modern working class. How it bred the miserable conditions under which they lived. How it demoralised them, dehumanised them, and reduced them to a condition of slavery in all but name; indeed, in some respects, to worse than slavery, for the worker under capitalism, whilst he has to sell his bodily strength and skill, and at that time, before he had learned the true value of efficient organisation, also his soul, to the owner of the means of production—the capitalist—he is not even sure from day to day whether he will have the wherewithal to satisfy his most elementary bodily needs. At the same time, and this is the most important point of all, the author saw in these new labour conditions of the workers the germ of the new hope. He saw how the

bringing together of great masses of workers into a collective form of industry (with, of course, individual ownership) would gradually develop a mass consciousness in the workers. How the mastery of man over nature (as illustrated in factory and town life) would breed confidence in the masses in their own power. How the workers would be forced by their very conditions of life to see that their only way out of their misery and degradation was by their combination as fellow workers against the exploiting class—the capitalists—and that in the horrible conditions of the life of the workers at that time there already existed, and was germinating, the hope of the future—the Socialist working-class movement, which would finally deliver mankind from all forms of slavery, from all forms of domination of man by his fellow men. This work was thus the first to lay the foundation of scientific Socialism, and was but the earnest beginning of Engels' life-long work in the Socialist labour movement.

The book shows how far he had emancipated himself from the intricacies, the useless parts, and the idealism (in a philosophic sense) of German philosophy, whilst yet holding fast and using with a sure hand all that was true and fruitful in the Hegelian philosophy.

In addition to his masterly analysis of capitalist industry and its economic and social results, Engels also investigated the various forms of the English labour movement of the time. He saw the significance, the importance of the Trade Union movement, and yet its inadequacy so long as it remained a purely economic organisation.

He therefore hailed the Chartist movement as the compact political form of the proletarian opposition to the bourgeoisie. In Chartism, the workers, as a whole class, stood against the bourgeoisie in order to wrest from it political power.

But whilst the Chartists rightly took an active part in all

the social struggles of the Trade Unions (for higher wages, shorter hours and better conditions of work and so forth), they were not yet sufficiently imbued with Socialist ideals and ideas. All their strivings were directed to bettering the condition of the workers within the framework of capitalist society. The Chartists were theoretically backward, but, nevertheless, they were in the main real proletarians imbued with the living fighting spirit.

The Socialists of the time, on the other hand, were more far-sighted, but they came mostly from the bourgeoisie and were mainly pacifist, tame, and lived on abstract ideals. They saw and lamented the demoralisation of the lower classes, but they did not realise that the germ of future progress lay in these classes, and that the real demoralisation of the possessing classes, induced by their private interests and hypocrisy, was far greater.

The Socialists did not recognise historical development. They deplored the bitterness displayed by the workers against the bourgeoisie, and they desired and hoped to bring about their own Socialist ideals by means of wholly fruitless moral suasion and philanthropy.

But if Socialism is to become a living part of the working-class movement, Engels maintained, it must adopt the revolutionary spirit of the Chartists, just as the Chartists needed the far-sightedness and clearer theoretical understanding of the Socialists. Or, in other words, Socialism must be essentially a proletarian movement, and the proletarian movement must be Socialist ere the working class can gain its emancipation from capitalism.

And although we have travelled far since then, although the workers have gained all the political aims of the Chartists, and have forced many economic concessions from the governing class, yet it is truer than ever to-day that the working-class movement, unless imbued with Socialist ideals, unless it is consciously working for the overthrow of

capitalism and the attainment of a Socialist system of society, will never accomplish its real aim: the emancipation of the worker from slavery.

Conversely, not only will the Socialists who rely on the moral conversion, on a change of heart of the bourgeoisie as a class, never make any progress, but so long as the Socialist parties, who do rely on the working class, are not an integral part of the general labour movement, so long as they are content to stand outside, hugging their moral and intellectual superiority, and preaching to and at the workers instead of being *within* and *part* of the labour movement itself, so long will most of their work and their sacrifices be in vain.

In the conclusion of his book, Engels expressed the opinion that England was not far from an outbreak of revolution. And it was this prophecy which was most seized upon by the critics because, at any rate in the form in which Engels predicted it, it was not fulfilled. Of course, the fact that Engels made a mistake in the nearness or the exact form of the revolution does not in the least detract from the value of the book, and we may indeed rather wonder, as Engels himself did shortly before his death, not that some of the hopes and prophecies of his fiery youth had fallen wide of the mark, but that so many of them had, indeed, come to pass.

It may be noted that particularly in their early years both Marx and Engels were prone to over-estimate at times the tempo of the revolutionary labour movement. But we must remember it was the *tempo* not the *course* of the revolution that was sometimes over-estimated.

While things did not move as quickly as they sometimes thought they should do, their analysis of the past, present and future course of development of society has proved remarkably apt and accurate.

But this was only because they saw the final course and

aim so clearly themselves that the actual road to be traversed seemed to them shorter than it was. As Lange has said: "In general, what we foresee very clearly we are wont to imagine as being nearer than it really is." The only really valid criticism on the book is that passed by Engels himself in his Introduction to the 1892 edition:

"It will be hardly necessary to point out that the general theoretical standpoint of this book—philosophical, economical, political—does not exactly coincide with my standpoint to-day. Modern international Socialism, since fully developed as a science chiefly and almost exclusively by the efforts of Marx, did not as yet exist in 1844. My book represents one of the phases of its embryonic development, and as the human embryo in its early stages still reproduces the gill-arches of our fish ancestors, so this book exhibits everywhere the traces of the descent of modern Socialism from one of its ancestors—German philosophy. Thus great stress is laid on the dictum that Communism is not a mere party doctrine of the working class, but a theory, compassing the emancipation of society at large, including the capitalist class, from its present narrow condition. This is true enough in the abstract, but absolutely useless and sometimes worse in practice: So long as the wealthy classes not only do not feel the want of any emancipation, but strenuously oppose the self-emancipation of the working class, so long will the social revolution have to be prepared and fought out by the working class alone."

And has not the experience since that date amply borne this out? Has the capitalist class of any country voluntarily given up its class power and privileges? Can we conceive that even in England—this classic land of compromise—the capitalist classes as a whole will ever become convinced of the folly of the present system, themselves resign their power, and help the workers to emancipate the

whole of society from the shackles of capitalist production for profit?

The *Condition of the Working Classes* was to have been only the first part of an all-embracing history of the English people. At the same time Engels was planning a monthly Socialist paper, to be edited together with Moses Hess, and also the publication of an encyclopædia of Socialist literature abroad, the publication of a criticism of List, and so on. The latter work he left to Marx, who had also intended doing it. The stress of the coming years, however, did not allow of the completion of all these plans.

## Chapter V

### HOME LIFE AND EARLY COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

THE first letter Engels wrote Marx after returning from Paris to Barmen was at the end of September, 1844. It is full of the eagerness of youth and enthusiasm for their common work.

He describes the progress made by their Communist teaching in Cologne, and he says: "Our people are very active, but the lack of a proper foundation is very evident. So long as our principles have not been developed in a few works, historically and logically, from our prevailing philosophy (*anschauungsweise*) and history, and shown to be the necessary corollary of these, so long shall we continue for the most part to grope blindly in the dark. . . . Best of all I like my Elberfeld boys, in whom the human philosophy has, indeed, passed into their flesh and blood. These fellows have really begun to revolutionise their families economically, and they read their elders a lesson

whenever these attempt to treat their servants or workers aristocratically. And this is, indeed, a great deal in patriarchal Elberfeld. . . .”

He describes bourgeois society at home in Barmen and district, and points out that the discontent of the workers is growing and is manifesting itself by the increase of crime and individual terrorist acts, and says: “And if the proletariat of this country develops according to the same law as the English, they will soon become convinced that to protest against the social order in this violent way, as individuals, is quite useless, and they will learn to protest as human beings in their collective capacity through Communism. If only we could show them the way. But this is impossible.” (The Communists could not then work in the open for fear of arrest.) And he ends the letter thus: “Well, now, see to it that the material you have collected is sent forth into the world as soon as possible—it is devilishly high time I, too, set to work in earnest. . . . And so let us work well and publish quickly. . . . Good-bye, dear fellow, and write soon. I have never since been in such a cheerful good-humoured mood as I was during the ten days I stopped with you.”

This letter not only characterises the young Engels, but it also shows how close were already the relations existing between himself and Marx. In this letter they are already on quite familiar terms, Engels using the familiar “du.” (thou) in addressing Marx. It may be as well to state here that the correspondence between Marx and Engels fills four fair-sized volumes. In these letters they discuss their economic and philosophical theories, the books they are reading and writing at the time, all the leading European events of the time, such as the commercial crises of 1857, the Crimean War, the French war against Austria, the war between the Northern and Southern States of America, and so on.

They also discuss the working-class movements and their leaders in Europe and America. They are keenly interested and exchange their views on all the discoveries of science, both practical and theoretical. In one letter Engels describes a discovery in electricity made by himself, and in a letter dated May 3, 1873, Engels communicates to Marx and Schorlemmer some reflections of his own in physical science. Schorlemmer, an eminent chemist and professor of chemistry at that time in Manchester, was an intimate friend of theirs, and, judging by his remarks at the end of the various paragraphs of Engels' letter, thought highly of the points made by Engels.

To deal adequately with this correspondence would require a book to itself. We shall, therefore, make no attempt to discuss it, only taking such extracts from it as will serve to illustrate Engels' life and character.

Engels' family very much wanted him to take up commerce as a career, and, of course, to enter his father's business, but every fibre in young Friedrich's soul protested against such a fate. His ambitions lay in a quite different direction. Thus, in March, 1845, he writes to Marx: "I am leading now a veritable dog's life. On account of the affairs with the meetings, and the slovenliness of several of the Communists here, with whom I, of course, associate, all the old religious fanaticism of my old governor [his father] has been re-awakened, and his ire has been increased still more by the declaration of my intention to give up definitely the office bench. Further, since my open appearance as a Communist"—(they had had some meetings at Barmen at which Friedrich had spoken)—"he has developed in addition a passionate bourgeois fanaticism.

"Now, just consider my position! As I am going away in about fourteen days or so, I cannot very well kick up a row. I let everything pass by without protest. They are not accustomed to this, and so their spirits rise. . . .

If it were not for my mother, whom I really love, who really possesses a very fine personality, only cannot stand up against my father, I would not dream for a moment of making the slightest concession to my fanatical and despotic governor. But my mother is in any case ill every now and again, and almost every time she is worried, especially about me, she gets an eight-days' headache. It is unbearable. I must get away, and hardly know how to hold out the few weeks I still have to remain here. Still, they will pass."

In 1845 Engels gave up his mercantile life, left Barmen and went to Brussels. He did this partly because his family and friends hindered his Communist work in his native town, but chiefly because he wanted to work out together with Marx their common philosophic and economic principles. Here in Brussels they worked out together their scientific system of Socialism, whilst at the same time endeavouring to bring the existing working-class movement to class consciousness, and to place it on the foundation of their theoretical system.

Their first work here was a criticism of the later Hegelian philosophy, which was a definite break with the contemporary German philosophy. This book, in two volumes, was not published until very recently on account of a literary boycott of Marx's works in Germany. In Marx's own phrase, "we abandoned the manuscript to the gnawing criticisms of the mice." It served the useful purpose of clearing their own thoughts, and giving them a sure grasp of their theories. And this accomplished, they went to work practically as well as theoretically.

They established a German Labour Union in Brussels, and took a leading part in conducting the *Deutschen-Brüsseler Zeitung*. At the same time they kept up a close and constant connection with the revolutionary elements of English Chartism and with the French Social-Democrats

through the journal *Reforme*, to which Engels supplied news of the English and German movements. They also became associated with the "League of the Just," which ultimately, under the influence of Marx's and Engels' teaching, developed into the International Communist League.

## Chapter VI

### THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

IN the summer of 1847 the League met in congress in London to adopt a new constitution and programme. Engels was present as the representative of the Paris group. In November of the same year the Congress met again to discuss the question of issuing a manifesto of its ideas and aims. The draft suggested by Marx and Engels was discussed very fully for ten days, and finally they were commissioned to prepare it for publication.

From a letter from Engels to Marx in November, 1847, we see that it was Engels who was responsible for the title of the manifesto. He writes: ". . . Think over the confession of faith a bit. I believe we had better drop the catechism form and call the thing: Communist *Manifesto*. As more or less history has got to be related in it, the form it has been in hitherto is quite unsuitable. I am bringing what I have done here with me; it is simply a narrative, but miserably put together in fearful haste. . . ." Then follow the headings of the various points with which the manifesto deals.

Under their influence the sentimental cry of the old Utopians—"All men are brothers"—was replaced by the living battle-cry of "Workers of all countries unite." The

manifesto was published in 1848, and it meant the public unfurling of the banner of modern Socialism.

The *Communist Manifesto* is based on historic materialism. Its fundamental idea is that the political and intellectual development of any historical epoch is based on, and can only be explained from, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange of that epoch, and the social structure resulting therefrom.

The whole history of mankind, since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership (this prehistoric period of human society has been worked out by Morgan, Engels and others, and fully supports the materialist conception of history), has been a history of class struggles, struggles between exploiter and exploited, the governing and the governed, at different stages of development in society.

The history of these struggles forms a series of evolutions in which a stage has now been reached when the oppressed and exploited class—the working class—can only attain its emancipation from the exploiting and ruling class—the capitalist class—by emancipating the whole of society once and for all from all exploitation, class distinctions and class struggles.

The first section of the *Manifesto* deals with the bourgeoisie (capitalists) and proletarians (workers) and shows in brief how the modern capitalist class developed from the earlier systems of society, and how the increase in the means of exchange and of commodities, the opening up of new markets and the discovery of new lands gave “an impulse never before known to commerce, to navigation, and to industry, and thereby also gave a more rapid development to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society of the time.”

