



Workers of All Countries, Unite!



Karl Marx



F. Engels

**KARL MARX
AND
FREDERICK ENGELS**

**ARTICLES
ON BRITAIN**



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW 1975

Н. МАРКС и Ф. ЭНГЕЛЬС

СТАТЬИ ОБ АНГЛИИ

На английском языке

First printing 1971

Second printing 1975

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

МЭ $\frac{10101-156}{014(01)-75}$ без объявл.

CONTENTS

FREDERICK ENGELS. THE POSITION OF ENGLAND. <i>The Eighteenth Century</i>	9
FREDERICK ENGELS. THE POSITION OF ENGLAND. <i>The British Constitution</i>	32
FREDERICK ENGELS. [THE COMMERCIAL CRISIS IN ENGLAND.—THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT.—IRELAND] . . .	<u>59</u>
FREDERICK ENGELS. THE MASTERS AND THE WORKERS IN ENGLAND. <i>To the Worker Editors of L'Atelier</i>	62
FREDERICK ENGELS. [THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT] . . .	65
FREDERICK ENGELS. [THE COERCION BILL FOR IRELAND AND THE CHARTISTS]	<u>68</u>
FREDERICK ENGELS. FEARGUS O'CONNOR AND THE IRISH PEOPLE	<u>71</u>
KARL MARX. SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF FREE TRADE. <i>Delivered to the Democratic Association of Brussels at Its Public Meeting of January 9, 1848</i>	74
KARL MARX. A REVIEW OF GUIZOT'S BOOK, <i>WHY HAS THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION BEEN SUCCESSFUL?</i> . . .	89
FREDERICK ENGELS. THE ENGLISH TEN HOURS BILL . .	96
KARL MARX. THE ELECTIONS IN ENGLAND.—TORIES AND WHIGS	109
KARL MARX. THE CHARTISTS	116
KARL MARX. CORRUPTION AT ELECTIONS	125
KARL MARX. POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE COMMERCIAL EXCITEMENT	132
KARL MARX. [ATTEMPTS TO FORM A NEW OPPOSITION PARTY]	137

KARL MARX. THE DUCHESS OF SUTHERLAND AND SLAVERY	142
KARL MARX. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	149
KARL MARX. PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.—THE CLERGY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE TEN-HOUR DAY.— STARVATION	153
KARL MARX. FORCED EMIGRATION	160
KARL MARX. THE BRITISH RULE IN INDIA	165
KARL MARX. THE EAST INDIA COMPANY—ITS HISTORY AND RESULTS	172
KARL MARX. IRISH TENANT RIGHT	182
KARL MARX. [THE LABOUR MOVEMENT IN BRITAIN]	188
KARL MARX. THE FUTURE RESULTS OF THE BRITISH RULE IN INDIA	195
KARL MARX. LORD PALMERSTON. <i>First Article</i>	202
KARL MARX. THE LABOUR QUESTION	210
KARL MARX. LETTER TO THE LABOUR PARLIAMENT	214
KARL MARX. THE ENGLISH MIDDLE CLASS	216
KARL MARX. THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION	219
KARL MARX. THE CRISIS IN ENGLAND	223
KARL MARX. A MEETING	227
KARL MARX. THE ASSOCIATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM.—[PEOPLE'S CHARTER]	231
KARL MARX. ANTI-CHURCH MOVEMENT.—[DEMONSTRA- TION IN HYDE PARK]	236
KARL MARX. LORD JOHN RUSSELL	243
KARL MARX. LORD JOHN RUSSELL	247
KARL MARX. SPEECH AT THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEOPLE'S PAPER. <i>Delivered in London, April 14, 1856</i>	260
KARL MARX. [ANGLO-PERSIAN WAR]	263
KARL MARX. THE ENGLISH ELECTION	266
FREDERICK ENGELS. PERSIA AND CHINA	272

KARL MARX. THE REVOLT IN THE INDIAN ARMY . . .	279
KARL MARX. From THE INDIAN QUESTION	283
KARL MARX. [BRITISH INCOMES IN INDIA]	288
KARL MARX. [POLITICAL PARTIES IN ENGLAND] . . .	293
KARL MARX. THE INDIAN BILL	295
KARL MARX. THE OPIUM TRADE	300
KARL MARX. <i>From</i> POLITICAL REVIEW	304
KARL MARX. THE LONDON <i>TIMES</i> AND LORD PALMER- STON	307
KARL MARX. THE CRISIS IN ENGLAND	313
KARL MARX. THE OPINION OF THE NEWSPAPERS AND THE OPINION OF THE PEOPLE	318
KARL MARX. A PRO-AMERICAN MEETING	322
KARL MARX. ENGLISH PUBLIC OPINION	325
KARL MARX. A LONDON WORKERS' MEETING	331
KARL MARX. THE MOOD AGAINST INTERVENTION . . .	335
KARL MARX. INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE WORKING MEN'S INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION. <i>Established</i> <i>September 28, 1864 at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's</i> <i>Hall, Long Acre, London</i>	338
KARL MARX. THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND THE FENIAN PRISONERS	<u>348</u>
KARL MARX. <i>From</i> THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF FRENCH SWITZERLAND . .	353
FREDERICK ENGELS. LETTERS FROM LONDON. I [<i>Strike</i> <i>of English Farm Workers</i>]	358
FREDERICK ENGELS. LETTERS FROM LONDON. III. [<i>Meet-</i> <i>ing in Hyde Park</i>]	361
FREDERICK ENGELS. THE ENGLISH ELECTIONS	364
FREDERICK ENGELS. TRADES UNIONS	371
FREDERICK ENGELS. A WORKING MEN'S PARTY . . .	378
FREDERICK ENGELS. SOCIAL CLASSES—NECESSARY AND SUPERFLUOUS	382

<i>FREDERICK ENGELS. ENGLAND IN 1845 AND IN 1885 . . .</i>	386
<i>FREDERICK ENGELS. THE ABDICATION OF THE BOUR- GEOISIE</i>	393
<i>FREDERICK ENGELS. [ON THE LONDON DOCK STRIKE] . . .</i>	399
<i>FREDERICK ENGELS. MAY 4 IN LONDON</i>	400
<i>FREDERICK ENGELS. [ON CERTAIN PECULIARITIES IN ENGLAND'S ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DEVELOP- MENT]</i>	407
NOTES	409
NAME INDEX	443
LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL CHARACTERS	461
INDEX OF PERIODICALS	462

FREDERICK ENGELS

THE POSITION OF ENGLAND

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

On the surface it may appear that the century of revolution has passed England by, bringing few changes with it. Whereas on the Continent the whole of the old world was shattered, whereas a war that lasted twenty-five years cleared the air, everything remained calm in England, and neither Church nor State appeared to be threatened. And yet since the middle of the last century England has undergone a greater upheaval than any other country, an upheaval which has had consequences all the more far-reaching for being effected quietly and which is therefore more likely to achieve its goal in practice than the French political revolution or the German philosophical revolution. England's revolution is a social one and therefore more comprehensive and profound than any other. There is no sphere of human knowledge and there are no living conditions too remote to have contributed to this revolution or, on the other hand, to have been in some way affected by it. Social revolution is the only true revolution, to which political and philosophical revolution must lead; this social revolution has already been at work in England for seventy or eighty years and at this very moment is rapidly approaching its crisis.

The eighteenth century reassembled and gathered together mankind from out of the disunity and isolation into which it had been thrown by Christianity; it was the last but one

step on the way to self-knowledge and self-liberation for mankind, but being the last step but one meant that it was still one-sided, caught up in contradictions. The eighteenth century summarised the results of the history that preceded it, which had formerly appeared as isolated episodes and coincidences, and elaborated its necessity and inner logic. Countless haphazardly confused items of knowledge were ordered and systematised according to the causal connections between them. Knowledge became science, and the sciences were approaching their culmination, i.e., linking up with philosophy, on the one hand, and practical activity, on the other. Before the eighteenth century there had been no science; the cognition of nature assumed a scientific character only in the eighteenth century or, in isolated fields, a few years earlier. Newton founded the science of astronomy with the law of gravitation, the science of optics with the decomposition of light, the science of mathematics with the binomial theorem and the theory of the infinite and the science of mechanics with his cognition of the nature of forces. Physics also assumed a scientific character in the eighteenth century; chemistry was just coming into being thanks to the work of Black, Lavoisier and Priestley¹; geography was elevated to the level of a science as a result of the establishment of the shape of the earth and numerous expeditions, which only then were undertaken for genuinely scientific purposes; the same applies to natural history, as a result of the work carried out by Buffon and Linnaeus; even geology started gradually to emerge from the morass of fantastic hypotheses into which it had degenerated. The concept of the Encyclopaedia was characteristic of the eighteenth century; it stemmed from the awareness that all these sciences were interrelated although it was not in a position to correlate them and thus had to content itself with mere juxtaposition. The same is true of history; it is at this juncture that we first find voluminous treatises on world history, still lacking critical or any philosophical analysis, yet world history nonetheless, as opposed to fragmented history, confined to specific times and places. Politics acquired a human foundation and political economy was reformed by Adam Smith. The summit of eighteenth-century science was

materialism, the first system of natural philosophy and the result of that culmination of the natural sciences outlined above. The struggle against the abstract subjectivity of Christianity led the philosophy of the eighteenth century to the opposite bias; objectivity was opposed to subjectivity, nature to the spirit, materialism to spiritualism, substance or the abstract general to the abstract particular. The eighteenth century saw the resurgence of the classical ethos as opposed to the Christian one; materialism and the republic, the philosophy and politics of the ancient world, came into their own once more and the French, who stood for the classical principle *within* Christendom, for a time assumed the historical initiative.

The eighteenth century thus failed to resolve the great contradiction, which had, from the outset, preoccupied historians, and the development of which constitutes the fabric of history, the contradiction between substance and subject, nature and spirit, necessity and freedom; yet it did delineate the two sides of this contradiction quite clearly and in the entirety of their evolution, and thereby made its elimination necessary. The result of this final, unmistakable evolution of the contradiction has been the universal revolution spread over various nations, the imminent culmination of which will also bring about the resolution of the contradiction inherent in history so far. The Germans, the Christian-spiritual people, experienced a philosophical revolution; the French, the classical materialist and hence political people, were destined to enact a political revolution; the English, whose national character is a mixture of German and French elements, and who thus embrace both aspects of the contradiction and therefore are of a more universal bent than either of the other two, have been drawn into a more universal, social revolution. This point requires more detailed exposition since the place of the various nations, at least as regards the recent period, has so far been treated very scantily in our philosophy of history or, to be more exact, not at all.

The assumption that Germany, France and England are the three leading countries of the present historical period will, I think, not be disputed; the fact that the Germans stand for the Christian-spiritual principle, the French for

the classical-materialist one or, alternatively, that the former stand for religion and the church and the latter for politics and the state is equally evident, or will become so in due course. The significance of the English in modern history is less conspicuous, but for our present purpose particularly important. The English nation was formed from Germanic and Romance elements at a time when the two nations had only just separated and their evolution in the direction of two contradictory principles had hardly begun. The Germanic and Romance elements evolved side by side, finally forming a nation which embraces within itself both unreconciled, contradictory principles. German idealism retained such free scope that it was even possible for it to be converted into its opposite—abstract extroversion; the fact that wives and children can still legally be sold in England, and the Englishman's mercantilism in general, can definitely be put down to the Germanic element. Meanwhile Romance materialism was converted into abstract idealism, introversion, religiosity—hence the persistence of Roman Catholicism *within* German Protestantism, the Established Church, the papacy of the princes and the thoroughly Catholic manner in which religion is reduced to formalities. The character of the English nation is that of an unresolved contradiction, a combination of the starkest contrasts. The English are the most religious people in the world and at the same time the most irreligious; they concern themselves more with the next world than any other nation, and yet live their lives as if this world were the be-all and end-all; their hopes of heaven do not stop them in the slightest from believing in the "Hell where there's no money to earn". Hence the Englishman's constant inner anxiety, the awareness of his incapacity to resolve the contradiction, which drives him outside himself to activity. The awareness of the contradiction is the source of his energy, but a strictly self-releasing energy, and it is the source of colonisation, seafaring and industry and, in general, of the Englishman's tremendous practical activity. The incapacity to resolve the contradiction permeates the whole of English philosophy and impels it towards empiricism and scepticism. Because Bacon was unable with *his* reason to resolve the contradiction between idealism and realism,

reason in general had to be incapable of doing so, idealism rejected once and for all, and empiricism regarded as the only means of salvation. From this same source also stem criticism of man's cognitive faculty and the psychological school in general, in the framework of which English philosophy has moved from the very start. Finally, after all manner of vain attempts to resolve the contradiction, English philosophers declared the contradiction irresolvable and reason inadequate and started seeking salvation in religious beliefs or empiricism. Hume's scepticism today still provides the model for all irreligious philosophising in England. It argues that we cannot know if a God exists; if one exists, then all communication with us on his part is impossible and we have to arrange our practical activity as if no God existed. We cannot know whether the soul is separate from the body and immortal; therefore we live our lives as if this life were our only one and do not concern ourselves with things which are beyond our comprehension. In short, this scepticism in practice is precisely the same as French materialism, but in metaphysical theory it remains incapable of reaching a definite decision.

Because the English carried within themselves both the elements, which moulded the course of history on the Continent, they were in a position to keep pace with developments there and at times even overtake them, while having little to do with the Continent. The English revolution of the seventeenth century is nothing other than the prototype of the French revolution of 1789. It is easy to distinguish in the Long Parliament the three stages which in France were to take the form of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies and the National Convention; the transition from constitutional monarchy to democracy, military despotism, restoration and *juste-milieu* revolution stands out clearly in the English revolution. Cromwell is Robespierre and Napoleon in one; the Presbyterians, Independents and Levellers appear again as the Gironde, the Mountain, the Hébertists and Babouvists; in both cases political results are rather lamentable and this whole parallel, which could have been drawn in still more precise terms, demonstrates at the same time that religious and irreligious revolutions, in as far as they

remain political, finally amount to one and the *same thing*. Admittedly, this lead of England's over the Continent was only temporary and was gradually balanced out; the English revolution led to *juste-milieu* and the creation of the two national parties, while the French one has not yet reached its completion and cannot do so, until it achieves the result that the German philosophical and the English social revolution also have to achieve.

The national character of the English differs essentially not only from the German but from the French national character as well; it is distinguished by despair of eliminating the contradiction and by the resultant total surrender to empiricism. The pure Germanic element also converted its abstract introversion into abstract extroversion but this extroversion never lost trace of its origin and always remained subordinate to introversion and spiritualism. The French also stand on the side of the material and empirical; but because their empiricism is of a directly national bent and not a secondary consequence of a national consciousness which is split within itself, it asserts itself as a national, general principle and expresses itself in the form of political activity. The Germans upheld the absolute legitimacy of spiritualism and hence sought to expound the common interests of mankind in terms of religion and later of philosophy. The French opposed to this spiritualism materialism as absolutely legitimate and consequently regarded the state as the eternal expression of these interests. The English however *have* no common interests and are unable to speak of them without touching on the sore point, the contradiction; common interests drive the English to despair, they have merely individual interests. This absolute subjectivity, the splintering of the general into myriad particulars is, to be sure, of German origin, but, as already observed, it is separated from its roots and is thus only *empirically* effective, and this is what distinguishes English social empiricism from the French political variety. France's activity was always national, conscious from the outset of its totality and universality; England's activity was the work of independent individuals existing side by side, the movement of unconnected atoms, which seldom and only out of *individual* interests act to-

gether as a whole, and whose lack of unity is at this very moment coming to light in general poverty and total disunity.

In other words, only England has a *social* history. Only in England have individuals as such, without consciously advocating general principles, promoted the advance of the nation and brought that advance almost to its completion. Only in this case have the masses acted as masses, each member of them acting for the sake of his individual interests; only here were principles transformed into interests before they could influence the course of history. The French and the Germans are also gradually acquiring a social history, but they have not acquired it yet. The Continent has also known poverty, misery and social oppression, but they did not influence national development. However, the misery and poverty of the working class in present-day England are of national and, what is more, universal historical significance. The social issue on the Continent is still completely buried beneath the political one and has shown no sign of separating itself from the latter, whereas in England the political issue has gradually given way to the social one and become subordinate to it. The whole of English politics is of a basically social nature and it is only because England has not yet progressed beyond the state and because politics provides it with a last resort, that social questions are expressed in political terms.

As long as State and Church remain the only forms in which the universal destinies of the human essence are fulfilled, social history is out of the question. Thus the classical era and the Middle Ages produced no social development, and it was not until the Reformation, the first as yet timid and half-hearted attempt at a reaction against the Middle Ages, that a major social upheaval occurred, when serfs became "free" workers. Yet even this upheaval was to prove of little lasting effect on the Continent and moreover only really took root after the revolution of the eighteenth century. In England, on the other hand, the Reformation transformed the caste of serfs into villains, bordars, cottars,² in other words, into a class of workers that were personally free, and the eighteenth century started unfolding the consequences of

this social upheaval. Why this only took place in England has been elaborated above.

The ancient world which knew nothing of the rights of the individual, and whose whole Weltanschauung was essentially abstract, universal and part of its very substance, could not have existed without slavery. The Christian-Germanic Weltanschauung set up abstract subjectivity—hence arbitrariness, introversion and spiritualism—as its fundamental principle over against the classical ethos. This subjectivity, however, was bound, precisely because it was abstract and one-sided, at once to reappear as its opposite, and give rise to the slavery rather than the freedom of the individual. Abstract introversion gave way to abstract extroversion, rejection and alienation of man, and the first consequence of the new principle was the reinstatement of slavery in another, less offensive, but hence all the more hypocritical and inhuman form, that of serfdom. The disintegration of the feudal system, the political reformation, i.e., the *apparent* recognition of reason, hence the actual culmination of non-reason, *appeared* to do away with serfdom, while in practice it merely made serfdom more inhuman and more universal. This political reformation first pronounced that men should no longer be held together by force, i.e., by *political* means, but only by interests, i.e., by *social* means, and with this principle laid the foundation for the social movement. Yet although the reformation thereby negated the state, on the other hand it actually served to reassert the state by restoring to it the content that had formerly been usurped by the church and thus gave the state, which during the Middle Ages had played an empty and negligible role, vigour for new development. Out of the ruins of feudalism there rose up the Christian state, the culmination of the Christian world order in its political aspect; by elevating interest to the universal principle the Christian world order achieved its culmination in another respect. Since interest is essentially subjective, egoistic, individualistic and as such represents the culmination of the Germanic and Christian subjectivity and individualisation principle, the setting up of interest as the bond among men, so long as this interest remains directly subjective, quite simply egoistic, inevitably leads to universal

disunity, the preoccupation of individuals with themselves, mankind's isolation and transformation into a heap of mutually repelling atoms. This individualisation also represents the final consequence of the Christian subjective principle, the culmination of the Christian world order.

Furthermore, so long as the basic form of alienation—private property—continues to exist, interest cannot be anything but private and its rule cannot be anything but the rule of property. The abolition of feudal servitude has made "cash payment the sole bond between men". Property, the element, which is natural and inanimate and which runs counter to all that is human and spiritual, has as a result been placed upon a pedestal and, in the last instance, so as to complete this alienation, money, the alienated, empty abstraction of property, has been made the world's master. Man has ceased to be a slave of man and has become a slave of the *thing*; the inversion of human relationships has come full circle. The servitude of the modern world of traffickers, the sophisticated, consummate, universal mercenariness, is more inhuman and all-pervasive than serfdom during the feudal era; prostitution is more immoral and bestial than *jus primae noctis*.

The Christian world order cannot be carried any further, it has to disintegrate and make way for a humane, reasonable order. The Christian state is merely the last possible manifestation of the state in general and its fall must lead to the fall of the state as such. The splitting of mankind into a mass of isolated, mutually repelling atoms already implies in fact the annihilation of all corporative, national and any other particular interests and the last necessary stage on the way to mankind's voluntary unification. The culmination of alienation in the rule of money is an inevitable stage through which man, now that he is approaching that moment, has to pass, if he is to return to himself.

These consequences of the abolition of the feudal system have been taken so far by the social revolution in England that the crisis which will destroy the Christian world order can no longer be a long way off. The era of this crisis, even if not in actual years or quantitative terms, can be forecast

quite definitely in qualitative terms; as soon as the Corn Laws³ are repealed and the Charter⁴ is made law, namely, as soon as the aristocracy of the nobility is politically defeated by the aristocracy of finance and the latter, by the democracy of the workers.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries brought into being all the prerequisites of a social revolution, put an end to the Middle Ages, established social, political and religious Protestantism, laid the foundation for England's colonial empire, sea power and trade and created a growing, already fairly powerful middle class alongside the aristocracy. Social relations became gradually more stable after the unrest of the seventeenth century and assumed a definite pattern, which they retained until 1780 or 1790.

At that time there were three classes of landowners: landlords of noble descent, still the only and unchallenged aristocracy of the realm, who leased out their land in plots and squandered the rents in London or while on their travels; landlords, not of noble descent, or country gentlemen (usually known as squires) who lived on their land, and leased it out and enjoyed among their tenants and other local inhabitants the aristocratic distinction denied them in the towns on account of their lowly birth, lack of education and blunt country ways. This class has now completely disappeared. The squires of the past, who lorded it over the local country people with patriarchal authority and acted as counsellors and arbiters, all things to all men, have died out completely. Their descendants call themselves England's untitled aristocracy, complete in education and fine manners, sumptuous living and aristocratic habits with the nobility, which now outdoes them by only a small margin, and have nothing in common with their blunt and unrefined forefathers except their possession of the land.

The third class of landowners was that of the yeomen, owners of small plots which they worked themselves, usually in the good old haphazard style of their ancestors. This class has also disappeared from the face of England, expropriated by the social revolution, which gave rise to the curious situation in which at one and the same time, while large

estates in France were being forcibly parcelled out, in England small plots were being drawn into the large estates and swallowed up by the latter. Alongside the yeomen there also existed small tenants, who usually went in for weaving as well as working their land, but this group is also no longer to be found in the England of today; now almost all the land is divided up into a relatively small number of large estates and thus leased out. Competition with richer leaseholders drove the petty leaseholders and the yeomen out of business and ruined them and they became agricultural day-labourers or wage-earning weavers supplying the masses who flocked to the towns, which as a result were growing at such an amazing pace.

The peasants at that time used to lead a quiet, peaceful life of honest piety harassed by few worries, but on the other hand inert, not united by common interests and lacking any education or any mental activity; they were still at a prehistoric stage of development. The situation in the towns was not very different. London alone was an important trade centre; Liverpool, Hull, Bristol, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds and Glasgow were hardly worth mentioning. Spinning and weaving, the main branches of industry, were practised for the most part in the country or, at least, outside the towns, on their outskirts. Metal-working and pottery-making were still at the handicraft stage and thus what real developments could be expected in the towns? The unequalled simplicity of the franchise spared the townspeople all political cares; they were nominal Whigs or Tories but knew full well that in fact it made little difference, since they did not have the right to vote. The town dwellers consisted exclusively of petty merchants, shopkeepers and artisans and theirs was the familiar life of the small provincial town, quite inconceivable in the England of today. Mines were still only being exploited on a small scale; iron, copper and tin deposits were left more or less untouched and coal was only used for domestic purposes. In short, England was then in a position, in which unfortunately the majority of the French and, in particular, the Germans still find themselves, in a position of antediluvian apathy with regard to anything of general or spiritual

interest, in social infancy, when there is as yet no society, no life, no consciousness and no activity. This position is a *de facto* continuation of feudalism and medieval mental apathy, which will only be surmounted with the emergence of modern feudalism, the division of society into property owners and the propertyless. We on the Continent, I repeat, still find ourselves entrenched in this position. The English started combating such conditions eighty years ago and surmounted them forty years ago. If civilisation is a matter of practice, a social quality, then the English are undoubtedly the most civilised people on earth.

I mentioned earlier that the sciences assumed a scientific character in the eighteenth century and that as a result they linked up on the one side with philosophy and on the other with practical activity. The result of the alignment with philosophy was materialism (which presupposed Newton just as much as Locke), the Enlightenment and the French political revolution. The result of the alignment with practical activity was the English social revolution.

In 1760 George III came to the throne, drove out the Whigs, who since the time of George I had been in power almost without interruption but had naturally ruled in thoroughly conservative fashion, and laid the foundation for the subsequent monopoly of the Tories which lasted until 1830. Thus the government recovered its inner truth; in a politically conservative age it was only fitting for England that the Conservative party should rule. From then on it was the social movement that absorbed the energies of the nation and pushed political interest into the background, even did away with it, since all domestic politics from then on were concealed socialism, the form which social questions assumed in order to assert themselves on a universal, nation-wide scale.

In 1763 Dr. James Watt of Greenock began to work on the construction of the steam-engine and completed it in 1768.

In 1763 Josiah Wedgwood laid the foundations of the English pottery industry by introducing scientific principles. Thanks to his efforts a barren strip of land in Staffordshire was transformed into an industrial area—the Potteries—

which now employs sixty thousand people and which has played a highly important role in the socio-political movement of recent years.

In 1764 James Hargreaves from Lancashire invented the spinning-jenny, a machine driven by one worker, which enabled him to spin sixteen times more yarn than had been possible on the old type of spinning-wheel.

In 1768 Richard Arkwright, a barber from Preston in Lancashire, invented the spinning-throstle, the first spinning-machine originally intended to be driven by machine-power. It produced water twist, yarn used as warp during the weaving process.

In 1776 Samuel Crompton from Bolton in Lancashire invented the spinning-mule by combining the mechanical principles on which the jenny and throstle were based. The mule, like the jenny spindle, spun mule twist, i.e., the weaver's woof. All three machines are designed for processing cotton.

In 1787 Dr. Cartwright invented the mechanical loom, which later underwent various improvements and was only ready to be put into operation in 1801.

These inventions gave stimulus to the social movement. Its immediate consequence was the emergence of English industry, and in the first place the cotton industry. The jenny certainly made the production of yarn cheaper and, as a result of the ensuing expansion of the market, gave industry its first impetus; however, it left the social aspect, the type of industrial production, more or less untouched. It was Arkwright's and Crompton's machines and Watt's steam-engine which set that movement going by creating the factory system. First of all small factories using horsepower or water power came into being, but these were soon supplanted by larger factories driven by water or steam. The first steam mill was set up in Nottinghamshire by Watt in 1785; it was followed by others and soon the new system became universal. The spread of steam-driven mills, just as that of all other industrial reforms introduced at the same time or subsequently, proceeded with breath-taking speed. Raw cotton imports, which in 1770 amounted to less than five million pounds a year, rose to fifty-four million (1800)

and 360 million by 1836. At that juncture steam-looms were put into operation and gave industrial progress a new impetus. All these machines were later to undergo countless small but, considered as a whole, very significant improvements and each improvement exerted a favourable influence on the expansion of the whole industrial system. All branches of the cotton industry were revolutionised; printing made untold progress as a result of the introduction of mechanical aids and of the advances made in the field of chemistry, which also served to promote dyeing and bleaching. Hosiery production was also swept along by the same current. Since 1809 items of fine cotton, tulle and lace have been produced mechanically. I do not have sufficient space at my disposal here to follow through the progress of the cotton industry step by step; I can only mention the results, which in comparison with the antediluvian industry importing four million pounds of cotton and using spinning-wheels, hand-combs and hand-looms, cannot fail to produce an impression.

In 1833 in Britain 10,264 million hanks of yarn with a total length of over 5,000 million miles were spun and 350 million yards of cotton material were printed; 1,300 cotton factories were operating which employed 237,000 spinners and weavers; over nine million spindles, 100,000 steam-looms and 240,000 hand-looms, 33,000 stocking-looms and 3,500 bobbin machines were in operation; cotton-processing machines with a total capacity of 33,000 steam h.p. and 11,000 water h.p. were operating and one and a half million people directly or indirectly were drawing their livelihoods from this branch of industry. Lancashire lives exclusively on cotton-spinning and weaving and Lanarkshire, in the main; Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire are the chief centres of the subsidiary branches of the cotton industry. Exports of cotton goods have multiplied eight times over since 1801 and the amount of cotton goods sold on the domestic market has grown still more.

The impetus given to cotton production soon made itself felt in other branches of industry. Formerly the *wool* industry had been the main branch of industry but it was now pushed into the background by cotton; however, instead of going

into decline it also proceeded to expand. In 1785 wool stocks from three preceding years lay unprocessed; the spinners were unable to keep pace with the stocks, using nothing but their primitive spinning-wheels. So a start was then made on adapting cotton-spinning machines for wool, a process that was successfully completed after various alterations had been carried out; after this the wool industry underwent the same rapid expansion which had already been seen in cotton production. Raw wool imports rose from seven million pounds (1801) to 42 million pounds (1835); in the latter year 1,300 wool factories were in operation, employing 71,300 workers, not counting a large number of hand weavers working at home and printers, dyers, bleachers, etc., etc., who also depended indirectly on the wool industry for their livelihood. The main centres of this branch of industry are the West Riding of Yorkshire and the West of England (in particular, Somerset and Wiltshire).

The *linen* industry was formerly centred in Ireland. The first flax-processing factories had been set up towards the end of the last century, in Scotland as a matter of fact. The machinery employed was still far from perfect; the material gave rise to difficulties, which demanded major modifications in the machines. They were first improved by the Frenchman, Girard (1810), but it was in England that these amendments were first applied in practice. The use of steam-looms in the linen industry followed later, and from that moment on linen production soared at a tremendous speed, despite competition with the cotton industry. The centres in England, Scotland and Ireland were Leeds, Dundee and Belfast respectively. Dundee alone imported 3,000 tons of flax in 1814 and 19,000 tons in 1834. Linen exports from Ireland, where hand-looms were to be found side by side with steam-looms, rose between 1800 and 1825 by 20 million yards, almost all of which was sent to England, from where part was subsequently re-exported elsewhere. Between 1820 and 1833 exports from the whole of Great Britain rose by 27 million yards; 1835 saw 347 linen factories in operation—of which 170 were situated in Scotland—employing a total of 33,000 workers, a figure that did not include a large number of Irish hand-loom weavers.

The *silk* industry first became important after 1824, when the restrictive tariffs were lifted; since then raw silk imports have doubled and the number of silk factories has risen to 266, with a total of 30,000 workers. The main centre of this industry is Cheshire (Macclesfield, Congleton and district) and then come Manchester and Paisley, in Scotland. Ribbon weaving is centred in Coventry in Warwickshire.

These four branches of industry producing yarn and textiles were thus totally revolutionised. Home industry was replaced by collective labour in large buildings; manual labour gave way to steam-power and machinery. With the help of a machine a child of eight was able to do more than had twenty adult men previously; six hundred thousand factory workers, half of whom are children and more than half of whom are of the female sex, are performing what would otherwise be the work of a hundred and fifty million people.

This is, however, only the beginning of the industrial revolution. We have seen how dyeing, printing and bleaching have been expanded as a result of the progress achieved in spinning and weaving and how they have benefited accordingly from mechanisation and chemistry. Since the introduction of steam-driven machines and metal cylinders for printing, one man has been able to do the work of two hundred; since chloride has been used for bleaching instead of oxygen, the time required for the operation has been reduced from a few months to a few hours. While the influence of the industrial revolution on those processes which the product undergoes *after* spinning and weaving was considerable, its repercussions as regards the raw materials used in the new industry were even more significant. It was steam-power which first made the inexhaustible coal deposits which stretch beneath England's surface assume true importance. Scores of new coal-mines were opened and the existing ones worked with twice the former intensity. The manufacture of spinning machines and weaving-looms came to constitute a separate branch of industry and attained a high degree of perfection, not achieved by any other nation. These machines were made by other machines and a detailed division of labour right down to the smallest operations paved

the way for a precision and accuracy which are responsible for the superiority of English machines. The production of machinery in its turn made an impact on iron and copper-mining, which meanwhile received their main stimulus from another quarter, but one still dependent on the original revolution effected by Watt and Arkwright.

The consequences of this initial industrial impetus are endless. The advance of one branch of industry affected all others. The newly created labour force requires food, as we have just observed; the newly created working population brings in its wake new living conditions and new needs. The mechanical advantages of factory production bring down the prices of manufactured goods and thus make the necessities of life and, as a result, wages in general cheaper; all other products can now be sold more cheaply and therefore demand an extension of the market proportional to this cheapness. Once there was an example of the advantages to be gained from the introduction of mechanical aids, the innovations were gradually imitated in all other branches of industry. The advance in civilisation which is the inevitable consequence of all industrial improvements creates new needs, new branches of production and hence further new improvements. The revolution in cotton-spinning was bound to bring in its wake a revolution throughout industry as a whole and if we are unable sometimes to follow the transmission of the driving force to the further removed branches of the industrial system, this is due purely to the lack of statistical and historical data. We shall, however, soon be seeing everywhere that the introduction of mechanical aids and scientific principles in general was the mainspring of progress.

After spinning and weaving, *metal-working* is England's chief industry. Its main centres are Warwickshire (Birmingham) and Staffordshire (Wolverhampton). This industry was very quick to introduce steam-power and, as a result of this and division of labour, production costs were cut by three-quarters. Between 1800 and 1835 metal exports grew to four times their previous total: in the first year 4,300 metric tons of iron and an equal quantity of copper goods were exported, rising to 16,000 tons of iron and 10,500 tons of copper and

brass ware in 1835. It is only recently that cast and bar iron have been exported on an important scale. In 1800 bar iron exports totalled 4,600 tons and in 1835 bar iron exports had reached 92,000 tons and cast iron exports 14,000.

All English cutlery is produced in Sheffield. The use of steam-power, especially for grinding and polishing blades, the conversion of iron into steel, which only then became important, and the new method for moulding steel gave rise to a far-reaching revolution in this field as well. Sheffield alone uses an annual total of 500,000 tons of coal and 12,000 tons of iron, 10,000 tons of which are imported (above all from Sweden).

The widespread consumption of cast-iron ware also dates from the second half of the last century and only acquired its present importance in recent years. Gas-lighting (introduced in practice in 1804) created an enormous demand for cast-iron tubes; railways, suspension bridges, etc., together with various types of machinery, etc., increased the demand still further. In 1780 puddling, i.e., the conversion of molten iron into malleable iron in a furnace through the expulsion of carbon, was invented and this gave the English iron mines new importance. For want of charcoal the English had hitherto been obliged to obtain all their wrought iron from abroad. From 1790 on nails were made by machine, and screws from 1810 onwards. In 1760 Huntsman, of Sheffield, invented steel-casting; machines for making wire were devised and, in general, throughout the iron and brass industry a mass of new machines was introduced, manual labour supplanted and, in as far as its nature would allow, the factory system was established.

The expansion of the mines was the inevitable consequence of these developments. Until 1788 all iron ore had been smelted with charcoal and iron extraction had thus been held back by the scarcity of fuel. After 1788 coke (sulphurated coal) was used instead of charcoal and within six years the annual output of iron had multiplied six times. As against the 17,000 tons produced in 1740, 553,000 tons were produced in 1835. The output of tin and copper mines has multiplied three times since 1770. Together with the iron mines, the coal pits ranked as the most important branch of England's min-

ing industry. The expansion of coal production since the middle of the last century is incalculable. The amount of coal now used by the countless steam machines employed in factories and mines, forges, furnaces and foundries, and for domestic heating by a population that has doubled over this period, bears absolutely no relation to the quantity being used eighty or a hundred years ago. The smelting of pig-iron alone consumes over three million tons a year.