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie, which played a very revolutionary role, was accompanied by a

corresponding political advance of that class. "The bourgeoisie, wherever it has obtained the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations . . . 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."

All venerated opinions are swept away and all new ones become antiquated before they can ossify, and the consequence of all this is that man is at last compelled to face realities and to get a clearer insight into things.

The capitalist mode of production, once brought into being, "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 capitalist system has concentrated vast masses of the population into huge towns. It has centralised the means of production and has concentrated property in few hands, and from this necessarily follows political concentration and the formation of the modern nations from the former loosely connected provinces.

It has made the country subject to the town. In the same way, it rendered barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on more civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of capitalists, the East on the West. (Since then, of course, the East has been awakening, and is necessarily itself rapidly becoming bourgeois, showing in its development, in spite of all the peculiarities of the climate and races inhabiting the Eastern hemisphere, similar features to the older bourgeois West.)

“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.” But, as the fetters of feudalism had to be burst asunder to make room for the growth of capitalist production, so bourgeois society is becoming incompatible with the rapidly developing mode of production, and all the social, political and intellectual relations in society resulting therefrom. The very weapons with which capitalism beat feudalism are now turned against itself. The great expansion in production, which resulted in its triumph, will now also be the cause of its death. As an example of this, the *Manifesto* points to the ever more frequent occurrence of commercial crises in which there breaks out an “epidemic of over-production.”

The bourgeoisie, however, has not only forged the weapon to be directed against itself, it has also produced the men who are to wield the weapon—the modern working class—the proletarians. The *Manifesto* then traces the rise of the proletariat, its relation to the bourgeoisie, and how it is recruited from all classes of the population. From its birth the working class is engaged in a conscious or unconscious struggle with the capitalist class. But the bourgeoisie itself is also constantly engaged in struggles—at first with the aristocracy, later with those portions of the bourgeoisie whose interests are antagonistic to the further progress of industry, and at all times with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries.

In all these battles the capitalist class is compelled in its own interests to call in the aid of the working class, and although the latter, without knowing it, is really fighting the battles of its worst enemy, it nevertheless in the process learns the value of co-operative effort; it is dragged into the political arena, and is thus supplied by the capitalists themselves with the weapon with which it will slay them.

Although the lower middle class, the small manufacturer,

the shopkeeper, the handworker, and the peasant are all at war with the bourgeoisie, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. It is the peculiar and essential product of modern industry, and is destined to bring about those new social relations and political conditions which will bring the latter into harmony with modern industrial development. As for the social scum, or, as it is known in German, the "lumpen proletariat," it may now and again be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution, but its whole condition of life is such as to make it the ever-ready, bribed tool of reaction. The *Manifesto* then proceeds:

"All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is (or must become) the self-conscious independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up without the whole super-incumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air. . . . The development of modern industry, therefore" (in the above and other ways) "cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

In the second section the *Manifesto* first points out the relation of the communists (or socialists) to the proletariat. The former have no interests apart from the latter; they are only the advance guard of the working class movement in all countries. Further, the ideas expressed by the communists have not been invented or discovered by this or that would-be universal reformer. "They merely express in general terms actual relations arising 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."

Communism does not propose the abolition of property in general, but of bourgeois private property, and a variety of still familiar objections to socialism are then dealt with. Says the *Manifesto*: "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 for these nine-tenths."

"You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for the existence of which 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. . . . 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 labours of others by means of such appropriation."

As for the philosophical arguments against the Communists, the *Manifesto* says: "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."

"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 past historical experience.' "

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

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

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

"Section III is a masterly exposition of the various schools of reformist, reactionary and utopian socialists.

The last section points out that whilst the Communists fight for the attainment of immediate aims and the enforcement of the momentary interests of the workers, they nevertheless do not lose sight of their real aim—the complete emancipation of the working class—and the *Manifesto* ends with the historic words : "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 communist revolution. The proletarians have

nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!"

In the course of an introduction to the 1888 edition, Engels, after pointing out that at that time (1888) the *Manifesto* was undoubtedly the most widespread, the most international production of all Socialist literature, says: "Yet when it was written we could not have called it a *socialist* manifesto. By Socialists, in 1847, were understood, on the one hand, the adherents of the various Utopian systems: Owenites in England, Fourierists in France, both of them already reduced to the position of mere sects and gradually dying out; on the other hand, the most multifarious social quacks, who, by all manners of tinkering, professed to redress, without any danger to capital and profits, all sorts of social grievances, in both cases, men outside the working-class movement and looking rather to the 'educated' classes for support.

"Whatever portions of the working class had become convinced of the insufficiency of mere political revolutions and had proclaimed the necessity of a total social change, that portion then called itself Communist. It was a crude, rough-hewn, purely instinctive sort of Communism; still, it touched the cardinal point. Thus, in 1847, Socialism was a middle class movement. Socialism was, on the Continent at least, 'respectable'; Communism was the very opposite. And as our notion, from the very beginning, was that 'the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself,' there could be no doubt as to which of the two names we must take. Moreover, we have, ever since, been far from repudiating it."

We shall have occasion later to make one more quotation from this preface. For the present we need say no more.

## Chapter VII

## BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY

AFTER the second Congress, which established the first International on a firm scientific basis, Engels and Marx went to Paris and thence to Germany, where they established the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in Cologne. Here they worked both practically and theoretically at combating the illusions of the revolutionaries of 1848, who for the most part thought that all that was needed was the gaining of civil and political freedom; that, these gained, the chains would at once fall from the people, and they would live thereafter in peace and prosperity. Needless to say, both Marx and Engels called for energetic action for the attainment of political liberties, for the overthrow of the reaction—but this only for the purpose of preparing the ground for the real struggle of the workers for their emancipation from capitalist domination. For Engels as for Marx the principles of democracy could only be realised in the advance to Communism.

“Any other democracy” (not Communism), said Engels, “can only exist in the heads of visionary theoreticians, who do not bother about realities, and according to whom men and circumstances do not develop principles, but principles develop of themselves. Democracy has become a proletarian principle.” Not until the power of the ruling class to use force against democratic advance has been broken is democratic advance guaranteed.

Engels truly says in his *Origin of the Family*, which we shall treat in greater detail below, “Universal suffrage is thus the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It cannot, and never will, be anything more in the modern state; but that is enough. On the day when the ther-

mometer of universal suffrage shows boiling-point, among the workers, they as well as the capitalists will know where they stand."

That is to say, the granting of universal suffrage shows the growing strength of the working class, the fact that the governing classes in order to maintain their rule must, while preserving for themselves the reality, grant the masses the appearance of power. But when the working class or its active class-conscious section is really ready to use this power, then it will have become obsolete, for the capitalist classes, seeing the *reality* of their power about to be wrested from them, will take, as so far in history they always have taken, to far different weapons than that of moral suasion and the kissing of grimy little children or shaking hands with bewildered housewives at election times.

And it is necessary to note here that no Socialist or Communist advocates forcible or violent revolution as an end in itself. But we must face realities. If the other side will not abdicate and quietly give up their possessions—what is to be done? So long as they are possessed of their wealth and are allowed to use that wealth freely, so long do the governing classes possess a weapon far stronger than any vote of the workers, and this wealth and the power it gives them they will not yield up without a struggle.

Should the Russian workers' Republic, surrounded by internal and external foes ready and eager to rend it to pieces, should it, figuratively speaking, have folded its arms and turned the other cheek to be smitten by its enemies? Would it really have been more "moral" for the Russian Red Army, instead of defending themselves and their revolution, to have lain down their arms and let the Whites and the Blacks and Tans over-run them and make a shambles of their country like the Horthy gangs did in Hungary? The absurdity of the anti-force fanaticism has only to be stated to be at once recognised.

At the same time, we are not, as Engels shows in his *Anti-Dühring*, to make a fetish of force. Force alone will not make a revolution or preserve a dominant class indefinitely in power. It is the underlying economic conditions and the degree of development in the productive forces which gives rise to particular forms of society, and it is the further development of the means of production which again gives rise to our scorn of former or still prevailing forms of society and our will and ability to overthrow them when conditions are ripe for such a step.

Thus, after pointing out the useful and necessary rôle played even by slavery in the progress of society from primitive Communism, Engels says: "It is very easy to inveigh against slavery and similar things in general terms, and to give vent to high moral indignation at such infamies. Unfortunately all that this conveys is only what everyone knows, namely, that these institutions of antiquity are no longer in accord with our present-day conditions and our sentiments, which these conditions determine. But it does not tell one word as to how these institutions arose, why they existed, and what role they have played in history. And when we examine these questions, we feel compelled to say—however contradictory and heretical it may sound—that the introduction of slavery under the conditions of that time was a great step forward."

The old primitive Communism was incapable of expanding because of the limited means of subsistence, and when these became more plentiful, then the productive forces of labour, being still so slight, "provided but a small surplus over and above the necessary means of subsistence, any increase of the productive forces, extension of trade, development of the state and of law, or beginning of art and science, was only possible by means of a greater division of labour."

The most natural and simplest form of this subdivision

was that of slavery, which, whilst burdening one section of men with all the menial work of society, left another, the master class, free to direct this work, to carry on the work of the State and to pursue trade, art and science. At that time, had the thought of the iniquity of slavery occurred, it would have been useless to attempt to abolish it, and no mass party could, or did, arise to demand and carry out its abolition.

But the wheel of time does not stand still, and leisured classes tend more and more to become purely parasitic; and now the productive forces have made such gigantic strides as to make the existence of a special leisured class not only superfluous, but a direct obstacle to further social progress; and they will, therefore, be "unceremoniously brushed aside in spite of their possession of 'pure force'" (a term used by Dühring). Nevertheless, force has played an important part in history, and should not be despised and lightly disclaimed.

"For Herr Dühring force is the absolute evil; the first act of force is for him the original sin; his whole exposition is a jeremiad on the contamination, which this brought about, of all subsequent history by this original sin; a jeremiad of the shameful perversion of all natural and social laws by this diabolical power, force. That force, however, plays another role in history, a revolutionary role; that, in the words of Marx, it is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with the new, and it is the instrument by the aid of which social development forces its way through and shatters the dead, fossilised, political forms—of this there is not a word in Herr Dühring. It is only with sighs and groans that he admits the possibility that force will perhaps be necessary for the overthrow of the economic system of exploitation—unfortunately because all use of force, forsooth, demoralises the person who uses it. And this in spite of the immense moral and spiritual

impetus which has resulted from every victorious revolution! And this in Germany, where a violent collision—which indeed may be forced on the people—would at least have the advantage of wiping out the servility which has permeated the national consciousness as a result of the humiliation of the Thirty Years' War."

## Chapter VIII

### CONSTITUTIONAL RISINGS IN GERMANY

THE working classes failed to get their political liberties in the 1848 revolutions: the reaction triumphed.

But they learned some valuable lessons: they learnt to recognise the unreliability of the small property-owners; their treachery, and the need to rely mainly on themselves alone as a class in their struggle with the bourgeoisie. Of course, the subsequent history of Europe shows that this lesson was not learnt thoroughly by all sections of the workers in all Europe; but the foremost ranks of the workers did learn the lesson, and after a short respite from the shock of their defeat there commenced a more definitely class-conscious action amongst the European working class.

In May, 1849, a portion of the Rhine province broke out in revolt, and as soon as Engels heard of this he hastened to the seat of action, to Elberfeld; but the workers being betrayed by the small bourgeoisie, the rising soon fizzled out. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was suppressed, and after remaining in hiding in Cologne for a short time, Engels went to the Palatinate, which had risen, together with Baden, for a constitution for the whole German Empire. Here he joined a volunteer corps as adjutant. But this rising

also failed, owing to the mismanagement and treachery of the South German Democrats—a small bourgeois party, which, supported by the workers, had led the rising. And it ended, as described by Engels, in a bloody massacre. Engels stopped with the conquered army to the very last, until all was hopelessly lost. He then went to Switzerland.

The day after he arrived at Vevey, he writes to Mrs. Marx explaining his long silence, and the course of the rising. Although, he says, he had at first tried to stand aside from this *soi-disant* revolution, still, when he heard that the Prussians had come he could not keep himself from entering the ranks. Although he does not think much of the rising, on the whole he is glad that one from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had taken part; otherwise the *democrats* might have denounced them as being too cowardly to fight. He is very anxious as to what has become of Marx, and says: "If only I were certain that Marx is free! I have often thought that there, in the midst of the Prussian bullets, I was in a much less dangerous post after all than the others in Germany, and particularly than Marx in Paris. Please relieve me immediately from this uncertainty."

In reply, Marx tells Engels how anxious they had been on his account and how delighted they were to hear from him again. He urges Engels to take the opportunity now to write a history or pamphlet on the rising.

When, in August, 1849, Marx was expelled from Paris and declared his intention to go to London, he wrote to Engels urging him strongly also to come to London, both because it was unsafe for him to remain in Switzerland, where the Prussians might get hold of him, and also for the sake of the work they could do together in London; and, indeed, very soon after, Engels followed Marx to London.

## Chapter IX

## FIGHTING ILLUSIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC REFUGEES

HERE, in London, they started intensive practical and theoretical work. Their first efforts were directed to perfecting, and as far as possible extending, the organisation of the Communist League; and not a little of their energy had to be given to explain to the large number of foreign refugees then in London that for the time being the counter-revolution had won the upper hand and it was useless there and then to appeal for an immediate violent revolution.

In a monthly review established by them, and published in Hamburg, they endeavoured to find the economic reason for the failure of the February revolution; and they found it in the discovery of the Californian Goldfields, which gave a fillip to world production and commerce that could not lightly be brushed aside and would not speedily exhaust itself. Just as the commercial world crisis of 1847 was the mother of the revolution, so the industrial prosperity ushered in by the discovery of the Californian Goldfields was the mother of the counter-revolution. The period was one, therefore, for agitation and education, not for revolution.

In the fifth and sixth numbers of their review they published a survey of political and economic events of the 'forties, in which they show that the 1847 depression was followed by a period of prosperity, which had not yet reached its zenith in 1850. "The prosperity of England would rise still further by the newly successful opening up of the Dutch Colonies, by the prospective establishment of new means of communication on the Pacific Ocean, and by the great industrial exhibition of 1851 . . . this exhibition is a striking proof of concentrated power, by means of

which modern great industry breaks down national barriers and obliterates local peculiarities in production, the social relations and character of the separate nations. . . .”

This prosperity in England would, of course, react on the Continent. “In the midst of such general prosperity, when the productive forces of bourgeois society are developing as luxuriantly as is possible at all within the limits of bourgeois society, there can be no question of any real revolution. Such a revolution is only possible in periods when the two factors, the modern productive forces and the bourgeois modes of production, come into conflict. The various quarrels in which the different factions of the party of order now indulge are, on the contrary, only possible because of the security of the basis of their immediate relations and, what the reaction does not know, just because these relations are so bourgeois. In face of this, all bourgeois attempts at restraining reaction are as impotent as all the moral indignations and all the exalted proclamations of the democrats. A new revolution will only be possible as a result of a new crisis. And the one is as inevitable as the other.”

The last words of their review were a crushing denunciation and merciless criticism of a proclamation by Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin, Ruge and Daraz, who had constituted themselves a European central committee, to the whole of the European refugees to unite under one flag, and in which the failure of the revolution was explained with bland simplicity—*i.e.*, as the result of quarrels and jealousies of the various leaders!

Of course, Marx and Engels denounce this as pure philistinism, and show that the bourgeois sentimentalists who think that the enthusiasms and ideals of a few are sufficient to induce a revolution at will in any desired direction, have simply put the cart before the horse, and, therefore, will never get any “forrarder.”

In this same review, Engels wrote a number of other articles and series of articles, such as on the Ten Hours Bill, and on the German Peasants' War, which was later published as a pamphlet and is the first historical description of pre-capitalist relations from the point of view of the materialistic conception of history.

The views held by Marx and Engels on the impossibility of making revolution at any time at will necessarily caused great dissensions in the ranks of the Communist League. The older members, such as Eccarius, Pfander, Seiler, Freiligrath, Ferdinand Wolff and Bauer, all with the exception of Schapper and Willich, followed Marx and Engels. The younger, with exceptions here and there, such as Wilhelm Liebknecht and Conrad Schramm, followed the general current of the refugees against them.

The crisis came to a head in the sitting of the central executive committee, September, 1850, in which, although the Marx-Engels tendency had a majority, it became evident that no compromise was possible between the two sections. As a result, both Marx and Engels were unable to do much practical work for some time, and they withdrew themselves into their theoretical works.

## Chapter X

### BACK TO MANCHESTER

IN the meantime, Engels' father was not content to see his son in the midst of the revolutionary movement in England, and he wrote offering him a post in Calcutta; this, however, Engels refused. He found, however, that by means of

journalism, which was the career he had decided to follow, he could earn no more than enough to keep himself.

On the other hand, Marx had a wife and three young children, and could, by means of his writings, earn very little to support his family. Engels felt he could not stand by and see a great man like Marx, whose genius he recognised from the first days of their more intimate relations in Paris, waste his strength in petty writings, for a living. Under these circumstances, he decided that he must earn enough to be able to support Marx, while the latter went on as far as possible with the working out of the economic and philosophic theories they held in common.

Consequently, although he hated the idea, he decided, after all, to go back into his father's business. And so, in 1850, we find him back in Manchester as a clerk at the cotton mill of Ermen and Engels. In December of that year Mrs. Marx writes to thank him for his sympathy with them in the loss of their baby. She says that his letter had comforted her greatly in her sorrow.

"My husband and all of us have missed you very much and have often longed to have you with us. Still, I am glad you have gone and are on the way to become a great cotton lord!" She advises him to make himself indispensable to his father, and "I already see you in imagination as Frederick Engels, junior partner of the senior Engels, and the best of it all is that in spite of all cotton trade you will still remain the old Fritz and will not become estranged from the holy cause of freedom. The children chatter much about uncle Engels, and the small Till sings the song you have taught him fine."

For the next twenty years Engels and Marx saw one another only for brief intervals from time to time, but they maintained constant intellectual intercourse by corresponding almost daily. No sooner did any idea on economic science or philosophy strike one of them than he immedi-

ately communicated it to the other, asking for his opinion, advice and further elucidation by means of new facts the other might possess.

Whilst in Manchester, Engels, besides his work in the business, continued his studies, particularly on military history and science. He also worked at comparative philology and the natural sciences. Speaking of his study of Russian, March, 1852, he deploras the little time he gets for the study of the Slav question, at which he was then working. He would like to write more for Ernest Jones' paper, but what with spending the whole day in the office, writing a weekly report to his father, the *Tribune* article, and almost weekly articles for Weydemeyer, he has rather more than he can manage. He must spend some regular time on the Slav question.

"I have pegged away at Russian," he writes, "for the last fourteen days, and am fairly well on with the grammar, another two or three months will give me the necessary vocabulary, and then I can start doing something else. I must finish with the Slav languages this year, and in reality they are not so very difficult. Apart from the intrinsic interest the subject has for me, I am also led thereto by the consideration that at least one of us should know the languages, history, literature, and the details of the social institutions of just those nations with whom we shall directly come into conflict. . . . Bakunin has only become of some importance because no one knows Russian. And the old pan-Slav trickery that the old Slav communal ownership can be transformed into Communism, and that the Russian peasants are to be regarded as born Communists, will again be widely canvassed."

In 1859, during the Italian war, Engels published the pamphlet *The Po and the Rhine*. Marx was enthusiastic in its praise when he read the manuscript. In accordance with his advice, it was published anonymously at first, in

order that it might be "attributed to some high-placed general," and in May, 1861, on the occasion of a trip to Germany, Marx writes to Engels saying that in high military circles the pamphlet is indeed so regarded.

After the conclusion of the Italian war, Engels wrote another pamphlet, entitled *Savoy, Nice and the Rhine*, and in 1865, in the pamphlet *The Prussian Military Question and the German Labour Party*, Engels attacked the incompetence and half-heartedness of the liberals and radicals, pointing out that a solution of the military problems of Prussia, as of every other serious question, could only be arrived at by a proletarian party.

In the middle of the sixties the labour movement began to revive in England and the Continent, and in 1864 the International Workingmen's Association was formed. Though Marx was the intellectual leader of the International, Engels, too, did a great deal of work for it.

## Chapter XI

### ENGELS' DEVOTION TO MARX

At the end of March, 1860, Engels lost his father, and in September, 1864, he became a partner in the firm. This, of course, meant added responsibilities and work, and was by no means to his liking, as we have seen above, and as we also see from a letter to Marx in May, 1860, in which he says that he is trying to make the contract as onerous as possible for Gottfried (Ermen), in order that at the decisive moment he may be only "too pleased to let me go," from which we can conclude that he already then had no intention of remaining in the business for ever. In the mean-

time his income rose, and that was, of course, of the greatest importance to himself and Marx.

During all the time that Engels worked at the Manchester cotton mills he felt anything but happy, and how both he and Marx regarded Engels' activity in the commercial world we shall see from extracts of their letters which we give below.

Speaking of what may happen when his contract will be up in 1869, Engels says that as things are he will probably have to go out of the business. He cannot reconcile himself to starting a new business. If he had to do that he would be done for. "I long for nothing so much as to get free of this dastardly commerce, which, with all the loss of time involved, is completely demoralising me. So long as I am in it, I am useless for anything; particularly since I became a partner it has become much worse, because of the greater responsibilities. Were it not for the larger income, I should really prefer to be a clerk again."

The one thing that worries him is what to do about Marx when he has to leave the business in a couple of years. Consequently he wishes all the more, and hopes that Marx will at last meet with literary success (from a financial point of view, too), and then comes the incurable optimist: he adds, "even should the revolution not come in between and make an end to all financial projects."

Marx undoubtedly understood the sacrifice Engels was making, and in reply to this letter, after expressing his own hope and belief (which, however, in a material sense, was not fulfilled) that in another year he would be a made man and would be able to stand on his own feet financially, he says, amongst other things: "Without you I could never have brought the work (*Capital*) to a conclusion, and I assure you that a load like a mountain has always lain on my mind: that chiefly on my account you have allowed your splendid powers to go to waste and to grow rusty in commerce."

Already in 1865, after describing his sad economic position at the moment—debts, etc. (and Engels, as always, came to the rescue as far as he possibly could)—Marx deploras his dependent position, and says: “The only thought that sustains me in it all is that we two form a sort of business company in which I give my time to the theoretical and the party section of the business.” And it was so indeed. Engels’ sacrifice was not only for the friend in whom he recognised genius of the highest order, but it was also a noble sacrifice of his own inclinations and powers for the purpose of furthering the interests of the party and the ideals both he and Marx had at heart.

In addition, when in the beginning of 1851 Marx was invited to write for the *New York Tribune*, Engels was of great assistance. In the first place, at that time Marx was not yet a sufficient master of the English language to write in English. Engels, therefore, translated his articles for him. Secondly, when Marx had no time to write, or was unwell, or when the question to be dealt with was a military one, or anything more in Engels’ domain, Engels wrote the article himself. Often enough Engels would write one or two articles during the week in addition to his work in the office and all his other studies and writings. These articles all went to the *Tribune* under Marx’s signature and highly valued they were (though miserably paid) whether they came from Marx’s or Engels’ pen.

January 5, 1854, Marx writes to Engels telling him that his military articles (on the position of affairs in the Crimean War, printed by the *Tribune* as leading articles on November 15 and December 16, 1853) had made a “great stir and have been attributed to General Scot” (a leading military authority at that time).

In the spring of 1854, Engels seemed for a while to have had great hopes of getting well paid work on the *Daily News*, and he was already making joyous plans for throw-

ing up his commercial life and coming back to London. Unfortunately, the plan came to nothing, and, much to his disgust, Engels had to remain at his Manchester office.

Early the following year Marx's only boy, a very gifted but delicate child, fell ill and died. Marx, writing to Engels, says in one letter: "I cannot thank you enough for the friendship with which you constantly work on my account and for the sympathy you feel for the child."

April 6 the child died, and Marx writes: "Poor Musch (Edgar—Musch was his nickname) is no more. . . . I shall never forget how your friendship has relieved this terrible time for us. . . ." Then a week later Marx writes again: "The house is, of course, quite desolated and deserted since the death of the dear child who was its vitalising soul. It is impossible to describe how we miss the child everywhere. I have gone through all sorts of misfortunes, but only now do I understand what real sorrow is. I feel broken down. . . . In the midst of all the frightful sufferings I have gone through in these days, the thought of you and of your friendship has sustained me, and the hope that we still have something rational to do in the world together."

In 1857 we find Engels troubled by a very serious illness—a disease of the glands. Marx, during these years, is much troubled by poverty, and the illness of his wife, and so on; Engels is all sympathy and helps as far as he can, but Marx is very much disturbed by his friend's illness, and writes: "In spite of all our misfortunes you may be quite sure that both my wife and I were much less concerned about our own affairs than by the last account of your state of health."

He urges Engels not to be obstinate and childish, and to give up work immediately, to go away to the sea and not to bother about the *Tribune* articles until he is much better. Finally, Engels followed the advice of going away, but even whilst away he continued to send Marx articles; nor did

he forget before going away to send Marx a good case of wine. Engels was no teetotaler, his wine cellars were always well stocked, and he usually saw to it that whatever else might be lacking in Marx's household, the wine cellar or its equivalent was not empty.

It is characteristic of the thoroughness with which both studied every subject to which they gave any attention at all, that, when advising Engels strongly to take iron, Marx says he is supported in his contentions by the "whole of the newest French, English and German medical literature" that he has just read through on the subject of his (Engels') illness. Engels replies in an equally learned treatise showing the superiority of cod-liver oil; agrees, however, to take both as the two do not necessarily exclude one another.

It is interesting to note that during all the time that Marx was writing his main work, *Capital*, not only did he discuss every theory advanced therein with Engels, but he asked for and received from Engels detailed information as to how exactly the manufacturer works with the various parts of his capital—how he looks upon it, how he divides it in his account books, etc. Also regarding wages value, surplus value, and so forth, Engels supplied Marx with essential information, for being himself a manufacturer he could do so at first hand.

And how much Marx valued Engels' help, advice and opinions is shown by many passages in his letters. Thus, June 7, 1859, he writes regarding the *Critique of Political Economy*: "First of all, let me tell you how delighted I was that you liked the first part, for your judgment alone is important for me in this matter. To the great amusement of my wife, I awaited with considerable anxiety your judgment." Then again, in sending Engels some further sheets of the manuscript of *Capital* in June, 1867, he says: "I hope you will be satisfied with these four sheets. Your satisfaction with what has gone before is more important

to me than anything the rest of the world might say." Where necessary, Engels criticised Marx's works quite freely, and Marx almost invariably utilised these criticisms and often altered his writings in accordance with them.

Finally, August 16, 1867, Marx had corrected the last proof sheet of the first volume of his great work, and that same day wrote to Engels:—

DEAR FRED,—Have just finished correcting the last sheet. The appendix—forms of value—in small print contains 1½ sheets.

The preface corrected yesterday and sent back. And so this volume is finished. It is only thanks to you that this was possible. Without your self-sacrifice on my behalf I could never have accomplished the enormous work for the three volumes. I embrace you full of thanks.

Enclosed two sheets of corrected proof.

Have received the £15 with best thanks.

Greetings, my dear, my beloved friend.—

Yours, K. MARX.