The building of industry led first of all to improvements in means of communication. The roads in England in the last century had been in as bad a condition as everywhere else and indeed remained so until the celebrated McAdam reformed road construction according to scientific principles and thereby gave a new impetus to the advance of civilisation. Between 1818 and 1829 new main roads with a total length of 1,000 English miles, quite apart from minor country roads, were built and almost all existing roads were resurfaced according to McAdam's principles. In Scotland the public works authorities have built over 1,000 bridges since 1803 and the barren moors in the south of Ireland, formerly inhabited by semi-wild bands of robbers, are now intersected by roads. Thus all corners of the realm, which had formerly been bereft of contact with the outside world, have been made accessible, namely, the Celtic-speaking districts of Wales, the Scottish highlands and the south of Ireland have thereby been obliged to make themselves known to the outside world and accept the civilisation forced upon them.

The first sizable canal was built in Lancashire in 1755. In 1759 the Duke of Bridgewater initiated the construction of the Worsley-Manchester Canal. Since then canals with a total length of 2,200 miles have been built. In addition, England possesses 1,800 miles of navigable rivers, the greater part of which have also been adapted for commercial purposes only in recent years.

Since 1807 steam-power has been used for driving ships, and since the first British steamship was built in 1811, six hundred more have followed. In 1835 there were 550 steamships sailing from British ports.

The first public railway was built in Surrey in 1801, but it was only after the Liverpool-Manchester railway was opened

in 1830 that this new means of communication assumed importance. Six years later 680 miles of railway had been laid and four major lines from London to Birmingham, Bristol and Southampton, and from Birmingham to Manchester and Liverpool, were in operation. In the meantime the network has spread over the whole of England; London is the junction for nine railways and Manchester for five.*

The revolutionising of British industry lies at the root of all relations in contemporary England and it provides the driving force behind the whole of the social movement. The first thing it led to was the elevation of interest mentioned above to its dominion over man. Interest held in its grip the newly created industrial potential and started to exploit it for its own purposes. This potential, which belonged to mankind by right, was to become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of a few rich capitalists and the tool for enslaving the masses. Commerce was to absorb industry and thus become all-powerful, the bond of mankind. All personal and national intercourse was reduced to commercial intercourse and, in other words, property, things became master of the world.

The rule of property was bound to turn first of all against the state and dissolve it or, at least, since it cannot do without the state altogether, emasculate it. Adam Smith started this emasculation of the state at the time of the industrial revolution, when in 1776 he published his *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, thus creating the science of finance. Hitherto all such science had been of an exclusively national character; political economy had been regarded as a mere branch of state affairs and, as such, subordinate to the state. Adam Smith made cosmopolitanism subordinate to national objectives and raised political economy to the *raison d'être* of the state. He reduced politics, parties, religion, in short, everything to economic categories, and thereby acknowledged property as the essence of the

* The above statistics have been taken mainly from *The Progress of the Nation* by George Porter who served on the Board of Trade under the Whig Government and may thus be presumed to have taken them from official sources.⁵

state and enrichment as its goal. On the other hand, William Godwin in his *Political Justice* (1793⁶) supported the republican political system; at the same time as Jeremy Bentham he formulated the utilitarian principle, whereby the republican *salus publica suprema lex* was taken to its logical conclusion, and attacked the very essence of the state in his proposition that the state be an evil. Godwin interpreted the utilitarian principle still in a very general way as the duty of the citizen to neglect individual interests and live only for the general good. Bentham, on the contrary, carried the essentially social nature of this principle further; in keeping with the national trend of that time he made individual interest the basis of the general interest, acknowledged that the identity of both was expressed in the proposition, later to be amplified in particular by his pupil Mill, that love of our fellow-men is nothing other than enlightened egoism and substituted the greatest happiness of the greatest number for the "general good". In his empiricism Bentham here makes the same error which Hegel committed in his theory; he makes no serious attempt to surmount contradictions, he makes a predicate of his subject, the whole dependent on the part and thus turns everything upside down. First he speaks of the inseparability of the general and individual interest and then confines himself to blatant individual interest. His proposition is merely the empirical expression of the other, to the effect that man is mankind, but because it is empirically expressed, it gives not the free, self-aware, self-creative man, but the rough, blind man, still caught up in contradictions, the rights of the species. Bentham makes free competition the essence of morality and classifies human relationships according to the laws of property, possessions, according to natural laws, and thus the culmination of the old, primitive Christian world order is the highest point of alienation but not the beginning of the new order to be created by self-aware man in complete freedom. Bentham does not go beyond the state but he deprives it of all content, replacing political principles by social ones and making of political organisation a form for social content, thus bringing the contradiction to the highest point possible.

It was while the industrial revolution was taking place that the democratic party came into being. In 1769 J. Horne Tooke founded the Society of the Bill of Rights, in which, for the first time since the republic, democratic principles were discussed again. As in France, so these democrats were men of purely philosophical education but they soon found that the upper and middle classes were against them and that it was only the working class which lent their principles an ear. From among this class they were soon to found a party and by 1794 this party had become quite strong, but still not strong enough to exert anything but an erratic influence. Between 1797 and 1816 no mention was made of the party; in the turbulent years from 1816 to 1823 it was very active again, and then stagnated once more until the July revolution. Since then it has retained its importance alongside the other parties and is making steady progress as we shall see later.

The most important result of the eighteenth century for England was the formation of the proletariat by the industrial revolution. The new industry demanded a constantly available mass of workers for countless new trades and indeed workers unlike any there had been before. Up to 1780 there had been few proletarians in England, as was inevitable in the light of the social situation in the nation described earlier. Industry concentrated labour in factories and the towns; the combination of industrial and agricultural activity was made impossible and the new working class depended exclusively on its work. What had been an exception in the past became the rule and gradually spread outside the towns as well. The cultivation of the land in small plots was ousted by the big tenant farmers and as a result a new class of agricultural labourers was formed. The population of the towns trebled and quadrupled and almost all this increase was due to the growth of the number of workers alone. The expansion of mining also demanded a large number of new workers, and they too lived by their wages alone.

On the other hand the middle class assumed the role of out-and-out aristocracy. The factory owners in the course of this industrial advance multiplied their capital with miraculous speed; merchants also received their share and

the capital created by this revolution provided the weapon with which the English aristocracy opposed the French revolution.

The result of this whole movement has been that England is now divided into three parties: the landed aristocracy, the financial aristocracy and the working-class democracy. These are the only parties in England, the only mainsprings which function here, and *how* they are at work we shall perhaps attempt to depict in a later article.

Written by F. Engels
in February 1844

Published in *Vorwärts!*
(Paris), Nos. 70, 71, 72 and 73;
August 31, September 4, 7
and 11, 1844

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS

THE POSITION OF ENGLAND

THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION

In the preceding article we developed the principles according to which the British Empire's present position in the history of civilisation should be judged, and also gave the necessary data on the development of the English nation, since they are indispensable for the purpose but are less known on the Continent; thus, having substantiated our premises, we may pass on to our subject without more ado.

England's position has up to now seemed enviable to all other European peoples, and so it is to anybody who scans the surface alone and sees only with the eyes of a politician. England is a world power in the sense in which such powers can exist today, and in which, essentially, all other world powers existed; for Alexander's and Caesar's empires, like the English, were also a dominion of civilised nations over barbarians and colonies. No other country in the world can vie with England in power and riches, and this power and these riches are not in the hands of a single despot, as they were in Rome, but belong to the educated part of the nation. For a hundred years already, England has known no fear of despotism, no struggle against the power of the Crown; England is undoubtedly the freest, that is, the least unfree country in the world, North America not excepted, and as a result the educated Englishman has a measure of inborn independence of which no Frenchman, let alone a German, can

boast. Political activity, the free press, the command of the seas, and England's gigantic industry have so fully developed in almost every individual the energy and determination which go hand in hand in the national character with the coolest prudence that in this respect, too, the continental peoples are infinitely far behind the English. The history of the British Army and Navy is a series of splendid victories, while England has for the past eight hundred years hardly seen an enemy near her shores. Only German literature and that of ancient Greece can vie with the English for precedence; in philosophy England has at least two great names—Bacon and Locke; in the empirical sciences the great names are beyond counting; and if it is a question of what people has *done* the most, no one will deny that the English are that people.

These are the things of which England may be proud, things in which she has the advantage over the Germans and the French and which I have enumerated here in advance, so that all good Germans may convince themselves of my "impartiality" from the very start; for I am well aware that in Germany one may speak without ceremony much rather of the Germans than of any other nation. And these things just enumerated form more or less the subject of the entire voluminous, yet utterly fruitless and superfluous, literature that has been written on the Continent about England. Nobody has ever taken it into his head to make a thorough study of the nature of English history and the English national character, and just how miserable the whole literature on England is can be seen from the simple fact that Herr von Raumer's miserable book⁷ is, as far as I know, still considered in Germany the best book on that subject.

Let us begin with the political aspect, since England has up to now been viewed only from that angle. Let us weigh the British Constitution, this, in Tory parlance, "most perfect product of the British mind" and, as yet another favour to the politicians, let us proceed for the present on purely empirical lines.

The *juste-milieu* values the British Constitution particularly for having developed "historically", which in plain German means that the old basis created by the 1688 revolu-

tion was preserved and that on this foundation, as they call it, building was continued. Later on we shall see the character the British Constitution has acquired because of this; for the time being a simple comparison of the Englishman of 1688 with the Englishman of 1844 is enough to prove that an identical constitutional foundation for both is an absurdity, an impossibility. Even disregarding the general advance of civilisation, the political character of the nation is quite different from what it was then. The Test-Act, the Habeas Corpus Act, and the Bill of Rights⁸ were measures which the Whigs were able to put into effect owing to the weakness of the Tories at that time and their victory over the Tories, and which were directed against these Tories, that is, against the absolute monarchy and against overt or covert Catholicism. But within the next fifty years the old Tories disappeared, and their descendants adopted the principles which had until then been those of the Whigs; with the coronation of George I the monarchic-Catholic Tories became an aristocratic-High-Church party, and since the French Revolution, which brought the first glimmer of light into their minds, the positive principles of Toryism have tended more and more towards the abstraction of "Conservatism", the naked, thoughtless defence of the existing order of things, but even this stage has already been left behind. In the person of Sir Robert Peel Toryism has decided to recognise progress, has realised that the British Constitution is untenable, and is making concessions merely in order to preserve this derelict structure as long as possible. The Whigs have also gone through an equally important development, a new democratic party has emerged, and yet the foundation of 1688 is to be broad enough for 1844! The necessary consequence of this "historical development" is that the internal contradictions, which make up the essence of constitutional monarchy, and which were sufficiently revealed at the time when modern German philosophy still maintained a republican standpoint, have reached their peak in the modern English monarchy. Indeed, the English constitutional monarchy is the consummation of constitutional monarchy in general, is the only state in which, insofar as this is still possible today, a *genuine* aristocratic nobility has been able to maintain its place next

to a relatively highly developed public consciousness, and where there actually exists that trinity of legislative power which has been artificially reconstructed and is preserved with difficulty on the Continent.

If the essence of the state, as of religion, lies in mankind's fear of itself, this fear reaches its culminating point in the constitutional, and particularly in the English, monarchy. The experience of three millennia has not made people any cleverer; on the contrary, it has made them more confused, more prejudiced, has driven them mad, and the result of this madness is the political state of present-day Europe. The pure monarchy inspires fear—it suggests the idea of Oriental and Roman despotism. Pure aristocracy is no less terrifying—the Roman patricians and medieval feudalism, the Venetian and Genoan Nobili did not exist for nothing. Democracy is more frightful than either; Marius and Sulla, Cromwell and Robespierre, the bleeding heads of two kings, the proscription lists and the dictatorship proclaim loudly enough the "horrors" of democracy. Moreover, it is well known that not one of these forms has ever lasted any length of time. What then was to be done? Instead of moving on directly, instead of concluding from the imperfection, or, rather, from the cruelty of all state forms, that the state itself is the cause of this cruelty, and is cruel itself, instead of that one simply reassured oneself by adopting the view that this immorality is inherent only in the *forms* of the state, inferred from the above premises that three immoral factors taken together could be transformed into a moral product, and created the constitutional monarchy.

The first principle of constitutional monarchy is the balance of power, and this principle is the most perfect expression of mankind's fear of itself. It is not my intention to discuss the absurdity, the total impracticability of this principle, I merely want to see if it has been sustained in the British Constitution, and shall, as I promised, conduct this investigation in a purely empirical way, so empirically, in fact, that it may be too much even for our political empiricists. I therefore take the British Constitution not as it is described in Blackstone's Commentaries, in de Lolme's fantasies,⁹ or in the long series of Constitutional Statutes, from

the Magna Charta¹⁰ to the Reform Bill, but as it exists in reality.

Let us begin with the monarchic element. Everybody knows what the sovereign counts for in England, whether male or female. In practice, the power of the Crown has been reduced to naught, and if this circumstance, notorious throughout the world, needs further proof, this is furnished by the fact that all struggle against the Crown ceased more than a hundred years ago, that even the radical-democratic Chartists know how to use their time to better purpose than to waste it on such struggle. Where, in that case, is the third of legislative power allotted to the Crown in theory? Yet—and herein the fear reaches its peak—the British Constitution cannot exist without the monarchy. Remove the Crown, the “subjective apex”, and the entire artificial structure collapses. The British Constitution is an inverted pyramid, the apex is at the same time the base. And the less significant the monarchic element has become in reality, the more significance has it acquired for the Englishman. Nowhere, as is well known, is this non-ruling personification worshipped more than in England. The English journals surpass the German by far in slavish servility. This disgusting cult of the king as such, the worship of a completely emasculated and meaningless notion, not even a notion, but the mere *word* “king”, is the consummation of monarchy, just as the worship of the mere *word* “god” is the consummation of religion. The word “king” is the essence of the state, just as the word “god” is the essence of religion, even if both words are meaningless. In both cases, the main thing is to see to it that the main thing, namely, man, who is at the back of both these words, should not come under discussion.

Next, the aristocratic element. It is, at least in the sphere allotted to it by the Constitution, not much better off than the Crown. If the mockery being constantly heaped on the House of Lords for over a hundred years now has gradually become so much part of public opinion that this branch of the legislative power is generally regarded as an asylum for pensioned-off statesmen, and that the offer of a peerage is considered an insult by any as yet not fully spent member of the Commons, one can easily imagine what respect is com-

manded by the second of the state powers established by the Constitution. Indeed, the activity of the Lords in the Upper House has been reduced to a mere, insignificant formality and only on rare occasions does this activity rise to a sort of *vis inertiae*, as happened during the rule of the Whigs between 1830 and 1840—but even then the Lords are not strong by themselves, but only thanks to the Tory party, whose purest representatives they are. The House of Lords, the main advantage of which, according to the theory of the Constitution, is supposed to be that it is equally independent of the Crown and of the people, in reality depends on a party, and hence on public opinion, and because of the right of the Crown to create peers, also on the Crown. But the feebler the House of Lords has become, the more strongly is it supported by public opinion. The constitutional parties, the Tories, Whigs and Radicals, equally dread an abolition of this empty formality, and the most the Radicals will say is that the House of Lords, as the only constitutional power without responsibility, is an anomaly, and that the hereditary peerage should therefore be replaced by an elected one. It is once again man's fear of himself that preserves this empty form, and the Radicals, who demand a purely democratic basis for the House of Commons, are driven by this fear even further than the other two parties in that they, in order to prevent the decline of that threadbare, outmoded Upper House, seek to breathe some vitality into it by an infusion of popular blood. The Chartists know better what they have to do: they know that under pressure from a democratic House of Commons the entire rotten structure—Crown and Lords and all—must collapse by itself and therefore they do not, as the Radicals do, bother with a reform of the peerage.

And just as the adoration of the Crown has grown in the same measure in which the power of the Crown has waned, so has the people's respect for the aristocracy increased in the measure in which the political influence of the House of Lords has dwindled. The point is that not only have the most humiliating formalities of feudal times been preserved, that the Members of the House of Commons, when they appear in an official capacity before the Lords, have to stand hat in

hand in front of the seated and hatted Lords, that the official address to a member of the aristocracy is: "May it please your lordship", etc., the worst of it is that all these formalities are really the expression of public opinion that regards a lord as a being of a superior kind and has a respect for the lineage, full-sounding titles, old family heirlooms, etc., which is as repugnant and disgusting to us continentals as is the worship of the Crown. In this trait of the English character, too, we once again see the adoration of an empty, senseless word, the completely insane, fixed idea that a great nation, that humanity and the universe cannot exist without the word aristocracy. For all that, the aristocracy has in reality still considerable influence; but just as the power of the Crown is the power of the Ministers, that is, the representatives of the majority in the House of Commons—thereby taking an utterly different direction from that envisaged by the Constitution—so, too, does the power of the aristocracy consist of something entirely different from its right to a hereditary seat in the legislature. The aristocracy is strong by its enormous estate, by its wealth in general, and hence shares this power with all the other, untitled rich; so the power of the Lords resides not in the Upper House, but in the House of Commons, and this leads us to that component of the legislature that, according to the Constitution, should represent the democratic element.

If the Crown and the House of Lords are powerless, the House of Commons must of necessity wield all power, and this is the case. The House of Commons does, in fact, pass the laws and administer them through the Ministers, who are but its committee. Hence, with this omnipotence of the House of Commons—though the two other branches of legislature would nominally continue to exist—England should be a pure democracy, if only the democratic element itself were really democratic. But this is not so. When the Constitution was established after the revolution of 1688 the composition of the constituencies remained quite unchanged; the towns, villages and boroughs, which formerly had the right to return a member, kept this right; and this right was by no means a democratic one, not a "universal human right", but a purely feudal privilege, which had long ago, in the time of

Elizabeth, been granted by the Crown quite arbitrarily and by grace to many towns that had until then not been represented. Even the character of representation which the elections to the Lower House had possessed at least initially was soon lost as a result of "historical development". The composition of the old House of Commons is known. In the towns the returning of a member was either in the hands of one person or of a closed and self-recruiting corporation; only a few towns were open, that is, had quite a large number of electors, and in them the most shameless bribery did away with the last remnants of true representation. The closed towns were mainly under the influence of an individual, generally a lord; and in the rural constituencies the omnipotence of the big landowners suppressed any more or less free and independent movement among the people, who were otherwise politically inert. The old House of Commons was nothing but a closed, medieval corporation independent of the people, a culmination of the "historical" right, a corporation that was unable to advance a single truly or seemingly rational argument in defence of its existence, that existed contrary to reason and therefore denied in 1794, through its committee, that it was a meeting of representatives and that England was a country with a representative government.* As compared with such a Constitution, the theory of a state with a representative government, even of an ordinary constitutional monarchy with a Chamber of Representatives, was bound to appear highly revolutionary and objectionable, and the Tories were therefore quite right when they called the Reform Bill a measure diametrically opposed to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution and undermining it. Nevertheless, the Reform Bill was passed, and we now have to consider what it has made of the British Constitution and especially the House of Commons. Above all, the conditions for the election of representatives in rural areas have remained unchanged. The voters there are almost exclusively tenants and, as such, are heavily dependent on their landlord

* Second Report of the Committee of Secrecy, to whom the Papers referred to in His Majesty's Message on the 12th May 1794 were delivered (Report on the London revolutionary societies, London, 1794). P. 68 ff.

because the latter may at any moment terminate the lease, there being no contractual relations between him and his tenants. The representatives of the counties (as opposed to the towns) are, as before, representatives of the landlords, for only in the most tumultuous times, as in 1831,¹¹ dare the tenants vote against the landlords. Moreover, the Reform Bill¹² has only aggravated these evils by increasing the number of representatives from the counties. Of the 252 county members the Tories can therefore always count on at least 200, unless any general disturbance which would make an intervention by the landlords unwise should break out among the tenants. In the towns representation has been introduced at least formally, and everyone who rents a house at no less than ten pounds a year and pays direct taxes (the Poor Tax, etc.) has the right to vote. This excludes the vast majority of the working classes; for, first of all, naturally, only the married live in houses and even if a considerable number of these houses are rented at ten pounds a year, most of their tenants evade the payment of direct taxes and are therefore not entitled to vote. Under the Chartist, universal suffrage the electorate would increase at least threefold. The towns are thus in the hands of the middle class, but in the smaller towns the latter frequently depends, directly or indirectly, on the landlords through the tenants, who are the small shopkeepers' and craftsmen's main customers. Only in the big towns does the middle class really come to power, and in the small factory towns, particularly in Lancashire, where the middle class is insignificant on account of its small number and the rural population has little influence, and where even a minority of the working class carries great weight, this semblance of representation approaches to some degree a real one. These towns, for example, Ashton, Oldham, Rochdale, Bolton, etc., therefore send almost exclusively Radical members to Parliament. An extension of the voting rights according to the Chartist principles would here too, as in all factory towns in general, give the latter party a majority of voters. In addition to these different and, in practical respects, very complicated influences, a telling effect is exerted by various local interests and, last but not least, by a very important factor—bribery. In the first

article in this series I mentioned that the House of Commons had declared through its committee set up to investigate corrupt practices that it had been elected through bribery, and Thomas Duncombe, the only confirmed Chartist member, has long since frankly told the House of Commons that not a single person in the whole assembly, himself included, could say that he had obtained his seat through the free ballot of his constituents, without bribery. Last summer, Richard Cobden, member for Stockport and leader of the Anti-Corn Law League,⁴³ declared at a public meeting in Manchester that bribery had at the time become more widespread than ever, that in the Tory Carlton Club and the Liberal Reform Club in London town seats were being blatantly auctioned off to the highest bidder, and that these clubs acted as entrepreneurs—for so and so many pounds we guarantee you such and such a seat, etc. And on top of all this, there is the “honourable” way in which these elections are carried out: the general drunkenness in which the voting takes place, the public houses in which the voters get drunk at the expense of the candidates, the disorder, the brawls and the howling of the crowd at the election boxes, put the final touches to the worthlessness of the representation elected for a term of *seven* years.

We have seen that the Crown and the House of Lords have lost their significance; we have seen in what manner the omnipotent House of Commons is recruited; the question now is: who really rules England? Property rules. Property enables the aristocracy to dominate the election of representatives from the rural areas and the small towns; property enables the merchants and factory owners to pick the representatives for the big and partly also for the small towns; property enables both to increase their influence through bribery. The rule of property is expressly recognised in the Reform Bill through the establishment of property qualifications. And since property and influence through property are the essence of the middle class, since the aristocracy takes advantage of its property in any election, and therefore acts not as an aristocracy, but puts itself on a par with the middle class, and since the influence of the middle class proper is much stronger than that of the aristocracy, it is, of course,

the middle class that really rules. But how and why does it rule? Because the people have not yet any clear idea of the nature of property, because they are generally—at least in rural areas—still spiritually dead and therefore put up with this tyranny of property. England is indeed a democracy, but in the way Russia is a democracy; for, without being aware of it, the people rule everywhere, and in all states the government is only a different expression for the people's level of education.

It will be difficult for us to return from the way the British Constitution is practised to its theory. Practice is in glaring contradiction with theory; the two are so far apart that there is no longer any resemblance between them. Here a trinity of legislation, there a tyranny of the middle class; here a two-chamber system, there an all-powerful House of Commons; here a royal prerogative, there a cabinet chosen by the Commons; here an independent House of Lords with hereditary law-givers, there an asylum for pensioned-off members of the Lower House. Each of the three components of the legislative power has had to hand over its power to a different element: the Crown to the Ministers, that is, to the majority of the House of Commons, the lords to the Tory party, that is, to a popular element, and to the peer-creating Ministers, that is, essentially also to a popular element, and the Commons to the middle class or, which is the same, to the political immaturity of the people. Actually, the British Constitution no longer exists; the whole tedious process of legislation is a mere farce; the contradiction between theory and practice has become so glaring that it cannot be preserved for long, and even if the Catholic Emancipation, of which we shall have more to say further on, and the parliamentary and municipal reform may seem to have instilled some life into this feeble Constitution, these measures are themselves a confession that all hope for the preservation of the Constitution has been lost. These measures introduce elements into the Constitution which decisively contradict its basic principles, and therefore only further aggravate the conflict by bringing theory into contradiction with itself.

We have seen that the power structure designed by the British Constitution rests on fear alone. This fear is revealed

even more starkly in the rules according to which legislation is implemented, in the so-called Standing Orders. Every Bill must be read in each of the two Houses three times at definite intervals; after the second reading it is passed on to a committee, which examines it in detail; in more important cases "the House becomes a committee of the whole House" for the examination of the Bill and appoints a chairman, who after the debates are over reports with a great deal of pomp on the debates to the same House that debated the Bill. Incidentally, is this not as beautiful an example of "transcendence within immanence and of immanence within transcendence" as any Hegelian could wish for? "The knowledge of the Lower House about the committee is the knowledge of the committee about itself", and the chairman is the "absolute personality of the mediator in which both are identical". Thus, every Bill is discussed eight times before it may receive royal assent. Naturally, this whole ridiculous procedure is once again due to the man's fear of himself. It is realised that progress is the essence of humanity but the courage is lacking to proclaim this progress openly; laws are issued which are to have absolute validity, which, therefore, set limits to progress, and then through the right reserved to amend laws the progress just denied is let in again through the back door. Only not too quickly, only not too rashly! Progress is revolutionary, dangerous and, therefore, a strong bar must at least be created; before it is decided to recognise it the matter must be thought over eight times. But this fear, which is contemptible in itself and only proves that those experiencing it are not yet really free people, must of necessity lead to blunders also in the measures which they undertake. Instead of ensuring a fuller consideration of the Bills, their repeated reading becomes superfluous in practice and a pure formality. Generally, the main debates are concentrated on the first or second reading, at times also on the debates in the committee, depending on what is more convenient for the opposition. The complete senselessness of these repeated debates becomes particularly clear if one considers that the fate of every Bill is decided from the outset, and if it is *not* decided, the subject of the debates is not some particular bill, but the existence of a particular government. Thus, the result of this

whole farce, which is repeated eight times over, is not the holding of a calmer debate in the House itself, but something entirely different, something that did not enter the plans of those who introduced this farce. The tediousness of the debates gives the public time to form an opinion about the proposed measure and in case of need to oppose it by means of meetings and petitions, and often—as last year in the case of Sir James Graham's Education Bill—with success. But this, as we said above, is not the original aim and could be achieved in a much simpler way.

Since we are dealing with the Standing Orders, we can mention a few more points in which the fear that permeates the British Constitution and the originally corporative character of the House of Commons are revealed. The debates in the House of Commons are not public; admittance is a privilege and is generally granted only by written order of some member. During the voting the galleries are cleared; despite this ridiculous mystery-making, to the abolition of which the House has always strongly objected, the names of the Members voting for or against appear on the next day in all the newspapers. The Radical members have never been able to achieve a printing of the authentic minutes—only a fortnight ago such a motion was defeated—and as a result the publisher of parliamentary reports appearing in the newspapers bears the sole responsibility for their content, and legal proceedings can be instituted against him for the publication of slander by anyone who feels offended by anything a Member of Parliament may have said—and according to law also by the government—while the author of the slander is protected by his parliamentary privileges against all persecution. This and a great number of other items in the Standing Orders show the exclusively anti-popular character of the reformed Parliament; and the tenacity, with which the House of Commons clings to these customs, shows clearly enough that it has no wish to change from a privileged corporation into an assembly of people's representatives.

A further proof of this is the parliamentary privilege, the exceptional position of the members with respect to the courts and the right of the House of Commons to have anyone it wishes arrested. Originally directed against encroachments

by the Crown, which has since been deprived of all power, this privilege has in recent times turned directly against the people. In 1771 the House grew angry about the audacity of the newspapers that had published its debates—which only the House itself is entitled to do—and attempted to put an end to this audacity by arresting first the publishers and then the officials who had released them. This attempt naturally failed, but it shows how things stand in the matter of parliamentary privilege, and the failure proves that the House of Commons, despite its elevated position over the people, is nevertheless dependent on them, that is to say, even the House of Commons does not rule.

In a country where "Christianity is part and parcel of the laws of the land" the *Established Church* is of necessity part of the Constitution. According to her Constitution, England is essentially a Christian state, and what is more, a fully developed one, a strong Christian state; state and church are perfectly fused and indissoluble. But this unity of church and state can exist only in *one* Christian creed, to the exception of all others, and these excommunicated sects are therefore naturally designated as heretics and subjected to religious and political persecution. This applies also to England. These sects had for long been lumped together in one class, as non-conformists or dissenters,¹⁴ barred from all participation in the state, prevented from worshipping and persecuted by penal laws. The more zealously they opposed the unity of church and state, the more zealously did the ruling party defend this unity and raise it to one of the maxims of the state. When the Christian state in England was still in full bloom, the persecution of dissenters, and especially of Catholics, was the order of the day, and this persecution, though less violent, was more universal and enduring than that of the Middle Ages. The acute disease became a chronic one, the sudden bloodthirsty fits of rage of Catholicism turned into a cold, political cunning, which sought to eradicate the heterodoxy by milder but persistent pressure. The persecution was transferred to the secular field and thus made unbearable. Refusal to believe the Thirty-nine Articles,¹⁵ though no longer considered blasphemy, became instead a political crime.

But the progress of history could not be arrested; the difference between the legislation of 1688 and the public opinion of 1828 was so great that in that year even the House of Commons found itself obliged to abolish the most oppressive laws against the dissenters. The Test-Act¹⁶ and the religious paragraphs of the Corporation Act¹⁷ were repealed; in the following year, despite violent Tory opposition, came the Catholic Emancipation.¹⁸ The Tories, the champions of the Constitution, were quite right in their opposition, since none of the liberal parties, including the Radicals, attacked the Constitution as such. For them, too, the Constitution was to remain the basis, and, on a constitutional basis, only the Tories were consistent. They realised, and said, that the above-mentioned measures would lead to the downfall of the High Church and hence inevitably to the downfall of the Constitution as well; that the granting of active civil rights to the dissenters would *de facto* mean destroying the High Church, sanctioning attacks against the High Church; that it would be a major inconsistency towards the state in general if the Catholic, who places the authority of the Pope above the authority of the state, were allowed to participate in government and legislation. Their arguments could not be refuted by the Liberals; nevertheless Emancipation was passed, and the prophecies of the Tories are already beginning to come true.

The High Church has thus become a name without meaning and differs from other creeds only in that it receives three million pounds a year and has several minor privileges which are just enough to sustain the struggle against it. This includes the ecclesiastical courts, in which the Anglican bishop has the exclusive but quite meaningless right of jurisdiction, and which are a burden due mainly to the exaction of law costs; then comes the local church tax, which is used to preserve the buildings placed at the disposal of the Established Church; the dissenters are under the jurisdiction of those courts and must also pay the tax.

However, not only the legislation *against* the church, but also the legislation *for* it, has contributed to making the Established Church a name without meaning. The Irish Church has always been nothing but a meaningless name,

a perfect Established or Government Church, a complete hierarchy, from the archbishop down to the vicar, one that has everything except a congregation, and whose mission it is to preach, to pray and to chant the litanies to the empty walls. The Church of England, it is true, has a public, though it, too, has been largely pushed aside by the dissenters, especially in Wales and the industrial districts, but the well-paid pastors of the soul do not worry particularly about the flock. "If you want to pour contempt on a caste of priests and to overthrow it, then pay it well," says Bentham, and the English and Irish churches testify to the truth of this maxim. In the country and in the towns of England the people hate nothing more, hold nothing in greater contempt than a Church-of-England parson. And with so religious a people as the English this means something.

Obviously, the more negligible and lamentable the reputation of the High Church becomes, the more strongly does the conservative and generally strictly constitutional party cling to it—even Lord John Russell would be reduced to tears by the separation of the church from state; obviously also, the more its reputation declines, the worse and the more perceptible becomes the burden it imposes. The Irish Church especially, being the least significant, is the best hated; it serves no other purpose than to embitter the people, than to remind them that they are an enslaved people on whom the conqueror imposes his religion and his institutions.

Thus, England is now in a state of transition from a definite to an indefinite Christian state, to a state in which there is no definite creed, but only a blend of all existing creeds, which has made indefinite Christianity its basis. The old, definite Christian state naturally took steps against this unbelief, and the Apostate Act of 1699 punishes unbelief with the loss of even passive civil rights and with imprisonment; though the Act has never been repealed, it is never applied. Another law dating back to Elizabeth's times prescribes that anyone who without good reason stays away from church on Sundays (if I am not mistaken, it even prescribes the Episcopal Church, for Elizabeth did not recognise the dissenting churches), is to be punished by a fine or imprisonment. This

law is still often enforced in rural areas, and even here, in civilised Lancashire, a few hours from Manchester, there are a few bigoted justices of the peace who—as M. Gibson, Member for Manchester, said in the Commons—have sentenced a great many people to as much as six weeks' imprisonment for failing to attend church. The main laws against unbelief, however, are those which disbar people who do not believe in a God or in a reward or punishment in the hereafter from taking an oath, and punish them for blasphemy. Blasphemy is everything that seeks to throw contempt on the Bible or the Christian religion, and also the outright denial of the existence of God; the punishment for it is imprisonment, generally for a year, and a fine.

But the indefinite Christian state is also steadily declining, even before it has been given official recognition by legislation. The Apostate Act is, as we said above, completely obsolete, and the law on attending church is also quite antiquated and is enacted only in exceptional cases. Thanks to the fearlessness of the English socialists, and especially of Richard Carlile, the law against blasphemy is also obsolescent and is applied only here and there, in particularly bigoted localities such as Edinburgh, for example, and even the denial of the oath is avoided wherever possible. The Christian party has become so weak that it sees itself that a strict enforcement of these laws would result in their prompt repeal, and therefore prefers to keep quiet so that the Damocles' sword of Christian legislation may at least continue to hang above the heads of the unbelievers and perhaps continue to act as a warning and deterrent.

In addition to the positive political institutions reviewed above, a few other things should be considered in connection with the Constitution. Up to now hardly any mention has been made of the Rights of Man; within the framework of the Constitution proper, the individual has no rights in England. These rights are founded either on usage or on the power of separate statutes which are in no way connected with the Constitution. We shall see how this peculiar division emerged, but in the meantime pass over to the criticism of those rights.

First there is the right of everyone to express his opinion without hindrance and without preliminary permission from the government—the freedom of the press. In general, it is true to say that nowhere is there a more extensive freedom of the press than in England, and yet this freedom is still very limited here. The libel law, the treason law and the blasphemy law weigh heavily on the press, and even if press persecution is seldom, *this is not because of the law*, but because of the government's fear of the inevitable unpopularity that measures against the press would entail. Every day the English newspapers of all parties commit offences both against the government and against individuals, but they are silently tolerated, no action is taken until the opportunity of starting a political trial arises, whereupon this opportunity is used to institute proceedings against the press as well. This was the case with the Chartists in 1842 and recently with the Irish repealers.¹⁹ The English freedom of the press has lived for the past hundred years by grace of the government, just as the Prussian freedom of the press has done since 1842.

The second "birthright" of the Englishman is the right of assembly, a right no other people in Europe as yet enjoys. This right, although age-old, has later been proclaimed in a statute as "the right of the people to assemble to discuss its grievances and to petition the legislation for their relief". This formula itself contains a certain restriction. If no petition results from a meeting, the latter assumes because of it if not a directly illegal, then at least a very doubtful character. In O'Connell's trial it was particularly stressed by the Crown that the meetings, which were qualified as illegal, had not been called to discuss petitions. The main restriction, however, is of a police nature; the central or local government can prohibit any meeting in advance or interrupt and disperse it, and this has been done not only at Clontarf but frequently even in England with Chartist and socialist meetings. But this is not considered an encroachment on the Englishman's birthrights, because the Chartists and socialists are poor devils and, as such, outside the pale of the law; nobody takes any notice of it except the *Northern Star*²⁰ and the *New Moral World*,²¹ and the Continent therefore does not get to know about it.