When at length the first volume of *Capital* was published, Engels left no stone unturned to advertise it, and to get the world, which tried its best to kill it by silence, to take notice of it.

## Chapter. XII

### TEMPORARY ESTRANGEMENT FROM MARX

IN January, 1863, there occurred the first and only estrangement between Engels and Marx, an event which only serves to illustrate their deep and lasting friendship.

Whilst in Manchester, Engels had become acquainted

with an Irish family, Burns, and had become deeply attached to one of the daughters, Mary, with whom he lived for many years as man and wife. She was a bright, pretty, witty girl, who loved Engels passionately. On January 6, 1863, Mary died quite suddenly, probably from heart disease; the evening before he had been with her, and she had been quite well. Her death was a terrible shock to Engels, but when he wrote to Marx telling him of his bereavement, Marx answered by expressing his regret in a couple of sentences, and then proceeded to relate his own household difficulties. Engels let six days pass by before replying, and then reproached Marx for the "frosty" manner in which he had received the news of the misfortune that had befallen him (Engels). In contradistinction to Marx; "All my friends, even philistines, have shown me more sympathy and friendship in my loss than I could expect."

Marx was evidently much touched, and wrote apologising for his seeming coldness. It was not due to want of feeling at Engels' loss, about which he had been terribly upset, but when Engels' letter came, the brokers were actually in the house, the various tradesmen were clamouring for payment, there was no food in the house, and his daughter Jenny was ill. As a consequence, he was almost mad with anxiety, could not work, and did not know where and to whom to turn.

But Engels was quick to forgive—he answered immediately: "I thank you for your sincerity. You can understand yourself the impression made on me by your previous letter. One cannot live with a woman for so long without being frightfully upset by her death. I felt that with her I was burying the last remains of my youth. When I received your letter she was not yet in her grave. I tell you that your letter was in my head the whole week; I could not forget it. Never mind, your last letter has made

up for it, and I am glad that I have not lost, together with Mary, my oldest and best friend." He then goes on to outline a plan of saving Marx from his immediate pecuniary anxieties.

Marx replied in the same tone. "I can tell you now without further formalities, that in spite of all the strain I have gone through these last few weeks, nothing weighed on me anywhere near so much as the fear of a break in our friendship. I have repeatedly declared to my wife that the whole wretched business is as nothing to me compared with the fact that these bourgeois worries and their consequent agitation should have made me capable, instead of consoling you at such a moment, to worry you with my private difficulties."

Towards the end of 1864, Lizzy, the sister of Mary Burns, became Engels' wife. They lived very happily together until her death in 1878. Mrs. Engels was a highly intelligent woman, who shared her husband's ideals and was an enthusiastic Fenian to the end of her life. They had no children, but Mrs. Engels' niece, Mary Ellen, nicknamed Pumps, lived with them and was educated and treated by both as their own daughter.

### Chapter XIII

#### AN END TO "SWEET COMMERCE"

TOWARDS the end of 1868 we find Engels concerned with the ending of his partnership in the cotton business, and it proves what a good man of business he must have been that his partner, Ermen, was willing to buy him out with a large sum of money in return for Engels binding himself

not to open up a business in the same trade on his own account (a thing Engels would, in any case, not have dreamt of doing, as we have seen above).

However, Engels' one concern was that he should have enough to support Marx adequately, and as the sum offered him by Ermen would be sufficient to enable him to give Marx a regular £350 a year, besides paying for unforeseen incidental expenses—doctor's bills, etc.—for about five or six years, he asks Marx to let him know the exact sum of his debts and whether if he (Engels) clears these completely first he could then manage to live on £350 (and extras) without making any further debts, as upon that depends how he will deal with Ermen's offer. What will happen after the five or six years he does not know. He will even then be able to assure Marx at least £150 a year, and he hopes that something else may turn up so as to enable him to make that sum larger, and that Marx's literary work may bring him in something. If £350 is not sufficient, Marx must let him know immediately what yearly sum would be enough. No wonder Marx replies that he is quite "knocked down" by Engels' goodness!

At last, July 1, 1869, Engels writes:—

"Hurrah! To-day I have done with sweet commerce and am a free man. . . . Gottfried (Ermen) has given way in everything. Tussy (Marx's youngest daughter Eleanor, who was spending a few weeks with Engels and his wife) and I have celebrated my first free day by taking a long country walk this morning. In addition, my eye (he had been troubled with his eyes for some time) is getting much better, and with a little care will be quite all right soon.

"The balances and lawyers will still tie me somewhat for a few more weeks—but this will no longer mean the enormous loss of time of hitherto. . . ."

To this Marx replies:—

“ Best congratulations on your liberation from the Egyptian bondage! In honour of this event, I have taken a glass too much, but late in the evening, not like the Prussian gendarmes, before dawn. . . . ”

#### Chapter XIV

#### IN LONDON AGAIN

FINALLY, at the end of September, 1870, having won over his wife, whose relatives were all in Manchester, to the idea, Engels removed to London. Here the division of labour between him and Marx took on a more definite character. Not a single piece of work by one or the other but was discussed by both before publication, but whilst Marx devoted himself mainly to a systematic working-out of their fundamental economic and philosophic theories, Engels undertook the carrying on of polemics and the discussion and solution of important questions of the day in the light of these theories. But how intimate was their co-work is proved by Engels' statement in the preface to the second edition of his *Anti-Dühring*:—

“ I may note in passing that inasmuch as the genesis and development of the mode of outlook expounded in this book were due in far greater measure to Marx, and only in a very small degree to myself, it was of course self-understood between us that this exposition of mine should not be issued without his knowledge. I read the whole manuscript to him before it was printed, and the tenth chapter of the section on economics (‘ From the *Critical History* ’) was written by Marx, and my part in it was only to shorten it slightly, to my regret, for purely external

reasons. As a matter of fact, we had always been accustomed to help each other out in special subjects.

"The greater part of the point of view developed here was founded and worked out by Marx and only a small part of it by me. Its presentation has not been made without his knowledge. I have read the whole manuscript to him before publication, and the tenth chapter of the section on economics was written by Marx, and, apart from some superficial observation, was merely abridged by me. It was always our custom to assist each other reciprocally in our special fields."

Engels wrote an enormous number of articles and pamphlets on current controversies and questions of interest which we cannot even enumerate here. But many of them are not only of interest historically, but are even applicable to present-day problems. Such, for instance, is his historic treatment of the "*Housing Question*," which appeared originally in 1872, as a series of articles in the *Volkstaat*. It was a polemic against the small bourgeois followers of Proudhon and Muhlberger, and afterwards went through several editions in pamphlet form. Much of it is even applicable at the present time, and actually was adopted by our comrades in Russia.

"How is the housing question to be solved then?" wrote Engels. "In present-day society just as any other social question is solved: by the gradual economic adjustment of supply and demand, a solution which ever reproduces the question itself anew and therefore is no solution. How a social revolution would solve this question depends not only on the circumstances which would exist in each case, but is also connected with still more far-reaching questions, among which one of the most fundamental is the abolition of the antithesis between town and country. As it is not our task to create utopian systems for the arrangement of the future society, it would be more than idle to go into

the question here. But one thing is certain: there are already in existence sufficient buildings for dwellings in the big towns to remedy immediately any real 'housing shortage,' given rational utilisation of them. This can naturally only take place by the expropriation of the present owners and by quartering in their houses the homeless or those workers excessively overcrowded in their former houses. Immediately the proletariat has conquered political power such a measure dictated in the public interest will be just as easy to carry out as other expropriations and billetings are by the existing state."

This passage is a very good illustration of Engels' forcible, clear and popular style. It is also interesting to note, as illustrating the concrete way in which both Marx and Engels founded and tested their theories, that already in this work, as in all the subsequent work of Marx and Engels, he takes into account the experience of the Paris Commune, the first attempt at full emancipation made by the working class, checking his theories, deductions and predictions thereby.

## Chapter XV

### ANTI-DÜHRING or THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF SOCIALISM

IN 1875 Engels published his famous *Anti-Dühring* as a scientific supplement to the *Vorwaerts*. The following year it was published in book form, and later part of it was issued under the title *Socialism Utopian and Scientific*. This edition met with great success, and was translated into a large number of languages.

In the early seventies, the growth and success of German Social Democracy tended to attract to it more and more of the discontented and liberal sections of the bourgeoisie. Now there is no objection whatever to welcoming members of the middle and upper classes in Socialist and Labour organisations, providing these elements have completely freed themselves from their own class modes of thought and ideals, and have completely adopted the proletarian revolutionary standpoint. But the stampede of the bourgeoisie to the Socialist camp by no means conformed to this rule. On the contrary, the new bourgeois elements sought to deprive the Socialist movement of that time of its proletarian character, to make it acceptable to the middle classes, in short, to make Socialism "respectable."

Amongst the most talented of these new bourgeois leaders was Eugen Dühring, who was beginning to have great influence, especially over the younger men of the party. He was a man of undoubtedly great abilities who had overcome many great difficulties in the circumstances of his early life. He wrote on, and knew a fair amount of, a very large number of subjects, but he lacked thoroughness in them all, and, above all, he had no unifying principle, no fundamental conception of the relations existing between the various branches of knowledge and their development.

Nevertheless, on account particularly of his growing influence in the party, he was not an unworthy opponent, and Engels, with his own encyclopædic knowledge and his incomparable mastery of the dialectic method, followed Dühring into the subjects touched on by him, and not merely made short work of him, but, what was of far greater importance, produced a work of enduring value, forming a brilliant exposition of scientific Communism and treating the whole of modern science from the Marxian materialistic point of view; whilst in its treatment of practical questions, arising from the social revolution, it is as

valuable to us as a guide at the present day as it was when first written.

In the first place, it forms a searching investigation into the sources of historic materialism, and elucidates the dialectic method of investigation employed by himself and Marx, and gives it its rightful place in science and philosophy. It illustrates the dialectic principle of the growth of the new within the old, and, indeed, as a result of it, the new at a certain stage of development or maturity inevitably replaces the old—Engels illustrates this principle in the various physical, natural and biological sciences as well as in the realms of history, philosophy, and so forth.

“But for dialectics, which grasps things and their images, ideas, essentially in their interconnection, in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death, such processes as those mentioned above are so many corroborations of its own method of treatment. Nature is the test of dialectics.

“An exact representation of the universe, of its evolution and that of mankind, as well as of the reflection of this evolution in the human mind, can therefore only be built up in a dialectical way, taking constantly into account the general actions and reactions of becoming and ceasing to be, of progressive or retrogressive changes.” The dialectic is, as a matter of fact, nothing but “the science of the universal law of motion and evolution in nature, human society and thought.”

He castigates with all the scorn of which he is such a master those pseudo-Socialists [and we have them in our midst still] who would have us believe in and act according to “eternal laws of morality, truth and justice.” “We here call attention to the attempt to force a sort of moral dogmatism upon us as eternal, final, immutable, moral law, upon the pretext that the moral law is possessed of fixed principles which transcend history and the variations of

individual peoples. We affirm, on the contrary, that, so far, all ethical theory is, in the last instance, a testimony to the existence of certain economic conditions prevailing in any community at any particular time.

“And as society has hitherto moved in class antagonisms, morality was always a class morality; it has either justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or, as soon as the oppressed class has been powerful enough, it has represented the revolt against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed.” Or again, “If we have no better security for the revolution in the present methods of distribution of the products of labour with all their crying antagonisms of misery and luxury, of poverty and ostentation, than the consciousness that this method of distribution is unjust and that Justice must finally prevail, we should be in evil plight and would have to stay there a long time.

“In other words, it has come about that the productive forces of the modern capitalist mode of production, as well as the system of distribution based upon it, are in glaring contradiction to the mode of production itself, and to such a degree that a revolution in the modes of production and distribution must take place which will abolish all class differences, or the whole of modern society will fall. It is in these actual material facts, which are necessarily becoming more and more evident to the exploited proletariat, that the confidence in the victory of modern Socialism finds its foundation, and not in this or that bookworm's notions of justice and injustice.”

Refuting Dühring's arguments that the course of class subjection is to be sought in political conditions, and that political force is the primary and economic conditions merely the secondary cause of class distinctions, Engels shows how private property arose amongst primitive peoples, not by forcible robberies as a rule, but because of a limita-

tion of certain things in the early tribal communes—hence arises the necessity for exchange and the production of wares for exchange instead of for use.

The modes of distribution are also altered thereby, and there arise inequalities in the possessions by individuals. Primitive Communism persists for centuries in spite of external violent despotisms, but competition by the products of great industry kills it in a comparatively short time.

With regard to the bourgeois revolution, it put an end to all feudal fetters. "Not, however, by adjusting the economic order to suit the political conditions, in accordance with Herr Dühring's principle . . . but by doing the opposite, by casting aside the old mouldering political rubbish and creating political conditions in which the new 'economic order' could exist and develop. And in this political and legal atmosphere, which was suited to its needs, it developed brilliantly, so brilliantly that the bourgeoisie already almost occupies the position filled by the nobility in 1789: it is becoming more and more not only socially superfluous, but a social hindrance; it is more and more becoming separated from productive activity and becoming more and more, like the nobility in the past, a class merely drawing its revenues; and it has accomplished this revolution in its own position and the creation of a new class, the proletariat, without any hocus-pocus of force whatever, and in a purely economic way."

Perhaps the most attacked of the principles brought forward by Marx and Engels has been their materialist conception of history; for this reason it may not be out of place here to give the following very brief and simple exposition of this subject taken from the booklet entitled *Karl Marx: His Life and Teaching*, referred to above:

"Of course, it goes without saying that we do not mean by this conception that the individual of any given epoch is actuated by his own material gain to act as he does.

On the contrary, the materialist is the first to recognise the enthusiasm, ideals and aspirations of individuals.