Next the right of association. All associations pursuing lawful aims with lawful means are permitted, but they are allowed every time to form only one large society, but not to include branch associations. The setting up of societies, which divide into local branches with a special organisation, is allowed only for philanthropic and generally pecuniary purposes, and can be undertaken here only if a license from the official appointed for that purpose is obtained. The socialists obtained such a license for their association by declaring such an aim; the Chartists were refused a license even though they copied the rules of the socialist society word for word in their Charter. They are now compelled to circumvent the law and are thereby placed in a position where a single slip of the pen of a single member of the Chartist Association can entangle the whole society in the snares of the law. But even apart from that, the right of association, in its full scope, is a privilege of the rich; for an association needs money above all, and it is easier for the rich Anti-Corn Law League to raise hundreds of thousands than it is for the poor Chartist society or the British Miners' Union to defray the costs of association alone. And an association that has no funds at its disposal has little importance and cannot engage in agitation.

The Habeas Corpus, that is, the right of every accused (excepted in the case of high treason) to be released on bail before trial, this much-praised right is also a privilege of the rich. The poor cannot procure bail and must therefore go to gaol.

The last of these Rights of Man is the right of every one to be judged only by his peers, and this, too, is a privilege of the rich. The poor man is not judged by his peers, he is in all cases judged by his sworn enemies, for in England the rich and the poor are in a state of open war. The jurors must possess certain qualifications, and what these are like, can be seen from the fact that the jury list of Dublin, a town of 250,000 inhabitants, contains only 800 who qualify. In the last Chartist trials in Lancaster, Warwick and Stafford workers were judged by big landowners and tenants, who were mostly Tories, and by factory owners or merchants, who were mostly Whigs, but in both cases enemies of the

Chartists and the workers. And that is not all. An "impartial jury" is generally an absurdity. When four weeks ago O'Connell was tried in Dublin every juryman was, as a Protestant and Tory, his enemy. Catholics and repealers would have been "his peers", and even they were not so, for they were his friends. A Catholic in the jury would have made this verdict, any verdict except acquittal, impossible. We have here a particularly vivid case, but essentially the same applies to any case. By its nature a jury is a political and not a legal institution, but since the whole judicial system is originally of a political nature, the jury reflects the *true* essence of that system, and the English jury, because it is the most developed, is the culmination of judicial deception and immorality. It begins with the fiction of the "impartial juror"; it is impressed upon the jurors that they should forget everything they have heard about the given case before the trial, that they should judge only according to the evidence presented here in court—as if this were possible! A second fiction is created, that of the "impartial judge", who is to explain the law and to weigh the evidence submitted by both sides impartially, completely "objectively"—as if this were possible! It is even demanded of the judge that he particularly and in spite of everything should not exercise any influence on the verdict of the jurors, should not suggest the verdict to them—that is, should interpret the premises as they should be interpreted to draw the conclusion; but he should not draw the conclusion itself, he is not allowed to draw it even for himself for that would influence his statement of the premises—all these and a hundred other things that are impossible, inhuman and stupid are demanded of him only in order to lend a mask of decency to the original stupidity and inhumanity. But you cannot bamboozle practice, in practice no one takes any notice of all this stuff; the judge clearly intimates to the jury what verdict it should bring in and the obedient jury regularly delivers that verdict.

Further! The accused must be protected in every way, the accused is, just as the king, sacred and inviolable and can do no wrong, that is, he may do nothing, and if he does do something, it is considered invalid. The accused may confess his

crime, but that does him no good at all. The law decides that he is not to be believed. I think it was in 1819 that a man accused his wife of adultery when she, during his illness, which she believed to be fatal, confessed to him that she had committed adultery—but the wife's advocate argued that a confession of the accused may not be taken in evidence and the complaint was rejected.* The sacredness of the accused is also reflected in the judicial procedure which is applied in the English trial by jury and which opens such a profitable field for the pettifogging tricks of the advocates. It seems incredible what ridiculous mistakes in procedure can upset the whole trial. In 1800 a man was found guilty of forgery but was released because his advocate discovered before the verdict had been handed in that in the counterfeit bank-note the name was abbreviated to Bartw, whereas in the indictment it was written Bartholomew, in full. The judge, as we said, sustained the objection and released the exposed forger.** In 1827 a woman was accused in Winchester of infanticide, but was acquitted because in its verdict the inquest jury had "upon their oath" (The jurors of our Lord the King upon their oath present that, etc.) declared that this and that had happened, but this jury was made up of thirteen men and had taken not one but thirteen oaths and the verdict should therefore have read: "Upon their oaths."*** A year ago in Liverpool a boy was caught on a Sunday evening in the act of stealing a handkerchief out of somebody's pocket and was arrested. His father objected that the police had arrested him unlawfully, because the law lays it down that no one is allowed to do on Sunday the work by which he earns his living, and that the police were therefore not allowed to arrest anybody on a Sunday. The judge agreed to this, but continued to question the youngster, who admitted to being a professional pickpocket. He was fined 5 shillings because he had pursued his trade on a Sunday. I could give hundreds of such examples, but those given are eloquent enough. English law justifies the accused but acts against society, for

* Wade, *British History*, London, 1838.

** Ibid.

*** Ibid.

the protection of which it actually exists. As in Sparta it is not the crime but the stupidity with which it was committed that is punished. All protection is turned against those whom it seeks to protect; the law seeks to protect society and attacks it; it seeks to protect the accused and does him nothing but harm—for it is clear that anybody too poor to oppose the official pettifoggery by an equally pettifogging advocate has against him the whole procedure that was created for his protection. Anyone who is too poor to put up an advocate or the requisite number of witnesses is lost in every somewhat doubtful case. He receives for preliminary perusal only the indictment and the sworn testimony initially given to the justice of the peace, and hence does not know in detail what will be brought in evidence against him (and this is particularly dangerous to an innocent person); he must reply as soon as the prosecution has presented its case, but is allowed to speak only once, and if he does not dispose of all doubts, if a witness whom he did not consider necessary to call is missing—he is lost.

The climax of the whole thing, however, is the rule that the twelve jurors must be unanimous in their verdict.

They are locked up in a room and are not allowed to leave until they reach a common decision or the judge realises that they cannot be made to agree. This is quite inhuman and so much against human nature that it makes it ridiculous to demand of twelve people that they should have an identical opinion on some point. But it is consistent. The inquisitorial system inflicts bodily or mental torture on the accused, while trial by jury sanctifies the accused and tortures the witnesses by a cross-examination that is no less exacting than the court of the inquisition. It even tortures the jurors, for it must obtain a verdict even if the world should go to ruin; the jury is locked up until it hands in a verdict, and if the jurors should really take it into their heads to act in accordance with their oaths, a new jury is appointed and the trial is repeated, and this continues until either the prosecution or the jurors tire of the struggle and surrender unconditionally. This is proof enough that the judiciary cannot exist without torture and is in all cases barbarism. It could not be otherwise; if one wants to achieve mathematical certainty about

things which do not admit of such certainty, one cannot but arrive at nonsense or barbarism. Practice once again reveals what is at the back of all this; in practice the jury takes it easy and, if there is no other way, breaks its oath without a twinge of conscience. In Oxford in 1824 a jury was unable to agree. One said guilty; eleven said not guilty. Finally they came to terms; the one dissenter wrote on the indictment: guilty, and withdrew; then came the alderman and the others, took the document and wrote a "not" in front of the "guilty" (Wade, *British History*). Another case is related by Fonblanque, the editor of the *Examiner*, in his *England Under Seven Administrations*. Here, too, the jury could not reach agreement and finally resorted to drawing lots; they took two straws and began to draw, and the opinion of the party drawing the longer straw was adopted.

Since we are discussing legal institutions let us look at the matter in somewhat greater detail in order to get a fuller view of the state of the law in England. The English penal code is known to be the strictest in Europe. As late as 1810 it still yielded nothing to the Carolina²² in barbarism; burning at the stake, breaking on the wheel, quartering, tearing intestines from the live body, etc., were very popular categories of punishment. Since then the most revolting atrocities have been abolished, but a great many brutalities and infamies remain unamended in the statutes. Capital punishment is prescribed for seven felonies (murder, treason, rape, sodomy, burglary, robbery with violence and arson with intent to murder); formerly much more widespread, it was limited to this number only in 1837; besides it, the English penal code contains two other exquisitely barbaric kinds of punishment—transportation, or the turning of man into beast through society, and solitary confinement, or the turning of man into beast through solitude. Nothing more cruel and vile can be devised than these two punishments to corrupt systematically the victims of the law bodily, intellectually and morally, and to make them worse than beasts. The transported criminal falls into such an abyss of demoralisation, of disgusting bestiality, that the best must succumb to it in six months; anyone who cares to read the eye-witnesses' reports about New South Wales and the Norfolk Island will

agree with me when I say that all the above said is still far from reflecting the reality. The person in solitary confinement is driven insane; the model prison in London has after three months of its existence had to deliver three madmen to Bedlam, not to mention religious madness, which still usually passes for sanity.

The penal laws against political crimes are drawn up in almost the same terms as the Prussian ones; especially the "exciting discontent" and "seditious language" are given in the same indefinite wording that leaves the judge and the jury so much elbow-room. The punishments are also stricter here than anywhere; transportation is the main punishment.

If these strict punishments and the vaguely defined political crimes do not have the practical results one might expect considering the law, this is on the one side a shortcoming of the law itself, which is so confused and unclear that a skilful advocate can always use these difficulties in favour of the accused. The English law is either common law, that is, unwritten law, as it existed at the time when the collection of the statutes began, and later when it was compounded by legal authorities; this law is naturally uncertain and doubtful on the main points; or the statute law, which consists of an endless series of individual parliamentary acts, collected over five hundred years, which contradict each other and create instead of a "state of law" a completely lawless state. The advocate is everything here; he who has been really thorough in wasting his time on this legal jumble, on this chaos of contradictions, is all-powerful in an English court. The uncertainty of the law naturally leads to faith in the authority of the decisions of former judges in similar cases, and is thus made only worse, for these decisions also contradict one another, and the result of the trial depends again on the extensive reading and presence of mind of the advocate. On the other hand, the meaninglessness of the English penal code is again only a grace, etc., an act of consideration for public opinion, which the law does not oblige the government to make; and that the legislature does not intend to change these conditions can be seen from the violent opposition to all law reforms. But one should not forget that property rules

and that this grace is conferred only on "respectable" criminals; the whole burden of this legalised barbarism falls on the poor, the pariah, the proletarian, and that is nobody's concern.

Again, this patronage of the rich is explicitly expressed in the law. While all serious crimes are punished with the heaviest punishments, almost all minor offences incur fines, which are naturally identical for the poor and the rich, and do no or little harm to the rich, whereas the poor man in nine cases out of ten is unable to pay and is then, without further ado, sent in default of payment for a few months to the treadmill. One has but to read the police reports in the first English daily paper one comes across to convince oneself of the truth of this assertion. The maltreatment of the poor and the patronage of the rich in all courts is so commonplace, is practised so openly and is so shamelessly reported by the newspapers that one can scarcely read a newspaper without burning with moral indignation. Thus a rich man is always treated with extraordinary politeness, and no matter how brutal his offence may have been, "the judges always very much regret" that they have to sentence him to a fine, usually a miserably small one. The administration of the law is in this respect much less humane than the law itself; "law grinds the poor, and rich men rule the law" and "there is one law for the poor and another for the rich" are absolutely true expressions that have long since become proverbial. But how could it be otherwise? The justices of the peace as well as the jurors are themselves rich men, they are enlisted from the middle class and are therefore biased in favour of their own, and are born enemies of the poor. And if the social influence of property, which cannot be considered here, is taken into account, then nobody can really feel surprised at this barbarian state of affairs.

The subject of *direct* social legislation, in which baseness reaches its climax, will be discussed later. At this point it could not be described in its full significance.

Let us now sum up this criticism of the state of the law in England. What can be said against it from the viewpoint of the "legal state" is a matter of complete indifference. That

England is not an official democracy cannot prejudice *us* against her institutions. To us only *one* thing matters, the thing we have observed everywhere, namely, that theory and practice are in glaring contradiction. All the power of the Constitution—the Crown, the Lords and the Commons—have dissolved before our very eyes; we have seen that the Established Church and all the so-called birthrights of the English are empty words, that even the jury is in reality only an illusion, that the law has no existence, in short, that a state which has placed itself on an accurately defined, legal basis, has denied this basis and violated it. The Englishman is not free because of the law, but despite the law, if he can be considered free at all.

We have also seen what a mass of lies and immorality result from this state of affairs; people prostrate themselves before meaningless names and deny reality, they do not want to know anything about it, refuse to recognise what actually exists, what they have themselves created; they deceive themselves and introduce a conventional language with artificial categories, each of which is a travesty, and cling fearfully to these meaningless abstractions, all this in order not to have to admit that in life, in practice, quite different things are at stake. The whole British Constitution and with it all of constitutional public opinion is nothing but one big lie, which is perpetually being propped up and concealed by a number of small lies, when its true nature is here or there revealed somewhat too openly. And even when they realise that all this edifice is nothing but falsehood and fiction, even then they cling to it more strongly than before, so that the meaningless words, the few senselessly compiled letters should not fall apart, for these words are precisely the main pillars of the world and with them the world and humanity would have to sink into the darkness of chaos! One cannot but turn away with deep disgust from this tissue of open and hidden lies, hypocrisy and self-deceit.

Can such a state continue for long? That is out of the question. The struggle of practice against theory, of reality against abstraction, of life against empty, meaningless words, in short, of man against inhumanity, must be resolved, and there is no doubt which side will achieve victory.

The struggle has already started. The basis of the Constitution has been shaken. How things will turn out in the near future can be seen from what has been said above. The new, alien elements in the Constitution are of a democratic nature; public opinion, too, as time will show, moves towards democracy. In the near future England will become a democracy.

But what a democracy! Not that of the French Revolution, whose antithesis were the monarchy and feudalism, but that democracy whose antithesis is the middle class and property. This is evident from the entire preceding development. The middle class and property rule; the poor man has no rights, is oppressed and flayed, the Constitution disowns him and the law maltreats him. The struggle of democracy against the aristocracy in England is the struggle of the poor against the rich. The democracy towards which England is heading is a *social* democracy.

But mere democracy is unable to remedy social ills. Democratic equality is a chimera, the struggle of the poor against the rich cannot be fought out on the ground of democracy or politics in general. Hence this stage too is only a transition, the last purely political measure that still has to be tried and from which a new element must immediately develop, a principle transcending everything political.

That principle is the principle of socialism.

Written by F. Engels
in March 1844

Published in *Vorwärts!*
(Paris), Nos. 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 83
and 84; September 18, 21, 25 and 28,
and October 5, 16 and 19, 1844

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS

**[THE COMMERCIAL CRISIS IN ENGLAND.—
THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT.—IRELAND]***

The commercial crisis to which England finds itself exposed at the moment is, indeed, more severe than any of the preceding crises. Neither in 1837 nor in 1842 was the depression as universal as at the present time. All the branches of England's vast industry have been paralysed at the peak of its development; everywhere there is stagnation, everywhere one sees nothing but workers thrown out on the pavement. It goes without saying that such a state of affairs gives rise to extreme anxiety among the workers who, exploited by the industrialists during the period of commercial prosperity, now find themselves dismissed *en masse* and abandoned to their fate. Consequently meetings of discontented workers are rapidly increasing. The *Northern Star*, the organ of the Chartist workers, uses more than seven of its large columns to report on meetings held in the past week; the list of meetings announced for the present week fills another three columns. The same newspaper mentions a brochure published by a worker, Mr. John Noakes,²³ in which the author makes an open and direct attack on the right of the aristocracy to own its lands.

* The title in brackets here and elsewhere has been provided by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.—*Ed.*

"English soil," he says, "is the property of the people, from whom our aristocrats seized it either by force or by trickery. The people must see that their inalienable right to property prevails; the proceeds of the land should be public property and used in the interest of the public. Perhaps I shall be told that these are revolutionary remarks. Revolutionary or not, it is of no concern; if the people cannot obtain that which they need in a law, they must get it without law."

It will not seem surprising that in these circumstances the Chartists should have recourse to most unusual measures; their leader, the famous Feargus O'Connor, has just announced that he is shortly to leave for Scotland, where he will call meetings in all the towns and collect signatures for the national petition for the People's Charter, which will be sent to the next Parliament. At the same time, he announced that before the opening of Parliament, the Chartist press is to be increased by the addition of a daily newspaper, the *Democrat*.²⁴

It will be recalled that at the last elections Mr. Harney, editor-in-chief of the *Northern Star*, was put forward as the Chartist candidate for Tiverton, a borough which is represented in Parliament by Lord Palmerston, the Foreign Secretary. Mr. Harney, who won on the show of hands, decided to retire when Lord Palmerston demanded a poll.²⁵ Now something has happened which shows how the feelings of the inhabitants of Tiverton differ from those of the small number of parliamentary electors. There was a vacancy to fill on the borough council; the municipal electors, a far more numerous class than that of the parliamentary electors, gave the free seat to Mr. Rowcliffe, the person who had proposed Mr. Harney at the elections. Moreover, the Chartists are preparing all over England for the municipal elections which will take place throughout the country at the beginning of November.

But let us turn now to England's greatest manufacturing district, Lancashire, a county which has suffered under the burden of industrial stagnation more than any other. The situation in Lancashire is alarming in the highest degree. Most of the factories have already stopped work entirely, and those which are still operating employ their workers for only two or at the most three days a week. But this is still not all: the industrialists of Ashton, a very important town

for the cotton industry, have announced to their workers that in eight days' time they are going to reduce wages by 10 per cent. This news, which is causing alarm among the workers, is spreading all over the county. A few days later a meeting of workers' delegates from all over the county was held in Manchester; this meeting resolved to send a deputation to the owners to induce them not to carry out the threatened reduction and, if this deputation achieved no results, to announce a strike of all workers employed in the Lancashire cotton industry. This strike, together with the strike of the Birmingham iron-workers and miners which has already started, would not fail to assume the same alarming dimensions which signalled the last general strike, that of 1842. It could quite well become even more menacing for the government.

In the meantime starving Ireland is writhing in the most terrible convulsions. The workhouses are overflowing with beggars, the ruined property owners are refusing to pay the Poor Tax, and the hungry people gather in their thousands to ransack the barns and stables of the farmers and even of the Catholic priests, whom they still worshipped a short time ago.

It looks as though the Irish will not die of hunger as calmly next winter as they did last winter. Irish emigration to England is getting more alarming each day. It is estimated that an average of 50,000 Irish arrive each year; the number so far this year is already over 220,000. In September, 345 were arriving daily and in October this figure increased to 511. This means that the competition between the workers will become stronger, and it would not be at all surprising if the present crisis caused such an uproar that it compelled the government to grant reforms of a most important nature.

Written by F. Engels
on October 23, 1847

Published in *La Réforme*,
October 26, 1847

Translated from the French

FREDERICK ENGELS

THE MASTERS AND THE WORKERS IN ENGLAND

TO THE WORKER EDITORS OF L'ATELIER²⁶

Gentlemen,

I have just read in your October issue an article entitled: "The Masters and the Workers in England"; this article mentions a meeting reported by *la Presse* of so-called delegates of workers employed in the Lancashire cotton industry, a meeting which took place on 29 August last in Manchester. The resolutions passed at this meeting were such as to prove to *la Presse* that there is perfect harmony between capital and labour in England.

You did quite well, gentlemen, to reserve your judgement on the authenticity of a report which a newspaper of the French bourgeoisie has given, based on newspapers of the English bourgeoisie. The report is accurate, it is true; the resolutions were adopted just as *la Presse* gives them; there is only one small statement lacking in accuracy, but it is precisely this small inaccuracy that is the crux of the matter: the meeting which *la Presse* describes was not a meeting of *workers*, but a meeting of *foremen*.

Gentlemen, I spent two years in the heart of Lancashire itself, and these two years were spent among the workers; I saw them both at their public meetings and in their small committees; I knew their leaders and their speakers, and I think I can assure you that in no other country in the world will you find men more sincerely devoted to democratic principles or more firmly resolved to cast off the yoke of the

capitalist exploiters, under which they find themselves suffering at present, than these Lancashire cotton factory workers. How, gentlemen, could these same workers whom I have seen with my own eyes throw several dozen factory owners off a meeting hall platform, whom I have seen cast terror into the ranks of the bourgeois gathered on this platform, their eyes glinting and fists raised, how, I repeat, could these same workers today pass a vote of thanks to their masters because the latter were kind enough to prefer a reduction in working hours to a reduction in wages?

But let us take a slightly closed look at the matter. Does not the reduction in work mean precisely the same thing for the worker as a reduction in wages? Evidently it does; in both cases the worker's position deteriorates to an equal extent. There was therefore no possible reason for the workers to thank their masters for having preferred the first method of reducing the workers' income to the second. However, gentlemen, if you study the English newspapers for late August, you will see that the cotton manufacturers had good reason to prefer a reduction in working hours to one in wages. At that time the price of raw cotton was rising; the same issue of the *London Globe* which reports the meeting in question also says that *the Liverpool speculators were going to take over the cotton market to produce an artificial rise in price*. What do the Manchester manufacturers do in such cases? They send their foremen to meetings and make them pass resolutions like those which *la Presse* communicated to you. This is a tried and tested device which is used each time the speculators try to raise the price of cotton. It is a warning to the speculators to be careful not to attempt to raise the price too high; for in that case the manufacturers would reduce consumption and, in so doing, inevitably produce a drop in price. So the meeting which gives *la Presse* grounds for so much rejoicing and acclamation is nothing but one of those foremen's assemblies which do not fool anyone in England.

In order to give you further proof of the extent to which this meeting was the exclusive work of the capitalists, it should suffice to tell you that the only newspaper to which the resolutions were sent, the newspaper from which all the

other newspapers borrowed them, was the *Manchester Guardian*, the organ of the manufacturers. The democratic workers' paper, the *Northern Star*, also gives them; but adds that it has taken them from this capitalist newspaper, a damning observation in the eyes of the workers.

Yours, etc.

Written by F. Engels
about October 26, 1847

Published in *l'Atelier*
No. 2, November 1847

Translated from the French

FREDERICK ENGELS

[THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT]

The opening of the recently elected Parliament that counts among its members distinguished representatives of the people's party could not but produce extraordinary excitement in the ranks of the democracy. Everywhere the local Chartist associations are being reorganised. The number of meetings increases and the most diverse ways and means of taking action are being proposed and discussed. The Chartist executive has just assumed leadership of this movement, outlining in an address to the British democrats the plan of campaign which the party will follow during the present session.

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

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

a Bill, finally, for the restoration of the sovereignty out of which the nation has been tricked for so many centuries.

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

The *Fraternal Democrats*,²⁷ a society consisting of democrats from almost every nation in Europe, has also just joined, openly and unreservedly, in the agitation of the Chartists. They adopted a resolution of the following tenor:

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

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

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

This fraternal society, which counts among its members the most distinguished democrats, both English and foreigners residing in London, is daily gaining in importance. It has grown to such proportions that the London liberals have considered it advisable to set up in opposition to it a bourgeois *International League*²⁸ headed by Free-Trade parliamentary celebrities. The sole object of this new association, whose leadership includes Dr. Bowring, Col. Thompson and other champions of Free Trade, is to carry on Free-Trade propaganda abroad under cover of philanthropic and liberal phrases. But it seems that the association will not make much headway. During the six months of its existence it has done almost nothing, whereas the Fraternal Democrats have openly come out against any act of oppression, no matter who may attempt to commit it. Hence the democracy, both English and foreign, in so far as the latter are represented

in London, have attached themselves to the Fraternal Democrats, declaring at the same time that they will not allow themselves to be exploited for the benefit of England's Free-Trade manufacturers.

Written by F. Engels
on November 21, 1847

Published in *La Réforme*,
November 22, 1847

Translated from the French

FREDERICK ENGELS

(THE COERCION BILL FOR IRELAND
AND THE CHARTISTS)

The Irish Coercion Bill came into force last Wednesday. The Lord Lieutenant was not slow in taking advantage of the despotic powers with which this new law invests him; the act has been applied all over the counties of Limerick and Tipperary and to several baronies in the counties of Clare, Waterford, Cork, Roscommon, Leitrim, Cavan, Longford and *King's County*.²⁹

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

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

* Daniel O'Connell.—*Ed.*

amendment put forward by Mr. Wakley, the Chartist member for a borough on the outskirts of London, who demanded that the Coercion Bill should also be accompanied by measures aimed at reducing the causes of the crimes which it was proposed to repress. And among these eighteen and twenty voters there were also four or five English Radicals and two Irishmen representing English boroughs, meaning that out of the hundred members which Ireland has in Parliament there were only a dozen who put up serious opposition to the Bill.

This was the first discussion on an important question affecting Ireland which had been held since the death of O'Connell. It was to decide who would take the place of the great agitator in leading Ireland. Up to the opening of Parliament Mr. John O'Connell had been tacitly acknowledged in Ireland as his father's successor. But it soon became evident after the debate had begun that he was not capable of leading the party and, what is more, that he had found a formidable rival in Feargus O'Connor. This democratic leader about whom Daniel O'Connell said, "We are happy to make the English Chartists a present of Mr. F. O'Connor", put himself at the head of the Irish party in a single bound. It was he who proposed the outright rejection of the Coercion Bill; it was he who succeeded in rallying all the opposition behind him; it was he who opposed each clause, who held up the voting whenever possible; it was he who in his speeches summed up all the arguments of the opposition against the Bill; and finally it was he who for the first time since 1835 reintroduced the motion for *Repeal of the Union*,³⁰ a motion which none of the Irish members would have put forward.

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

Ireland, they are obliged to submit to his leadership in Parliament.

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

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

Written by F. Engels
on January 4, 1848

Published in *La Réforme*,
January 8, 1848

Translated from the French

FREDERICK ENGELS

FEARGUS O'CONNOR AND THE IRISH PEOPLE

The first issue of the *Northern Star* for 1848 contains an address to the Irish people by *Feargus O'Connor*, the well-known leader of the English Chartists who also represents them in the House of Commons. The whole address deserves to be read and carefully considered by every democrat, but our restricted space prevents us from reproducing it in full.

We would, however, be remiss in our duty if we were to pass it over in silence. The momentous consequences of this forceful appeal to the Irish will very soon be clearly evident. *Feargus O'Connor*—who is of Irish descent, a Protestant and who has been for over ten years a leader and main pillar of the great labour movement in England—must henceforth be regarded as the virtual chief of the Irish Repealers and advocates of reform. The part he played in opposing the latest of the ignominious Irish Coercion Bills has given him the first claim to this status, and his continuous agitation for the Irish cause has shown that *Feargus O'Connor* is just the man Ireland needs.

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

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

He correctly elucidates the conduct of John O'Connell, who has taken possession of his father's political heritage and who like his father is prepared to sacrifice millions of credulous Irishmen for the sake of his personal ventures and interests. All O'Connell's orations at the Dublin Conciliation Hall³¹ and all his hypocritical protestations and beautiful phrases will not obliterate the disrepute he has brought upon himself by his earlier actions and in particular now by the way he acted during the debates on the Irish Coercion Bill.

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

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

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

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

Furthermore O'Connor pointed out that justice for Ireland had been demanded even earlier by the English workers in a petition which had received $3\frac{1}{2}$ million signatures,³² and that now the English Chartists again protested against the Irish Coercion Bill in numerous petitions. He finally stressed

that the oppressed classes in England and Ireland must fight together and conquer together or continue to languish under the same burden and live in the same misery and dependence on the privileged and ruling capitalist class.

Henceforth the mass of the Irish people will undoubtedly unite ever more closely with the English Chartists and will act in accordance with a common plan. This will bring the victory of the English democrats, and hence the liberation of Ireland, considerably nearer. That is the significance of O'Connor's address to the Irish people.

Written by F. Engels
at the beginning of January 1848

Published in *Deutsche-Brüsseler-
Zeitung* No. 3, January 9, 1848

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF FREE TRADE

DELIVERED TO THE DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION
OF BRUSSELS AT ITS PUBLIC MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 1848

Gentlemen,

The repeal of the Corn Laws in England is the greatest triumph which free trade has won in the nineteenth century. In all the countries where manufacturers are talking about free trade they have in mind first and foremost free trade in grain and raw materials in general. The imposition of protective tariffs on foreign grain is a disgrace, it is speculation on people's hunger.

Cheap food and high wages, this is the sole aim for which the free-traders in England have spent millions, and their enthusiasm has already spread to their brothers on the Continent. In general, if one wants free trade, it is to relieve the condition of the working classes.

But how astonishing! The people, for whom every effort is being made to obtain cheap food, are very ungrateful. Cheap food in England is just as disreputable as cheap government is in France. The people see devoted men such as Bowring, Bright and company as their greatest enemies and most shameless hypocrites.

Everyone knows that the struggle between the Liberals and the democrats in England is called the struggle between the free-traders and the Chartists.

Let us now see how the English free-traders have given the people proof of the noble sentiments which motivated them to act.

This is what they said to the factory workers:

The duty levied on grain is a tax on wages; you pay this tax to the landowners, those medieval aristocrats; if your position is wretched, it is because of the high price of prime necessities.

The workers in their turn put this question to the factory owners: How is it that during the last thirty years when our industry has developed like never before, our wages have dropped much more rapidly compared to the rise in the price of grain?

You claim that the tax which we pay to the landowners deprives the worker of about three pence a week. Yet the hand weavers' real wages dropped from 28 shillings a week to five shillings between 1815 and 1843; and the wages of the weaver in a machine workshop were cut from 20 shillings a week to eight shillings between 1823 and 1843.

And all this time the part of the tax which we paid to the landowner was never more than three pence. And what about this? In 1834, when bread was very cheap and trade was flourishing, what did you tell us? If you are unhappy it is because you have too many children and your marriage is more productive than your work!

These are the actual words which you told us then, and you went and passed new poor laws and built workhouses, those prisons for workers.

To all this the factory owners replied:

You are right, gentlemen; wages are determined not only by the price of corn, but also by competition between labour.

But bear in mind the fact that our land is nothing but rocks and sandbanks. Surely you do not by any chance imagine that corn could be made to grow in flower-pots! Consequently, if instead of wasting our capital and labour on completely barren soil, we were to give up agriculture in order to devote ourselves exclusively to industry, the whole of Europe would stop manufacturing and England would be the only large manufacturing town, with the rest of Europe as its countryside.

While he is speaking in this manner to his own workers, the factory owner is interrupted by the small trader who says to him:

But if we abolish the Corn Laws, we will ruin our agriculture, that is true, but by doing that we will not force the other countries to order goods from our factories and give up their own.

What will be the result? I will lose the customers whom I have now in the country and domestic trade will lose its markets.

Turning his back on the workers the factory owner replies to the grocer: Just leave all that to us. Once the tax on corn has been abolished we will get cheaper corn from abroad. Then we will lower wages at the same time as they are rising in the other countries which are supplying us with grain.

Thus in addition to the advantages which we possess already, we shall also have that of a lower wage, and with all these advantages we shall force the Continent to buy from us.

But then the farmer and agricultural worker join in the discussion.

And what about us, they say, what is going to happen to us?

Are we to sign the death sentence for agriculture which is our means of subsistence? Are we to suffer the ground being taken away from beneath our feet?

The sole reply of the Anti-Corn Law League has been to award prizes to the three best essays dealing with the beneficial influence which the repeal of the Corn Laws would have on English agriculture.

These prizes were won by Messrs. Hope, Morse and Greg whose books were circulated in the country in thousands of copies.

One of the prize-winners tries to prove that neither the farmer nor the paid labourer will lose by the free import of foreign grain, only the landowner. The English farmer need not fear the repeal of the Corn Laws, he writes, because no other country could produce corn of such fine quality and so cheaply as England.

Consequently even if the price of corn were to fall it would do you no harm, because this drop would affect only rent which would have dropped and not profit on capital or wages which would remain the same.

The second prize-winner, Mr. Morse, maintains on the other hand that the price of corn will rise following the repeal of the Corn Laws. He goes to tremendous pains to show that the protective tariffs have never been able to ensure a profitable price for corn.

In support of his assertion he quotes the fact that each time foreign corn was imported the price of corn rose considerably in England and when small quantities were imported the price dropped sharply. The prize-winner has forgotten that it is not importation that causes high prices but high prices that lead to importation.

In complete contradiction to his fellow prize-winner, he maintains that all rises in the price of grain profit the farmer and the worker, not the landowner.

The third prize-winner, Mr. Greg, who is a big factory owner and whose book is intended for the class of big farmers, could not confine himself to repeating such nonsense. His language is more scientific.

He argues that the Corn Laws only cause rents to rise by causing a rise in the price of corn and that they only cause a rise in the price of corn by forcing capital to be applied to land of inferior quality and this is explained quite naturally.

As the population increases, if foreign grain is not allowed to enter the country, one is forced to make use of less fertile land, the cultivation of which requires more expenditure and the produce of which is consequently more expensive.

Since the market for grain is guaranteed, the price will necessarily be regulated by the price of produce from the most expensive land. The difference between this price and the cost of production on better land constitutes the rent.

Thus, if the price of corn and, consequently, rent fall after the repeal of the Corn Laws, this is because the less fertile land will cease to be cultivated. Thus the reduction in the rent will inevitably lead to the ruin of a section of the farmers.

These observations were necessary to make Mr. Greg's language comprehensible.

The small farmers, he says, who are not able to hold their own in agriculture, will turn to industry for a living. As for the big farmers, they stand to profit. Either the land-

owners will be forced to sell them their land very cheaply, or the leases which they grant them will be very long-term ones. This will allow them to invest considerable capital in the land, to make use of machinery there on a much larger scale and thus to economise on manual labour, which will be cheaper anyway because of the general drop in wages, an immediate consequence of the abolition of the Corn Laws.

Dr. Bowring gave all his arguments a religious consecration by declaring at a public meeting: Jesus Christ is free trade; free trade is Jesus Christ.

It will be clear that all this hypocrisy was not able to make cheap bread more attractive to the workers.

In any case how could the workers have understood the sudden philanthropy of the factory owners, the same people who were still engaged in opposing the Ten Hours Bill which was intended to reduce the working day in the factories from twelve hours to ten.³³

To give you an idea of the philanthropy of these factory owners, I will remind you, gentlemen, of the regulations established in all factories.

Each factory owner has an actual code for his special use which lays down fixed fines for all offences intentional or unintentional. For example, the worker pays the same amount if he has the misfortune to sit down on a chair, if he whispers, chats, laughs, if he arrives a few minutes late, if part of his machine breaks, if he does not produce objects of the requisite quality, etc., etc. The fines are always higher than the actual damage done by the worker. And in order to provide the worker with every opportunity of incurring penalties the factory clock is put fast, and shoddy raw materials are provided for him to turn into good articles. The foreman who is not clever enough to increase the number of offences loses his job.

As you can see, gentlemen, this domestic legislation is made to encourage offences, and offences are encouraged to make money. Thus the factory owner uses all the means at his disposal to reduce nominal wages and exploit even those accidents over which the worker has no control.

These factory owners are the same philanthropists who tried to make the workers believe that they were capable of

going to great expense solely in order to improve their lot.

Thus, on the one hand, they were using the factory regulations to reduce workers' wages in a most despicable manner and on the other they were going to great sacrifices to raise them by the Anti-Corn Law League.

At great expense they are building palaces where the League will establish, as it were, its official headquarters, they are sending out an army of missionaries to all parts of England to preach the religion of free trade, they are printing and distributing free of charge thousands of brochures to enlighten the worker about his own interests, they are spending enormous sums to enlist the support of the press for their cause, they are organising a vast administration to direct the movements of the free-traders, and they are deploying all the riches of their eloquence at public meetings. It was at one of these meetings that a worker shouted:

"If the landowners were to sell our bones, you other factory owners would be the first to buy them so as to throw them into a steam mill and make flour out of them."

The English workers realised full well the significance of the struggle between the landowners and the industrial capitalists. They know full well that the latter want to lower the price of bread in order to lower wages, and that profit on capital would rise as rents fell.

Ricardo, the apostle of the English free-traders and the most distinguished economist of our century, is in perfect agreement with the workers on this point.

In his famous work on political economy he says:

"If, instead of growing our own corn, we discover a new market from which we can supply ourselves with these commodities at a cheaper price, wages will fall and profits rise. The drop in the price of agricultural produce reduces the wages not only of workers employed in the cultivation of the land, but also of all those who work in factories or are employed in commerce."³⁴

And do not imagine, gentlemen, that it is a matter of complete unconcern to the worker if he receives no more than 4 francs when corn is cheaper, as compared to the 5 francs which he received before.

Have not his wages always dropped in relation to profits? And is it not clear that his social position has deteriorated

compared to that of the capitalist? Apart from that he is actually losing more.

As long as the price of corn was high and wages were too, a small saving made on the consumption of bread was sufficient to procure him other delights. But the moment that the price of bread and, consequently, wages drop considerably he can hardly save anything on bread to buy other things.

The English workers have made the free-traders realise that they are not taken in by the latter's illusions and lies, and if, in spite of this, they have associated with the free-traders against the landowners it was to destroy the last vestiges of feudalism and to make sure that they now had only a single enemy to face. The workers were not mistaken in their calculations, because in order to avenge themselves on the factory owners the landowners joined with the workers to get the Ten Hours Bill passed which the latter had been demanding to no avail for 30 years and which was passed immediately after the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Although Dr. Bowring brought a long list out of his pocket at a congress of economists to show how much beef, ham, lard and chickens, etc., had been imported into England for consumption, as he says, by the workers, he unfortunately forgot to tell you that at the same time workers in Manchester and other manufacturing towns found themselves thrown out on to the street by the impending crisis.

It is a principle of political economy that one must never conclude general laws from figures relating to one year only. One must always take the average period of six to seven years—the time lapse during which modern industry passes through the different stages of prosperity, overproduction, stagnation and crisis completing its fatal cycle.

Without a doubt, if the price of all goods drops, and this is the necessary consequence of free trade, I can buy far more things with a franc than before. And a worker's franc is worth as much as any other. It follows that free trade is very advantageous to the worker. Only there is a slight drawback here, namely, that the worker, before exchanging his franc for other goods, has already exchanged his labour with capital. If in this exchange he were always to receive the franc in question for the same work and the price of all

the other goods fell he would always stand to gain in these transactions. The difficult point is not to prove that when the price of all goods drops I should have more goods for the same money.

Economists always take the price of labour at the point when it is exchanged for other commodities. But they disregard entirely the point when labour effects its exchange for capital.

When less expenditure is required to put into operation a machine that produces commodities, the things necessary for the upkeep of this machine, which is called the worker, are correspondingly cheaper. If all commodities are cheaper, labour, which is also a commodity, will also drop in price and, as we shall see later, this labour-as-a-commodity drops considerably more in proportion to other commodities. The worker still relying on the arguments of the economists will find that the franc in his pocket has vanished into thin air and he has nothing but five sous.

With respect to this the economists will tell you: All right, we agree that competition between the workers, which will certainly not diminish under free trade, will not be long in bringing wages into line with the low price of commodities. But on the other hand the low price of commodities will increase consumption; greater consumption will require greater production which will be followed by a greater demand for labour, and this greater demand for labour will be succeeded by a rise in wages.

All these arguments return to the same point; free trade increases the productive forces. If industry is growing, if the riches, if the productive power, if in a word the productive capital is increasing the demand for labour, the price of labour and as a result wages will rise accordingly. The best condition for the worker is the augmentation of capital. And one is bound to agree. If capital remains stationary, industry will not simply be stationary, but will decline and in this case the worker will be the first victim. He will perish before the capitalist. And what will be the fate of the worker when capital is augmenting, the situation which, as we have said, is the best one for the worker? He will perish likewise. The augmentation of productive capital implies the accumulation

and concentration of capital. The centralisation of capital leads to a greater division of labour and the greater use of machines. The greater division of labour destroys the worker's special skills and by substituting for these skills a job which anybody can do it increases competition between the workers.

This competition grows even stronger as the division of labour provides the worker with the means of performing the work of three men on his own. Machines produce the same result on a much larger scale. By forcing the industrial capitalists to run their businesses with ever increasing means, the increase in productive capital ruins the small industrialists and casts them into the proletariat. Then, with the rate of interest diminishing as capital accumulates, the small stock-holders are no longer able to survive on their income and are forced to turn to industry, thereby increasing the numbers of the proletariat.

Finally, the more productive capital increases the more it is forced to produce for a market whose needs it does not know, the more production precedes consumption, the more supply seeks to increase demand and a result crises grow in intensity and rapidity. But each crisis in its turn accelerates the centralisation of capital and swells the ranks of the proletariat.

Thus, as productive capital increases, the competition between the workers increases in a far greater proportion. Remuneration for labour diminishes for everyone and the burden of labour increases for some.

In 1829 there were 1,088 spinners in Manchester employed in 36 factories. In 1841 there were only 448 and these spinners were working 53,353 more spindles than the 1,088 workers in 1829. If manual labour had increased in proportion to productive power the number of workers should have reached the figure of 1,848 meaning that the improvements made in the machinery have made 1,100 workers redundant.

We know in advance what the economists will reply to this. These men who have been deprived of work, they say, will find another job. Dr. Bowring did not fail to reproduce this argument at the congress of economists, but nor did he fail to refute it himself.

In 1835 Dr. Bowring gave a speech in the House of Commons on the subject of the 50,000 London weavers who

have been starving to death for a long time without being able to find this new occupation which the free-traders have given them a hazy glimpse of in the distance.

We shall quote the most salient passages from Dr. Bowring's speech.

"This distress of the weavers," he says, "is an inevitable condition of a species of labour easily learned—and constantly intruded on and superseded by cheaper means of production. A very short cessation of demand, where the competition for work is so great, and the workmen so multitudinous, produces a crisis. The hand-loom weavers are on the verge of that state beyond which human existence can hardly be sustained, and a very trifling check hurls them into the regions of starvation. . . . The great changes which the improvements of machinery have introduced into the whole field of manufacturing industry, improvements which, by superseding manual labour more and more, infallibly bring with them in the transition much of temporary suffering. . . . The national good cannot be purchased but at the expense of some individual evil. No advance was ever made in manufactures but at some cost to those who are in the rear; and of all discoveries, the power-loom is that which most directly bears on the condition of the hand-loom weaver. He is already beaten out of the field in many articles; he will infallibly be compelled to surrender many more. . . .

"I hold," he says later on, "in my hand, the correspondence which has taken place between the Governor-General of India and the East India Company, on the subject of the Dacca hand-loom weavers. The governor says in his letters: Some years ago the East India Company annually received of the produce of the looms of India to the amount of from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 of pieces of cotton goods. The demand gradually fell to somewhat more than 1,000,000, and has now nearly ceased altogether. In 1800, the United States took from India nearly 800,000 pieces of cottons; in 1830, not 4,000. In 1800, 1,000,000 pieces were shipped to Portugal; in 1830, only 20,000. Terrible are the accounts of the wretchedness of the poor Indian weavers, reduced to absolute starvation. And what was the sole cause? The presence of the cheaper English manufacture, the production by the power-loom of the article which these unhappy Hindoos had been used for ages to make by their unimproved and hand-directed shuttles. . . . Numbers of them died of hunger; the remainder were, for the most part, transferred to other occupations, principally agricultural. Not to have changed their trade was inevitable starvation. And at this moment, Sir, that Dacca district is supplied with yarn and cotton cloth from the power-looms of England. . . . The Dacca muslins, celebrated over the whole world for their beauty and fineness, are also annihilated from the same cause. And the present suffering, to numerous classes in India, is scarcely to be paralleled in the history of commerce."

Dr. Bowring's speech is all the more remarkable since the facts which are quoted in it are true and the phrases with

which he seeks to palliate them are of precisely the same hypocritical nature as all the sermons of the free-traders. He represents the workers as means of production which must be replaced by less expensive means of production. He pretends to see the work about which he is talking as a quite exceptional type of work and the machine which has ruined the weavers as an equally exceptional machine. He forgets that there is no manual labour which is not liable to suffer the fate of weaving at any moment.

"It is, in fact, the constant aim and tendency of every improvement in machinery to supersede human labour altogether, or to diminish its cost, by substituting the industry of women and children for that of men; or that of ordinary labourers, for trained artisans. In most of the water twist, or throstle cotton mills, the spinning is entirely managed by females of sixteen years and upwards*. The effect of substituting the self-acting mule for the common mule, is to discharge the greater part of the men spinners, and to retain adolescents and children."

These words of a most passionate free-trader, the Honourable Dr. Ure,³⁵ serve to complete the confessions of Mr. Bowring. Mr. Bowring speaks of some individual suffering and says at the same time that this individual suffering will make entire classes perish; he speaks of passing suffering in the time of transition and at the same time he does not attempt to conceal the fact that this passing suffering has been the passage from life to death for the majority, and for the rest the transition to a condition inferior to that in which they were placed before. When he says later on that the misfortunes of these workers are inseparable from industrial progress and necessary for the national well-being, he is saying simply that the misfortunes of the working class are a necessary condition for the well-being of the bourgeois class.

The only consolation which Mr. Bowring lavishes on the workers who are perishing, and in general the whole doctrine of compensation which the free-traders have laid down, boils down to this:

You other thousands of workers who are perishing, do not be downhearted. You can die with your minds at rest. Your class will not perish. It will always be numerous enough

* The manuscript has "sixteen years and under".—*Ed.*

for capital to be able to decimate it without fear of annihilating it totally. In any case, how could you expect capital to find a useful occupation if it did not always take care to be sparing with exploitable material, the workers, in order to exploit them afresh?

But also why raise the question of the effect which the introduction of free trade will have on the condition of the working class as a problem still to be solved? All the laws which the economists have elaborated from Quesnay to Ricardo are based on the supposition that the fetters which still trammel free commerce no longer exist. The more free trade is realised, the stricter these laws become. The first of these laws is that competition reduces the price of all commodities to the minimum cost of their production. Thus minimum wages are the natural price of labour. And what are minimum wages? They are quite simply that which is necessary to produce those things which are indispensable for the sustenance of the worker, to make it possible for him to have more or less enough to eat and just manage to propagate his race.

Do not think that the worker will have only the minimum wage for this; do not think either that he will always have this minimum wage.

No, according to this law the working class will sometimes be more fortunate. It will occasionally have more than the minimum; but this surplus will only be a supplement to what it receives below the minimum in times of industrial stagnation. This means that over a certain length of time, which is always periodic, the circle that industry describes passing through the vicissitudes of prosperity, over-production, stagnation and crisis, taking into account all that the working class will have above or below that which is necessary, it will be seen that in all it will have had no more and no less than the minimum: that is to say, the working class will be preserved as a class after a great deal of misfortune, misery and corpses left on the field of industrial battle. But what does that matter? The class will still survive and, what is even better, will have increased.

This is not all. The progress of industry produces less expensive means of subsistence. Thus brandy has replaced

beer, cotton has replaced wool and linen, and potatoes have replaced bread.

Consequently, since ways are always found of supplying labour with less expensive and more wretched things, the minimum wage will always decrease. Whereas in the beginning wages made man work in order to live, they finish by making him live the life of a machine. His existence has no other worth than that of a simple productive force, and the capitalist treats him accordingly.

This law of labour-as-a-commodity, the minimum wage, will be confirmed as the supposition of the economists, free trade, becomes a truth, an actual fact. Thus one is faced with this alternative: either one denies the whole of political economy based on the supposition of free trade, or one has to agree that the workers will be hit by all the severity of economic laws under this free trade.

To sum up: What is free trade in the present state of society? It is the freedom of capital. When you remove the few national fetters that still trammel the advance of capital, you will have done nothing but give it entire freedom of action. As long as you allow the relation between wage-labour and capital to continue, the exchange of commodities between them will be carried on in more favourable conditions to no avail; there will always be a class which exploits and a class which is exploited. It is really extremely difficult to understand the claim of the free-traders who imagine that the more advantageous use of capital will make the antagonism between the industrial capitalists and the wage-workers disappear. Quite on the contrary all that will result from it is that the opposition between these two classes will stand out even more sharply.

Let us imagine for a moment that there are no more Corn Laws, no more customs, no more dues, finally that all the accidental circumstances which the worker can still blame as the cause of his miserable condition have entirely disappeared and you have torn away all the veils which conceal his true enemy from him.

He will see that freed capital does not enslave him any less than capital constrained by tariffs.

Gentlemen, do not allow yourselves to be impressed by the

abstract word *freedom*. Freedom for whom? It is not the freedom of a single individual in the presence of another individual. It is the freedom which capital has to crush the worker.

How can you still want to sanction free competition by this idea of freedom, when this freedom is nothing but the product of a state of things based on free competition?

We have seen the nature of the fraternity which free trade engenders between the different classes of one and the same nation. The fraternity which free trade will establish between the different nations of the world will not be any more fraternal. Calling exploitation in its cosmopolitan form by the name of universal fraternity is an idea that could only originate in the bosom of the bourgeoisie. All the destructive phenomena which free competition engenders inside a country are reproduced in more gigantic proportions on the world market. We have no need to dwell any longer on the sophisms which are recited on this subject by the free-traders and which are little better than the arguments of our three prize-winners, Messieurs Hope, Morse and Greg.

We are told, for example, that free trade will give rise to the international division of labour which will assign to each country production in accordance with its natural advantages.

Perhaps you may think, gentlemen, that the production of coffee and sugar is the natural destiny for the West Indies.

Two centuries ago nature, which does not meddle with commerce, had not provided them with either a coffee pot or a sugar tin.

And is it not perhaps possible that in fifty years time you will find neither coffee nor sugar there, because the East Indies by cheaper production have already victoriously combated this so-called natural destiny for the West Indies. And these same West Indies with their natural gifts are already as heavy a burden for the English as the Dacca weavers who were also destined from time immemorial to weave by hand.

Another thing which must never be overlooked is that, just as everything has become a monopoly, there are also some branches of industry in our day which dominate all others and which assure to those peoples who exploit them

most supremacy on the world market. Thus in international commerce cotton alone has a far greater commercial value than all the other raw materials used for making clothing taken together. And it is really laughable to see the free-traders bringing out the few special branches of industry to compare them with the output of objects of common use which are cheaper in countries where industry is more developed.

We should not be surprised if the free-traders cannot understand how one country can get rich at the expense of another, because these same gentlemen also find it impossible to understand how within a single country one class can get rich at the expense of another.

Do not imagine, gentlemen, that in criticising commercial liberty we wish to defend the protective system.

One can be an enemy of the constitutional regime without being a friend of the *ancien régime*.

Moreover the protectionist system is only a means of establishing industry on a large scale in a country, that is to say, making it depend on the world market, and as soon as one depends on the world market one depends to a greater or lesser degree on free trade. Apart from this, the protective system helps to develop free competition within a country. This is why we see that in those countries where the bourgeoisie has begun to make itself felt as a class, in Germany for example, it is making great efforts to have protective tariffs. These are its weapons against feudalism and against absolute government, a means of concentrating its forces and achieving free trade within the country in question.

But, generally speaking, in our time the protective system is conservative, whereas the system of free trade is destructive. It dissolves the old nationalities and drives the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat to the extreme. In a word, the system of commercial freedom hastens the social revolution. It is only in this revolutionary sense, gentlemen, that I vote in favour of free trade.

Published as a pamphlet
at the beginning of February 1848
in Brussels
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Translated from the French

KARL MARX

**A REVIEW OF GUIZOT'S BOOK,
"WHY HAS THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION
BEEN SUCCESSFUL?"***

It is the purpose of M. Guizot's pamphlet to show why Louis Philippe and Guizot's policy should really not have been overthrown on February 24, 1848, and how the abominable character of the French was to blame for the ignominious downfall of the July monarchy of 1830 after an arduous existence of only eighteen years and for its failure to attain the permanency enjoyed by the English monarchy ever since 1688.

From this pamphlet one may see how even the most capable people of the *ancien régime*, people whose own kind of talent in the realm of history can by no means be disputed, have been brought to such a state of perplexity by the fatal events of February that they have lost all understanding of that science, that they now even fail to comprehend their own former course of conduct. Instead of being impelled by the February Revolution to realise the totally different historical relations, the totally different class alignment of society, in the French monarchy of 1830 and the English of 1688, M. Guizot disposes of the whole difference with a few moralising phrases, averring in conclusion that the policy that was upset on February 24 "preserves the states and alone quells revolutions".

Exactly formulated, the question M. Guizot wants to answer reads as follows: Why has bourgeois society developed

* F. Guizot, *Pourquoi la révolution d'Angleterre a-t-elle réussi?* Discours sur l'histoire de la révolution d'Angleterre. Paris, 1850.—Ed.

longer in England in the form of the constitutional monarchy than in France?

The following passage will serve to characterise M. Guizot's acquaintance with the course of bourgeois development in England:

"In the reigns of George I and George II public spirit veered. Foreign policy ceased to be their main concern; home affairs, maintenance of peace, problems of finance, colonies and trade, the development of parliamentary rule as well as parliamentary struggles now mainly engaged the attention of both the government and the public" (p. 168).

M. Guizot finds only two facts in the reign of William III worthy of mention: maintenance of the balance of power between Parliament and Crown, and maintenance of the balance of power in Europe by fighting Louis XIV. Then, under the Hanoverian dynasty, "public spirit" suddenly "veered", no one knows how or why. We see here that M. Guizot applies terms common enough in French parliamentary debate to English history and believes he thereby has explained it. Similarly, M. Guizot imagined, when he was minister, that he held the balance of power between Parliament and Crown as well as the balance of power in Europe, whereas in reality all he did was to barter away piecemeal the whole French state and the whole of French society to the financial sharks of the Paris bourse.

M. Guizot does not consider it worthwhile mentioning that the wars against Louis XIV were purely trade wars to destroy French commerce and French sea power, that under William III the domination of the financial bourgeoisie received its first sanction by the establishment of the Bank and the institution of the national debt,³⁶ and that the manufacturing bourgeoisie was given new impetus by the consistent application of a protective tariff system. Only political phrases mean anything to him. He does not even mention that in Queen Anne's reign the ruling parties could maintain themselves and the constitutional monarchy only by a bold stroke, the lengthening of the term of Parliament to seven years, thus almost completely destroying the influence of the people upon the government.

Under the Hanoverian dynasty England was already so far advanced that she could wage a trade war against France

in its modern form. England herself fought France only in America and the East Indies; on the Continent she confined herself to hiring foreign princes like Frederick II to do the fighting against France. Thus foreign wars assumed a different form, about which M. Guizot says: "foreign policy ceases to be the main concern" and is replaced by "the maintenance of peace." The extent to which "the development and the struggles of the parliamentary regime now mainly engaged the attention of both the government and the public" may be gauged from the accounts of the bribery practised under Walpole's Ministry, which, of course, do not differ a hair's breadth from the scandals that figured so largely on the order of the day under M. Guizot.

M. Guizot explains that there are two particular reasons why in his opinion the English Revolution took a more favourable turn in the sequel than the French: firstly, because the English Revolution was thoroughly religious in character and was therefore far from breaking with all the traditions of the past; secondly, because from its very inception it did not act destructively but conservatively and that Parliament defended the old laws in force against the usurpations of the Crown.

As for the first point, M. Guizot forgets that free thought, which gives him such shivers in connection with the French Revolution, was brought to France from no other country than England. Locke was its father, and with Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke it assumed that keen-spirited form which was subsequently developed so splendidly in France. We thus arrive at the odd conclusion that free-thinking, which, according to M. Guizot, shipwrecked the French Revolution, was one of the most essential products of the religious English Revolution.

As far as the second point is concerned, M. Guizot forgets entirely that the French Revolution began just as conservatively as the English, if not much more so. Absolutism, particularly as it manifested itself finally in France, was here, too, an innovation, and it was against this innovation that the parliaments rose and defended the old laws, the *us et coutumes** of the old monarchy based on estates. Whereas

* usages and customs.—Ed.

the first step of the French Revolution was the resurrection of the States General, which had been dormant since Henry IV and Louis XIII, no fact of equal classical conservatism had been revealed by the English Revolution.

According to M. Guizot the main result of the English Revolution was that the king was put in a position where he could not possibly rule against the will of Parliament, particularly the House of Commons. The whole revolution amounted merely to this, that in the beginning both sides, Crown and Parliament, overstepped the mark and went too far until at last, under William III, they found the proper balance and neutralised each other. M. Guizot deems it superfluous to mention that the subordination of the kingship to Parliament was its subordination to the rule of a class. He need not therefore go into the details of how this class acquired the power necessary to make the crown at last its servant. In his opinion the only issues involved in the whole struggle between Charles I and Parliament were purely political prerogatives. Not a word about the reason why Parliament and the class represented in it needed these prerogatives. M. Guizot has just as little to say about Charles I's direct interference in free competition, which made England's trade and industry more and more impossible; or about his dependence upon Parliament, which because of his constant financial straits became the greater the more he sought to defy Parliament. Hence the only explanation he can find for the whole revolution is the malevolence and religious fanaticism of individual trouble-makers who would not be satisfied with a moderate freedom. Nor can M. Guizot enlighten us on the connection between the religious movement and the development of bourgeois society. The republic, too, is naturally only the handiwork of a few ambitious, fanatic and evil-minded people. That about the same time attempts to set up a republic were likewise made in Lisbon, Naples and Messina,³⁷ patterned likewise, as in England, after Holland, is a fact that he entirely fails to mention. Although M. Guizot never loses sight of the French Revolution, he does not even draw the simple conclusion that everywhere the transition from the absolute to the constitutional monarchy is effected only after severe struggle and after a republican form of govern-

ment has been gone through, and that even then the old dynasty, become useless, has to make room for a usurpatory collateral line. The most trivial commonplaces are therefore the only information he can give us about the overthrow of the restored English monarchy. He does not even mention the direct causes of it: the fear of the new big landed proprietors created by the Reformation that Catholicism might be re-established, in which event they would naturally have to restore all the lands of which they had robbed the Church—a proceeding in which seven-tenths of the entire area of England would have changed hands; the dread experienced by the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie *vis-à-vis* Catholicism, which in no way suited their book; the nonchalance with which the Stuarts, to their own advantage and that of the court aristocracy, sold all English industry, and commerce as well, to the government of France, that is, of the only country which at that time dangerously, and in many respects successfully, competed with the English, etc. As M. Guizot omits everywhere the most important points, all he has left is a most inadequate and banal narration of mere political events.

The only explanation M. Guizot is able to offer of what to him is a great puzzle, the puzzle of why the English Revolution was conservative in character, is that it was due to the superior intelligence of the English, whereas its conservatism is to be attributed to the permanent alliance between the bourgeoisie and the greater part of the big landlords, an alliance which essentially differentiates the English Revolution from the French—the revolution that abolished big landownership by parcellation. Unlike the French feudal landowners of 1789, this class of big landed proprietors, which had allied itself with the bourgeoisie and which, incidentally, had arisen already under Henry VIII, was not antagonistic to but rather in complete accord with the conditions of life of the bourgeoisie. In actual fact their landed estates were not feudal but bourgeois property. On the one hand, the landed proprietors placed at the disposal of the industrial bourgeoisie the people necessary to operate its manufactories and, on the other, were in a position to develop agriculture in accordance with the state of industry and trade. Hence their

common interests with the bourgeoisie; hence their alliance with it.

As far as M. Guizot is concerned, English history stopped with the consolidation of the constitutional monarchy in England. To him everything that followed was merely a pleasant game of seesaw between Tories and Whigs, something in the nature of the great debate between M. Guizot and M. Thiers. In reality, however, the consolidation of the constitutional monarchy was precisely the thing that marked the beginning of the grand development and metamorphosis of bourgeois society in England. Where M. Guizot sees only placid tranquillity and idyllic peace, most violent conflicts, most thoroughgoing revolutions, were actually developing. First manufacture developed under the constitutional monarchy to a hitherto unknown extent, only to make room, subsequently, for big industry, the steam-engine and the gigantic factories. Entire classes of the population disappear, and new ones with new conditions of existence and new requirements take their place. A new, more colossal bourgeoisie arises. While the old bourgeoisie fights the French Revolution, the new one conquers the world market. It becomes so omnipotent that even before the Reform Bill puts direct political power into its hands it forces its opponents to pass laws almost exclusively in *its* interests and according to *its* needs. It conquers for itself direct representation in Parliament and uses it to destroy the last remnants of real power that landed property retains. Lastly, it is engaged at the present time in utterly demolishing the handsome edifice of the English constitution that M. Guizot so admires.

While M. Guizot congratulates the English on the fact that in their country the detestable excrescences of French social life—Republicanism and Socialism—have not shaken the foundations of the monarchy, which alone can save men's souls, class antagonisms in English society have become more acute than in any other country. Here a bourgeoisie possessed of unparalleled wealth and productive forces is opposed by a proletariat whose strength and concentration are likewise unparalleled. Thus M. Guizot's approbation of England finally amounts to this, that here, under the protection of a constitutional monarchy, far more numerous and far more

radical elements of social revolution have developed than in all other countries of the world taken together.

When the threads of development in England are gathered into a knot which he can no longer cut, even for appearance's sake, with the aid of purely political phrases, M. Guizot resorts to religious phrases, to the armed intervention of God. Thus, for instance, the spirit of the Lord suddenly descends upon the army and keeps Cromwell from proclaiming himself king, etc., etc. From his conscience Guizot seeks safety in God; from the profane public, in his style.

Indeed, not only *les rois s'en vont*, but also *les capacités de la bourgeoisie s'en vont*.*

Written in February 1850

Published in *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* No. 2, 1850

Translated from the German

* Not only kings pass away, but also the men of talent among the bourgeoisie.—Ed.

FREDERICK ENGELS

THE ENGLISH TEN HOURS BILL

The English workers have suffered a major defeat, which came from a most unexpected quarter. A few weeks ago the Court of Exchequer, one of England's four High Courts, reached a decision, as a result of which the main stipulations of the Ten Hours Bill, passed in the year 1847, have been for all intents and purposes revoked.

The history of the Ten Hours Bill provides a striking example of the path of development peculiar to the class contradictions in England and therefore deserves closer perusal.

It is common knowledge how the rise of large-scale industry brought in its wake a completely new, utterly shameless form of exploitation of the working class by the factory owners. The new machines made the labour of adult men superfluous, since their supervision only required the labour of women and children, which was far better suited to this task and at the same time more cheaply obtainable than that of men. Thus, industrial exploitation at once engulfed the whole family, imprisoning it in the factory; women and children were obliged to work without ceasing day and night, until they fell victim to complete exhaustion. As a result of the growing demand for child labour, workhouse children became nothing more nor less than commodities; from the age of four or even three they were auctioned off by the

dozen, bound as apprentices to the highest bidder among the factory owners. The memory of the shameless and brutal treatment of women and children at that time, which was quite relentless while there was still a single muscle, sinew or drop of blood to be exploited, is still very much alive among the older generation of workers in England. Some of these workers still carry this memory with them in the form of a crooked back or crippled limb, and all are haunted by it on account of their irrevocably damaged health. The lot of the slaves on the worst of the American plantations was pure bliss in comparison with that of the English workers of that period.

From an early stage the state was obliged to introduce measures to check the factory owners' utterly ruthless exploitation, which defied all postulates of a civilised society. However, these original legal restrictions proved highly inadequate and were soon obviated. It was not until fifty years after the introduction of large-scale industry, when industrial development had already taken firm root, not until 1833, that it was possible to enact an effective law, which at least put a stop to the most glaring excesses.

As early as the beginning of this century a group was formed under the leadership of a number of philanthropists, which campaigned for the legal restriction of the working day in the factories to ten hours. This group, which, under Sadler's leadership in the twenties and, after his death, that of Lord Ashley and Richard Oastler, continued agitating until the Ten Hours Bill was finally passed, gradually rallied to its banner, apart from the workers themselves, the aristocracy and all those sections of the bourgeoisie that were hostile to the factory owners. This association between workers and the most heterogeneous and reactionary elements of English society meant that the campaign for the Ten Hours Bill had to be conducted quite separately from the revolutionary campaign of the workers. The Chartists, of course, supported the Ten Hours Bill to a man; they were the most numerous and active participants at the meetings in support of the Ten Hours Bill and they put their press at the disposal of the Short-Time Committee. Yet not a single Chartist campaigned officially alongside the aristocratic and bourgeois

advocates of the Bill or sat on the Short-Time Committee in Manchester. This committee consisted exclusively of workers and factory foremen. The workers concerned, however, were completely broken individuals, worn out by work, meek, God-fearing, respectable men, who were filled with pious horror at the very thought of Chartism and socialism, showed deep respect for Crown and Church and were too downtrodden to hate the industrial bourgeoisie; all they were still capable of was humble reverence for the aristocracy, who at least deigned to take an interest in their wretched plight. The working-class Toryism of these supporters of the Ten Hours Bill was the echo of the workers' original opposition to industrial progress, which was aimed at re-establishing the former patriarchal conditions, while its most active manifestations had gone no further than the smashing of machines. The bourgeois and aristocratic leaders of this group were just as reactionary as these workers. They were all without exception sentimental Tories, for the most part utopian visionaries, wallowing in reminiscences of the extinct patriarchal cottage-industry exploitation and its concomitant piety, homeliness, hidebound worthiness and its set patterns handed down from generation to generation. Their thick skulls reeled at the mere glimpse of industrial revolutionary ferment. Their petty-bourgeois minds were gripped with fear at the prospect of the new forces of production developing at miraculous speed, which in a matter of a few years had swept away what had been the most venerable, sacrosanct and important classes in society, substituting in their place new, formerly unknown classes, whose interests, sympathies, attitudes and way of life were quite incompatible with the institutions of the old English society. These soft-hearted visionaries lost no opportunity to protest on moral, humanitarian and compassionate grounds against the unrelenting cruelty and ruthlessness that accompanied this upheaval contrasting it with the stability, quiet cosiness and modest respectability of the vanishing patriarchal system which they held up as the ideal society.

Whenever the question of the ten-hour working day became a focus of public interest, all sections of society whose interests had suffered as a result of the industrial revolution

and whose livelihood was threatened by it gave their support to these elements. At such times the bankers, stockjobbers, shipowners and merchants, the landed aristocracy, the big landowners from the West Indies and the petty bourgeoisie rallied in ever larger numbers to the support of the Ten Hours Bill campaign.

The Ten Hours Bill provided an excellent meeting ground for these reactionary classes and factions to join forces with the proletariat against the industrial bourgeoisie. While the Bill served to hold down the rapid growth of the wealth and influence, social and political power of the factory owners, it brought the workers a purely material, even strictly physical benefit. It saved their health from too rapid deterioration. It did not, however, give them anything which might have made of them a threat to their reactionary fellow-campaigners: it neither brought them political power nor altered their social position as wage-workers. On the contrary, this campaigning for a ten-hour working day kept the workers permanently under the influence and to some extent under the actual leadership of these property-owning allies, a leadership from which they had been making increasing efforts to dissociate themselves ever since the Reform Bill and the rise of the Chartist movement. It was quite natural, particularly at the beginning of the industrial revolution, that the workers, engaged as they were in direct struggle against only the industrial bourgeoisie, should ally themselves to the aristocracy and other sections of the bourgeoisie, who did not exploit them directly and who were also opposing the industrial bourgeoisie. But this alliance contaminated the working-class movement with a considerable influx of reactionary elements, which is taking a long time to disappear; it gave rise to a significant increase in the influence of reactionary elements in the working-class movement, namely, those workers, whose branch of production was still at the manufactory stage and therefore threatened by industrial progress, as, for example, the hand-loom weavers.

It was therefore most fortunate for the workers that the Ten Hours Bill was finally put through in 1847, at a time of general turmoil, when all the old parliamentary parties were disintegrating and the new ones had not yet taken

shape. The passing of this Bill was but one of a whole series of extremely confused parliamentary divisions, the results of which appeared to be determined by nothing other than chance and during which, apart from the convinced free-traders among the factory owners, on the one hand, and the fanatically protectionist landowners, on the other, no party voted in a consistent united fashion. This Bill was seen as a cunning blow, which the aristocracy, some of the Peelites and some of the Whigs had dealt at the factory owners, so as to take their revenge for the major victory the latter had won by repealing the Corn Laws.

The Ten Hours Bill not only satisfied an absolutely essential need of the workers by protecting their health to some extent from the frenzied exploitation of the factory owners, but also freed the workers from the association with sentimental dreamers, from the partnership with England's reactionary classes in general. Patriarchal rantings of the Oastlers and moving professions of sympathy from the Lord Ashleys fell on deaf ears, once the Ten Hours Bill ceased to be the point of their tirades. It was only then that the working-class movement started to concentrate its entire attention on the conquest of political power by the proletariat, as the primary means of revolutionising the whole of the existing society. Whereupon the aristocracy and reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie, but a short while ago allies of the workers, now started both violently opposing the working-class movement and allying themselves with the bourgeoisie with a similar fervour.

As a result of the industrial revolution, industry, by means of which England had been able to secure complete domination of the world market, had become England's all-important branch of production. England stood to rise or fall in time with her industry, soar or sink with industry's fluctuations. As industry came to exert this decisive influence, so the industrial bourgeoisie, the factory owners, came to constitute the all-important class in English society; the political domination of industrialists and the removal of all social and political institutions which obstructed the development of large-scale industry became a necessity. The industrial bourgeoisie set about this task and English history from 1830 to the present

day is a history of the victories which it gained one after the other over its united reactionary opponents.

Whereas the July Revolution in France brought the financial aristocracy to power, the Reform Bill in England, which was passed soon afterwards, in 1832, led to the fall of the financial aristocracy. The bank, the national creditors and the stock-exchange speculators, in a word, those dealing in money, to whom the aristocracy was deeply in debt, had hitherto held almost unchallenged sway in England, behind the checkered mask of their electoral monopoly. The more large-scale industry and world trade developed, the more intolerable, despite various concessions, this domination became. It was overthrown by the alliance of all the other sections of the bourgeoisie with the English proletariat and the Irish peasants. In face of the threat of popular revolution the bourgeoisie returned its notes by the pile to the bank, bringing it to the verge of bankruptcy. The financial aristocracy stepped down at the right moment and through its flexibility spared England a February Revolution.

The Reform Bill gave all propertied classes in the country, down to the last shopkeeper, a share in political power. All sections of the bourgeoisie were thus granted a domain where they could legitimately assert their interests and claims to power. Rivalries between various sections of the bourgeoisie, similar to those which have been going on in France under the Republic ever since the June victory of 1848 have in England since the Reform Bill proceeded in Parliament. It goes without saying that the results these rivalries have led to in the two countries, where widely differing conditions prevail, also show little similarity.