“The philosophic materialists, those who accept Marx’s materialist conception of history most completely, are the very individuals who are most ready to sacrifice, and have sacrificed, their own material advantages for the sake of their ideals; witness as only one example the numberless Marxian Socialists in Russia who gave up and were daily prepared to give up their all, including their lives, for the cause dearest to their hearts, the social revolution.

“What distinguishes the materialist is not that he is a man without ideals, and denies the possession of these to other men, but that he probes deeper into the reality of things and enquires whence come these ideals and enthusiasms—why these particular ideals and morals and thoughts at this particular epoch?

“Why for instance do we now shudder with horror at the idea of cannibalism, of slavery, even of serfdom, whereas we accept without demur the hidden form of slavery—wage-slavery—existing at the present time? Simply because when the productive forces of society were small and primitive, the prisoner of war or the stranger caught trespassing could serve no more useful purpose than that of a meal for his conqueror—to keep him would only have meant a burden for society; and, for a very poor society, even an intolerable burden.

“The cannibal did not thus reason with himself, but unconsciously to himself, his ideas, his moral feelings, his whole psychology accepted the eating of his fellow-men as a natural, quite moral thing to do, because, without knowing it, it was the most natural thing to do under the conditions of the society in which he lived. Similarly with the custom of killing off female or weakly babies prevalent in some primitive societies who otherwise are extremely kind and tender to their children.

**Autonomous tariff powers.**

In 1920 a law<sup>4</sup> empowered the Executive to alter the tariff in view of the extraordinary conditions following the World War. Executive action under this authority had to be reported to the legislature.

This law was superseded by a new tariff law, effective since January 1, 1925,<sup>5</sup> which authorizes the Executive (1) to increase import duties without limit whenever required for the benefit of important Hungarian branches of production, and to reverse such action; (2) to suspend import duties on necessities of life during periods of scarcity; and (3) temporarily to reduce or remove import duties on necessary raw and auxiliary industrial materials produced in Hungary only in negligible proportion to the demand. The Executive needs only to report to the legislature all measures taken under those powers. The same law (art. 7) further authorizes the Minister of Finance under specified conditions to reduce or remove import duties on river vessels, machinery, and equipment. Various decrees issued under this law have given designated ministers the power to alter specified duties.<sup>6</sup> However, article 3 of the law expressly stated that the Executive might not utilize the tariff powers conferred in the law in order to put into force tariff provisions in commercial agreements.

**Tariff-agreement powers.**

Briefly stated, the Executive had legal authority, not used in practice, prior to 1925 to put into effect, without legislative approval, tariff concessions valid only through the current year; had no such authority from 1925 to July 1, 1931; and since then, except for the first semester of 1932, has had power to put into force tariff agreements valid for not over 3 years and terminable on not more than 6 months' notice. These variations are the result of three series of enabling measures concerning commercial agreements.

The first series, beginning in 1920, authorized the Executive to put into effect, subject only to report to the legislature, commercial agreements whose periods of validity did not extend beyond December 31 of the current year.<sup>7</sup> At that time the Danubian States were concerned with liberalizing the prohibitions on foreign trade originally introduced during the World War, and in general were not concluding tariff agreements. Moreover the time limitation in these enabling measures rendered their use impracticable for the putting into effect of tariff agreements.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Law XXII, art. 1 (Budapesti Közlöny, the official gazette, No. 208, September 4; and Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1920, p. 523). Specifically this provision authorized the Executive to make any changes in the Austro-Hungarian tariff law of 1907, which had been adopted by Hungary. Art. 2 sanctioned tariff changes already made by the Executive after August 7, 1919, when the present regime superseded the short-lived Communist Government.

The sources in Hungarian utilized in the preparation of this section were consulted by Mr. Leslie Lovass, an economist on the Tariff Commission's staff.

<sup>5</sup> Art. 2, law XXI of July 29, 1924, Országos Törvénytár—Corpus Juris—August 3, 1924; and Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1925, p. 134.

<sup>6</sup> See *Legislativer Informationsdienst* for examples.

<sup>7</sup> Law XXI, August 27, 1920 (Budapesti Közlöny, No. 203, September 4; and Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1921, p. 49); law XIII, February 24, 1923 (Budapesti Közlöny, No. 46, February 27; Handels-Archiv, 1923, p. 470); law I, February 7, 1924 (Országos Törvénytár, February 10; Handels-Archiv, 1924, p. 1252); and law II, April 2, 1925 (Országos Törvénytár, April 7; Handels-Archiv, 1925, p. 1345). It is understood that similar enabling measures (texts not available) were issued in 1921, 1922, and 1926.

<sup>8</sup> By inference, however, the powers conferred before 1925 could have been so used in theory, since the 1925 law contained a new article expressly stipulating that this law did not invalidate art. 3 of the new tariff law, which excluded the putting into force by executive action of tariff provisions in commercial agreements.

The enabling acts of the second series (1927-32)<sup>9</sup> were each valid for 2 years. They empowered the Executive to put into force, subject only to report to the legislature, commercial agreements with a nonterminable duration of not over 3 years and terminable on not longer than 6 months' notice, but excluded tariff concessions with the exception of those resulting automatically from the grant of most-favored-nation treatment. The law for 1931-32, however, was amended for the second semester of each of these 2 years by laws permitting the inclusion of new tariff concessions in agreements put into effect under its authority.<sup>10</sup>

The enabling acts of the third series (since 1933)<sup>11</sup> have been like those of the second series, except that they include (in art. 2) the amendment permitting tariff concessions.

#### Nontariff import controls.

Import-permit requirements were introduced in October 1930 for specified products of nonagreement countries, and were subsequently extended in scope as regards both commodities and countries, especially since the outbreak of the war. Foreign-exchange control was introduced in July 1931, and a system of charging premiums for foreign exchange in December 1932. In March 1940, a Foreign Trade Office was reorganized to exercise constant supervision over all foreign trade.

### ICELAND

Executive tariff powers in Iceland have been extremely limited.

The Executive<sup>12</sup> has had some powers to grant duty or surtax exemptions,<sup>13</sup> and to apply a surtax of 25 percent ad valorem, except on grains, if the pound sterling was worth 25 or more Icelandic crowns.<sup>14</sup>

A law of December 31, 1937,<sup>15</sup> effective January 1, 1938, levied a supplementary import duty of 11 percent of the existing rates on all regular import duties, and authorized the Executive to increase the supplementary duty to 12 percent of existing rates, if the Executive exercised a power granted by the same law to remove the import duty on salt and to refund to fishing steamers the duty levied on coal used for salt fishing. The Executive exercised these powers in the

<sup>9</sup> Law XV, June 1, 1927, for 1927 (effective retroactively from January 1) and 1928 (Országos Törvénytár, July 3; and Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1928, p. 1631); law XLV, December 29, 1928, for 1929-30 (Országos Törvénytár, December 31; Handels-Archiv, 1929, p. 434), and law XLVI, December 30, 1930, for 1931-32 (Országos Törvénytár, December 31; Handels-Archiv, 1931, p. 604).

<sup>10</sup> Law XIV of 1931 (Országos Törvénytár, July 1; and Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1931, p. 2137); and law XV, June 30, 1932 (Országos Törvénytár, July 1; Handels-Archiv, 1932, p. 1790). No tariff agreements were concluded in 1932 until June, and these were put into effect in July under law XV. In the period 1928-31, the legislature occasionally authorized the Executive to put into effect specific tariff agreements by decree prior to formal legislative ratification. (For example, see law XLVI of 1930, art. 3.)

<sup>11</sup> Law XX, December 30, 1932, for 1933-34 (Országos Törvénytár, December 31; Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1933, p. 421); law XXV, December 29, 1934, for 1935-36 (Országos Törvénytár, December 31; Handels-Archiv, 1937, p. 2901); and law XXXIV, December 23, 1936 (Országos Törvénytár, December 31; and Legislativer Informationsdienst, 13605/1519). It is probable that there is a similar law (text not available) for 1939-40.

<sup>12</sup> By an act of union of November 30, 1918, Iceland was recognized as a sovereign State, united with Denmark in a dual monarchy. The Executive is the King acting through a Cabinet of Icelandic ministers responsible to the Icelandic Legislature. After occupation of Denmark by Germany, Iceland dissolved the union with Denmark.

<sup>13</sup> Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1918, p. 268, and 1924, p. 1722.

<sup>14</sup> Law of March 27, 1924 (cited in Deutsches Handels-Archiv, 1924, p. 1722).

<sup>15</sup> Board of Trade Journal, January 27, 1938.

It is inevitable that the collectivism which is manifesting itself more and more daily in the domain of production should lead to the association of the workers engaged in this production, first for comparatively small economic gains, then more and more for political aims for the purpose of mastering production rather than being mastered by it. In short, it is inevitable that the capitalist psychology of the workers should change into Socialist psychology as the economic conditions become ripe for Socialism.

But the more we understand the need and necessity of this change, the more enthusiastically we work for ideals which we know to be in accordance with the historic development of society, the quicker will this change be brought about.

The materialist is, therefore, anything but a fatalist. He is simply logical and practical. Instead of being moved by mere sympathy to devise pretty schemes (as, for instance, did the Utopian Socialists) which may or may not be possible of realisation, he works in a direction which he *knows* must bear fruitful results.

Further, in choosing his methods, he again studies economic and historic conditions. Here he finds that what gives our capitalist society its characteristic form is the appropriation by the capitalist, without any equivalent return, of the surplus values created by the workers. There is thus a fundamental antagonism between the capitalists as a class and the workers as a class.

It is the working class which is most vitally interested in freeing itself from the enslavement of capital. It is, therefore, to the worker that the scientific Socialist chiefly appeals. Moreover, studying the conditions of present-day life, we see that the workers in their mass are those to whom Socialism will appeal most strongly. Compare the psychological effect their respective conditions of life are bound to have on the factory worker, the small peasant working

on his own bit of land, and the small shopkeeper or private tradesman. The peasant leads an isolated life; he has little means of intercourse with his fellow-beings; his ideas are likely to be narrow; he knows little of the great world and cares less. He is mastered by the forces of nature, depends on them and lives in awe of them, thus being a ready subject for the belief in the supernatural.

He gets his living by his own exertions on his own bit of land; the idea of association with his fellow-men can scarcely enter his mind. The idea of collectivism, of common ownership, at once conjures up to him the idea of losing his all, his plot of land on which his whole life depends. He would quite naturally not readily risk so much for what must seem to him a mere chimera. He is evidently not very suitable material for Socialist propaganda. (Of course, the case is different with the hired peasants on large farms where the land is being worked on capitalist lines.)

Now take the small shopkeeper. While his mind may be somewhat broadened by the fact that he lives a somewhat more social life than the peasant, nevertheless he is not ready material for the Socialist. The small property he possesses gives him a certain sense of a stake in the existing order of things. He is living in daily dread of being hurled into the working class, but, on the other hand, he is also living in hopes of increasing his property and thus lifting himself up to a higher social order. It is true he hates the large capitalist, but there is more envy than distrust in his feeling towards the latter. He may even rise up against him, but it will be for reactionary purposes, to stay further progress, and he will not go too far lest the horny-handed sons of toil also lay their grimy hands on *his* property.

That is why, as a class, the small bourgeoisie has always proved a treacherous ally of the working class. That, of

course, does not mean that individuals of this, or a higher class, may not join in the struggle for the emancipation of the workers, and may not by their greater opportunities and knowledge render great service to the movement, providing always that they quite declass themselves intellectually, *i.e.*, providing they adopt in their entirety the ideals of the class-conscious workers.

Lastly, let us take the factory worker. He has no private property\*; his attachment to it is therefore comparatively slight. Of course, he believes in it and stands in awe of it and wants some, and so on, but his attachment to it is not personal. The idea of a society without private property cannot appal him to the same extent that it does the others. He has none to lose himself, and he will therefore be more disposed to accept the possibility of a form of society where no one shall possess any. He is in daily intercourse with his fellow workers; his ideas have broadened. He is associated with his fellow workers in the production of things; the idea of producing things collectively seems a natural thing to him; the idea of owning these things collectively is but a step.

His employers associate for their common good—why should not the workers associate for *their* common good?—and they do so. In the factory and in town he is constantly brought face to face with wonderful human achievements, and sees how men have mastered the forces of nature. The supernatural, therefore, loses some of its terrors for him and he learns to rely on his own efforts.

Thus, apart from all the other influences at work, the extension of education, and so on, the aims and ideals of Socialism fall on fruitful ground when propagated among

\* The private property envisaged here is, of course, not one's individual personal possessions. It is only the private ownership of the means of production and exchange, that is, the sort of property which is used for the exploitation of other people's labour and for the extraction of private profit which we have in mind.

the workers. That is why the scientific Socialist says it is inevitable that the masses of the industrial workers must sooner or later embrace Socialism, and by carrying on his propaganda mainly, but of course not exclusively, among them he is doing all he can to bring about this change as rapidly as possible.

With the extension of the means of communication and the bringing of the countryside closer to the towns, the rural areas too will become and are becoming more and more amenable to Socialist teaching, but as has been shown in the U.S.S.R., for instance, although the peasantry was eventually won over to collectivist forms of working the land, it was far more difficult to convince them of the desirability of Socialist forms of production and labour on the land than it was to convince the urban worker of the need for the nationalisation and socialisation of the factories, mines, railways, etc.

## Chapter XVI

### AFTER SPLIT IN FIRST INTERNATIONAL AND DEATH OF MARX

AFTER the split in the International, brought about as a last straw by the Marx-Bakunin conflict, and the removal of its headquarters to New York, both Marx and Engels devoted themselves to their theoretical work, at the same time acting as advisers to the working-class and Socialist movements of Europe and America. Numerous letters, pamphlets and manifestos written by them since that time amply testify to the fact that no one who came to them with a sincere desire to learn went away empty-handed, or, perhaps we should say, empty-headed, after seeing them.

In 1883 Marx died, and the whole of this work fell on Engels' shoulders.

When Marx died, Engels was already sixty-three years of age, but, nevertheless, not only did he continue to defend with all his wonted vigour his and Marx's theories, not only did he continue to apply the materialistic conception of history to all the important questions of the day—writing numerous pamphlets and articles—but he continued his own philosophic and historical studies, acted as general adviser to the workers and Socialists of all nations, and last, and what he considered to be most important of all, and as a first duty, he worked on the completion of the work begun by Marx. Perhaps we cannot more vividly bring to the mind of the reader the life of Engels after the death of Marx than by quoting Engels' own description of it in his preface to the third volume of *Capital* in 1894. We shall see from it, too, how important was the contribution made by Engels to this great book.

“In the first place it was a weakness of my eyes which restricted my time of writing to a minimum for years, and which permits me even now only exceptionally to do any writing by artificial light.

“There were, furthermore, other labours which I could not refuse, such as new editions and translations of earlier works of Marx and myself, revisions, prefaces, supplements, which frequently required special study, etc. There was, above all, the English edition of the first volume of this work, for whose text I am ultimately responsible and which absorbed much of my time. Whoever has followed the colossal growth of international Socialist literature during the last ten years, especially the great number of translations of earlier works of Marx and myself, will agree with me in congratulating myself that there is but a limited number of languages in which I am able to assist a translator and which compel me to accede to the request for a revision.

“ This growth of literature, however, was but an evidence of a corresponding growth of the International Working-Class Movement itself. And this imposed new obligations on me. From the very first days of our public activity, a good deal of the work of negotiation between the national movements of Socialists and working people had fallen on the shoulders of Marx and myself. This movement increased to the extent that the movement, as a whole, gained in strength. Up to the time of his death, Marx had borne the brunt of this burden. But after that the ever-swelling amount of work had to be done by myself alone.

“ Meanwhile, the direct intercourse between the various national Labour parties has become the rule, and fortunately it is becoming more and more so. Nevertheless, my assistance is still in demand a good deal more than is agreeable to me in view of my theoretical studies. But if a man has been active in the movement for more than fifty years, as I have, he regards the work connected with it as a duty, which must not be shirked, but immediately fulfilled. In our stirring times, as in the 16th century, mere theorizers on public affairs are found only on the side of the reactionaries, and for this reason these gentlemen are not even theoretical scientists, but simply apologists of reaction.

“ The fact that I live in London implies that my intercourse with the parties is limited in winter to correspondence, while in summer time it largely takes place by personal interviews.

“ This fact, and the necessity of following the course of the movement in a steadily growing number of countries and a still more rapidly increasing number of party organs, compelled me to reserve matters which brooked no interruption for the winter months of the year.

“ When a man is past seventy, his brain's fibres of association work with a certain disagreeable slowness. He does not overcome interruptions of difficult theoretical problems

as easily and quickly as formerly. Thus it came about that the work of one winter, if it was not completed, had to be largely done over the following winter.

“And this took place particularly in the case of the most difficult section—the fifth.

“The reader will observe by the following statements that the work of editing the third was essentially different from that of the second volume. Nothing was available for the third volume but a first draft, and it was very incomplete.

“The beginnings of the various sections were, as a rule, pretty carefully elaborated, or even polished as to style. But the farther one proceeded, the more sketchy and incomplete was the analysis, the more excursions it contained into side issues whose proper place in the argument was left for later decision, the longer and more complex became the sentences in which the rising thoughts were deposited as they came. In several places the handwriting and the treatment of the matter clearly revealed the approach and gradual progress of those attacks of ill-health, due to overwork, which at first rendered original work more and more difficult for the author, and finally compelled him from time to time to stop work altogether.

“And no wonder. Between 1863 and 1867 Marx had not only completed the first draft of the last two volumes of *Capital*, and made the first volume ready for the printer, but had also mastered the enormous work connected with the foundation and expansion of the International Workingmen's Association. The result was the appearance of the first symptoms of that ill-health which is to blame for the fact that Marx did not himself put the finishing touches to the second and third volumes.”

## Chapter XVII

## "THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY"

IN the summer of 1884 Engels published his best-known book, *The Origin of the Family, of Private Property and the State*, and this is the last of his works with which we shall deal in any detail here.

With his characteristic modesty he opens his preface to the first edition thus: "The following chapters are, in a sense, the execution of a bequest. No less a man than Karl Marx had made it one of his future tasks to present the results of Morgan's researches in the light of the conclusions of his own—within certain limits, I may say our—materialistic examination of history, and thus to make clear their full significance. For Morgan in his own way had discovered afresh in America the materialist conception of history discovered by Marx forty years ago, and in his comparison of barbarism and civilisation it has led him, in the main points, to the same conclusions as Marx. And just as the professional economists in Germany were for years as busy in plagiarising *Capital* as they were persistent in attempting to kill it by silence, so Morgan's *Ancient Society* received precisely the same treatment from the spokesmen of 'prehistoric' science in England. My work can only provide a slight substitute for what my dead friend no longer had the time to do."

Needless to say, in this short booklet we cannot give any adequate résumé of this work, but in view of its interest and importance we shall attempt to give as much as space will permit.

By filling in the gaps in Morgan's investigation, by working on the rich material in *Ancient Society* on the development of the gens and the family, and by applying to it the

materialistic conception of history, Engels traces in this book the development of the family from the early group marriage through various stages corresponding with the economic development of society, to its present monogamic form.

Like every other existing institution of society hallowed by time and the convenience of the governing class, the present form of the family is looked upon as a divinely ordained institution, or as the most natural form of relation between the sexes without any relation to our particular form of society.

As a matter of fact, however, the family, like every other social institution, has had a long history, and has developed in accordance with the development of society and the growth of private property. The earliest form of the family corresponding to the state of savagery was that of group marriages.

As society progressed to the state of society known as barbarism, we have the pairing family, in which each man has a principal wife, and to the wife this man is her principal husband. The marriage of near relations was more and more prohibited, but so long as society was organised in the form of gentes, the family in the modern sense did not exist.

On the contrary, we have the communistic form of the household, in which most of or all the women belonged to one and the same gens, while the husbands came from various gentes. In these households the women naturally played a leading rôle and were anything but the slave of man. Thus, says Asher Wright, quoted by Engels: "Usually the female portion ruled the house. . . . The stores were in common; but woe to the luckless husband or lover who was too shiftless to do his share of the providing. No matter how many children, or whatever goods he might have in the house, he might at any time

be ordered to pick up his blanket and budge; and after such orders it would not be healthful for him to attempt to disobey. The house would be too hot for him; and . . . he must retreat to his own clan (*gens*); or, as was often done, go and start a new matrimonial alliance in some other. The women were the great power among the clans (*gentes*), as everywhere else. They did not hesitate, when occasion required, to 'knock off the horns,' as it was technically called, from the head of a chief and send him back to the ranks of the warriors."

But the growth of wealth and of private property changed all this.

How great a rôle the question of property already played in later gentile society, is shown for instance by the fact, amongst many others, that although, generally speaking, marriage was not allowed between the various members of the *gens*, an exception was made in the case of an orphan heiress, who was allowed to marry within the *gens*, so that her property might remain within it. However much the laws of inheritance might change, property still had to remain within the *gens*.

Speaking of the organisation of the *gens*, Engels says: "And a wonderful constitution it is, this gentile constitution, in all its childlike simplicity! No soldiers, no gendarmes and police, no nobles, kings, regents, prefects or judges, no prisons, no lawsuits—and everything takes its orderly course. All quarrels and disputes are settled by the whole community affected, by the *gens* or the tribe, or by the *gentes* among themselves; only as an extreme and exceptional measure is blood revenge threatened—and our capital punishment is nothing but blood revenge in a civilised form, with all the advantages and drawbacks of civilisation. Although there were many more matters to be settled in common than to-day—the household is maintained by a number of families in common, and is communistic, the

land belongs to the tribe, only the small gardens are allotted provisionally to the households—yet there is no need for even a trace of our complicated administrative apparatus with all its ramifications. The decisions are taken by those concerned, and in most cases everything has been already settled by the custom of centuries. There cannot be any poor or needy—the communal household and the gens know their responsibilities towards the old, the sick and those disabled in war. All are equal and free—the women included.”

But these gentile institutions were such only within the tribe. Tribe and tribe were enemies to one another, and as private property increased so at first the laws of inheritance changed, there developed paternal law and the inheritance of property by the father's children, thus giving greater power to particular families; and as the means of production developed; that is, as the methods of creating wealth required more and more labour, slavery came into vogue, and the family, first in the patriarchal form and then in the more private form of the present day, gained greater importance and the gens institution became weaker and weaker, until it gave rise to the primitive form of present-day society in which the possessing classes live on the exploitation of the dispossessed classes, whether the position of the latter in society is that of body slave, serf or wage slave.

In all these changes private property was the driving force, as Morgan says in speaking of the change of Grecian society from the gens organisation into that of political society. “Property was the element which was demanding the change. The development of municipal life and institutions, the aggregation of wealth in walled cities, and the great changes in the mode of life thereby produced, prepared the way for the overthrow of gentile institutions.”

## Chapter XVIII

## THE POSITION OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY

SIDE by side with this, the household, as a social institution or function, necessarily shrinks in importance, the social life of society is now in the new industries, and the man who has to occupy himself as heretofore with obtaining the means of subsistence, now becomes the owner of herds of animals, of the tools for tilling the soil, then, later, also of slaves, and thus, owing to the fact that the household is now no longer a social function, but purely a private one, the man begins to take the *first*, the woman the *second*, place in society.

At the same time, to insure the inheritance to his own children—since he knew them now—the man used his new power definitely to change the law of inheritance from the mother's to the father's side, thus further strengthening his position in the family and in society. The position of woman in society, as that of every class at a given epoch, thus has nothing to do with her alleged inferiority to man, but is due to the historical development in the modes of obtaining the means of subsistence and the growth of private property.

Speaking of the woman's question, Engels says: "Only by the great industries of our times was access to social production again opened to women. . . . This occurs in such wise as to exclude them from earning anything in public industries, if they fulfil their duties in the private service of the family; or that they are unable to attend to their family duties, if they wish to participate in public industries and earn a living independently. As in the factory, so women are situated in all business departments up to the medical and legal professions.

“The modern monogamous family is founded on the open or disguised domestic slavery of women, and modern society is a mass composed of molecules in the form of monogamous families. In the great majority of cases the man has to earn a living and to support his family; he thereby obtains a superior position that has no need of any legal special privilege. In the family he is the bourgeois; the woman represents the proletariat. . . . It will be seen that the emancipation of women is primarily dependent on the reintroduction of the whole female sex into the public industries. To accomplish this the monogamous family must cease to be the industrial unit of society. . . .

“We are now approaching a social revolution in which the old economic foundation of monogamy will disappear just as surely as those of its complement—prostitution. Monogamy arose through the concentration of considerable wealth in one hand—a man’s hand—and from the endeavour to bequeath this wealth to the children of this man to the exclusion of all others. This necessitated monogamy on the woman’s part, not on the man’s part. . . . Now, the impending social revolution will reduce this whole case of inheritance to a minimum by changing at least the overwhelming part of permanent and inheritable wealth—the means of production—into social property.”

As to the question whether monogamy will survive when the economic reason for its existence has disappeared, Engels, refusing to prophesy and to indulge in useless speculation, simply points out that prostitution must certainly disappear with the introduction of Communism, since there will no longer be any economic reason for it. If monogamy continues to exist for the woman, for the first time in history it will be equally compulsory for the man.

Whilst the private household of the present day, with all its wastefulness and pettiness, will certainly disappear, and children, whether legal or illegal, will receive more and

more care from the State, yet for the first time in history individual sex-love, which is supposed to form the basis of all marriages and of the monogamic family, will attain to that position in actual fact as well as in theory. Mutual love will then be the only real consideration which will force a couple to live together, and to be true to one another.

It is certainly no accident that this has been attained almost completely and in actual fact and not merely in theory in the U.S.S.R.—the first really Socialist country, the national economy of which is based on a social collectivist system.

As for how exactly the men and women of the future will regulate their lives, Engels says: "That will be decided after a new generation has come to maturity—a race of men who have never in their lives had occasion for buying with money or other economic means of power the surrender of a woman; a race of women who have never had any occasion for surrendering to any man for any other reason but love, or for refusing to surrender to their lover for fear of economic consequences. Once such people are in the world, they will not give a moment's thought to what we to-day believe should be their course. They will follow their own practice and fashion their own public opinion about the individual practice of every person—only this and nothing more."

Thus, whilst private ownership in wealth and the means of production, with its concomitant existence of classes and subjection of women, was a necessary result of the accumulation of wealth, it yet bears within itself the germs of its own destruction. Private property and class domination can no longer cope with the problems confronting it. The rise of the great towns, the massing together of large numbers of men in factory and workshop and forcing them to unite in defence of their interests, the recurrence of trade crises and unemployment, the production of

unheard-of luxuries side by side with the direst misery, the collective methods of production the owners of private property have themselves been forced to introduce—in short, all the facts of our modern industrial life have been digging and are rapidly completing the grave of private property in the means of production and exchange and the inevitable ultimate extinction of all class or sex domination.

But if we say that this is inevitable, it does not mean that we are to fold our hands and do nothing. All things in society are brought about by human beings, but the psychology of these human beings is moulded by the economic conditions of the time, and this psychology again reflects and exerts an influence in changing these economic conditions.

In pure self-defence, and partly unconsciously, the workers are compelled to carry on a constant class struggle. Some of them are led again by these economic conditions to see the real trend of this struggle, its necessary aim, the doing away with private property, and the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth, and finally Communism. The more consciously and vigorously we work for this aim, the sooner shall we do away with all class domination and bring the organisation of society into harmony with the present vast and still developing productive forces.