The industrial bourgeoisie, having once gained access to the field of parliamentary struggle after the Reform Bill, could not fail to win victory after victory. As a result of the restrictions on sinecures the financiers' aristocratic hangers-on were sacrificed to the industrial bourgeoisie,³⁸ as were the paupers as a result of the Poor Law of 1833³⁹ and the financiers and landowners through the reduction of tariffs and the introduction of income tax, which did away with their tax privileges. These victories swelled the numbers of the industrialists' minions. Wholesale and retail trade became their tributaries

and London and Liverpool began paying homage at the altar of free trade, the industrialists' Messiah. But with these victories their requirements and aspirations also grew.

Modern large-scale industry can only hold its own provided that it is constantly expanding and constantly conquering new markets. The infinite facility of mass production, the incessant development and improvement of machinery, which lead to the constant ousting of capital and workers, oblige it to follow this course. Any lull marks the onset of ruin. The expansion of industry, however, depends on the expansion of the market. Yet, since industry at its present level of development is expanding its productive forces incomparably faster than it can expand its markets, those periodic crises occur, when, owing to a surplus of means of production and output, commercial circulation suddenly comes to a standstill and industry and trade can do nothing but mark time, until the surplus output finds an outlet through new channels. England is the focal point of these crises, the crippling effect of which cannot fail to make itself felt in the most distant and remote corners of the world market and bring about the ruin of a considerable section of the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie everywhere. In such crises, which incidentally make all sections of English society still more clearly aware of their dependence on the factory owners, there is only one way to save the situation: to expand markets, either through winning new ones or exploiting more thoroughly those in existence. Apart from a few exceptions when, as for instance in China in 1842, a previously tightly closed market was prised open by force of arms, there is only one industrial means of opening up new markets and exploiting existing ones more thoroughly, namely, introducing lower prices, i.e., reducing production costs. Production costs can be reduced by the adoption of new, improved production methods and by means of cuts in profits or wages. The introduction of improved production methods, however, cannot avert crises, since this in its turn leads to increased production, which again makes new markets necessary. Profit cuts are out of the question at times of crisis, when everyone is only too glad to sell even at a loss. The same applies to wages, which moreover, like profit are subject to laws that are independent of

the wishes and intentions of the factory owners. Nevertheless, it is wages that constitute the bulk of production costs and repeated cuts are the only means of expanding markets and surmounting such crises. Yet wages will fall only if the necessities of life can be provided for the worker more cheaply. However, the necessities of life in England were made more expensive for the worker by protective tariffs on corn, on produce imported from the English colonies, etc., and also by indirect taxes.

This is what lay at the root of the industrialists' unremitting, energetic and nation-wide agitation for free trade and, in particular, for the abolition of the corn tariffs. Hence the significant fact that from 1842 onwards each trade and industrial crisis brought them yet another victory. The interests of the landowners in England were sacrificed to those of the interests of the landowners in the colonies likewise through the lifting of differential tariffs on sugar and other produce, and those of the shipowners through the repeal of the Navigation Laws.⁴⁰ At the present juncture the industrialists are campaigning for restrictions on state spending and on taxation and for the enfranchisement of that section of the working class on whom they can best rely. They are eager to bring new allies into Parliament in order to win direct political power for themselves all the faster: this alone will enable them to put an end to the now absurd but very costly traditional appendages of the English state machine, namely, the aristocracy, the church, the rotten boroughs and the semi-feudal legal system. There is no doubt that the now imminent new trade crisis, which seems bound to coincide with new major collisions on the Continent, will at least bring about this advance in England's development.

Yet amidst this series of uninterrupted victories of the industrial bourgeoisie reactionary groups succeeded in hampering its advance with the fetters of the Ten Hours Bill. The Ten Hours Bill was passed at a time marked neither by prosperity nor crisis, during one of those transition periods when industry is sufficiently embarrassed by the consequences of over-production as to be able to put in motion only a part of its resources and when the factory owners themselves do not allow their factories to work full time. At a

moment such as this, when the Ten Hours Bill set limits to the competition between the factory owners themselves, only at such a moment, could it be tolerated. However, this moment was soon to make way for a new period of prosperity. The emptied markets demanded new supplies; speculation got under way once more, thus doubling demand and the factory owners could not produce enough. Now the Ten Hours Bill became an intolerable shackle for industry, which more than ever before required complete independence and freedom from all restrictions with regard to the disposal of all its resources. What was to become of the industrialists during the next crisis if they were not permitted to exploit to the full this short period of prosperity? The Ten Hours Bill had to be revoked. Since there was as yet insufficient support in Parliament to do this, ways would have to be found to obviate it.

The Bill set a ten-hour limit for the working day of young people under eighteen and all women workers. Since the latter and children make up the majority of factory workers, this meant that factories in general could work only ten hours a day. The factory owners, however, when the next wave of prosperity called for an increase in working hours, found a way out of the situation. As before, with regard to children under fourteen, whose working hours had been made subject to still stricter limits, so on this occasion they proceeded to engage some women and young people as relief and shift workers. Thus they were able to keep their factories running and adult employees working for as many as thirteen, fourteen and fifteen hours a day without a single individual, among those effected by the Ten Hours Bill, working for more than the statutory ten hours a day. This contravened the letter of the law to a certain extent, but the whole spirit of the law and the intention of its authors far more so. The factory inspectors complained while Justices of the Peace were divided among themselves and reached varying verdicts. The higher the wave of prosperity rose, the louder the industrialists protested against the Ten Hours Bill and against the intervention of factory inspectors. Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary, instructed the inspectors to close their eyes to the relay or shift system. Yet a good number

of them did not let these instructions harass them, in the knowledge that they had the law behind them. Finally a much publicised case was brought before the Court of Exchequer which came out in favour of the factory owners. This verdict was tantamount to an abrogation of the Ten Hours Bill and the factory owners are once again unchallenged masters of their factories; in times of crisis they can keep their factories running two, three or six hours and during periods of prosperity thirteen or fifteen hours, while the factory inspector is no longer in a position to interfere.

The Ten Hours Bill was supported mainly by reactionaries and put through Parliament by exclusively reactionary classes, and it is now clear from the way in which the Bill was put through that it was indeed a thoroughly reactionary measure. The whole of England's social development is bound up with the development and advance of industry. All institutions which stand in the way of this advance, which restrict it or seek to regulate and control it according to any outside criteria are of necessity reactionary: their position is precarious and they are bound to be swept away by it. The revolutionary current which dealt so easily with the whole patriarchal society of the England of the Past, the aristocracy and the finance bourgeoisie, is most unlikely to allow the moderate Ten Hours Bill to stem its passage. All attempts of Lord Ashley and his associates to reinstate the Bill by means of an authentic interpretation will be in vain or at best achieve ephemeral results.

Nevertheless the Ten Hours Bill is indispensable for the workers. For them it is a physical necessity. Without this Bill the whole of the present generation of English workers is doomed to physical collapse. Yet there is a tremendous gulf between the Ten Hours Bill which the workers are now demanding and the Ten Hours Bill which Sadler, Oastler and Ashley campaigned for and which was passed by the reactionary coalition of 1847. The Bill's short lifespan, its simple undoing—a mere court ruling, not even an act of Parliament, was required to revoke it—and the subsequent behaviour of their former reactionary associates have taught the workers what an alliance with reaction is worth. It has taught them how little they gain from the enactment of

isolated, minor measures against the industrial bourgeoisie. It has taught them that the industrial bourgeoisie is so far the only class which at the present time is capable of providing their movement with leaders and that to obstruct its progressive mission would be fruitless. Despite their open hostility towards the industrialists, which has in no way been cooled, the workers are now much more inclined to support the latter in their campaign to achieve completely free trade, financial reform and an extension of the franchise, than to let themselves be rallied once more to the banners of the united forces of reaction by philanthropic mystification. They feel that their time can only come after the industrialists' energy has been completely spent and are thus responding to the right instincts in going out of their way to accelerate the process of development which will give the industrialists the power they seek and lead to their subsequent downfall. Meanwhile they do not forget that in doing so they are bringing their own, immediate enemies to power, and that they can only achieve their own liberation by overthrowing the industrialists and winning political power for themselves. The virtual annulment of the Ten Hours Bill has proved this to them once again most pointedly. The reinstatement of this Bill is futile without universal suffrage, and universal suffrage in England, two-thirds of whose population consists of industrial proletarians, implies exclusive political power for the working class, together with all those revolutionary changes in social conditions intrinsic to that power. The Ten Hours Bill which the workers are now calling for is therefore quite different from the one which the Court of Exchequer has just abrogated. It no longer represents an isolated attempt to cripple industrial progress, it is a link in a long chain of measures aimed at radically changing the whole of the present structure of society and gradually doing away with hitherto existing class contradictions. It is no longer a reactionary but a revolutionary measure for which they are campaigning.

The virtual repeal of the Ten Hours Bill, first by the factory owners taking the law into their own hands, and then by the Court of Exchequer, served above all to shorten the recent period of prosperity and bring the next crisis

nearer. Meanwhile all that serves to bring these crises nearer also serves to accelerate the advance of English society and the immediate goal of that advance, namely, the overthrow of the industrial bourgeoisie by the industrial proletariat. The means at the disposal of the industrialists for the expansion of markets and the elimination of crises are few and far between. The reduction of state spending advocated by Cobden is either merely a piece of Whig talk or it borders on a revolution, even if it is only a temporary solution. If this measure is to be followed through on a wide, truly revolutionary scale—in as far as the English industrialists can be revolutionary—how is the next crisis to be averted? It is evident that the English industrialists, whose means of production possess an inestimably greater capacity for expansion than their commodity markets, are rapidly approaching the point when they will no longer have any loopholes to turn to, when the periods of prosperity, which now still separate one crisis from the next, will disappear altogether under the pressure of the inordinate growth of productive forces, when crises will only be separated by short periods of feeble half-hearted industrial activity and when industry, trade and the whole of modern society will perish as a result of an excess of energy, for which it has no outlet, on the one hand, and utter exhaustion on the other, were it not for the fact that this abnormal state of affairs bears its own remedy within itself and that industrial development at the same time has engendered the one class which will be able to take over the direction of society, namely, the proletariat. The proletarian revolution is then inevitable and its victory assured.

Such is the logical normal sequence of events that is bound to stem from the whole complex of social conditions in present-day England. To what extent this normal process can be shortened by clashes on the Continent and revolutionary upheavals in England will soon emerge.

And what of the Ten Hours Bill?

The moment the confines of the world market become too narrow for the full deployment of all modern industry's resources, the moment this industry requires a social revolution in order that its potential may once more have free scope for action, the restriction of working hours ceases to be a reac-

tionary measure or a brake on industrial progress. On the contrary such restrictions emerge of their own accord. The first result of the proletarian revolution in England will be the centralisation of large-scale industry in the hands of the state, in other words, in the hands of the ruling proletariat, and those rivalries which today lie at the root of the contradiction between regulation of working hours and industrial progress will vanish with the centralisation of industry. Thus the problem of the ten-hour working day, like all those which stem from the contradiction between capital and wage-labour, can be solved by one thing and one thing only—the *proletarian revolution*.

Written by F. Engels
in March 1850

Published in *Neue Rheinische
Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische
Revue* No. 4, April 1850

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

THE ELECTIONS IN ENGLAND.—
TORIES AND WHIGS⁴¹

London, Friday, August 6, 1852

The results of the General Election for the British Parliament are now known. These results I shall analyse more fully in my next letter.⁴²

What were the parties which during this electioneering agitation opposed or supported each other?

Tories, Whigs, Liberal Conservatives (Peelites), Free-Traders, *par excellence* (the men of the Manchester School,⁴³ Parliamentary and Financial Reformers), and lastly, the Chartists.

Whigs, Free-Traders and Peelites coalesced to oppose the Tories. It was between this coalition on one side, and the Tories on the other, that the real electoral battle was fought. Opposed to Whigs, Peelites, Free-Traders and Tories, and thus opposed to entire official England, were the Chartists.

The political parties of Great Britain are sufficiently known in the United States. It will be sufficient to bring to mind, by a few strokes of the pen, the distinctive characteristics of each of them.

Up to 1846 the Tories passed as the guardians of the traditions of Old England. They were suspected of admiring in the British Constitution the eighth wonder of the world; to be *laudatores temporis acti*, enthusiasts for the throne, the High Church,⁴⁴ the privileges and liberties of the British subject. The fatal year, 1846, with its repeal of the Corn

Laws, and the shout of distress which this repeal forced from the Tories, proved that they were enthusiasts for nothing but the rent of land, and at the same time disclosed the secret of their attachment to the political and religious institutions of Old England. These institutions are the very best institutions, with the help of which the *large landed property*—the landed interest—has hitherto ruled England, and even now seeks to maintain its rule. The year 1846 brought to light in its nakedness the *substantial class interest* which forms the *real base* of the Tory party. The year 1846 tore down the traditionally venerable lion's hide, under which Tory class interest had hitherto hidden itself. The year 1846 transformed the Tories into *Protectionists*. Tory was the sacred name, Protectionist is the profane one; Tory was the political battle-cry, Protectionist is the economical shout of distress; Tory seemed an idea, a principle; Protectionist is an interest. Protectionists of what? Of their own revenues, of the rent of their own land. Then the Tories, in the end, are Bourgeois as much as the remainder, for where is the Bourgeois who is not a protectionist of his own purse? They are distinguished from the other Bourgeois in the same way as the rent of land is distinguished from commercial and industrial profit. Rent of land is conservative, profit is progressive; rent of land is national, profit is cosmopolitical; rent of land believes in the State Church, profit is a dissenter by birth. The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 merely recognised an already accomplished fact, a change long since enacted in the elements of British civil society, viz., the subordination of the landed interest to the moneyed interest, of property to commerce, of agriculture to manufacturing industry, of the country to the city. Could this fact be doubted since the country population stands, in England, to the towns' population in the proportion of one to three? The substantial foundation of the power of the Tories was the rent of land. The rent of land is regulated by the price of food. The price of food, then, was artificially maintained at a high rate by the Corn Laws. The repeal of the Corn Laws brought down the price of food, which in its turn brought down the rent of land, and with sinking rent broke down the real strength upon which the political power of the Tories reposed.

What, then, are they trying to do now? To maintain a political power, the social foundation of which has ceased to exist. And how can this be attained? By nothing short of a *Counter-Revolution*, that is to say, by a reaction of the State against Society. They strive to retain forcibly institutions and a political power which were condemned from the very moment at which the rural population found itself outnumbered three times by the population of the towns. And such an attempt must necessarily end with their destruction; it must accelerate and make more acute the social development of England; it must bring on a crisis.

The Tories recruit their army from the farmers, who either have not yet lost the habit of following their landlords as their natural superiors, or who are economically dependent upon them, or who do not yet see that the interest of the farmer and the interest of the landlord are no more identical than the respective interests of the borrower and of the usurer. They are followed and supported by the Colonial Interest, the Shipping Interest, the State Church Party, in short, by all those elements which consider it necessary to safeguard their interests against the necessary results of modern manufacturing industry, and against the social revolution prepared by it.

Opposed to the Tories, as their hereditary enemies, stand the *Whigs*, a party with whom the American Whigs⁴⁵ have nothing in common but the name.

The British Whig, in the natural history of politics, forms a species which, like all those of the amphibious class, exists very easily, but is difficult to describe. Shall we call them, with their opponents, Tories out of office? or, as continental writers love it, take them for the representatives of certain *popular* principles? In the latter case we should get embarrassed in the same difficulty as the historian of the Whigs, Mr. Cooke, who, with great *naïveté*, confesses in his "History of Parties"⁴⁶ that it is indeed a certain number of "liberal, moral and enlightened principles" which constitute the Whig party, but that it was greatly to be regretted that during the more than a century and a half the Whigs have existed, they have been, when in office, always prevented from carrying

out these principles. So that in reality, according to the confession of their own historian, the Whigs represent something quite different from their professed "liberal and enlightened principles". Thus they are in the same position as the drunkard brought up before the Lord Mayor who declared that he represented the Temperance principle but from some accident or other always got drunk on Sundays.

But never mind their principles; we can better make out what they are in historical fact; what they carry out, not what they once believed, and what they now want other people to believe with respect to their character.

The Whigs, as well as the Tories, form a fraction of the large landed proprietary of Great Britain. Nay, the oldest, richest and most arrogant portion of English landed proprietary is the very nucleus of the Whig party.

What, then, distinguishes them from the Tories? The Whigs are the *aristocratic representatives* of the bourgeoisie, of the industrial and commercial middle class. Under the condition that the Bourgeoisie should abandon to them, to an oligarchy of aristocratic families, the monopoly of government and the exclusive possession of office, they make to the middle class, and assist it in conquering, all those concessions, which in the course of social and political development have shown themselves to have become *unavoidable* and *undelayable*. Neither more nor less. And as often as such an unavoidable measure has been passed, they declare loudly that herewith the end of historical progress has been obtained; that the whole social movement has carried its ultimate purpose, and then they "cling to finality".⁴⁷ They can support more easily than the Tories a decrease of their rental revenues, because they consider themselves as the heaven-born farmers of the revenues of the British Empire. They can renounce the monopoly of the Corn Laws, as long as they maintain the monopoly of government as their family property. Ever since the "glorious revolution" of 1688⁴⁸ the Whigs, with short intervals, caused principally by the first French Revolution and the consequent reaction, have found themselves in the enjoyment of the public offices. Whoever recalls to his mind this period of British history, will find no other distinctive mark of Whigdom but the maintenance of

their family oligarchy. The interests and principles which they represent besides, from time to time, do not belong to the Whigs; they are forced upon them by the development of the industrial and commercial class, the Bourgeoisie. After 1688 we find them united with the Bankocracy, just then rising into importance, as we find them in 1846 united with the Millocracy. The Whigs as little carried out the Reform Bill of 1831 as they carried the Free Trade Bill of 1846. Both Reform movements, the political as well as the commercial, were movements of the Bourgeoisie. As soon as either of these movements had ripened into irresistibility, as soon as, at the same time, it had become the safest means of turning the Tories out of office, the Whigs stepped forward, took up the direction of the Government, and secured to themselves the governmental part of the victory. In 1831 they extended the political portion of reform as far as was necessary in order not to leave the middle class entirely dissatisfied; after 1846 they confined their Free Trade measures so far as was necessary, in order to save to the landed aristocracy the greatest possible amount of privileges. Each time they had taken the movement in hand in order to prevent its forward march, and to recover their own posts at the same time.

It is clear that from the moment when the landed aristocracy is no longer able to maintain its position as an independent power, to fight, as an independent party, for the government position, in short, that from the moment when the Tories are definitively overthrown, British history has no longer any room for the Whigs. The aristocracy, once destroyed, what is the use of an aristocratic representation of the Bourgeoisie against this aristocracy?

It is well known that in the Middle Ages the German Emperors put the just then arising towns under Imperial Governors, "*advocati*", to protect these towns against the surrounding nobility. As soon as growing population and wealth gave them sufficient strength and independence to resist, and even to attack the nobility, the towns also drove out the noble Governors, the *advocati*.

The Whigs have been these *advocati* of the British middle class, and their governmental monopoly must break down as

soon as the landed monopoly of the Tories is broken down. In the same measure as the middle class has developed its independent strength, they have shrunk down from a party to a coterie.

It is evident what a distastefully heterogeneous mixture the character of the British Whigs must turn out to be: Feudalists, who are at the same time Malthusians, money-mongers with feudal prejudices, aristocrats without point of honour, Bourgeois without industrial activity, finality-men with progressive phrases, progressists with fanatical Conservatism, traffickers in homeopathical fractions of reforms, fosterers of family-nepotism, Grand Masters of corruption, hypocrites of religion, Tartuffes of politics. The mass of the English people have a sound aesthetical common sense. They have an instinctive hatred against everything motley and ambiguous, against bats and Russellites. And then, with the Tories, the mass of the English people, the urban and rural proletariat, has in common the hatred against the "money-monger". With the Bourgeoisie it has in common the hatred against aristocrats. In the Whigs it hates the one and the other, aristocrats and Bourgeois, the landlord who oppresses it, and the money lord who exploits it. In the Whigs it hates the oligarchy which has ruled over England for more than a century, and by which the people is excluded from the direction of its own affairs.

The Peelites (Liberals and Conservatives) are no party; they are merely the *souvenir* of a party man, of the late Sir Robert Peel. But Englishmen are too prosaical, for a *souvenir* to form, with them, the foundation for anything but elegies. And now that the people have erected brass and marble monuments to the late Sir Robert Peel in all parts of the country, they believe they are able so much the more to do without those perambulant Peel monuments, the Grahams, the Gladstones, the Cardwells, etc. The so-called Peelites are nothing but this staff of bureaucrats which Robert Peel had schooled for himself. And because they form a pretty complete staff, they forget for a moment that there is no army behind them. The Peelites, then, are old supporters of Sir Robert Peel, who have not yet come to a conclusion as to what party to attach themselves to. It is evident that a similar

scruple is not a sufficient means for them to constitute an independent power.

Remain the Free-Traders and the Chartists, the brief delineation of whose character will form the subject of my next.

Written by K. Marx
on August 6, 1852.

Published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* No. 3540,
August 21, 1852;
and in *The People's Paper*
No. 22, October 2, 1852
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according to the text
of the *New-York Daily Tribune* and checked with the
text of *The People's Paper*

KARL MARX

THE CHARTISTS

London, Tuesday, August 10, 1852

While the Tories, the Whigs, the Peelites—in fact, all the parties we have hitherto commented upon—belong more or less to the past, the Free-Traders (the men of the Manchester School, the Parliamentary and Financial Reformers) are the *official representatives of modern English society*, the representatives of that England which rules the market of the world. They represent the party of the self-conscious Bourgeoisie, of industrial capital striving to make available its social power as a political power as well, and to eradicate the last arrogant remnants of feudal society. This party is led on by the most active and most energetic portion of the English Bourgeoisie—the *manufacturers*. What they demand is the complete and undisguised ascendancy of the Bourgeoisie, the open, official subjection of society at large under the laws of modern, bourgeois production, and under the rule of those men who are the directors of that production. By Free Trade they mean the unfettered movement of capital, freed from all political, national and religious shackles. The soil is to be a marketable commodity, and the exploitation of the soil is to be carried on according to the common commercial laws. There are to be manufacturers of food as well as manufacturers of twist and cottons, but no longer any lords of the land. There are, in short, not to be tolerated any political or social restrictions, regulations or monopolies, unless they proceed from “the eternal laws of political economy”, that is, from the conditions under which Capital produces and distributes. The struggle of this party against

the old English institutions, products of a superannuated, an evanescent stage of social development, is resumed in the watchword: *Produce as cheap as you can, and do away with all the faux frais of production* (with all superfluous, unnecessary expenses in production). And this watchword is addressed not only to the private individual, but to the nation at large principally.

Royalty, with its "barbarous splendours", its court, its civil list and its flunkies—what else does it belong to but to the *faux frais* of production? The nation can produce and exchange without royalty; away with the crown. The sinecures of the nobility, the House of Lords? *faux frais* of production. The large standing army? *faux frais* of production. The Colonies? *faux frais* of production. The State Church, with its riches, the spoils of plunder or of mendicity? *faux frais* of production. Let parsons compete freely with each other, and everyone pay them according to his own wants. The whole circumstantial routine of English Law, with its Court of Chancery?⁴⁹ *faux frais* of production. National wars? *faux frais* of production. England can exploit foreign nations more cheaply while at peace with them.

You see, to these champions of the British Bourgeoisie, to the men of the Manchester School, every institution of Old England appears in the light of a piece of machinery as costly as it is useless, and which fulfils no other purpose but to prevent the nation from producing the greatest possible quantity at the least possible expense, and to exchange its products in freedom. Necessarily, their last word is the Bourgeois Republic, in which free competition rules supreme in all spheres of life; in which there remains altogether that *minimum* only of government which is indispensable for the administration, internally and externally, of the common class interest and business of the Bourgeoisie; and where this minimum of government is as soberly, as economically organised as possible. Such a party, in other countries, would be called *democratic*. But it is necessarily revolutionary, and the complete annihilation of Old England as an aristocratic country is the end which it follows up with more or less consciousness. Its nearest object, however, is the attainment

of a Parliamentary reform which should transfer to its hands the legislative power necessary for such a revolution.

But the British Bourgeois are not excitable Frenchmen. When they intend to carry a Parliamentary reform they will not make a Revolution of February. On the contrary. Having obtained, in 1846, a grand victory over the landed aristocracy by the repeal of the Corn Laws, they were satisfied with following up the material advantages of this victory, while they neglected to draw the necessary political and economical conclusions from it, and thus enabled the Whigs to reinstate themselves into their hereditary monopoly of government. During all the time, from 1846 to 1852, they exposed themselves to ridicule by their battle-cry: Broad principles and practical (read *small*) measures. And why all this? Because in every violent movement they are obliged to appeal to the *working class*. And if the aristocracy is their vanishing opponent the working class is their arising enemy. They prefer to compromise with the vanishing opponent rather than to strengthen the arising enemy, to whom the future belongs, by concessions of a more than apparent importance. Therefore, they strive to avoid every forcible collision with the aristocracy; but historical necessity and the Tories press them onwards. They cannot avoid fulfilling their mission, battering to pieces Old England, the England of the Past; and the very moment when they will have conquered exclusive political dominion, when political dominion and economical supremacy will be united in the same hands, when, therefore, the struggle against capital will no longer be distinct from the struggle against the existing Government—from that very moment will date the *social revolution of England*.

We now come to the *Chartists*, the politically active portion of the British *working class*. The six points of the Charter which they contend for contain nothing but the demand of *Universal Suffrage*, and of the conditions without which Universal Suffrage would be illusory for the working class; such as the ballot, payment of members, annual general elections. But Universal Suffrage is the equivalent for political power for the working class of England, where the proletariat forms the large majority of the population,

where, in a long, though underground civil war, it has gained a clear consciousness of its position as a class, and where even the rural districts know no longer any peasants, but only landlords, industrial capitalists (farmers) and hired labourers. The carrying of Universal Suffrage in England would, therefore, be a far more socialistic measure than anything which has been honoured with that name on the Continent.

Its inevitable result, here, is *the political supremacy of the working class*.

I shall report, on another occasion, on the revival and the reorganisation of the Chartist Party. For the present I have only to treat of the recent election.

To be a voter for the British Parliament, a man must occupy, in the Boroughs, a house rated at £10 to the poor's-rate, and, in the counties, he must be a freeholder to the annual amount of 40 shillings, or a leaseholder to the amount of £50. From this statement alone it follows, that the Chartists could take, officially, but little part in the electoral battle just concluded. In order to explain the actual part they took in it, I must recall to mind a peculiarity of the British electoral system:

Nomination day and Declaration day! Show of hands and Poll!

When the candidates have made their appearance on the day of election, and have publicly harangued the people, they are elected, in the first instance, by the show of hands, and every hand has the right to be raised, the hand of the non-electors as well as that of the electors. For whomsoever the majority of the hands are raised, that person is declared, by the returning officer, to be (provisionally) elected by show of hands. But now the medal shows its reverse. The election by show of hands was a mere ceremony, an act of formal politeness toward the "sovereign people", and the politeness ceases as soon as privilege is menaced. For if the show of hands does not return the candidates of the privileged electors, these candidates demand a poll; only the privileged electors can take part in the poll, and whosoever has there the majority of votes is declared duly elected. The first election, by show of hands, is a show satisfaction allowed,

for a moment, to public opinion, in order to convince it, the next moment, the more strikingly of its impotency.

It might appear that this election by show of hands, this dangerous formality, had been invented in order to ridicule universal suffrage, and to enjoy some little aristocratic fun at the expense of the "rabble" (expression of Major Beresford, Secretary of War). But this would be a delusion, and the old usage, common originally to all Teutonic nations, could drag itself traditionally down to the nineteenth century, because it gave to the British class-Parliament, cheaply and without danger, an appearance of popularity. The ruling classes drew from this usage the satisfaction that the mass of the people took part, with more or less passion, in their sectional interests as its national interests. And it was only since the Bourgeoisie took an independent station at the side of the two official parties, the Whigs and Tories, that the working masses stood up, on the nomination days in their own name. But in no former year the contrast of show of hands and poll, of Nomination day and Declaration day, has been so serious, so well defined by opposed principles, so threatening, so general, upon the whole surface of the country, as in this last election of 1852.

And what a contrast! It was sufficient to be named by show of hands in order to be beaten at the poll. It was sufficient to have had the majority at a poll, in order to be saluted, by the people, with rotten apples and brickbats. The duly elected members of Parliament, before all, had a great deal to do, in order to keep their own parliamentary bodily selves in safety. On one side the majority of the people, on the other the twelfth part of the whole population, and the fifth part of the sum-total of the male adult inhabitants of the country. On one side enthusiasm, on the other bribery. On one side parties disowning their own distinctive signs, Liberals pleading the conservatism, Conservatives proclaiming the liberalism of the views; on the other, the people, proclaiming their presence and pleading their own cause. On one side a worn-out engine which, turning incessantly in its vicious circle, is never able to move a single step forward, and the impotent process of friction by which all the official parties gradually grind each other into dust; on the other,

the advancing mass of the nation, threatening to blow up the vicious circle and to destroy the official engine.

I shall not follow up, over all the surface of the country, this contrast between nomination and poll, of the threatening electoral demonstration of the working class, and the timid electioneering manoeuvres of the ruling classes. I take one borough from the mass, where the contrast is concentrated in a focus: the Halifax election. Here the opposing candidates were: Edwards (Tory); Sir Charles Wood (late Whig Chancellor of the Exchequer, brother-in-law to Earl Grey); Frank Crossley (Manchester man); and finally Ernest Jones, the most talented, consistent and energetic representative of Chartism. Halifax being a manufacturing town, the Tory had little chance. The Manchester man Crossley was leagued with the Whigs. The serious struggle, then, lay only between Wood and Jones, between the Whig and the Chartist.

Sir Charles Wood made a speech of about half an hour, perfectly inaudible at the commencement, and during its latter half for the disapprobation of the immense multitude. His speech, as reported by the reporter, who sat close to him, was merely a recapitulation of the Free Trade measures passed, and an attack on Lord Derby's Government, and a laudation of "*the unexampled prosperity of the country and the people!*"—(Hear, hear.) He did not propound one single new measure of reform; and but faintly, in very few words, hinted at Lord John Russell's bill for the franchise.

I give a more extensive abstract of E. Jones's speech, as you will not find it in any of the great London ruling-class papers.

Ernest Jones, who was received with immense enthusiasm, then spoke as follows:

Electors and Non-electors, you have met upon a great and solemn festival. Today, the Constitution recognises Universal Suffrage in theory that it may, perhaps, deny it in practice on the morrow. Today the representatives of two systems stand before you, and you have to decide beneath which you shall be ruled for seven years. Seven years—a little life! I summon you to pause upon the threshold of those seven years: today they shall pass slowly and calmly in review before you: today decide, you 20,000 men, that perhaps five hundred may undo your will tomorrow. (Hear, hear.) I say the representatives of two systems stand before you. Whig, Tory, and money-mongers are on my left, it is true, but they are all as one. The money-monger says, buy cheap and sell dear. The Tory says, buy dear, sell dearer. Both are the same for labour.

But the former system is in the ascendant, and pauperism rankles at its root. That system is based on foreign competition. Now, I assert, that under the buy cheap and sell dear principle, brought to bear on foreign competition, the ruin of the working and small trading classes must go on. Why? Labour is the creator of all wealth. A man must work before a grain is grown, or a yard is woven. But there is no self-employment for the working-man in this country. Labour is a hired commodity—labour is a thing in the market that is bought and sold; consequently, as labour creates all wealth, labour is the first thing bought—"Buy cheap! buy cheap!" Labour is bought in the cheapest market. But now comes the next: "Sell dear! sell dear!" Sell what? *Labour's produce*. To whom? To the foreigner—aye! and to *the labourer himself*—for labour, not being self-employed, the labourer is *not* the partaker of the first fruits of his toil. "Buy cheap, sell dear." How do you like it? "Buy cheap, sell dear." Buy the working-man's labour cheaply, and sell back to that very working-man the produce of his own labour dear! The principle of inherent loss is in the bargain. The employer buys the labour cheap—he sells, and on the sale he must make a profit: he sells to the working-man himself—and thus every bargain between employer and employed is a deliberate cheat on the part of the employer. Thus labour has to sink through eternal loss, that capital may rise through lasting fraud. But the system stops not here. *This is brought to bear on foreign competition—which means, we must ruin the trade of other countries, as we have ruined the labour of our own.* How does it work? The high-taxed country has to undersell the low-taxed. Competition abroad is constantly increasing—consequently cheapness must increase constantly also. Therefore, wages in England must keep constantly falling. And how do they effect the fall? By *surplus labour*. How do they obtain the surplus labour? By monopoly of the land, which drives more hands than are wanted into the factory. By monopoly of machinery, which drives those hands into the street—by woman labour which drives the man from the shuttle—by child labour which drives the woman from the loom. Then planting their foot upon that living base of surplus, they press its aching heart beneath their heel, and cry "Starvation! Who'll work? A half loaf is better than no bread at all"—and the writhing mass grasps greedily at their terms. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear".) Such is the system for the working-man. But Electors! How does it operate on you? How does it affect home trade, the shopkeeper, poor's-rate and taxation? For every increase of competition abroad, there must be an increase of cheapness at home. Every increase of cheapness in labour is based on increase of labour surplus, and this surplus is obtained by an increase of machinery. I repeat, how does this operate on you! The Manchester Liberal on my left establishes a new patent, and throws three hundred men as a surplus in the streets. Shopkeepers! Three hundred customers less. Rate payers! Three hundred paupers more. (Loud cheers.) But, mark me! The evil stops not there. These three hundred men operate first to bring down the wages of those who remain at work in their own trade. The employer says, "Now I reduce your wages." The men demur. Then he adds: "Do you see those three hundred men who have *just* walked out—you may change place if you like,

they're sighing to come in on any terms, for they're starving." The men feel it, and are crushed. Ah! you Manchester Liberal! Pharisee of politics! those men are listening—have I got you now? But the evil stops not yet. Those men, driven from their own trade, seek employment in others, when they swell the surplus, and bring wages down. The low paid trades of today were the high paid once—the high paid of today will be the low paid soon. Thus the purchasing power of the working classes is diminished every day, and with it dies home trade. Mark it, shopkeepers! your customers grow poorer, and your profits less, while your paupers grow more numerous and your poor's-rates and your taxes rise. Your receipts are smaller, your expenditure is more large. You get less and pay more. How do you like the system? On you the rich manufacturer and landlord throw the weight of poor's-rate and taxation. Men of the middle class! You are the tax-paying machine of the rich. They create the poverty that creates their riches, and they make you pay for the poverty they have created. The landlord escapes it by privilege, the manufacturer by repaying himself out of the wages of his men, and that reacts on you. How do you like the system? Well, that is the system upheld by the gentlemen on my left. What then do I propose? I have shown the wrong. That is something. But I do more; I stand here to show the right, and prove it so. (Loud cheers.)