## Chapter XIX

### THE STATE

ENGELS traces the effect of the overthrow of the gens institutions in Greece, and shows how its members, without realising it, gradually lost control of their products, for when the producers no longer produce for their own consumption,

but for exchange, the products become commodities and their producers lose all control of them. The result of all this is production for exchange without any direct relation to the needs of society and the enslavement of the producers of the commodities by the owners of the means of production. With this came the tilling of the soil by individuals on their own account, and this was necessarily followed by the private ownership of land, and there arose a great landless class.

With the production of commodities came money, the general commodity for which all others could be exchanged, and this, in its turn, facilitated the growth of commodity production, circulation and exchange. This necessitated again new social and political forms; the gens had outgrown the new methods of production. It was no longer capable of maintaining order within society or of allowing the new productive forces to expand. Nor was it capable of regulating the new relations between debtor, creditor and all the intricacies of social organisation within a society based on commodity production and class domination. Hence arose the State.

In view of the fact, however, that the State as such is still so largely deified and looked upon as something quite permanent which we can at most only modify here and there to suit our purposes, it will be well to dwell a little longer on what Engels has to say on the subject of the State. Discussing the influence which was undermining gentile society in the Greece of heroic times, Engels shows how the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the paternal family, and the consequent laws of inheritance, raised the power of the family as against the gens and formed the rudiments of a hereditary nobility and monarchy. With the growth of the possibility of accumulating wealth came slavery, first only applying to prisoners of war, but soon embracing the poorer members of one's own tribe.

“In short,” says Engels, “wealth is praised and respected as the highest treasure, and the old gentile institutions are abused in order to justify the forcible robbery of wealth. Only one thing was missing: an institution that not only secured the newly acquired property of private individuals against the communistic traditions of the gens, that not only declared as sacred the formerly despised private property and represented the protection of this sacred property as the highest purpose of human society, but that also stamped the gradually developing new forms of acquiring property, of constantly increasing wealth with the universal sanction of society. An institution that lent the character of perpetuity not only to the newly rising division into classes, but also to the right of the possessing classes to exploit and rule the non-possessing classes. And this institution was found. The State arose.”

“Thus, in place of the free armed nation, spontaneously acknowledging its Elder as their military and civic chief, armed only for their defence against external foes, there arises the State which is a “product of society at a certain stage of its development. The State is tantamount to an acknowledgement that the given society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it has broken up into irreconcilable antagonisms, of which it cannot rid itself.” To keep the conflict of these antagonisms or classes within certain limits some force standing seemingly above society, but really expressing the will and power of the governing class, becomes necessary. “And this force, arising from society, but placing itself above it—this force is the State.”

The State is distinguished first by “the grouping of the subjects of the State according to territorial divisions” (the tribal or clan organisation was independent of territory), secondly, by the existence of “a public power no longer identical with the whole population and which is organised

as an armed force," consisting "not only of armed men, but also of material additions in the shape of prisons and repressive institutions of all kinds which were unknown in the gentile (clan) form of society."

Engels traces the various forms through which the State has passed, and shows that in "most historical States the rights of the citizens are differentiated according to their wealth. This is a direct confirmation of the fact that the State is organised for the protection of the possessing against the non-possessing classes." Engels further shows how class morality and class ideals permeate the whole of our modern State institutions, and how, with the emancipation of the working class the whole of the modern State machinery will have to be scrapped.

"The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purpose," says Engels, in his preface to the 1888 edition of the *Communist Manifesto*. No, they must break it up, for the triumph of the working class means the end of class rule and the class State. This, of course, does not mean the abolition of representative institutions. On the contrary, it means their real establishment and the abolition of institutions which *misrepresent* the workers. It means the abolition of bureaucracy. It means the setting up of bodies composed of direct representatives of the workers elected for very short periods and subject to recall at any time should they act contrary to the wishes of their electors; these representative bodies not forming a privileged section of the community, their members receiving moderate salaries, placing them on the same footing as any other citizen of the country, and whilst making the laws at the instruction of their electors, they are themselves to carry out these laws, thus doing away with all bureaucracy and gradually with the incubus of permanent officialdom.

Finally, Engels sums up his teaching on the State and

our attitude towards it thus: "The State has not always existed. There have been societies without it that had no idea of the State or of State power. At a given stage of economic development which was, of necessity, bound up with the division of society into classes, the State became the inevitable result of this division. We are now rapidly approaching a stage of development in production in which the existence of classes has not only ceased to be a necessity, but is becoming a positive fetter on production. Hence these classes must fall as inevitably as they once inevitably arose. With the disappearance of classes, the State, too, must inevitably disappear. The society that will reorganise production on the basis of a free and equal association of producers will banish the whole State machine to the most suitable place for it: into the museum of antiquities by the side of the spinning-wheel and the bronze axe."

We shall give but one more passage dealing with this subject to illustrate Engels' views as to how the proletariat must deal with the State, namely, the one from *Anti-Dühring* we promised above:—

"The proletariat takes control of the State authority, and, first of all, converts the means of production into State property. But by this very act it destroys itself, as a proletariat, destroying as it does all class differences and class antagonisms and with this also the State. Past and present society, which moved amidst class antagonisms, had need of the State to enforce the will of the possessing classes on the exploited. . . . In ancient times it was the State of the slave-owners—the only citizens of the State; in the Middle Ages it was the State of the feudal nobility; in our own times it is the State of the capitalists. When, ultimately, the State really becomes the representative of the whole of society it will make itself superfluous. From the time when, together with class domination and the struggle for individual existence, resulting from the present anarchy in pro-

duction, those conflicts and excesses which arise from this struggle will all disappear, from that time there will be nobody to be oppressed; there will, therefore, be no need for any special form of oppression—no need for the State.

“The first act of the State, in which it really acts as the representative of the whole of Society—namely, the assumption of control over the means of production on behalf of society—is also its last independent act as a State. The interference of the authority of the State with social relations will cease of itself. The authority of the government over persons will be replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the processes of production. The State will not be ‘abolished,’ it will wither away.”

Thus, in gaining power, the working class, organising itself as a ruling class by means of the dictatorship of the proletariat, breaks up and scraps the present State machinery, setting up in its place a *sort* of State which is no longer a State in the present sense of the word, for by the very assumption of power the working class does away with all classes in society. This *sort* of State continues to function throughout the transition period towards complete Communism, using at the same time every means at its disposal, armed forces where necessary, etc., to do away with the remnants of class antagonisms and the resistance of the overthrown classes.

As, however, the working class—or rather, it would be more correct now to say the workers’ Republic—becomes consolidated and the remnants of the bourgeoisie and aristocracy disappear, as the Republic becomes more and more a purely workers’ Republic with no exploited or oppressed classes, so this *sort* of transition State withers away, and its place is taken by an elected executive body organising the affairs of the whole society; and for the first time since primitive Communism, and in a far more perfect form,

carrying out the will and representing the whole of society and not one particular group or class.

And how far this analysis and prognostication of Engels is correct and to the point has been shown particularly by the experience of the Russian Revolution. Before it could become effective, before the working class could gain control, they had to break up, to scrap the whole capitalist form of the State. Even this cannot be done overnight, of course, but it is useless to try and simply modify it so long as the capitalist class is in absolute control. And one reason why the various attempts at revolution in European countries in 1918 onwards failed was precisely because they attempted to tinker with the capitalist State instead of setting up their own transition State based on all power in the hands of the workers by hand and brain.

How the opportunists of the Second International have distorted this teaching of Marx and Engels will be found excellently explained in Lenin's *The State and Revolution*.

## Chapter XX

### THE NATURE OF THE PROLETARIAN TRANSITION STATE

IN view of the history of the world during the past twenty-five years it is of special importance to make some analysis of the most natural form of this *sort* of transition State of the proletariat, basing ourselves, of course, as we do throughout, on the materialist conception of history. Because the present State is based on territory and the election to the State organs are territorial, it does not, of course, follow that the transition State set up by the dictatorship of the

proletariat need necessarily also be based on the present or similar electoral division.

On the contrary, since it will be a *workers'* Republic, the most natural unit is the factory and workshop, or other place of work or union of similar workers—whether these be State, literary or skilled or unskilled manual workers. But this will exclude all the non-workers who can live on the wealth they have saved from the hands of the revolution or who can live on the proceeds of illegitimate secret trade and so forth! Naturally! In a real workers' Republic there is, and should be, no room for parasitic elements.

Marx and Engels, and the whole of history, have taught us that there are no such things as abstract moral truths or ethical rules that hold for all times. What might seem to be a universal rule of conduct or absolute truth in reality receives a particular interpretation in different ages even though we may use the almost identical words, but if there is a maxim, the justice of which would appeal in the abstract to all, in the concrete to the working class, certainly it is that "he who will not work (when able to do so by brain or hand) neither shall he eat." In any case, this is a maxim which is bound to, and rightly will, receive its full due and application in a Communist society, and the first stage in the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth is therefore to make *work* of all able-bodied and able-brained adults the test of citizenship.

Territory, possessions were the characteristic tests of citizenship of the feudal and capitalist eras. It was, therefore, no wanton denial of rights or hatred towards an enemy, but sure instinct of the needs of the new society which caused our Russian comrades, and the Paris Commune (to a more limited extent, because of the different conditions) before it, to scrap the whole of the old State machinery, with its own peculiar methods and forms of elections and modes of work, and introduce in its place

institutions really representative of the workers as distinct from bourgeois or parasitic interests, namely, the Soviets or Councils of Workers, which, in their essence, cannot be other than democratic, in which every citizen of the workers' Republic has equal opportunity and equal right to exercise all his duties and privileges of citizenship.

There is yet another reason why the Soviet or Workers' Councils system is the one most peculiarly adapted to the workers' Republic in its transition state towards complete Communism. Particular circumstances induce in all of us corresponding modes of thought and feelings.

Thus the manufacturer or trader, for instance, has a dual personality. As a manufacturer, it is his interest and his aim to get as high a price as possible for his wares, but as a consumer he quite as naturally grumbles at high prices, at the high cost of living.

So, too, the shopkeeper, as such, will be interested in the improvement of his district, roads, means of communication and so forth, for it improves his business, but as a ratepayer he constantly grumbles at the increase in rates.

So the worker, when he votes as a resident of a district, will vote largely as a citizen of the bourgeois democracy to which he has been accustomed all his life. The social standing, wealth, charitable propensities and so forth of the particular candidate has considerable effect upon him. But when he votes in his union or workshop, he votes surrounded by the actual facts of his existence. He will then be less prone to be influenced by outside factors. When confronted by national and international questions he will view them in the first instance from the point of view of his life as a worker, and will thus reflect more truly the interests of himself and his fellow workers.

This is another reason why it is so important to be clear from the first on this point. Why in any proletarian revolution the first step must be as Marx and Engels have said

repeatedly, to break up, to scrap the bourgeois State machinery—the degree of force used to do this will depend not on the desire of the revolutionary working class, but simply and solely on the degree of resistance of the governing classes—and to set up in its place a purely proletarian transition State.

Of course, the transition State itself passes through various forms. This is very well illustrated by the evolution of the State in the U.S.S.R.

In the very early days the Soviet State was based almost exclusively on the dictatorship of the proletariat. In view of the political and cultural backwardness of the peasantry in 1918, the first Soviet Constitution, as well as the subsequent 1923-25 Constitutions of the U.S.S.R., gave the workers greater representation—it was then definitely a dictatorship of the proletariat—as they had played a predominant part in the organisation of the revolution and the consolidation of its gains.

But when the political consciousness and cultural level of the peasants had been raised by the collective system of agriculture, and the spread of education in the villages, to a level approaching that of the workers, the peasants attained political equality with the workers. In the Stalin Constitution of 1936, Article 3 lays down: "All power in U.S.S.R. belongs to the toilers of the town and village in the form of Soviets of Toilers' Deputies." Toilers here mean all who work by hand and brain.

Moreover, so long as there was still any doubt as to "who would conquer whom" [Lenin's phrase], so long was State power guarded jealously from those who might be expected to be hostile to the Soviet regime—the class alien elements (the bourgeoisie and their hangers-on, the Kulaks, etc.), as they were called. By 1936, however, although undoubtedly there still were such elements in the towns and villages of the U.S.S.R., their number was

already comparatively small, and they could therefore safely be given an opportunity to enter into the new life by being accorded the rights of full Soviet citizenship.

The equality of rights of the sexes, races and nationalities of the U.S.S.R. was, of course, recognised by the Soviets from the very first.

The electoral system has also undergone a change—the only change which concerns us here is the re-adoption of the territorial unit for election purposes. When the workers were still struggling to maintain and consolidate their supremacy it was undoubtedly important psychologically for the electors to vote as definite sections of workers, etc., and for the local deputy to be clearly identified with these groups. When, however, the whole population had become toilers with equal rights there was no longer any special need to organise elections on an occupational basis, and the territorial electoral unit was found to be more convenient.

In general, the differences between the early Soviet Constitutions and the 1936 Stalin Constitution reflect the progress of the U.S.S.R. towards a completely classless society. This does not signify the elimination of all differences in earnings, modes of life, etc., of different *sections* of Soviet society, but it does mean the elimination of class distinctions, of the *domination* of one class over other classes.

As to the future, we may say what Engels said regarding the sex relations of the future men and women—when a race of men and women have grown up to whom the idea of parasitic, exploiting elements in society is absolutely foreign—men and women who will regard the performance of some useful work for the good of Socialism and then of society as a first duty and who will look upon the enjoyment of all the best that life can offer, of all the joys of nature, science and art as the inalienable right of every human being, such men and women will know how to

order their lives in accordance with their principles—we, however, are only concerned with the building up of the first stage of Communism upon the ruins of the capitalist State and from the materials now at our hand.

## Chapter XXI

### LAST YEARS

IN 1888 Engels published his book on *Feuerbach*, in which, with his customary clear logic, he annihilates the later Hegelian philosophy of which Feuerbach was a leading exponent. He then goes on to explain in clear, concise language the materialistic conception of history as worked out by Marx and himself. As we have already dealt with this subject, we shall not stop here to examine this book any further.

Almost to a few weeks before his death, Engels kept his freshness for work. Only a few months before his death he was still planning new labours for himself or the re-editing of some of Marx's works and the writing of introductions to them. The last work he completed was the introduction to Marx's *The Class Struggles in France from 1848-50*. This work he wrote only five months before his death, but it is characterised by all the vigour, logic and merciless criticism of which he was always such a master. In it Engels gives a short but comprehensive survey of European history from 1850 to 1895.

Like Marx, Engels was not much of a public speaker. His last public appearances were in 1893, at the Congress of Zürich. Also at Vienna and Berlin.

In March, 1895, he developed cancer of the throat, and

on August 6 of the same year he died of this disease. He had requested that he should be cremated and his ashes thrown into the sea. This last sad service was performed by some of his best friends, amongst them Eleanor Marx, who travelled to his favourite seaside resort, Eastbourne, August 27, hired a boat and threw his ashes into the sea.

## Chapter XXII

### FAILURE OF SECOND INTERNATIONAL

ALL his life Engels had been an incurable optimist and ever saw the imminence of the revolution. This is seen throughout his letters to Sorge in the latter years of his life. In 1895, the year of his death, he wrote enthusiastically of the progress made by the Socialist parties of all countries and of his hopes of the International.

From its first foundation Engels had hoped very great things from the Second International. And he had reason to do so at the time.

One could not have foreseen then that all its fine international sentiments and phrases would fall together like a pack of cards on the first war cry of the capitalist masters of the world. The Second International fell on the outbreak of war in 1914, because it had outlived its time. It had grown to be a body of comfortable representatives of, on the whole, safe and comfortable Socialist movements. It represented very largely a parlour Socialism which had become fairly respectable.

The First International had fallen because the Socialist parties of which it had been composed had outgrown their then narrow international connection and required a period

to develop nationally before they could again unite into a fuller international organisation: the First International fell because its sections were not yet sufficiently developed nationally. The Second International fell largely because it represented, in the main, Socialist parties which had no clear conceptions of the evolution of society and of the methods of attaining their goal, and which to a large extent were content to play the role, in Miliukov's words, of "His Majesty's opposition and not in opposition to His Majesty." They were not waging an active life and death struggle with the capitalist order of society.

A friend of the writer of this book, an old Russian exile, and, theoretically, a good Marxian to wit, once told her in confidence (as the friend in question is now dead—luckily he died *after* the outbreak of revolution in Russia, and lived to go back to his native country and to see it with his own eyes—there can be no objection to mentioning what he said now) that although he worked in the movement, although he did all he could by pen and mouth to advance Socialism, in his heart of hearts he had little faith in the realisation of Socialism within measurable distance. He worked as he did more out of habit and because he could not bring himself to avow his feelings to his Socialist friends. Now and again he was buoyed up by hope, but on the whole he had little faith.

At the time one could assume that this was an exception—that it was merely a mood brought on by pessimism due to the miserable economic position of the friend in question—for the life of a poor Russian exile in London or America was no sweet one. But we can now see that in reality this was no exception, that what this man, in a moment of deep depression, brought himself to avow to a particular friend, was what a large section of the Second International consciously or unconsciously felt. The movement had outgrown the revolutionary ardour of its youth.

The members of the Second International Socialist Bureau, more successful materially than this comrade, continued to *talk* about revolution, but in their heart of hearts they did not believe in it.

At most they thought it might perhaps come in a few centuries. In the meantime it was pleasant to meet similar Socialists of other countries, and, whilst expressing loud international sentiments, they yet kept a very warm corner of their hearts for their own capitalist Fatherland, and placed the interests of the latter far above those of international Socialism. The little faith in their own ideals was shown up even more vividly in the attitude of most of the leaders of the Second International to the Soviet revolution.

Here was a revolution in action. The working class of Russia had risen and were sweeping away the capitalist State, they were trying to bring about a classless Socialist State of which we had all been dreaming for so long. They were doing this under conditions of the utmost difficulty, in a country ruined by the ravages of war and in opposition to their own ruling classes; they were also beset by the armed forces of foreign countries. Surely it was the duty of the Socialists of other countries to give every possible support to the Soviet revolution.

The Socialists of other countries could have been excused if at first they doubted whether the Bolsheviks had chosen the right moment or right method of realising their aims—but when once the fight was on, when once the workers were on one side of the barricade and the owning classes, on the other, then there should no longer have been any room for doubt as to which side Socialists should support.

It would be well to recall in this connection that whilst Marx was originally, before the event, against the Paris rising of 1871, because he did not think conditions were ripe for it, yet when once the step was taken, he and Engels threw aside all criticism, rallied to its side enthusiastically,

gave it every possible support and encouragement, and when it was over studied carefully all the lessons that could be derived from it.

This was felt instinctively by large sections of the Labour movement in Britain and other countries who did rally to the support of the Soviets, but many of the "Socialists" of the Second International were among the bitterest foes of the Soviet revolution.

## Chapter XXIII

### ENGELS—THE MAN

AND now in conclusion we must say a few more words as to Engels—the man. About his personal life we shall say little more. Whilst he, too, knew what it was to be in straitened circumstances, yet there were not in his life those terribly poignant, pathetic times of suffering which we know Marx and his family had to go through during their life of exile in London.

That he was a remarkably clear thinker, that he had a most original mind, and that quality of taking infinite pains to study and thoroughly master every problem and subject which interested him—which appertains to every true genius—that we have already seen above.

In addition to his knowledge of history and philosophy, he made a searching study of the natural sciences, of military science and of comparative philology. Like Marx, he was a good linguist. He knew ten languages, and at the age of seventy he learnt Norwegian so as to read Ibsen in the original. His personal appearance is described thus by Lessner, who knew him well. "Engels' personal appear-

ance was quite different from that of Marx. Engels was tall and slender, his movements quick and impulsive, his language short and to the point, his bearing erect and with a soldierly effect. He was of a lively nature with an effective wit, and everyone who came into contact with him could feel at once that he had to deal with an unusually intellectual man."

This description is borne out by a letter of Mrs. Marx to Sorge, written January 21, 1877, in which, after telling him all the latest news of her daughters and their families, and so forth, she also speaks about Engels: "Our friend Engels is getting on as well as ever. He is always in good health, fresh, lively, and in good spirits, and he has a great relish for his beer, especially if it is Viennese."

That he was often wrong in his judgment of men, that he had no patience with anyone whom he suspected of the least intellectual dishonesty, or of dilettantism, that he was not as polite, as tolerant, or, as the Germans would call it, as "höflich," to those for whom he had no regard, of that we can have little doubt; nevertheless the strictures passed on him by Hyndman in his memoirs are quite undeserved.

That Engels' estimate of Hyndman personally was perhaps too harsh, we readily admit. Both Engels' and Marx's judgment on Lassalle and others was also far from accurate always, but after all we cannot say that Engels was so far wrong when he said of the Social Democratic Federation that it had made a dogma of Marxism which it wished to force down the throats of the workers, that its leaders were trying to make a sect of the party instead of making it a real labour movement—that it was better to have a real proletarian movement, although it may at times make grievous mistakes, than to be a sect which hugs correct theories but knows not how to apply them, and, therefore, does nothing, and so comes "from nothing through nothing to nothing."

We can now see that had the early leaders of the S.D.F. not held the party outside the labour movement, had the party been allowed to work with and through it, both the party and the movement would have gained immensely thereby.

Mehring tells us that Engels himself once said that in England Hyndman and the men of the S.D.F. understood the Marxian theory the best. What Engels attacked was their inept application of the theory.

Hyndman and many other leaders of the S.D.F. failed to understand that Marxism is above all a *method* wherewith to unravel the mysteries of the past and to find solutions for the problems of the present and near future. It is precisely because Lenin, Stalin and their comrades understood this so well and were such masters in the application of the Marxist method to the numerous intricate problems which beset them that they succeeded so brilliantly in converting Russia from a chaotic, economically backward empire, peopled by masses of uncultured, illiterate natives, to a first-class multi-national Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in which illiteracy is a thing of the past, in which every nationality has an equal opportunity of developing its own national culture, and whose economic, cultural and military achievements have won the unwilling admiration of even its quondam bitterest opponents.

From a different point of view, and with quite equal justice, he attacked the leaders of the Fabians, with their mortal fear of revolution, and of the Independent Labour Party. But throughout he had faith in the rank and file of both the S.D.F. and the I.L.P., and of the labour movement in general. And on the whole his faith has not proved to have been misplaced. In Engels, as in Marx, there was no trace of the philistine. Engels could be, and was, exceedingly friendly and considerate to his friends, but to an opponent or what he considered to be a false friend, an

enemy to the cause he had at heart, he could be merciless and even rude.

His relations with Marx were throughout life of a most affectionate and sincere nature. To this not only their interchange of letters testify, but also the way in which Mrs. Marx and her daughter Eleanor refer to him. It is interesting to note that before Marx's second daughter Laura would consent to a formal engagement with Lafargue, so Marx wrote, she insisted on having Engels' consent to it. So again later on when Marx was anxious about Lissagaray's attachment to his youngest daughter Eleanor it is with Engels he talks matters over. He was a real intimate of the whole family, and there can be no doubt that what Hyndman says in his memoirs his wife told him of Mrs. Marx having said about Engels must have been due to some misapprehension on Mrs. Hyndman's part. It surely speaks volumes for the characters of both men that during the stress and storm of their forty years' friendship, through success and disappointment, and they had many, no shadow of discord came between them, never did their friendship flag except on the one occasion mentioned above, which was due to a misunderstanding.

Already in 1845, when Engels heard that Marx had been expelled from Paris, he at once opened up a subscription for him "in order," he wrote, "that the extra cost occasioned thereby should be shared by all of us communistically." And later he says: "As I do not know whether this (the money collected) will suffice for your settling down in Brussels, it goes without saying that my honorarium for my first English thing (*The Condition of the Working Classes in England*), which I hope very soon to get at least in part, and which for the moment I can do without, will be placed, with the greatest pleasure, entirely at your disposal. The hounds shall not at least have the pleasure of causing you pecuniary embarrassment through their infamy." And, as

we have seen above, he was ever afterwards always ready to help Marx in every way.

During the last illness of Marx's wife, and later that of his daughter Jenny, Engels was not only all sympathy in words, but did all he could practically to mitigate their suffering. When Marx had gone to Paris with his wife on her last visit to her daughters, he writes to Marx telling him to let him know if he needs anything—not to hesitate in the least about naming whatever sum of money he may need. "Your wife must be denied nothing. Whatever she wants, or whatever any of you think may cause her pleasure, that she must have," he writes—July 29, 1881.

Lessner bears testimony to the fact that Engels was always ready to help anyone who came to him in need. Perhaps, however, no better testimony to his generosity can be adduced than the truly remarkable way in which both during Marx's lifetime and after his death Engels always belittled his own share of their joint work, and gave Marx credit for all that was best and most profound in it. The quotations given above already prove this. At other times he said: "Marx stood higher, saw farther, observed more, and comprehended more rapidly than any of us." He maintained that what he (Engels) had discovered Marx would in any case have discovered without him.

But, after all, this does not detract in the least from his own merit, and as Mehring well says: "History has to do with what *was*, not with what might have been." If Marx was the greater genius, Engels undoubtedly runs him a very close second, and is almost absurdly modest about it.

But Engels always was very modest. Thus, regarding the congratulations on his seventieth birthday, he writes: "I wish it were all over. I am not in the least in a birthday humour . . . and, after all, I am only just the one who is gathering in the harvest of Marx's fame."

In 1893 he made a journey through Germany, Switzer-

land and Austria. Naturally, as the veteran founder, leader and guide of a movement that was gaining strength every day, he was accorded a very warm and noisy welcome. In a letter dated October 7, 1893, this, however, is what he says about it: "This was, indeed, all very nice of the people, but it is not the thing for me. I am glad it is over, and next time I shall demand a written pledge that there will be no need for me to parade before the public, but that I travel as a private person under private circumstances. I was and am amazed at the magnitude of the welcome prepared for me wherever I went, but I had rather leave this sort of thing to the parliamentarians and people's tribunes to whose rôle this sort of thing belongs—but for my work this is hardly the thing."

But he was, of course, delighted with the splendid progress made by the movement in Germany and Austria during the seventeen years of his absence.

Perhaps we cannot better conclude this short sketch of Engels' life and work than by reproducing the quotation by Lessner of the words of Julian Harney, one of the finest of the Chartist leaders, and at one time editor of the Chartist organ, the *Northern Star*:—

"I have known him, he was my friend and occasional contributor for many years. It was in 1843, when he came from Bradford to Leeds and inquired after me at the office of the *Northern Star*. . . . I found a tall, stately young man, with an almost boyish face; his English was already at that time—in spite of his German birth and education—without fault. He told me he was a constant reader of the *Northern Star*, and with the greatest interest had followed the Chartist movement. And so commenced our friendship thirty-two years ago. Engels, with all his work and troubles, always found time to remember his friends, to give advice, to help where required. His vast knowledge and influence never made him proud; on the contrary, with

fifty-five years, he was just as modest and ready to acknowledge the work of others as when he was twenty-two. He was extremely hospitable, full of fun, and his fun was contagious. He was the soul of an entertainment, and managed admirably to make his guests comfortable, who at that time were mostly Owenites, Chartists, Trade Unionists and Socialists."

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN  
AT THE CHAPEL RIVER PRESS  
ANDOVER, HANTS  
9.45