Ernest Jones then went on to expose his own views on political and economical reform, and continued as follows:

Electors and Non-electors, I have now brought before you some of the social and political measures, the immediate adoption of which I advocate now, as I did in 1847. But, because I tried to extend *your* liberties, *mine* were curtailed. (Hear, hear.) Because I tried to rear the temple of freedom for you all, I was thrown into the cell of a felon's jail; and there, on my left sits one of my chief jailers. (Loud and continued groans, directed towards the left.) Because I tried to give voice to truth, I was condemned to silence. For two years and one week he cast me into a prison in solitary confinement on the silent system, without pen, ink, or paper, but oakum picking as substitute.—Ah! (turning to Sir Charles Wood) it was your turn for two years and one week; it is mine this day. I summon the angel of retribution from the heart of every Englishman here present. (An immense burst of applause.) Hark! you feel the fanning of his wings in the breath of this vast multitude! (Renewed cheering, long continued.) You may say this is not a public question. But it is! (Hear, hear.) It is a public question, for the man who cannot feel for the wife of the prisoner, will not feel for the wife of the working-man. He who will not feel for the children of the captive will not feel for the children of the labour-slave. ("Hear, hear", and cheers.) His past life proves it, his promise of today does not contradict it. Who voted for Irish coercion, the gagging bill, and tampering with the Irish press? The Whig! There he sits! Turn him out! Who voted fifteen times against Hume's motion for the franchise; Locke King's on the counties; Ewart's for short Parliaments; and Berkeley's for the ballot? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted

against the release of Frost, Williams, and Jones? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted against inquiry into colonial abuses and in favour of Ward and Torrington, the tyrants of Ionia and Ceylon?—The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted against reducing the Duke of Cambridge's salary of £12,000, against all reductions in the army and navy; against the repeal of the window-tax, and 48 times against every other reduction of taxation, his own salary included? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted against a repeal of the paper duty, the advertisement duty, and the taxes on knowledge? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted for the batches of new bishops, vicarages, the Maynooth grant, against its reduction, and against absolving dissenters⁵⁰ from paying Church rates? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted against all inquiry into the adulteration of food? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted against lowering the duty on sugar, and repealing the tax on malt? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Who voted against shortening the nightwork of bakers, against inquiry into the condition of frame-work knitters, against medical inspectors of workhouses, against preventing little children from working before six in the morning, against parish relief for pregnant women of the poor, and against the Ten Hours Bill? The Whig—there he sits; turn him out! Turn him out, in the name of humanity and of God! Men of Halifax! Men of England! the two systems are before you. Now judge and choose! (It is impossible to describe the enthusiasm kindled by this, and especially at the close; the voice of the vast multitude, held in breathless suspense during each paragraph, came at each pause like the thunder of a returning wave, in execration of the representative of Whiggery and class rule. Altogether it was a scene that will long be unforgotten. On the show of hands being taken, very few, and those chiefly of the hired or intimidated, were held up for Sir C. Wood; but almost everyone present raised both hands for Ernest Jones, amidst cheering and enthusiasm it would be impossible to describe.)

The Mayor declared Mr. Ernest Jones and Mr. Henry Edwards to be elected by show of hands. Sir C. Wood and Mr. Crossley then demanded a poll.

What Jones had predicted took place; he was nominated by 20,000 votes, but the Whig Sir Charles Wood and the Manchester man Crossley were elected by 500 votes.

Written by K. Marx
on August 2, 1852

Published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* No. 3543, August 25, 1852:
and in an abridged form in *The People's Paper* No. 23, October 9, 1852
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according to the text of the *New-York Daily Tribune* and checked with the text of *The People's Paper*

KARL MARX

CORRUPTION AT ELECTIONS

London, Friday, August 20, 1852

Just before the late House of Commons separated, it resolved to heap up as many difficulties as possible for its successors in their way to Parliament. It voted a Draconian law against bribery, corruption, intimidation, and electioneering sharp practices in general.

A long list of questions is drawn up, which, by this enactment, may be put to petitioners or sitting members, the most searching and stringent that can be conceived. They may be required on oath to state who were their agents, and what communications they held with them. They may be asked and compelled to state, not only what they know, but what they "believe, conjecture, and suspect", as to money expended either by themselves or any one else acting—authorised or not authorised—on their behalf. In a word, no member can go through the strange ordeal without risk of perjury, if he have the slightest idea that it is possible or likely that any one has been led to overstep on his behalf the limits of the law.

Now, even supposing this law to take it for granted that the new legislators will use the same liberty as the clergy, who only believe *some* of the Thirty-nine Articles, yet contrive to sign them *all*, yet there remain, nevertheless, clauses sufficient to make the new Parliament the most virginal assembly that ever made speeches and passed laws for the three kingdoms. And in juxtaposition with the general

election immediately following, this law secures to the Tories the glory, that under their administration the greatest purity of election has been theoretically proclaimed, and the greatest amount of electoral corruption has been practically carried out.

"A fresh election is proceeded with, and here a scene of *bribery, corruption, violence, drunkenness and murder* ensues, *unparalleled* since the times the old Tory monopoly reigned supreme before. We actually hear of soldiers with loaded guns, and bayonets fixed, taking Liberal electors by force, dragging them under the landlord's eyes to vote against their own consciences, and these soldiers, shooting with deliberate aim the people who dared to sympathise with the captive electors, and committing wholesale murder on the unresisting people! [Allusion to the event at Six Mile Bridge, Limerick, County Clare.] It may be said: That was in Ireland! Ay, and in England they have employed their police to break the stalls of those opposed to them; they have sent their organised gangs of midnight ruffians prowling through the streets to intercept and intimidate the Liberal electors; they have opened the cesspools of drunkenness; they have showered the gold of corruption, as at Derby, and in almost every contested place they have exercised systematic intimidation."

Thus far Ernest Jones's *People's Paper*. Now, after this Chartist weekly paper, hear the weekly paper of the opposite party, the most sober, the most rational, the most moderate organ of the industrial Bourgeoisie, the London *Economist*:

"We believe we may affirm, at this general election, there has been more *truckling*, more *corruption*, more *intimidation*, more *fanaticism* and more *debauchery* than on any previous occasion. It is reported that bribery has been more extensively resorted to at this election than for many previous years. . . . Of the amount of intimidation and undue influence of every sort which has been practised at the late election, it is probably impossible to form an exaggerated estimate. . . . And when we sum up all these things—the brutal drunkenness, the low intrigues, the wholesale corruption, the barbarous intimidation, the integrity of candidates warped and stained, the honest electors who are ruined, the feeble ones who are suborned and dishonoured; the lies, the stratagems, the slanders, which stalk abroad in the daylight, naked and not ashamed—the desecration of holy words, the soiling of noble names—we stand aghast at the holocaust of victims, of destroyed bodies and lost souls, on whose funeral pile a new Parliament is reared."

The means of corruption and intimidation were the usual ones: direct Government influence. Thus on an electioneering agent at Derby, arrested in the flagrant act of bribing, a letter was found from Major Beresford, the Secretary at

War, wherein that same Beresford opens a credit upon a commercial firm for electioneering monies. *The Poole Herald* publishes a circular from the Admiralty-House to the half-pay officers, signed by the commander-in-chief of a naval station, requesting their votes for the ministerial candidates.—Direct force of arms has also been employed, as at Cork, Belfast, Limerick (at which latter place eight persons were killed).—Threats of ejectment by landlords against their farmers, unless they voted with them. The Land Agents of Lord Derby herein gave the example to their colleagues.—Threats of exclusive dealing against shopkeepers, of dismissal against workmen, intoxication, etc., etc.—To these *profane* means of corruption *spiritual* ones were added by the Tories; the royal proclamation against Roman Catholic Processions was issued in order to inflame bigotry and religious hatred; the No-Popery cry was raised everywhere. One of the results of this proclamation were the Stockport Riots.⁵¹ The Irish priests, of course, retorted with similar weapons.

The election is hardly over, and already a single Queen's Counsel has received from twenty-five places instructions to invalidate the returns to Parliament on account of bribery and intimidation. Such petitions against elected members have been signed, and the expenses of the proceedings raised at Derby, Cockermouth, Barnstaple, Harwich, Canterbury, Yarmouth, Wakefield, Boston, Huddersfield, Windsor, and a great number of other places. Of eight to ten Derbyite members it is proved that, even under the most favourable circumstances, they will be rejected on petition.

The principal scenes of this bribery, corruption and intimidation were, of course, the agricultural counties and the Peers' Boroughs, for the conservation of the greatest possible number of which latter, the Whigs had expended all their acumen in the Reform Bill of 1831. The constituencies of large towns and of densely populated manufacturing counties were, by their peculiar circumstances, very unfavourable ground for such manoeuvres.

Days of general election are in Britain traditionally the bacchanalia of drunken debauchery, conventional stock-jobbing terms for the discounting of political consciences,

the richest harvest times of the publicans. As an English paper* says, "these recurring *saturnalia* never fail to leave enduring traces of their pestilential presence". Quite naturally so. They are *saturnalia* in the ancient Roman sense of the word. The master then turned servant, the servant turned master. If the servant be master for one day, on that day brutality will reign supreme. The masters were the grand dignitaries of the ruling classes, or sections of classes, the servants formed the mass of these same classes, the privileged electors encircled by the mass of the non-electors, of those thousands that had no other calling than to be mere hangers-on, and whose support, vocal or manual, always appeared desirable, were it only on account of the theatrical effect.

If you follow up the history of British elections for a century past or longer, you are tempted to ask, not why British Parliaments were so bad, but on the contrary, how they managed to be even as good as they were, and to represent as much as they did, though in a dim refraction, the actual movement of British society. Just as opponents of the representative system must feel surprised on finding that legislative bodies in which the abstract majority, the accident of the mere number is decisive, yet decide and resolve according to the necessities of the situation—at least during the period of their full vitality. It will always be impossible, even by the utmost straining of logical deductions, to derive from the relations of mere numbers the necessity of a vote in accordance with the actual state of things; but from a given state of things the necessity of certain relations of members will always follow as of itself. The traditional bribery of British elections, what else was it, but another form, as brutal as it was popular, in which the relative strength of the contending parties showed itself? Their respective means of influence and of dominion, which on other occasions they used in a *normal* way, were here enacted for a few days in an abnormal and more or less burlesque manner. But the premise remained, that the candidates of the rivalling parties represented the interests of the

* *The Economist*.—Ed.

mass of the electors, and that the privileged electors again represented the interests of the non-voting mass, or rather, that this voteless mass had, as yet, no specific interest of its own. The Delphic priestesses had to become intoxicated by vapours to enable them to find oracles; the British people must intoxicate itself with gin and porter to enable it to find its oracle-finders, the legislators. And where these oracle-finders were to be looked for, that was a matter of course.

This relative position of classes and parties underwent a radical change from the moment the industrial and commercial middle classes, the Bourgeoisie, took up its stand as an official party at the side of the Whigs and Tories, and especially from the passing of the Reform Bill in 1831. These Bourgeois were in no wise fond of costly electioneering manoeuvres, of *faux frais* of general elections. They considered it cheaper to compete with the landed aristocracy by general moral, than by personal pecuniary means. On the other hand they were conscious of representing a universally predominant interest of modern society. They were, therefore, in a position to demand that electors should be ruled by their common national interests, not by personal and local motives, and the more they recurred to this postulate, the more the latter species of electoral influence was, by the very composition of constituencies, centred in the landed aristocracy, but withheld from the middle classes. Thus the Bourgeoisie contended for the principle of moral elections and forced the enactment of laws in that sense, intended, each of them, as safeguards against the local influence of the landed aristocracy; and indeed, from 1831 down, bribery adopted a more civilised, more hidden form, and general elections went off in a more sober way than before. When at last the mass of the people ceased to be a mere chorus, taking a more or less impassioned part in the struggle of the official heroes, drawing the lots among them, rioting, in bacchantic carouse, at the creation of parliamentary divinities, like the Cretan Curetes at the birth of Jupiter,⁵² and taking pay and treat for such participation in their glory—when the Chartists surrounded in threatening masses the whole circle within which the official election struggle must come off, and watched with scrutinising mistrust every

movement taking place within it—then an election like that of 1852 could not but call for universal indignation, and elicit even from the conservative *Times*, for the first time, some words in favour of general suffrage, and make the whole mass of the British Proletariat shout as with one voice. The foes of Reform, they have given Reformers the best arguments; such is an election under the class system; such is a House of Commons with such a system of election!

In order to comprehend the character of bribery, corruption and intimidation, such as they have been practised in the late election, it is necessary to call attention to a fact which operated in a parallel direction.

If you refer to the general elections since 1831, you will find that, in the same measure as the pressure of the voteless majority of the country upon the privileged body of electors was increasing, as the demand was heard louder, from the middle classes, for an extension of the circle of constituencies, from the working class, to extinguish every trace of a similar privileged circle—that in the same measure the number of electors who actually voted grew less and less, and the constituencies thus more and more contracted themselves. Never was this fact more striking than in the late election.

Let us take, for instance, London. In the City the constituency numbers 26,728; only 10,000 voted. The Tower Hamlets number 23,534 registered electors; only 12,000 voted. In Finsbury, of 20,025 electors, not one-half voted. In Liverpool, the scene of one of the most animated contests, of 17,433 registered electors, only 13,000 came to the polls.

These examples will suffice. What do they prove? The apathy of the privileged constituencies. And this apathy, what proves it? That they have outlived themselves—that they have lost every interest in their own political existence. This is in no wise apathy against politics in general, but against a species of politics, the result of which, for the most part, can only consist in helping the Tories to oust the Whigs, or the Whigs to conquer the Tories. The constituencies feel instinctively that the decision lies no longer either with Parliament, or with the making of Parliament. Who repealed the Corn Laws? Assuredly not the voters who had

elected a Protectionist Parliament, still less the Protectionist Parliament itself, but only and exclusively the pressure from without. In this pressure from without, in other means of influencing Parliament than by voting, a great portion even of electors now believe. They consider the hitherto lawful mode of voting as an antiquated formality, but from the moment Parliament should make front against the pressure from without, and dictate laws to the nation in the sense of its narrow constituencies, they would join the general assault against the whole antiquated system of machinery.

The bribery and intimidation practised by the Tories were, then, merely violent experiments for bringing back to life dying electoral bodies which have become incapable of production, and which can no longer create decisive electoral results and really national Parliaments. And the result? The old Parliament was dissolved, because at the end of its career it had dissolved into sections which brought each other to a complete standstill. The new Parliament begins where the old one ended; it is paralytic from the hour of its birth.

Written by K. Marx
about August 16, 1852

Published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* No. 3552, September 4, 1852
and in *The People's Paper* No. 24, October 16, 1852
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according to the text of the *New-York Daily Tribune* and checked with the text of *The People's Paper*

KARL MARX

**POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE COMMERCIAL
EXCITEMENT**

London, Tuesday, October 19, 1852

My last letter described the present industrial and commercial situation of this country; let us now draw the political consequences therefrom.

If the outbreak of the anticipated industrial and commercial revulsion will give a more dangerous and revolutionary character to the impending struggle with the Tories, the present prosperity is, for the moment, the most valuable ally to the Tory party; an ally, which, indeed, will not enable them to re-enact the Corn Laws, abandoned already by themselves, but which effectually consolidates their political power and assists them in carrying on a social reaction that, if let alone, would necessarily end in the conquest of substantial class-advantages, as it has been from its beginning started in the name of a substantial class-interest. No Corn Laws, says Disraeli, but a fresh settlement of taxes in the interest of the oppressed farmers. But why are farmers oppressed? Because they, for the most part, continue to pay the old protectionist rates of rent, while the old protectionist price of corn is gone the way of all flesh. The aristocracy will not abate the rent of their land, but they will introduce a new mode of taxation which shall make up, to the farmers, for the surplus farmers have to pay into the pockets of the aristocracy.

I repeat that the present commercial prosperity is favourable to Tory reaction. Why?

"Patriotism", complains *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*,⁵³ "patriotism is apt to go to sleep in the cupboard if meat and drink be there. Hence, free trade is the present security of the Earl of Derby; he lies on a bed of roses plucked by Cobden and Peel."

The mass of the people is fully employed and more or less well off—always deducting the paupers inseparable from British prosperity; it is therefore not at present a very malleable material for political agitation. But what, above all things, enables Derby to carry out his machinations, is the fanaticism with which the *middle class* has thrown itself into the mighty process of industrial production, erecting of mills, constructing of machinery, building of ships, spinning and weaving of cotton and wool, storing of warehouses, manufacturing, exchanging, exporting, importing, and other more or less useful proceedings, the purpose of which, to them, is always the making of money. The Bourgeoisie, in this moment of brisk trade—and it very well knows that these happy moments are getting more and more few and far between—will and must make money, much money; nothing but money. It leaves to its politicians *ex professo* the task of watching the Tories. But the politicians *ex professo* (compare, for instance, Joseph Hume's letter to *The Hull Advertiser*⁵⁴) complain justly that, deprived of pressure from without, they can agitate as little as the human frame could react without the pressure of the atmosphere.

The Bourgeoisie have, indeed, a sort of uneasy divination that in the high regions of government something suspicious is brewing, and that the ministry *exploits* not overscrupulously the political apathy in which prosperity has thrown them. They, therefore, sometimes give the ministry a warning through their organs in the press. For instance:

"To what extent the democracy [read the Bourgeoisie] may carry their present *wise* forbearance, their respect for their own power and for the rights of others, making no attempt to strengthen themselves by doing as the aristocracy have done, we cannot foresee; but the aristocracy must not infer, from the general conduct of the democracy, that they will never depart from moderation." [London *Economist*.]

But Derby replies: Do you think I am fool enough to be frightened by you now, when the sun shines, and to be idle

until commercial storms and stagnation of trade give you the time to mind politics more clearly?

The plan of the Tory campaign shows itself every day.

The Tories began by chicaning open-air meetings; they prosecute, in Ireland, newspapers which contain articles unpleasant to them; they indict, in this moment, for seditious libel, the agents of the Peace Society,⁵⁵ who have distributed pamphlets against the use of the lash in the militia. In this quiet manner, they push back, wherever they can, the isolated opposition of the street and of the press.

In the meantime, they avoid every great and public rupture with their opponents, by delaying the meeting of Parliament, and by preparing everything in order to occupy it, when met, with the funeral "of a dead Duke, instead of the interests of a living people". [Radical Paper.*] In the first week of November, Parliament will meet. But before January there can be no question of a serious beginning of the session.

And how do the Tories fill up the meantime? With the Registration campaign and the formation of the militia.

In the Registration campaign the object is to throw out or to prevent their opponents from entering the new lists of parliamentary electors for the ensuing year, by making out this or that objection which legally prevents a man from being registered a voter. Each political party is represented by its lawyers, and carries on the action at its own expense, and the revising barristers, named by the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench,⁵⁶ decide on the admissibility of claims or objections. This campaign has hitherto had its principal theatre in Lancashire and Middlesex. In order to get up the money for the campaign in North Lancashire, the Tories circulated lists of subscription on which Lord Derby himself had put down his name for the liberal sum of £500. The extraordinary number of 6,749 objections to voters have been taken in Lancashire, viz., 4,650 for South, and 2,099 for North Lancashire. For the former, the Tories objected to 3,557 qualifications; the Liberals to 1,093; for the latter, the Tories, to 1,334 qualifications; the Liberals to 765. (This, of

* *The People's Paper*.—Ed.

course, merely amongst County voters, independently of the voters for the Boroughs, situated in that County.) The Tories were victorious in Lancashire. In the County of Middlesex there were expunged from the registers 353 Radicals and 140 Conservatives—the Conservatives thus gaining 200 votes.

In this battle, the Tories stand on one side—the Whigs, with the men of the Manchester School, on the other. The latter, it is pretty well known, have formed freehold land societies—machines for manufacturing new voters. The Tories leave the machines alone, but destroy their products. Mr. Shadwell, revising barrister for Middlesex, gave decisions by which great numbers of the freehold land society voters have been disfranchised, declaring that a plot of land did not confer the franchise unless it had cost £50. As this was a question of fact and not of law, there is no appeal from this decision to the Court of Common Pleas.⁵⁷ Everybody conceives that this distinction of fact and law gives to the revising barristers, always open to the influence of the existing Ministry, the greatest power in composing the new voters' lists.

And what do these great efforts of the Tories, and the direct interference of their leader in the Registration campaign, prognosticate?

That the Earl of Derby has no very sanguine hopes for the continuance of his new Parliament, that he is inclined to dissolve it in case of resistance on its part, and that in the meantime he seeks to prepare, by the revising barristers, a conservative majority for another general election.

And while thus the Tories, on one hand, hold in reserve the Parliament-making machine placed at their disposal by the Registration campaign, they carry out, on the other hand, the Militia Bill, which places at their disposal the necessary bayonets for carrying out even the most reactionary acts of Parliament, and for supporting in tranquillity the frowns of the Peace Society.

"With Parliament to give it a legal semblance, with an armed militia to give it an active power, what may not the reaction do in England?"—exclaims the organ of the Chartists.*

* *The People's Paper*.—Ed.

And the death of the "Iron Duke", of the common-sense-hero of Waterloo, has in this particular critical moment freed the aristocracy of an importune guardian angel, who had experience enough in warfare to sacrifice, often enough, apparent victories to a well-covered retreat, and the brilliant offensive to a timely compromise. Wellington was the moderator of the House of Lords; he held in decisive moments often 60 and more proxies; he prevented the Tories from declaring open war against the Bourgeoisie and against public opinion. But now, with a conflict-seeking Tory Ministry under the direction of a sporting character,* the House of Lords,

"instead of being, as under the guidance of the Duke, the steady ballast of the State, may become the top-hamper that may endanger its safety".

This latter notion, that the lordly ballast is necessary to the safety of the State, does of course not belong to us, but to the liberal London *Daily News*. The present Duke of Wellington, hitherto Marquis of Douro, has at once passed from the Peelite into the Tory Camp. And thus there is every sign that the aristocracy are about to make the most reckless efforts to reconquer the lost ground, and to bring back the golden times of 1815 to 1830. And the Bourgeoisie, in this moment, has no time to agitate, to revolt, not even to get up a proper show of indignation.

Written by K. Marx
on October 12, 1852

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3602,
November 2, 1852
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

* Derby.—*Ed.*

KARL MARX

[ATTEMPTS TO FORM A NEW OPPOSITION PARTY]

London, Tuesday, November 9, 1852

In the same measure as the hitherto predominating parties dissolve themselves, and as their distinctive marks are effaced, the want of a new opposition party is felt, as a matter of course. This want finds an expression in different ways.

Lord John Russell, in his already quoted speech, takes the lead. Part of the alarm raised by Lord Derby, he says, had sprung from the rumours that he, Lord J. Russell, had adopted "highly democratical opinions". "Well, I need not say on that subject that this rumour was totally unfounded; that it has no circumstances on which it rested." Nevertheless, he pronounces himself a Democrat, and then explains the harmless meaning of the word:

"The people of this country are, in other words, the Democracy of the country. Democracy has as fair a right to the enjoyment of its rights as monarchy or nobility. Democracy does not mean to diminish any of the prerogatives of the Crown. Democracy does not attempt to take away any of the lawful privileges of the House of Lords. What, then, is this Democracy? The growth of wealth, the growth of intellect, the forming of opinions more enlightened and more calculated to carry on in an enlightened manner the Government of the world. But I will say more. I will say that the manner of dealing with that increase of the position of the Democracy could not be *according to the old system of restraint with which I was but too familiar*. On the contrary, Democracy ought to be maintained and encouraged, there ought to be given a legitimate and legal organ to that power and influence."

"Lord John Russell," exclaims the *Morning Herald* in reply, "has one set of principles for office and another set of principles for opposi-

tion. When in office, his principle is to do nothing, and when out of office, to pledge himself to everything."

What in all the world may the *Morning Herald* mean by "nothing", if it calls the above trash, pronounced by Lord John Russell, "everything!" and if it menaces little John Russell, for his king-loving, lords-respecting, bishop-conserving "Democracy", with the fate of Frost, Williams & Co.! But the humour of the thing is that Lord Derby, in the House of Lords, announces himself as the prominent opponent of "Democracy", and speaks of Democracy as of the only party against which it is worthwhile to struggle. And in steps the inevitable John Russell with an examination of what this Democracy is, viz., the growth of wealth, of the intellect of this wealth, and of its claims to influence Government through public opinion and through legal organs. Thus, then, Democracy is nothing but the claims of the Bourgeoisie, the industrial and commercial middle class. Lord Derby stands up as the opponent, Lord John Russell volunteers as the standard-bearer of this Democracy. Both of them agree in the implicit confession, that the ancient feuds within their own class, the aristocracy, are no longer of any interest to the country. And Russell is quite prepared to drop the name of Whig for that of Democrat, if this be the *conditio sine qua non* for turning his opponents out. The Whigs, in this case, would in fact continue to play the same part, and appear officially as the servants of the middle class. Thus, Russell's plan of a party reorganisation is confined to the adoption of a new party name.

Joseph Hume, too, considers the formation of a new "people's party" a necessity. But, he says, that on tenant-right and similar propositions it cannot be formed. "On these matters you could not muster a hundred out of the 654 members to unite." What, then, is his nostrum?

"The people's league or party, or union, must agree on one point—say the ballot; and after carrying the one point, proceed from step to step to other points. And while the movement must begin with a few individual members of the House of Commons, it cannot succeed until the people out of doors and the electors shall see the necessity of doing their part and of giving support to the small party of the people in Parliament."

This same Hume was one of the drawers-up of the People's Charter. From the People's Charter and its six points, he retreated to the "little Charter" of the financial and parliamentary reformers with only three points, and now we see him reduced to one point, the ballot. What success he promises to himself from his new nostrum, he will tell us himself in the concluding words of his letter to *The Hull Advertiser*:

"Tell me how many editors will risk to give their support to a party that, as Parliament is now composed, *can never succeed to power?*"

Now, as this new party does not mean to change for the present anything in the composition of Parliament, but confines itself to the ballot, it will, by its own confession, never succeed to power. What is the good of forming a party of *impotence*, and of openly confessed impotence?

Next to Joseph Hume, there is another attempt made for the creation of a new party. This is the so-called *National Party*. Instead of the People's Charter, this party would make universal suffrage its *exclusive* shibboleth, and thus leave out those very conditions which can alone make the movement for universal suffrage a national movement and secure to it popular support. I shall hereafter have occasion to recur to this National Party. It consists of ex-Chartists who wish to conquer *respectability* for themselves, and of Radicals, middle-class ideologists, who wish to get hold of the Chartist movement. Behind them—whether "Nationals" are aware of it or not—you find the parliamentary and financial reformers, the men of the Manchester School, urging them on and using them as their vanguard.

Now, what cannot but be evident to everyone in all these miserable compromises and backslidings, these huntings after weakly expediency, these vacillations and quack *nostra*, is this:—Catiline is at the gates of the city, a decisive struggle is drawing near, the opposition knows its unpopularity, its incapacity for resistance, and all the attempts at the formation of new centres of defence agree in one point only, in a "going backwards policy". The "National Party" retreats from the Charter to General Suffrage, Joe Hume from General Suffrage to the ballot, a third from the ballot to the

equalisation of electoral districts, and so forth, until at last we arrive at Johnny Russell, who has nothing to give out for a battle-cry but the mere name of democracy. Lord J. Russell's Democracy would be, practically speaking, the ultimatum of the National Party, of Hume's "People's Party", and of all the other party shams, if any one of them had anything like vitality about it.

But on the one hand, the political flaccidity and indifference consequent upon a period of material prosperity, on the other hand the conviction that nevertheless the Tories are menacing mischief—on the one hand, the certainty on the part of the *Bourgeois* leaders that they will very soon require the people to back them, on the other hand the knowledge acquired by some popular leaders that the people are too indolent to create, for the moment, a movement of their own—all these circumstances produce the phenomenon that parties attempt to make themselves acceptable to each other, and that the different fractions of the opposition out of Parliament attempt a union by making to each other concessions, from the most advanced faction downwards until at last they again arrive at what Lord J. Russell is pleased to call democracy.

Of the attempts at creating a self-styled "National Party", Ernest Jones justly remarks:

"The People's Charter is the most comprehensive measure of political reform in existence, and the Chartists are the only truly national party of political and social reforms in Great Britain."

And R. G. Gammage, one of the members of the Chartist Executive, thus addresses the people:

"Would you then refuse the co-operation of the middle classes? Certainly not, if that co-operation is offered on fair and honourable terms. And what are these terms? They are easy and simple; adopt the Charter, and having adopted that Charter, unite with its friends who are already organised for its achievement. If you refuse to do this, you must either be opposed to the Charter itself, or, piquing yourselves upon your class superiority, you must imagine that superiority to entitle you to leadership. In the first case, no honest Chartist can unite with you, in the second, no working man ought so far to lose his self-respect as to succumb to your class prejudices. Let the working men trust their own power alone, receiving honest aid from whatever sources, but acting as though their salvation depended upon their own exertions."

The mass of the Chartists, too, are at the present moment absorbed by material production; but on all points the nucleus of the party is reorganised, and the communications re-established, in England as well as in Scotland, and in the event of a commercial and political crisis, the importance of the present noiseless activity at the headquarters of Chartism will be felt all over Great Britain.

Written by K. Marx
on October 16, 1852

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3622,
November 25, 1852
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

THE DUCHESS OF SUTHERLAND AND SLAVERY

London, Friday, January 21, 1853

During the present momentary slackness in political affairs, the address of the Stafford House Assembly of Ladies to their sisters in America upon the subject of Negro-Slavery, and the "affectionate and Christian address of many thousands of the women of the United States of America to their sisters, the women of England", upon white slavery, have proved a god-send to the press. Not one of the British papers was ever struck by the circumstance that the Stafford House Assembly took place at the palace and under the Presidency of the Duchess of Sutherland, and yet the names of Stafford and Sutherland should have been sufficient to class the philanthropy of the British Aristocracy—a philanthropy which chooses its objects as far distant from home as possible, and rather on that than on this side of the ocean.

The history of the wealth of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the expropriation of the Scotch-Gaelic population from its native soil. As far back as the tenth century, the Danes had landed in Scotland, conquered the plains of Caithness, and driven back the aborigines into the mountains. Mhoir-Fhear-Chattaibh, as he was called in Gaelic, or the "Great Man of Sutherland", had always found his companions-in-arms ready to defend him at the risk of their lives against all his enemies, Danes or Scots, foreigners

or natives. After the revolution which drove the Stuarts from Britain,⁵⁸ private feuds among the petty chieftains of Scotland became less and less frequent, and the British Kings, in order to keep up at least a semblance of dominion in these remote districts, encouraged the levying of family regiments among the chieftains, a system by which these *lairds* were enabled to combine modern military establishments with the ancient *clan* system in such a manner as to support one by the other.

Now, in order to distinctly appreciate the usurpation subsequently carried out, we must first properly understand what the *clan* meant. The *clan* belonged to a form of social existence which, in the scale of historical development, stands a full degree below the feudal state; viz., the *patriarchal* state of society. "*Klaen*", in Gaelic, means children. Every one of the usages and traditions of the Scottish Gaels reposes upon the supposition that the members of the *clan* belong to one and the same family. The "great man", the chieftain of the clan, is on the one hand quite as arbitrary, on the other quite as confined in his power, by consanguinity, &c., as every father of a family. To the clan, to the family, belonged the district where it had established itself, exactly as in Russia, the land occupied by a community of peasants belongs, not to the individual peasants, but to the community. Thus the district was the common property of the family. There could be no more question, under this system, of private property, in the modern sense of the word, than there could be of comparing the social existence of the members of the clan to that of individuals living in the midst of our modern society. The division and subdivision of the land corresponded to the military functions of the single members of the clan. According to their military abilities, the chieftain entrusted to them the several allotments, cancelled or enlarged according to his pleasure the tenures of the individual officers, and these officers again distributed to their vassals and under-vassals every separate plot of land. But the district at large always remained the property of the clan, and, however the claims of individuals might vary, the tenure remained the same; nor were the contributions for the common defence, or the tribute for the Laird,

who at once was leader in battle and chief magistrate in peace, ever increased. Upon the whole, every plot of land was cultivated by the same family, from generation to generation, under fixed imposts. These imposts were insignificant, more a tribute by which the supremacy of the "*great man*" and of his officers was acknowledged, than a rent of land in a modern sense, or a source of revenue. The officers directly subordinate to the "*great man*" were called "*Taks-men*", and the district entrusted to their care, "*Tak*". Under them were placed inferior officers, at the head of every hamlet, and under these stood the peasantry.

Thus you see, the *clan* is nothing but a family organised in a military manner, quite as little defined by laws, just as closely hemmed in by traditions, as any family. But the land is the *property of the family*, in the midst of which differences of rank, in spite of consanguinity, do prevail as well as in all the ancient Asiatic family communities.

The first usurpation took place, after the expulsion of the Stuarts, by the establishment of the family Regiments. From that moment, *pay* became the principal source of revenue of the *Great Man*, the Mhoir-Fhear-Chattaibh. Entangled in the dissipation of the Court of London, he tried to squeeze as much money as possible out of his officers, and they applied the same system to their inferiors. The ancient tribute was transformed into fixed money contracts. In one respect these contracts constituted a progress, by fixing the traditional imposts; in another respect they were a usurpation, inasmuch as the "*great man*" now took the position of landlord toward the "*taks-men*" who again took toward the peasantry that of farmers. And as the "*great man*" now required money no less than the "*taks-men*", a production not only for direct consumption but for export and exchange also became necessary; the system of national production had to be changed, the hands superseded by this change had to be got rid of. Population, therefore, decreased. But that it as yet was kept up in a certain manner, and that man, in the 18th century, was not yet openly sacrificed to net-revenue, we see from a passage in Steuart, a Scotch political economist, whose work was published 10 years before Adam Smith's, where it says (Vol. 1, Chap. 16):

"The rent of these lands is very trifling compared to their extent, but compared to the number of mouths which a farm maintains, it will perhaps be found that a plot of land in the highlands of Scotland feeds ten times more people than a farm of the same extent in the richest provinces."⁵⁹

That even in the beginning of the 19th century the rental imposts were very small, is shown by the work of Mr. Loch (1820),⁶⁰ the steward of the Countess of Sutherland, who directed the improvements on her estates. He gives for instance the rental of the Kintradawell estate for 1811, from which it appears that up to then, every family was obliged to pay a yearly impost of a few shillings in money, a few fowls, and some days' work, at the highest.

It was only after 1811 that the ultimate and real usurpation was enacted, the forcible transformation of *clan-property* into the *private property*, in the modern sense, of the *Chief*. The person who stood at the head of this economical revolution, was a female Mehemet Ali, who had well digested her Malthus—the *Countess of Sutherland*, alias *Marchioness of Stafford*.

Let us first state that the ancestors of the Marchioness of Stafford were the "great men" of the most northern part of Scotland, of very near three-quarters of Sutherlandshire. This county is more extensive than many French *Departments* or small German Principalities. When the Countess of Sutherland inherited these estates, which she afterward brought to her husband, the Marquis of Stafford, afterward Duke of Sutherland, the population of them was already reduced to 15,000. My lady Countess resolved upon a radical economical reform, and determined upon transforming the whole tract of country into sheep-walks. From 1814 to 1820, these 15,000 inhabitants, about 3,000 families, were systematically expelled and exterminated. All their villages were demolished and burned down, and all their fields converted into pasturage. British soldiers were commanded for this execution, and came to blows with the natives. An old woman refusing to quit her hut, was burned in the flames of it. Thus my lady Countess appropriated to herself *seven hundred and ninety-four thousand acres of land*, which from time immemorial had belonged to the clan. In the exuber-

ance of her generosity she allotted to the expelled natives about 6,000 acres—two acres per family. These 6,000 acres had been lying waste until then, and brought no revenue to the proprietors. The Countess was generous enough to sell the acre at 2s. 6d. on an average, to the clan-men who for centuries past had shed their blood for her family. The whole of the unrightfully appropriated clan-land she divided into 29 large sheep farms, each of them inhabited by one single family, mostly English farm-labourers; and in 1821 the 15,000 Gaels had already been superseded by 131,000 sheep.

A portion of the aborigines had been thrown upon the sea-shore, and attempted to live by fishing. They became amphibious, and, as an English author says, lived half on land and half on water, and after all did not half live upon both.

Sismondi, in his *Etudes Sociales*, observes with regard to this expropriation of the Gaels from Sutherlandshire—an example, which, by-the-by, was imitated by the other “great men” of Scotland:

“The large extent of seignorial domains is not a circumstance peculiar to Britain. In the whole Empire of Charlemagne, in the whole Occident, entire provinces were usurped by the warlike chiefs, who had them cultivated for their own account by the vanquished, and sometimes by their own companions-in-arms. During the 9th and 10th centuries the Counties of Maine, Anjou, Poitou were for the Counts of these provinces rather three large estates than principalities. Switzerland, which in so many respects resembles Scotland, was at that time divided among a small number of *Seigneurs*. If the Counts of Kyburg, of Lenzburg, of Habsburg, of Gruyères had been protected by British laws, they would have been in the same position as the Earls of Sutherland; some of them would perhaps have had the same taste for improvement as the Marchioness of Stafford, and more than one republic might have disappeared from the Alps in order to make room for flocks of sheep. Not the most despotic monarch in Germany would be allowed to attempt anything of the sort.”⁶¹

Mr. Loch, in his defence of the Countess of Sutherland (1820), replies to the above as follows:

“Why should there be made an exception to the rule adopted in every other case, just for this particular case? Why should the absolute authority of the landlord over his land be sacrificed to the public interest and to motives which concern the public only?”

And why, then, should the slave-holders in the Southern States of North America sacrifice their private interest to the philanthropic grimaces of her Grace, the Duchess of Sutherland?

The British aristocracy, who have everywhere superseded man by bullocks and sheep, will, in a future not very distant, be superseded, in turn, by these useful animals.

The process of *clearing estates*, which, in Scotland, we have just now described, was carried out in England in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. Thomas Morus already complains of it in the beginning of the 16th century. It was performed in Scotland in the beginning of the 19th, and in Ireland it is now in full progress. The noble Viscount Palmerston, too, some years ago cleared of men his property in Ireland, exactly in the manner described above.

If of any property it ever was true that it was *robbery*, it is literally true of the property of the British aristocracy. Robbery of Church property, robbery of commons, fraudulent transformation, accompanied by murder, of feudal and patriarchal property into private property—these are the titles of British aristocrats to their possessions. And what services in this latter process were performed by a servile class of lawyers, you may see from an English lawyer of the last century, Dalrymple, who, in his *History of Feudal Property*,⁶² very naïvely proves that every law or deed concerning property was interpreted by the lawyers, in England, when the middle class rose in wealth, in favour of the *middle class*—in Scotland, where the nobility enriched themselves, in favour of the *nobility*—in either case it was interpreted in a sense hostile to the *people*.

The above Turkish reform by the Countess of Sutherland was justifiable, at least, from a Malthusian point of view. Other Scottish noblemen went further. Having superseded human beings by sheep, they superseded sheep by game, and the pasture grounds by forests. At the head of these was the Duke of Atholl.

"After the conquest, the Norman Kings afforested large portions of the soil of England, in much the same way as the landlords here are now doing with the Highlands." (R. Somers, *Letters of the Highlands*, 1848.)⁶³

As for a large number of the human beings expelled to make room for the game of the Duke of Atholl, and the sheep of the Countess of Sutherland, where did they fly to, where did they find a home?

In the United States of North America.

The enemy of British Wages-Slavery has a right to condemn Negro-Slavery; a Duchess of Sutherland, a Duke of Atholl, a Manchester Cotton-lord—never!

Written by K. Marx
on January 21, 1853

Published in *The People's Paper*
No. 45, March 12, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according to the text
of *The People's Paper*

KARL MARX

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT⁶⁴

London, Friday, January 28, 1853

The *Times* of Jan. 25 contains the following observations under the head of "Amateur Hanging":

"It has often been remarked that in this country a public execution is generally followed closely by instances of death by hanging, either suicidal or accidental, in consequence of the powerful effect which the execution of a noted criminal produces upon a morbid and unmaturing mind."

Of the several cases which are alleged by the *Times* in illustration of this remark, one is that of a lunatic at Sheffield, who, after talking with other lunatics respecting the execution of Barbour, put an end to his existence by hanging himself. Another case is that of a boy of 14 years, who also hung himself.

The doctrine to which the enumeration of these facts was intended to give its support, is one which no reasonable man would be likely to guess, it being no less than a direct apotheosis of the hangman, while capital punishment is extolled as the *ultima ratio* of society. This is done in a leading article of the "leading journal".

The Morning Advertiser, in some very bitter but just strictures on the hanging predilections and bloody logic of the *Times*, has the following interesting data on 43 days of the year 1849:

<i>Executions of:</i>	<i>Murders and Suicides:</i>
Millan March 20	Hannah Sandles . . . March 22
Pulley March 26	M. G. Newton . . . March 22
Smith March 27	J. G. Gleeson — 4 murders at Liverpool March 27
Howe March 31	Murder and suicide at Leices- ter April 2
	Poisoning at Bath . . April 7
	W. Bailey April 8
Landich April 9	J. Ward murders his mother April 13
Sarah Thomas April 13	Yardley April 14
	Doxy, parricide . . . April 14
J. Griffiths April 18	J. Bailey kills his two children and himself April 17
J. Rush April 21	Charles Overton . . . April 18
	Daniel Holmston . . . May 2

This table, as the *Times* concedes, shows not only suicides, but also murders of the most atrocious kind, following closely upon the execution of criminals. It is astonishing that the article in question does not even produce a single argument or pretext for indulging in the savage theory therein propounded; and it would be very difficult, if not altogether impossible, to establish any principle upon which the justice or expediency of capital punishment could be founded in a society glorying in its civilisation. Punishment in general has been defended as a means either of ameliorating or of intimidating. Now what right have you to punish me for the amelioration or intimidation of others? And besides, there is history—there is such a thing as statistics—which prove with the most complete evidence that since Cain the world has neither been intimidated nor ameliorated by punishment. Quite the contrary. From the point of view of abstract right, there is only one theory of punishment which recognises human dignity in the abstract, and that is the theory of Kant especially in the more rigid formula given to it by Hegel. Hegel says:

“Punishment is the *right* of the criminal. It is an act of his own will. The violation of right has been proclaimed by the criminal as his own

right. His crime is the negation of right. Punishment is the negation of this negation, and consequently an affirmation of right, solicited and forced upon the criminal by himself."⁶⁵

There is no doubt something specious in this formula, inasmuch as Hegel, instead of looking upon the criminal as the mere object, the slave of justice, elevates him to the position of a free and self-determined being. Looking, however, more closely into the matter, we discover that German idealism here, as in most other instances has but given a transcendental sanction to the rules of existing society. Is it not a delusion to substitute for the individual with his real motives, with multifarious social circumstances pressing upon him, the abstraction of "free-will"—one among the many qualities of man for man himself! This theory, considering punishment as the result of the criminal's own will, is only a metaphysical expression for the old "jus talionis"; eye against eye, tooth against tooth, blood against blood. Plainly speaking, and dispensing with all paraphrases, punishment is nothing but a means of society to defend itself against the infraction of its vital conditions, whatever may be their character. Now, what a state of society is that, which knows of no better instrument for its own defence than the hangman, and which proclaims through the "leading journal of the world" its own brutality as eternal law?

Mr. A. Quetelet, in his excellent and learned work, *l'Homme et ses Facultés*,⁶⁶ says:

"There is a *budget* which we pay with frightful regularity—it is that of prisons, dungeons and scaffolds. . . . We might even predict how many individuals will stain their hands with the blood of their fellow men, how many will be forgers, how many will deal in poison, pretty nearly the same way as we may foretell the annual births and deaths."

And Mr. Quetelet, in a calculation of the probabilities of crime published in 1829, actually predicted with astonishing certainty, not only the amount but all the different kinds of crimes committed in France in 1830. That it is not so much the particular political institutions of a country as the fundamental conditions of modern bourgeois society in general, which produce an average amount of crime in a given national fraction of society, may be seen from the following table, communicated by Quetelet, for the years 1822-24. We

find in a number of one hundred condemned criminals in America and France:

Age	Philadelphia	France
Under twenty-one years	19	19
Twenty-one to thirty	44	35
Thirty to forty	23	23
Above forty	14	23
<hr/>		
Total	100	100

Now, if crimes observed on a great scale thus show, in their amount and their classification, the regularity of physical phenomena—if as Mr. Quetelet remarks, “it would be difficult to decide in respect to which of the two” (the physical world and the social system) “the acting causes produce their effect with the utmost regularity”—is there not a necessity for deeply reflecting upon an alteration of the system that breeds these crimes, instead of glorifying the hangman who executes a lot of criminals to make room only for the supply of new ones?

Written by K. Marx
on January 28, 1853

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3695,
February 18, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.—THE CLERGY
AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE TEN-HOUR DAY.—
STARVATION⁶⁷**

London, Friday, February 25, 1853

The Parliamentary debates of the week offer but little of interest. On the 22nd inst., Mr. Spooner moved, in the House of Commons, the repeal of the money grants for the Catholic College at Maynooth,⁶⁸ and Mr. Scholefield proposed the amendment "to repeal all enactments now in force, whereby the revenue of the State is charged in aid of any ecclesiastical or religious purpose whatever". Mr. Spooner's motion was lost by 162 to 192 votes. Mr. Scholefield's amendment will not come under discussion before Wednesday next; it is, however, not improbable that the amendment will be withdrawn altogether. The only remarkable passage in the Maynooth debate is an observation that fell from Mr. Duffy (Irish Brigade):

"He did not think it wholly impossible that the President of the United States or the new Emperor of the French, might be glad to renew the relations between those countries and the Irish Priesthood."

In the session of last night Lord John Russell brought before the House of Commons his motion for the "removal of some disabilities of Her Majesty's Jewish subjects". The motion was carried by a majority of 29. Thus the question is again settled in the House of Commons, but there is no doubt that it will be once more unsettled in the House of Lords.

The exclusion of Jews from the House of Commons, after the spirit of usury has so long presided in the *British*

Parliament, is unquestionably an absurd anomaly, the more so as they have already become eligible to all the civil offices of the community. But it remains no less characteristic for the man and *for his times*, that instead of a Reform Bill which was promised to remove the disabilities of the mass of the English people, a bill is brought in by Finality-John for the exclusive removal of the disabilities of Baron Lionel de Rothschild. How utterly insignificant an interest is taken in this affair by the public at large, may be inferred from the fact that from not a single place in Great Britain a petition in favour of the admission of Jews has been forwarded to Parliament. The whole secret of this miserable reform farce was betrayed by the speech of the present Sir Robert Peel.

"After all, the House were only considering the noble Lord's private affairs. [Loud cheers.] The noble Lord represented London with a Jew [cheers] and had made the pledge to bring forward annually a motion in favour of the Jews. [Hear!] No doubt Baron Rothschild was a very wealthy man, but this did not entitle him to any consideration, especially considering how his wealth had been amassed. [Loud cries of "hear, hear", and "Oh! Oh!" from the Ministerial benches.] Only yesterday he had read in the papers that the House of Rothschild had consented to grant a loan to Greece, on considerable guaranties, at 9⁰/₁₀. [Hear!] No wonder, at this rate, that the House of Rothschild were wealthy. [Hear.] The President of the Board of Trade had been talking of gagging the Press. Why, no one had done so much to depress freedom in Europe as the house of Rothschild [Hear, hear!] by the loans with which they assisted the despotic powers. But even supposing the Baron to be as worthy a man as he was certainly rich, it was to have been expected that the noble Lord who represented in that House a government consisting of the leaders of all the political factions who had opposed the late Administration, would have proposed some measure of more importance than the present."

The proceedings on election-petitions have commenced. The elections for Canterbury and Lancaster have been declared null and void, under circumstances which proved the habitual venality on the part of a certain class of electors, but it is pretty sure that the majority of cases will be adjusted by way of compromise.

"The privileged classes," says the *Daily News*, "who have successfully contributed to baffle the intentions of the Reform Bill and to recover their ascendancy in the existing representation, are naturally alarmed at the idea of full and complete exposure."

On the 21st inst., Lord John Russell resigned the seals on the Foreign Office, and Lord Clarendon was sworn in as his successor. Lord John is the first Member of the House of Commons admitted to a seat in the Cabinet without any official appointment. He is now only a favourite adviser, without a place—and without salary. Notice, however, has already been given by Mr. Kelly of a proposition to remedy the latter inconvenience of poor Johnny's situation. The Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs is at the present juncture the more important, as the Germanic Diet has bestirred itself to ask the removal of all political refugees from Great Britain, as the Austrians propose to pack us all up and transport us to some barren island in the South Pacific.

Allusion has been made, in a former letter, to the probability of the Irish Tenant Right agitation becoming, in time, an anti-clerical movement, notwithstanding the views and intentions of its actual leaders. I alleged the fact, that the higher Clergy was already beginning to take a hostile attitude with regard to the League. Another force has since stepped into the field which presses the movement in the same direction. The landlords of the north of Ireland endeavour to persuade their tenantry that the Tenant League and the Catholic Defence Association are identical, and they labour to get up an opposition to the former under the pretence of resisting the progress of Popery.

While we thus see the Irish landlords appealing to their tenants against the Catholic clergy we behold on the other hand the English Protestant clergy appealing to the working classes against the mill-lords. The industrial proletariat of England has renewed with double vigour its old campaign for the Ten Hours Bill and against the *truck and shoppage system*. As the demands of this kind shall be brought before the House of Commons, to which numerous petitions on the subject have already been presented, there will be an opportunity for me to dwell in a future letter on the cruel and infamous practices of the factory despots, who are in the habit of making the press and the tribune resound with their liberal rhetorics. For the present it may suffice to recall to memory that from 1802 there has been a continual strife on the part of the English working

people for legislative interference with the duration of factory labour, until in 1847 the celebrated Ten Hours Act of John Fielden was passed, whereby young persons and females were prohibited to work in any factory longer than ten hours a day. The liberal mill-lords speedily found out that under this act factories might be worked by shifts and relays. In 1849 an action of law was brought before the Court of Exchequer, and the Judge decided that to work the relay or shift-system, with two sets of children, the adults working the whole space of time during which the machinery was running, was legal. It therefore became necessary to go to Parliament again, and in 1850 the relay and shift-system was condemned there, but the Ten Hours Act was transformed into a Ten and a Half Hours' Act. Now, at this moment, the working classes demand a restitution *in integrum* of the original Ten Hours Bill; yet, in order to make it efficient, they add the demand of a restriction of the moving power of machinery.

Such is, in short, the exoteric history of the Ten Hours Act. Its secret history was as follows: The landed aristocracy having suffered a defeat from the bourgeoisie by the passing of the Reform Bill of 1831, and being assailed in "their most sacred interests" by the cry of the manufacturers for Free Trade and the abolition of the Corn Laws, resolved to resist the middle class by espousing the cause and claims of the working-men against their masters, and especially by rallying around their demands for the limitation of factory labour. So-called philanthropic Lords were then at the head of all Ten-Hours' meetings. Lord Ashley has even made a sort of "renommée" by his performances in this movement. The landed aristocracy having received a deadly blow by the actual abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846, took their vengeance by forcing the Ten Hours Bill of 1847 upon Parliament. But the industrial bourgeoisie recovered by judiciary authority, what they had lost by Parliamentary legislation. In 1850, the wrath of the Landlords had gradually subsided, and they made a compromise with the Mill-lords, condemning the shift-system, but imposing, at the same time, as a penalty for the enforcement of the law, half an hour extra work *per diem*

on the working classes. At the present juncture, however, as they feel the approach of their final struggle with the men of the Manchester School, they are again trying to get hold of the short-time movement; but, not daring to come forward themselves, they endeavour to undermine the Cotton-lords by directing the popular force against them through the medium of the *State Church Clergymen*. In what rude manner these holy men have taken the anti-industrial crusade into their hands, may be seen from the following few instances. At Crampton a Ten-Hours' meeting was held, the Rev. Dr. Brammell [of the State Church], in the chair. At this meeting, Rev. J. R. Stephens, Incumbent of Stalybridge, said:

"There had been ages in the world when the nations were governed by Theocracy. . . . That state of things is now no more. . . . Still the spirit of law was the same. . . . The labouring man should, first of all, be partaker of the fruits of the earth, which he was the means of producing. The factory law was so unblushingly violated that the Chief Inspector of that part of the factory district, Mr. Leonard Horner, had found himself necessitated to write to the Home Secretary, to say that he dared not, and would not send any of his Sub-Inspectors into certain districts until he had police protection. . . . And protection against whom? Against the factory-masters! Against the richest men in the district, against the most influential men in the district, against the magistrates of the district, against the men who hold her Majesty's Commission, against the men who sat in the Petty Sessions as the Representatives of Royalty. . . . *And did the masters suffer for their violation of the law?* . . . In his own district, it was a settled custom of the male, and to a great extent of the female workers in factories, to be in bed till 9, 10 or 11 o'clock on Sunday, because they were tired out by the labour of the week. Sunday was the only day on which they could rest their wearied frames. . . . It would generally be found that, the longer the time of work, the smaller the wages. . . . *He would rather be a slave in South Carolina, than a factory operative in England.*"

At the great Ten-Hours' meeting, at Burnley, Rev. E. A. Verity, Incumbent of Habbergham Eaves, told his audience among other things:

"Where was Mr. Cobden, where was Mr. Bright, where were the other members of the Manchester School, when the people of Lancashire were oppressed? . . . What was the end of the rich man's thinking? Why, he was scheming how he could defraud the working classes out of an hour or two. That was the scheming of what he called the Manchester School. That made them such *cunning hypocrites*, and such *crafty rascals*. As a minister of the Church of England, he protested against such work."

The motive, that has so suddenly metamorphosed the gentlemen of the Established Church, into as many knights-errant of labour's rights, and so fervent knights too, has already been pointed out. They are not only laying in a stock of popularity for the rainy days of approaching democracy, they are not only conscious that the Established Church is essentially an aristocratic institution, which must either stand or fall with the landed Oligarchy—there is something more. The men of the Manchester School are Anti-State Church men, they are Dissenters, they are, above all, so highly enamoured of the £13,000,000 annually abstracted from their pockets by the State Church in England and Wales alone, that they are resolved to bring about a separation between those profane millions and the holy orders, the better to qualify the latter for heaven. The reverend gentlemen, therefore, are struggling *pro aris et focis*.* The men of the Manchester School, however, may infer from this diversion, that they will be unable to abstract the political power from the hands of the Aristocracy, unless they consent, with whatever reluctance, to give the people also their full share in it.

On the Continent, hanging, shooting and transportation is the order of the day. But the executioners are themselves tangible and hangable beings, and their deeds are recorded in the conscience of the whole civilised world. At the same time there acts in England an invisible, intangible and silent despot, condemning individuals, in extreme cases, to the most cruel of deaths, and driving in its noiseless, every day working, whole races and whole classes of men from the soil of their forefathers, like the angel with the fiery sword who drove Adam from Paradise. In the latter form the work of the unseen social despot calls itself *forced emigration*, in the former it is called *starvation*.

Some further cases of starvation have occurred in London during the present month. I remember only that of Mary Ann Sandry, aged 43 years, who died in Coal-lane, Shadwell, London. Mr. Thomas Peene, the surgeon, assisting the Coroner's inquest, said the deceased died from starvation

* For their altars and firesides, i.e., for all that is sacred to them.—*Ed.*

and exposure to the cold. The deceased was lying on a small heap of straw, without the slightest covering. The room was completely destitute of furniture, firing and food. Five young children were sitting on the bare flooring, crying from hunger and cold by the side of the mother's dead body.

On the working of "*forced emigration*" in my next.

Written by K. Marx
on February 25, 1853

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune*, March 15, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

FORCED EMIGRATION

London, Friday, March 4, 1853

The Colonial Emigration Office gives the following return of the emigration from England, Scotland, and Ireland, to all parts of the world, from January 1, 1847 to June 30, 1852:

Year	English	Scotch	Irish	Total
1847	34,685	8,616	214,969	258,270
1848	58,865	11,505	177,719	248,089
1849	73,613	17,127	208,758	299,498
1850	57,843	15,154	207,852	280,849
1851	69,557	18,646	247,763	335,966
1852 (till June) . . .	40,767	11,562	143,375	195,704
<hr/>				
Total	335,330	82,610	1,200,436	1,618,376

"Nine-tenths," remarks the Office, "of the emigrants from Liverpool are assumed to be Irish. About three-fourths of the emigrants from Scotland are Celts, either from the Highlands, or from Ireland through Glasgow."

Nearly four-fifths of the whole emigration are, accordingly, to be regarded as belonging to the Celtic population of Ireland and of the Highlands and islands of Scotland. The London *Economist* says of this emigration:

"It is consequent on the breaking down of the system of society founded on small holdings and potato cultivation"; and adds: "The departure of the redundant part of the population of Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland is an indispensable preliminary to every kind of improvement. . . . The revenue of Ireland has not suffered in any degree

from the famine of 1846-47, or from the emigration that has since taken place. On the contrary, her *net revenue* amounted in 1851 to £4,281,999, being about £184,000 greater than in 1843."

Begin with pauperising the inhabitants of a country, and when there is no more profit to be ground out of them, when they have grown a burden to the revenue, drive them away, and sum up your Net Revenue! Such is the doctrine laid down by Ricardo in his celebrated work, *The Principles of Political Economy*.⁶⁹ The annual profits of a capitalist amounting to £2,000, what does it matter to him whether he employs 100 men or 1,000 men? "Is not," says Ricardo, "the real income of a nation similar?" The net real income of a nation, rents and profits, remaining the same, it is no subject of consideration whether it is derived from ten millions of people or from twelve million. Sismondi, in his *Nouveaux principes d'économie politique*,⁷⁰ answers that, according to this view of the matter, the English nation would not be interested at all in the disappearance of the whole population, the King (at that time it was no Queen, but a King*) remaining alone in the midst of the island, supposing only that automatic machinery enabled him to procure the amount of *net revenue* now produced by a population of twenty million. Indeed that grammatical entity, "the national wealth", would in this case not be diminished.

In a former letter I have given an instance of the clearing of estates in the Highlands of Scotland. That emigration continues to be forced upon Ireland by the same process, you may see from the following quotation from *The Galway Mercury*:

"The people are fast passing away from the land in the West of Ireland. The landlords of Connaught are tacitly combined to weed out all the smaller occupiers, against whom a regular systematic war of extermination is being waged.... The most heart-rending cruelties are daily practised in this province, of which the public are not at all aware."

But it is not only the pauperised inhabitants of Green Erin** and of the Highlands of Scotland that are swept

* George III.—*Ed.*

** Ireland.—*Ed.*

away by agricultural improvements, and by the "breaking down of the antiquated system of society". It is not only the able-bodied agricultural labourers from England, Wales, and Lower Scotland, whose passages are paid by the Emigration Commissioners. The wheel of "improvement" is now seizing another class, the most stationary class in England. A startling emigration movement has sprung up among the smaller English farmers, especially those holding heavy clay soils, who, with bad prospects for the coming harvest, and in want of sufficient capital to make the great improvements on their farms which would enable them to pay their old rents, have no other alternative but to cross the sea in search of a new country and of new lands. I am not speaking now of the emigration caused by the gold mania, but only of the compulsory emigration produced by landlordism, concentration of farms, application of machinery to the soil, and introduction of the modern system of agriculture on a great scale.

In the ancient States, in Greece and Rome, compulsory emigration, assuming the shape of the periodical establishment of colonies, formed a regular link in the structure of society. The whole system of those States was founded on certain limits to the numbers of the population, which could not be surpassed without endangering the condition of antique civilisation itself. But why was it so? Because the application of science to material production was utterly unknown to them. To remain civilised they were forced to remain few. Otherwise they would have had to submit to the bodily drudgery which transformed the free citizen into a slave. The want of productive power made citizenship dependent on a certain proportion in numbers not to be disturbed. Forced emigration was the only remedy.

It was the same pressure of population on the powers of production that drove the barbarians from the high plains of Asia to invade the Old World. The same cause acted there, although under a different form. To remain barbarians they were forced to remain few. They were pastoral, hunting, war-waging tribes, whose manners of production required a large space for every individual, as is now the case with the Indian tribes in North America. By augment-

ing in numbers they curtailed each other's field of production. Thus the surplus population was forced to undertake those great adventurous migratory movements which laid the foundation of the peoples of ancient and modern Europe.

But with modern compulsory emigration the case stands quite opposite. Here it is not the want of productive power which creates a surplus population; it is the increase of productive power which demands a diminution of population, and drives away the surplus by famine or emigration. It is not population that presses on productive power; it is productive power that presses on population.

Now I share neither in the opinion of Ricardo, who regards 'Net Revenue' as the Moloch to whom entire populations must be sacrificed, without even so much as complaint, nor in the opinion of Sismondi, who, in his hypochondriacal philanthropy, would forcibly retain the superannuated methods of agriculture and proscribe science from industry, as Plato expelled poets from his Republic.⁷¹ Society is undergoing a silent revolution, which must be submitted to, and which takes no more notice of the human existences it breaks down than an earthquake regards the houses it subverts. The classes and the races, too weak to master the new conditions of life, must give way. But can there be anything more puerile, more short-sighted, than the views of those Economists who believe in all earnest that this woeful transitory state means nothing but adapting society to the acquisitive propensities of capitalists, both landlords and money-lords? In Great Britain the working of that process is most transparent. The application of modern science to production clears the land of its inhabitants, but it concentrates people in manufacturing towns.

"No manufacturing workmen," says the *Economist*, "have been assisted by the Emigration Commissioners, except a few Spitalfields and Paisley hand-loom weavers, and few or none are emigrated at their own expense."

The *Economist* knows very well that they could not emigrate at their own expense, and that the industrial middle class would not assist them in emigrating. Now, to what does this lead? The rural population, the most stationary

and conservative element of modern society, disappears while the industrial proletariat, by the very working of modern production, finds itself gathered in mighty centres, around the great productive forces, whose history of creation has hitherto been the martyrology of the labourers. Who will prevent them from going a step further, and appropriating these forces, to which they have been appropriated before? Where will be the power of resisting them? Nowhere! Then, it will be of no use to appeal to the 'rights of property'. The modern changes in the art of production have, according to the Bourgeois Economists themselves, broken down the antiquated system of society and its modes of appropriation. They have *expropriated* the Scotch clansman, the Irish cottier and tenant, the English yeoman, the hand-loom weaver, numberless handicrafts, whole generations of factory children and women; they will expropriate, in due time, the landlord and the cotton lord.

Written by K. Marx
on March 4, 1853

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3722,
March 22, 1853
and republished in
The People's Paper
No. 50, April 16, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according to the text
of *The People's Paper* and
checked with the text of the
New-York Daily Tribune

KARL MARX

THE BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

London, Friday, June 10, 1853

Telegraphic dispatches from Vienna announce that the pacific solution of the Turkish, Sardinian and Swiss questions is regarded there as a certainty.

Last night the debate on India was continued in the House of Commons, in the usual dull manner. Mr. Blackett charged the statements of Sir Charles Wood and Sir J. Hogg with bearing the stamp of optimist falsehood. A lot of Ministerial and Directorial advocates rebuked the charge as well as they could, and the inevitable Mr. Hume summed up by calling on Ministers to withdraw their bill. Debate adjourned.

Hindustan is an Italy of Asiatic dimensions, the Himalayas for the Alps, the Plains of Bengal for the Plains of Lombardy, the Deccan for the Apennines, and the Isle of Ceylon for the Island of Sicily. The same rich variety in the products of the soil, and the same dismemberment in the political configuration. Just as Italy has, from time to time, been compressed by the conqueror's sword into different national masses, so do we find Hindostan, when not under the pressure of the Mohammedan, or the Mogul, or the Briton, dissolved into as many independent and conflicting States as it numbered towns, or even villages. Yet, in a social point of view, Hindostan is not the Italy, but the Ireland of the East. And this strange combination of

Italy and of Ireland, of a world of voluptuousness and of a world of woes, is anticipated in the ancient traditions of the religion of Hindostan. That religion is at once a religion of sensualist exuberance, and a religion of self-torturing asceticism; a religion of the Lingam and of the Juggernaut; the religion of the Monk, and of the Bayadere.⁷²

I share not the opinion of those who believe in a golden age of Hindostan, without recurring, however, like Sir Charles Wood, for the confirmation of my view, to the authority of Khuli-Khan. But take, for example, the times of Aurung-Zebe; or the epoch, when the Mogul appeared in the North, and the Portuguese in the South; or the age of Mohammedan invasion, and of the Heptarchy in Southern India⁷³; or, if you will, go still more back to antiquity, take the mythological chronology of the Brahmin himself, who places the commencement of Indian misery in an epoch even more remote than the Christian creation of the world.

There cannot, however, remain any doubt but that the misery inflicted by the British on Hindostan is of an essentially different and infinitely more intensive kind than all Hindostan had to suffer before. I do not allude to European despotism, planted upon Asiatic despotism, by the British East India Company, forming a more monstrous combination than any of the divine monsters startling us in the Temple of Salsette.⁷⁴ This is no distinctive feature of British colonial rule, but only an imitation of the Dutch, and so much so that in order to characterise the working of the British East India Company, it is sufficient to literally repeat what Sir Stamford Raffles, the *English* Governor of Java, said of the old Dutch East India Company.

"The Dutch Company, actuated solely by the spirit of gain, and viewing their subjects with less regard or consideration than a West India planter formerly viewed a gang upon his estate, because the latter had paid the purchase money of human property, which the other had not, employed all the existing machinery of despotism to squeeze from the people their utmost mite of contribution, the last dregs of their labour, and thus aggravated the evils of a capricious and semi-barbarous Government, by working it with all the practised ingenuity of politicians, and all the monopolising selfishness of traders."

All the civil wars, invasions, revolutions, conquests, famines, strangely complex, rapid and destructive as the

successive action in Hindostan may appear, did not go deeper than its surface. England has broken down the entire framework of Indian society, without any symptoms of reconstitution yet appearing. This loss of his old world, with no gain of a new one, imparts a particular kind of melancholy to the present misery of Hindoo, and separates Hindostan, ruled by Britain, from all its ancient traditions, and from the whole of its past history.

There have been in Asia, generally, from immemorial times, but three departments of Government: that of Finance, or the plunder of the interior; that of War, or the plunder of the exterior; and, finally, the department of Public Works. Climate and territorial conditions, especially the vast tracts of desert, extending from the Sahara, through Arabia, Persia, India and Tartary, to the most elevated Asiatic highlands, constituted artificial irrigation by canals and waterworks the basis of Oriental agriculture. As in Egypt and India, inundations are used for fertilising the soil of Mesopotamia, Persia, etc.; advantage is taken of a high level for feeding irrigative canals. This prime necessity of an economical and common use of water, which, in the Occident, drove private enterprise to voluntary association, as in Flanders and Italy, necessitated, in the Orient where civilisation was too low and the territorial extent too vast to call into life voluntary association, the interference of the centralising power of Government. Hence an economical function devolved upon all Asiatic Governments, the function of providing public works. This artificial fertilisation of the soil, dependent on a Central Government, and immediately decaying with the neglect of irrigation and drainage, explains the otherwise strange fact that we now find whole territories barren and desert that were once brilliantly cultivated, as Palmyra, Petra, the ruins in Yemen, and large provinces of Egypt, Persia and Hindostan; it also explains how a single war of devastation has been able to depopulate a country for centuries, and to strip it of all its civilisation.

Now, the British in East India accepted from their predecessors the department of finance and of war, but they have neglected entirely that of public works. Hence the deterioration of an agriculture which is not capable of being

conducted on the British principle of free competition, of *laissez-faire* and *laissez-aller*.⁷⁵ But in Asiatic empires we are quite accustomed to see agriculture deteriorating under one government and reviving again under some other government. There the harvests correspond to good or bad government, as they change in Europe with good or bad seasons. Thus the oppression and neglect of agriculture, bad as it is, could not be looked upon as the final blow dealt to Indian society by the British intruder, had it not been attended by a circumstance of quite different importance, a novelty in the annals of the whole Asiatic world. However changing the political aspect of India's past must appear, its social condition has remained unaltered since its remotest antiquity, until the first decennium of the 19th century. The hand-loom and the spinning-wheel, producing their regular myriads of spinners and weavers, were the pivots of the structure of that society. From immemorial times, Europe received the admirable textures of Indian labour, sending in return for them her precious metals, and furnishing thereby the material to the goldsmith, that indispensable member of Indian society, whose love of finery is so great that even the lowest class, those who go about nearly naked, have commonly a pair of golden earrings and a gold ornament of some kind hung round their necks. Rings on the fingers and toes have also been common. Women as well as children frequently wore massive bracelets and anklets of gold or silver, and statuettes of divinities in gold and silver were met with in the households. It was the British intruder who broke up the Indian hand-loom and destroyed the spinning-wheel. England began with depriving the Indian cottons from the European market; it then introduced twist into Hindostan and in the end inundated the very mother country of cotton with cottons. From 1818 to 1836 the export of twist from Great Britain to India rose in the proportion of 1 to 5,200. In 1824 the export of British muslins to India hardly amounted to 1,000,000 yards, while in 1837 it surpassed 64,000,000 yards. But at the same time the population of Dacca decreased from 150,000 inhabitants to 20,000. This decline of Indian towns celebrated for their fabrics was by no means the worst consequence. British steam and science

uprooted, over the whole surface of Hindostan, the union between agriculture and manufacturing industry.

These two circumstances—the Hindoo, on the one hand, leaving, like all Oriental peoples, to the central government the care of the great public works, the prime condition of his agriculture and commerce, dispersed, on the other hand, over the surface of the country, and agglomerated in small centres by the domestic union of agricultural and manufacturing pursuits—these two circumstances had brought about, since the remotest times, a social system of particular features—the so-called *village system*, which gave to each of these small unions their independent organisation and distinct life. The peculiar character of this system may be judged from the following description, contained in an old official report of the British House of Commons on Indian affairs:

“A village, geographically considered, is a tract of country comprising some hundred of thousand acres of arable and waste lands; politically viewed it resembles a corporation or township. Its proper establishment of officers and servants consists of the following descriptions: The *potail*, or head inhabitant, who has generally the superintendence of the affairs of the village, settles the disputes of the inhabitants, attends to the police, and performs the duty of collecting the revenue within his village, a duty which his personal influence and minute acquaintance with the situation and concerns of the people render him the best qualified for this charge. The *kurnum* keeps the accounts of cultivation, and registers everything connected with it. The *tallier* and the *totie*, the duty of the former of which consists in gaining information of crimes and offences, and in escorting and protecting persons travelling from one village to another; the province of the latter appearing to be more immediately confined to the village, consisting, among other duties, in guarding the crops and assisting in measuring them. The *boundaryman*, who preserves the limits of the village, or gives evidence respecting them in cases of dispute. The Superintendent of Tanks and Watercourses distributes the water for the purposes of agriculture. The Brahmin, who performs the village worship. The schoolmaster, who is seen teaching the children in a village to read and write in the sand. The calender-Brahmin, or astrologer, etc. These officers and servants generally constitute the establishment of a village; but in some parts of the country it is of less extent; some of the duties and functions above described being united in the same person; in others it exceeds the above-named number of individuals. Under this simple form of municipal government, the inhabitants of the country have lived from time immemorial. The boundaries of the villages have been but seldom altered; and though the villages themselves have been sometimes injured, and even

desolated by war, famine or disease, the same name, the same limits, the same interests, and even the same families, have continued for ages. The inhabitants gave themselves no trouble about the breaking up and divisions of kingdoms; while the village remains entire, they care not to what power it is transferred, or to what sovereign it devolves; its internal economy remains unchanged. The potail is still the head inhabitant, and still acts as the petty judge or magistrate, and collector or renter of the village."⁷⁶

These small stereotype forms of social organism have been to the greater part dissolved, and are disappearing, not so much through the brutal interference of the British tax-gatherer and the British soldier, as to the working of English steam and English Free Trade. Those family-communities were based on domestic industry, in that peculiar combination of hand-weaving, hand-spinning and hand-tilling agriculture which gave them self-supporting power. English interference having placed the spinner in Lancashire and the weaver in Bengal, or sweeping away both Hindoo spinner and weaver, dissolved these small semi-barbarian, semi-civilised communities, by blowing up their economical basis, and thus produced the greatest, and to speak the truth, the only *social* revolution ever heard of in Asia.

Now, sickening as it must be to human feeling to witness those myriads of industrious patriarchal and inoffensive social organisations disorganised and dissolved into their units, thrown into a sea of woes, and their individual members losing at the same time their ancient form of civilisation, and their hereditary means of subsistence, we must not forget that these idyllic village communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies. We must not forget the barbarian egotism which, concentrating on some miserable patch of land, had quietly witnessed the ruin of empires, the perpetration of unspeakable cruelties, the massacre of the population of large towns, with no other consideration bestowed upon them than on natural events, itself the helpless prey of any aggressor who deigned to notice it at all. We must not forget that this

undignified, stagnant, and vegetative life, that this passive sort of existence evoked on the other part, in contradistinction, wild, aimless, unbounded forces of destruction and rendered murder itself a religious rite in Hindostan. We must not forget that these little communities were contaminated by distinctions of caste and by slavery, that they subjugated man to external circumstances instead of elevating man to be the sovereign of circumstances, that they transformed a self-developing social state into never changing natural destiny, and thus brought about a brutalising worship of nature, exhibiting its degradation in the fact that man, the sovereign of nature, fell down on his knees in adoration of *Kanuman*, the monkey, and *Sabbala*, the cow.

England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in Hindostan, was actuated only by the vilest interests, and was stupid in her manner of enforcing them. But that is not the question. The question is, can mankind fulfil its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia? If not, whatever may have been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution.

Then, whatever bitterness the spectacle of the crumbling of an ancient world may have for our personal feelings, we have the right, in point of history, to exclaim with Goethe:

*"Sollte diese Qual uns quälen,
Da sie unsre Lust vermehrt;
Hat nicht Myriaden Seelen
Timurs Herrschaft aufgezehrt?"**

Written by K. Marx
on June 10, 1853

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3804,
June 25, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

* *Should this torture then torment us
Since it brings us greater pleasure?
Were not through the rule of Timur
Souls devoured without measure?*

From Goethe's *Westöstlicher Diwan. An Suleika*.—Ed.

KARL MARX

**THE EAST INDIA COMPANY—
ITS HISTORY AND RESULTS**

London, Friday, June 24, 1853

The debate on Lord Stanley's motion to postpone legislation for India, has been deferred until this evening. For the first time since 1783 the India Question has become a Ministerial one in England. Why is this?

The true commencement of the East India Company cannot be dated from a more remote epoch than the year 1602, when the different societies, claiming the monopoly of the East India trade, united together in one single Company. Till then the very existence of the original East India Company was repeatedly endangered, once suspended for years under the protectorate of Cromwell, and once threatened with utter dissolution by parliamentary interference under the reign of William III. It was under the ascendancy of that Dutch Prince when the Whigs became the farmers of the revenues of the British Empire, when the Bank of England sprang into life, when the protective system was firmly established in England, and the balance of power in Europe was definitively settled, that the existence of an East India Company was recognised by Parliament. That era of apparent liberty was in reality the era of monopolies not created by Royal grants, as in the times of Elizabeth and Charles I., but authorised and nationalised by the sanction of Parliament. This epoch in the history of England bears, in fact, an extreme likeness to the epoch of Louis Philippe

in France, the old landed aristocracy having been defeated, and the bourgeoisie not being able to take its place except under the banner of moneyocracy, or the "*haute finance*". The East India Company excluded the common people from the commerce with India, at the same time that the House of Commons excluded them from parliamentary representation. In this as well as in other instances, we find the first decisive victory of the *bourgeoisie* over the feudal aristocracy coinciding with the most pronounced reaction against the people, a phenomenon which has driven more than one popular writer, like Cobbett, to look for popular liberty rather in the past than in the future.

The union between the Constitutional Monarchy and the monopolising monied interest, between the Company of East India and the "glorious" revolution of 1688 was fostered by the same force by which the liberal interests and a liberal dynasty have at all times and in all countries met and combined, by the force of corruption, that first and last moving power of Constitutional Monarchy, the guardian angel of William III and the fatal demon of Louis Philippe. So early as 1693, it appeared from parliamentary inquiries, that the annual expenditure of the East India Company, under the head of "gifts" to men in power, which had rarely amounted to above £1,200 before the revolution, reached the sum of £90,000. The Duke of Leeds was impeached for a bribe of £5,000, and the virtuous King himself convicted of having received £10,000. Besides these direct bribes, rival Companies were thrown out by tempting Government with loans of enormous sums at the lowest interest, and by buying off rival Directors.

The power the East India Company had obtained by bribing the Government, as did also the Bank of England, it was forced to maintain by bribing again, as did the Bank of England. At every epoch when its monopoly was expiring, it could only effect a renewal of its charter by offering fresh loans and by fresh presents made to the Government.

The events of the seven years' war transformed the East India Company from a commercial into a military and territorial power.⁷⁷ It was then that the foundation was laid of the present British Empire in the East. Then East India

stock rose to £263, and dividends were then paid at the rate of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But then there appeared a new enemy to the Company, no longer in the shape of rival societies, but in the shape of rival ministers and of a rival people. It was alleged that the Company's territory had been conquered by the aid of British fleets and British armies, and that no British subjects could hold territorial sovereignties independent of the Crown. The ministers of the day and the people of the day claimed their share in the "wonderful treasures" imagined to have been won by the last conquests. The Company only saved its existence by an agreement made in 1767 that it should annually pay £400,000 into the National Exchequer.

But the East India Company, instead of fulfilling its agreement, got into financial difficulties, and, instead of paying a tribute to the English people, appealed to Parliament for pecuniary aid. Serious alterations in the Charter were the consequence of this step. The Company's affairs failing to improve, notwithstanding their new condition, and the English nation having simultaneously lost their colonies in North America, the necessity of elsewhere regaining some great Colonial Empire became more and more universally felt. The illustrious Fox thought the opportune moment had arrived, in 1783, for bringing forward his famous India bill, which proposed to abolish the Courts of Directors and Proprietors, and to vest the whole Indian government in the hands of seven Commissioners appointed by Parliament. By the personal influence of the imbecile King over the House of Lords, the bill of Mr. Fox was defeated, and made the instrument of breaking down the then Coalition Government of Fox and Lord North, and of placing the famous Pitt at the head of the Government. Pitt carried in 1784 a bill through both Houses, which directed the establishment of the Board of Control, consisting of six members of the Privy Council, who were

"to check, superintend and control all acts, operations and concerns which in any wise related to the civil and military Government, or revenues of the territories and possessions of the East India Company".

On this head, Mill, the historian, says:

"In passing that law two objects were pursued. To avoid the imputation of what was represented as the heinous object of Mr. Fox's bill, it was necessary that the principal part of the power should APPEAR to remain in the hands of the Directors. For ministerial advantage it was necessary that it should in *reality* be all taken away. Mr. Pitt's bill professed to differ from that of his rival, chiefly in this very point, that while the one destroyed the power of the Directors, the other left it almost entire. Under the act of Mr. Fox the powers of the ministers would have been avowedly held. Under the act of Mr. Pitt, they were held in secret and by fraud. The bill of Fox transferred the power of the Company to Commissioners appointed by Parliament. The bill of Mr. Pitt transferred them to Commissioners appointed by the King."⁸

The years of 1783 and 1784 were thus the first, and till now the only years, for the India question to become a ministerial one. The bill of Mr. Pitt having been carried, the charter of the East India Company was renewed, and the Indian question set aside for twenty years. But in 1813 the anti-Jacobin war, and in 1833 the newly introduced Reform Bill superseded all other political questions.

This, then, is the first reason of the India question's having failed to become a great political question, since and before 1784; that before that time the East India Company had first to conquer existence and importance; that after that time the Oligarchy absorbed all of its power which it could assume without incurring responsibility; and that afterwards the English people in general were at the very epochs of the renewal of the Charter, in 1813 and at 1833, absorbed by other questions of overbearing interest.

We will now take a different view. The East India Company commenced by attempting merely to establish factories for their agents, and places of deposit for their goods. In order to protect them they erected several forts. Although they had, even as early as 1689, conceived the establishment of a dominion in India, and of making territorial revenue one of their sources of emolument, yet, down to 1744, they had acquired but a few unimportant districts around Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta. The war which subsequently broke out in the Carnatic had the effect of rendering them after various struggles virtual sovereigns of that part of India. Much more considerable results arose from the war in Bengal and the victories of Clive. These results were the

real occupation of Bengal, Bichar, and Orissa. At the end of the eighteenth century, and in the first years of the present one, there supervened the wars with Tippoo Sahib, and in consequence of them a great advance of power, and an immense extension of the subsidiary system.⁷⁹ In the second decennium of the nineteenth century the first convenient frontier, that of India within the desert, had at length been conquered. It was not till then that the British Empire in the East reached those parts of Asia, which had been, at all times, the seat of every great central power in India. But the most vulnerable point of the Empire, from which it had been overrun as often as old conquerors were expelled by new ones, the barriers of the Western frontier, were not in the hands of the British. During the period from 1838 to 1849, in the Sikh and Afghan wars, British rule subjected to definitive possession the ethnographical, political, and military frontiers of the East Indian Continent by the compulsory annexation of the Punjab and of Scinde.⁸⁰ These were possessions indispensable to repulse any invading force issuing from Central Asia, and indispensable against Russia advancing to the frontiers of Persia. During this last decennium there have been added to the British Indian territory 167,000 square miles, with a population of 8,572,630 souls. As to the interior, all the native States now became surrounded by British possessions, subjected to British *suzeraineté* under various forms, and cut off from the seacoast, with the sole exception of Guzerat and Scinde. At to its exterior, India was now finished. It is only since 1849, that the one great Anglo-Indian Empire has existed.

Thus the British Government has been fighting, under the Company's name, for two centuries, till at last the natural limits of India were reached. We understand now, why during all this time all parties in England have connived in silence, even those which had resolved to become the loudest with their hypocritical peace-cant, after the *arrondissement* of the one Indian Empire should have been completed. Firstly, of course, they had to get it in order to subject it afterward to their sharp philanthropy. From this view we understand the altered position of the Indian question in the

present year, 1853, compared with all former periods of Charter renewal.

Again, let us take a different view. We shall still better understand the peculiar crisis in Indian legislation, on reviewing the course of British commercial intercourse with India through its different phases.

At the commencement of the East India Company's operations, under the reign of Elizabeth, the Company was permitted for the purpose of profitably carrying on its trade with India to export an annual value of £30,000 in silver, gold, and foreign coin. This was an infraction against all the prejudices of the age, and Thomas Mun was forced to lay down in *A Discourse on Trade from England to the East Indies*,⁸¹ the foundation of the "mercantile system", admitting that the precious metals were the only real wealth a country could possess, but contending at the same time that their exportation might be safely allowed, provided the *balance of payments* was in favour of the exporting nation. In this sense, he contended that the commodities imported from East India were chiefly re-exported to other countries, from which a much greater quantity of bullion was obtained than had been required to pay for them in India. In the same spirit, Sir Joshua Child wrote "A Treatise wherein it is demonstrated that the *East India Trade is the most national Trade of all Foreign Trades*."⁸² By-and-by the partisans of the East India Company grew more audacious, and it may be noticed as a curiosity, in this strange Indian history, that the Indian monopolists were the first preachers of free trade in England.

Parliamentary intervention, with regard to the East India Company, was again claimed, not by the commercial, but by the industrial class, at the latter end of the 17th century, and during the greater part of the 18th, when the importation of East Indian cotton and silk stuffs was declared to ruin the poor British manufacturers, an opinion put forward in John Pollexfen: *England and India inconsistent in their Manufactures*; London, 1697,⁸³ a title strangely verified a century and a half later, but in a very different sense. Parliament did then interfere. By the Act 11 and 12 William III., cap. 10, it was enacted that the wearing of wrought

silks and of printed or dyed calicoes from India, Persia and China should be prohibited, and a penalty of £200 imposed on all persons having or selling the same. Similar laws were enacted under George I., II. and III., in consequence of the repeated lamentations of the afterward so "enlightened" British manufacturers. And thus, during the greater part of the 18th century, Indian manufactures were generally imported into England in order to be sold on the Continent, and to remain excluded from the English market itself.

Besides this parliamentary interference with East India, solicited by the greedy home manufacturer, efforts were made, at every epoch of the renewal of the Charter, by the merchants of London, Liverpool and Bristol, to break down the commercial monopoly of the Company, and to participate in that commerce, estimated to be a true mine of gold. In consequence of these efforts, a provision was made in the Act of 1773 prolonging the Company's Charter till March 1, 1814, by which private British individuals were authorised to export from, and the Company's Indian servants permitted to import into England, almost all sorts of commodities. But this concession was surrounded with conditions annihilating its effects, in respect to the exports to British India by private merchants. In 1813 the Company was unable to further withstand the pressure of general commerce, and except the monopoly of the Chinese trade, the trade to India was opened, under certain conditions, to private competition. At the renewal of the Charter in 1833, these last restrictions were at length superseded, the Company forbidden to carry on any trade at all—their commercial character destroyed, and their privilege of excluding British subjects from the Indian territories withdrawn.

Meanwhile the East India trade had undergone very serious revolutions, altogether altering the position of the different class interests in England with regard to it. During the whole course of the 18th century the treasures transported from India to England were gained much less by comparatively insignificant commerce, than by the direct exploitation of that country, and by the colossal fortunes there extorted and transmitted to England. After the opening of

the trade in 1813 the commerce with India more than trebled in a very short time. But this was not all. The whole character of the trade was changed. Till 1813 India had been chiefly an exporting country, while it now became an importing one; and in such a quick progression, that already in 1823 the rate of exchange, which had generally been $2/6$ per rupee, sunk down to $2/$ per rupee. India, the great workshop of cotton manufacture for the world, since immemorial times, became now inundated with English twists and cotton stuffs. After its own produce had been excluded from England, or only admitted on the most cruel terms, British manufactures were poured into it at a small and merely nominal duty, to the ruin of the native cotton fabrics once so celebrated. In 1780 the value of British produce and manufactures amounted only to £386,152, the bullion exported during the same year to £15,041, the total value of exports during 1780 being £12,648,616, so that the India trade amounted to only $1/32$ of the entire foreign trade. In 1850 the total exports to India from Great Britain and Ireland were £8,024,000, of which cotton goods alone amounted to £5,220,000, so that it reached more than $1/8$ of the whole export, and more than $1/4$ of the foreign cotton trade. But the cotton manufacture also employed now $1/8$ of the population of Britain, and contributed $1/12$ of the whole national revenue. After each commercial crisis the East Indian trade grew of more paramount importance for the British cotton manufacturers, and the East India Continent became actually their best market. At the same rate at which the cotton manufactures became of vital interest for the whole social frame of Great Britain, East India became of vital interest for the British cotton manufacture.

Till then the interests of the moneyocracy which had converted India into its landed estates, of the oligarchy who had conquered it by their armies, and of the millocracy who had inundated it with their fabrics, had gone hand in hand. But the more the industrial interest became dependent on the Indian market, the more it felt the necessity of creating fresh productive powers in India, after having ruined her native industry. You cannot continue to inundate a country with your manufactures, unless you enable it to give you some

produce in return. The industrial interest found that their trade declined instead of increasing. For the years ending with 1846, the imports to India from Great Britain were to the amount of 261 million rupees; for the four years ending 1850 they were only 253 million, while the exports for the former period 274 million rupees, and for the latter period 254 million. They found out that the power of consuming their goods was contracted in India to the lowest possible point, that the consumption of their manufactures by the British West Indies was of the value of about 14s. per head of the population per annum, by Chile of 9s. 3d., by Brazil of 6s. 5d., by Cuba of 6s. 2d., by Peru of 5s. 7d., by Central America of 10d., while it amounted in India only to about 9d. Then came the short cotton crop in the United States, which caused them a loss of £11,000,000 in 1850, and they were exasperated at depending on America, instead of deriving a sufficiency of raw cotton from the East Indies. Besides, they found that in all attempts to apply capital to India they met with impediments and chicanery on the part of the India authorities. Thus India became the battle-field in the contest of the industrial interest on the one side, and of the moneyocracy and oligarchy on the other. The manufacturers, conscious of their ascendancy in England, ask now for the annihilation of these antagonistic powers in India, for the destruction of the whole ancient fabric of Indian government, and for the final eclipse of the East India Company.

And now to the fourth and last point of view, from which the Indian question must be judged. Since 1784 Indian finances have got more and more deeply into difficulty. There exists now a national debt of 50 million pounds, a continual decrease in the resources of the revenue, and a corresponding increase in the expenditure, dubiously balanced by the gambling income of the opium tax, now threatened with extinction by the Chinese beginning themselves to cultivate the poppy, and aggravated by the expenses to be anticipated from the senseless Burmese war.⁸⁴

"As the case stands," says Mr. Dickinson, "as it would ruin England to lose her Empire in India, it is stretching our own finances with ruin, to be obliged to keep it."⁸⁵

I have shown thus how the Indian question has become for the first time since 1783 an English question, and a ministerial question.

Written by K. Marx
on June 24, 1853

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3816,
July 11, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

IRISH TENANT RIGHT

London, June 28, 1853

As the Coalition Ministry depends on the support of the Irish party, and as all the other parties composing the House of Commons so nicely balance each other that the Irish may at any moment turn the scales which way they please, some concessions are at last about to be made to the Irish tenants. The "Leasing powers (Ireland) Bill", which passed the House of Commons on Friday last, contains a provision that for the improvements made on the soil and separable from the soil, the tenant shall have, at the termination of his lease, a compensation in money, the incoming tenant being at liberty to take them at the valuation, while with respect to improvements in the soil, compensation for them shall be arranged by contract between the landlord and the tenant.

A tenant having incorporated his capital, in one form or another, in the land, and having thus effected an improvement of the soil, either directly by irrigation, drainage, manure, or indirectly by construction of buildings for agricultural purposes, in steps the landlord with demand for increased rent. If the tenant concedes, he has to pay the interest for his own money to the landlord. If he resists, he will be very unceremoniously ejected, and supplanted by a new tenant, the latter being enabled to pay a higher rent by the very expenses incurred by his predecessors, until he also, in his turn, has become an improver of the land, and is replaced in the same way, or put on worse terms. In this easy way a class of absentee landlords has been enabled to pocket, not merely the labour, but also the capital, of whole generations, each generation of Irish peasants sinking a grade lower in the social scale, exactly in proportion to the exertions and sacrifices made for the raising of their condi-

tion and that of their families. If the tenant was industrious and enterprising, he became taxed in consequence of his very industry and enterprise. If, on the contrary, he grew inert and negligent, he was reproached with the "aboriginal faults of the Celtic race". He had, accordingly, no other alternative left but to become a pauper—to pauperise himself by industry, or to pauperise by negligence. In order to oppose this state of things, "Tenant Right" was proclaimed in Ireland—a right of the tenant, not in the soil but in the improvements of the soil effected at his cost and charges. Let us see in what manner the *Times*, in its Saturday's leader, attempts to break down this Irish "Tenant Right"⁸⁶:

"There are two general systems of farm occupation. Either a tenant may take a lease of the land for a fixed number of years, or his holding may be terminable at any time upon certain notice. In the first of these events, it would be obviously his course to adjust and apportion his outlay so that all, or nearly all, the benefit would find its way to him before the expiration of his term. In the second case it seems equally obvious that he should not run the risk of the investment without a proper assurance of return."

Where the landlords have to deal with a class of large capitalists who may, as they please, invest their stock in commerce, in manufactures or in farming, there can be no doubt but that these capitalist farmers, whether they take long leases or no time leases at all, know how to secure the "proper" return of their outlays. But with regard to Ireland the supposition is quite fictitious. On the one side you have there a small class of land monopolists, on the other, a very large class of tenants with very petty fortunes, which they have no chance to invest in different ways, no other field of production opening to them, except the soil. They are, therefore, forced to become tenants at will. Being once tenants at will, they naturally run the risk of losing their revenue, provided they do not invest their small capital. Investing it, in order to secure their revenue, they run the risk of losing their capital, also.

"Perhaps," continues the *Times*, "it may be said, that in any case a tenantry could hardly expire without something being left upon the ground, in some shape or another, representing the tenant's own property, and that for this compensation should be forthcoming. There is some truth in the remark, but the demand thus created ought, under proper conditions of society, to be easily adjusted between landlord and

tenant, as it might, at any rate, be provided for in the original contract. We say that the conditions of society should regulate these arrangements, because we believe that no Parliamentary enactment can be effectually substituted for such an agency."

Indeed, under "proper conditions of society", we should want no more Parliamentary interference with the Irish land-tenant, as we should not want, under "proper conditions of society", the interference of the soldier, of the policeman, and of the hangman. Legislature, magistracy, and armed force are all of them but the offspring of improper conditions of society, preventing those arrangements among men which would make useless the compulsory intervention of a third supreme power. Has, perhaps, the *Times* been converted into a social revolutionist? Does it want a *social* revolution, reorganising the "conditions of society", and the "arrangements" emanating from them, instead of "Parliamentary enactments"? England has subverted the conditions of Irish society. At first it confiscated the land, then it suppressed the industry by "Parliamentary enactments", and lastly, it broke the active energy by armed force. And thus England created those abominable "conditions of society" which enable a small *caste* of rapacious lordlings to dictate to the Irish people the terms on which they shall be allowed to hold the land and to live upon it. Too weak yet for revolutionising those "social conditions", the people appeal to Parliament, demanding at least their mitigation and regulation. But "No", says the *Times*; if you don't live under proper conditions of society, Parliament can't mend that. And if the Irish people, on the advice of the *Times*, tried tomorrow to mend their conditions of society, the *Times* would be the first to appeal to bayonets, and to pour out sanguinary denunciations of the "aboriginal faults of the Celtic race", wanting the Anglo-Saxon taste for pacific progress and legal amelioration.

"If a landlord," says the *Times*, "deliberately injures one tenant, he will find it so much the harder to get another, and whereas his occupation consists in letting land, he will find his land all the more difficult to let."

The case stands rather differently in Ireland. The more a landlord injures one tenant, the easier he will find it to

oppress another. The tenant who comes in, is the means of injuring the ejected one, and the ejected one is the means of keeping down the new occupant. That, in due course of time, the landlord, beside injuring the tenant, will injure himself and ruin himself, is not only a probability, but the very fact, in Ireland—a fact affording, however, a very precarious source of comfort to the ruined tenant.

"The relations between the landlord and tenant are those between two traders," says the *Times*.

This is precisely the *petitio principii* which pervades the whole leader of the *Times*. The needy Irish tenant belongs to the soil, while the soil belongs to the English lord. As well you might call the relation between the robber who presents his pistol, and the traveller who presents his purse, a relation between two traders.

"But," says the *Times*, "in point of fact, the relation between Irish landlords and tenants will soon be reformed by an agency more potent than that of legislation. The property of Ireland is fast passing into new hands, and, if the present rate of emigration continues, its cultivation must undergo the same transfer."

Here, at least, the *Times* has the truth. British Parliament does not interfere at a moment when the worked out old system is terminating in the common ruin, both of the thrifty landlord and the needy tenant, the former being knocked down by the hammer of the *Encumbered Estates* Commission, and the latter expelled by compulsory emigration. This reminds us of the old Sultan of Morocco. Whenever there was a case pending between two parties, he knew of no more "potent agency" for settling their controversy, than by killing both parties.

"Nothing could tend," concludes the *Times* with regard to Tenant Right, "to greater confusion than such a *communistic distribution of ownership*. The only person with any right in the land, is the landlord."

The *Times* seems to have been the sleeping Epimenides of the past half century, and never to have heard of the hot controversy going on during all that time upon the claims of the landlord, not among social reformers and Communists, but among the very political economists of the British middle class. Ricardo, the creator of modern political econ-

omy in Great Britain, did not controvert the "right" of the landlords, as he was quite convinced that their claims were based upon fact, and not on right, and that political economy in general had nothing to do with questions of right; but he attacked the land monopoly in a more unassuming, yet more scientific, and therefore more dangerous manner. He proved that private proprietorship in land, as distinguished from the respective claims of the labourer, and of the farmer, was a relation quite superfluous in, and incoherent with, the whole framework of modern production; that the economical expression of that relationship and the rent of land, might, with great advantage, be appropriated by the State; and finally that the interest of the landlord was opposed to the interest of all other classes of modern society. It would be tedious to enumerate all the conclusions drawn from these premises by the Ricardo School against the landed monopoly. For my end, it will suffice to quote three of the most recent economical authorities of Great Britain.

The London *Economist*, whose chief editor, Mr. J. Wilson, is not only a Free Trade oracle, but a Whig one, too, and not only a Whig, but also an inevitable Treasury-appendage in every Whig or composite ministry, has contended in different articles that exactly speaking there can exist no title authorising any individual, or any number of individuals, to claim the exclusive proprietorship in the soil of a nation.

Mr. Newman, in his *Lectures on Political Economy*, London, 1851, professedly written for the purpose of refuting socialism, tells us:

"No man has, or can have, a natural right to *land*, except so long as he occupies it in person. His right is to the use, and to the use only. All other right is the creation of artificial law" (or Parliamentary enactments as the *Times* would call it)... "If, at any time, land becomes needed to *live upon*, the right of private possessors to withhold it comes to an end."⁸⁷

This is exactly the case in Ireland, and Mr. Newman expressly confirms the claims of the Irish tenantry, and in lectures held before the most select audiences of the British aristocracy.

In conclusion let me quote some passages from Mr. Herbert Spencer's work, *Social Statics*, London, 1851, also,

purporting to be a complete refutation of communism, and acknowledged as the most elaborate development of the Free Trade doctrines of modern England.

"No one may use the earth in such a way as to prevent the rest from similarly using it. Equity, therefore, does not permit property in land, or the rest would live on the earth by sufferance only. The landless men might equitably be expelled from the earth altogether. . . . It can never be pretended, that the existing titles to such property are legitimate. Should anyone think so let him look in the Chronicles. The original deeds were written with the sword, rather than with the pen. Not lawyers but soldiers were the conveyancers: blows were the current coin given in payment; and for seals blood was used in preference to wax. Could valid claims be thus constituted? Hardly. And if not, what becomes of the pretensions of all subsequent holders of estates so obtained? Does sale or bequest generate a right where it did not previously exist? . . . If one act of transfer can give no title, can many? . . . At what rate per annum do invalid claims become valid? . . . The right of mankind at large to the earth's surface is still valid, all deeds, customs and laws notwithstanding. It is impossible to discover any mode in which land can become private property. . . . We daily deny landlordism by our legislation. Is a canal, a railway, or a turnpike road to be made? We do not scruple to seize just as many acres as may be requisite. We do not wait for consent. . . . The change required would simply be a change of landlords. . . . Instead of being in the possession of individuals, the country would be held by the great corporate body—society. Instead of leasing his acres from an isolated proprietor, the farmer would lease them from the nation. Instead of paying his rent to the agent of Sir John, or His Grace, he will pay to an agent, or deputy-agent of the community. Stewards would be public officials, instead of private ones, and tenantry the only land tenure. . . . Pushed to its ultimate consequences, a claim to exclusive possession of the soil involves landowning despotism."⁸⁸

Thus, from the very point of view of modern English political economists, it is not the usurping English landlord, but the Irish tenants and labourers, who have the only right in the soil of their native country, and the *Times*, in opposing the demands of the Irish people, places itself into direct antagonism to British middle-class science.

Written by K. Marx
on June 28, 1853

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3816,
July 11, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

[THE LABOUR MOVEMENT IN BRITAIN]

London, Friday, July 1, 1853

Strikes and combinations of workmen are proceeding rapidly, and to an unprecedented extent. I have now before me reports on the strikes of the factory hands of all descriptions at Stockport, of smiths, spinners, weavers, etc., at Manchester, of carpet-weavers at Kidderminster, of colliers at the Ringwood Collieries, near Bristol, of weavers and loomers at Blackburn, of loomers at Darven, of the cabinet-makers at Boston, of the bleachers, finishers, dyers and power-loom weavers of Bolton and neighbourhood, of the weavers of Barnsley, of the Spitalfields broad-silk weavers, of the lace makers of Nottingham, of all descriptions of working men throughout the Birmingham district, and in various other localities. Each mail brings new reports of strikes; the turn-out grows epidemic. Every one of the larger strikes, like those at Stockport, Liverpool, etc., necessarily generates a whole series of minor strikes, through great numbers of people being unable to carry out their resistance to the masters, unless they appeal to the support of their fellow-workmen in the Kingdom, and the latter, in order to assist them, asking in their turn for higher wages. Besides it becomes alike a point of honour and of interest for each locality not to isolate the efforts of their fellow-workmen by submitting to worse terms, and thus strikes in one locality are echoed by strikes in the remotest other localities. In some instances the demands for higher wages are only a

settlement of long-standing arrears with the masters. So with the great Stockport strike.

In January 1848, the mill-owners of the town made a general reduction of 10 per cent from all descriptions of factory workers' wages. This reduction was submitted to upon the condition that when trade revived the 10 per cent was to be restored. Accordingly the workpeople memorialised their employers, early in March 1853, for the promised advance of 10 per cent; and as they would not come to arrangements with them, upward of 30,000 hands struck. In the majority of instances, the factory workmen affirmed distinctly their *right to share* in the prosperity of the country, and especially in the prosperity of their employers.

The distinctive feature of the present strikes is this, that they began in the lower ranks of unskilled labour (not factory labour) actually trained by the direct influence of emigration, according to various strata of artisans, till they reached at last the factory people of the great industrial centres of Great Britain; while at all former periods strikes originated regularly from the heads of the factory workers, mechanics, spinners, &c., spreading thence to the lower classes of this great industrial hive, and reaching only in the last instance, to the artisans. This phenomenon is to be ascribed solely to emigration.

There exists a class of philanthropists, and even of socialists, who consider strikes as very mischievous to the interests of the "working man himself", and whose great aim consists of finding out a method of securing permanent average wages. Besides, the fact of the industrial cycles, with its various phases, puts every such average wages out of the question. I am, on the very contrary, convinced that the alternative rise and fall of wages, and the continual conflicts between masters and men resulting therefrom, are, in the present organisation of industry, the indispensable means of holding up the spirit of the labouring classes, of combining them into one great association against the encroachments of the ruling class, and of preventing them from becoming apathetic, thoughtless, more or less well-fed instruments of production. In a state of society founded upon the antagonism of classes, if we want to prevent Slavery in fact as well

as in name, we must accept war. In order to rightly appreciate the value of strikes and combinations, we must not allow ourselves to be blinded by the apparent insignificance of their economical results, but hold, above all things, in view their moral and political consequences. Without the great alternative phases of dullness, prosperity, over-excitement, crisis and distress, which modern industry traverses in periodically recurring cycles, with the up and down of wages resulting from them, as with the constant warfare between masters and men closely corresponding with those variations in wages and profits, the working classes of Great Britain, and of all Europe, would be a heart-broken, a weak-minded, a worn-out, unresisting mass, whose self-emancipation would prove as impossible as that of the slaves of Ancient Greece and Rome. We must not forget that strikes and combinations among the serfs were the hot-beds of the medieval communes, and that those communes have been in their turn, the source of life of the now ruling bourgeoisie.

I observed in one of my last letters, of what importance the present labour crisis must turn out to the Chartist movement in England, which anticipation I now find realised by the results obtained in the first two weeks of the reopened campaign by Ernest Jones, the Chartist leader. The first great open-air meeting was, as you know, to be held on the mountain of Blackstone-Edge. On the 19th ult., the Lancashire and Yorkshire delegates of the respective Chartist localities congregated there, constituting themselves as Delegate-Council. Ernest Jones's petition for the Charter was unanimously adopted as that proposed to emanate from the meetings in the two counties, and the presentation of the Lancashire and Yorkshire petitions was voted to be entrusted to Mr. Apsley Pellatt, M.P. for Southwark, who had agreed to undertake the presentation of all Chartist petitions. As to the general meeting, the most sanguine minds did not anticipate its possibility, the weather being terrific, the storm increasing hourly in violence and the rain pouring without intermission. At first there appeared only a few scattered groups climbing up the hill, but soon larger bodies came into sight, and from an eminence that overlooked the surrounding valleys, thin but steady streams of people could

be viewed as far as the eye could carry, through the base pelting of the rain, coming upward along the roads and foot-paths leading from the surrounding country. By the time at which the meeting was announced to commence, upward of 3,000 people had met on the spot, far removed from any village or habitation, and during the long speeches, the meeting, notwithstanding the most violent deluge of rain, remained steadfast on the ground.

Mr. Edward Hooson's resolution: "That the social grievances of the working classes of the country are the result of class-legislation, and that the only remedy for such class legislation is the adoption of the people's Charter", was supported by Mr. Gammage, of the Chartist Executive,⁸⁹ and Mr. Ernest Jones, from whose speeches I give some extracts.

"The resolution which has been moved attributed the people's grievances to class legislation. He thought that no man who had watched the course of events could disagree with that statement. The House of Commons, so called, had turned a deaf ear to all their complaints, and when the wail of misery had arisen from the people, it had been mocked and derided by the men who assumed to be the representatives of the nation, and if by any singular chance the voice of the people found an echo in that House, it was always drowned in the clamour of the murderous majority of our class legislators. [Loud applause.] The House of Commons not only refused to do justice to the people, but it even refused to inquire into their social condition. They would all recollect that sometime ago, Mr. Slaney had introduced into the House a motion for the appointment of a standing commission, whose business it should be to inquire into that condition and suggest measures of relief—but such was the determination of the House to evade the question, that on the introduction of the motion, only twenty-six members were present, and the House was counted out. [Loud cries of shame, shame.] And on the reintroduction of that motion, so far from Mr. Slaney being successful, he [Mr. Gammage] believed that out of 656 honourable men, but 19 were present even to enter on a discussion of the question. When he told them what was the actual condition of the people, he thought they would agree with him, that there existed abundant reasons for inquiry. They were told by Political Economists that the annual production of this country was £820,000,000. Assuming that there were in the United Kingdom 5,000,000 of working families, and that such families received an average income of fifteen shillings per week, which he believed was a very high average compared with what they actually received [cries of "a great deal too high"], supposing them, however, to average this amount, they received out of their enormous annual production a miserable one hundred and ninety-five millions,—[cries of shame]—and all the rest went into the pockets of idle landlords, usurers and the capitalist class generally. . . . Did they

require a proof that these men were robbers? They were not the worst of thieves who were confined within the walls of our prisons; the greatest and cleverest of thieves were those who robbed by the power of laws made by themselves and these large robberies were the cause of all the smaller ones that were transacted throughout the country...⁹⁰

Mr. Gammage then entered into an analysis of the House of Commons, proving that from the classes to which the members of that House belonged, and the classes which they represented, it was impossible that there should exist the smallest sympathy between them and the working millions. In conclusion, said the speaker, the people must become acquainted with their Social Rights.

Mr. Ernest Jones, said:

"Today we proclaim that the Charter shall be law. [Loud cheers.] I ask you not to re-engage in this great movement, because I know that the time has arrived for so doing, and that the game is in your hand, and because I am anxious that you should not let the opportunity go by. Brisk trade and emigration have given you a momentary power, and upon how you use that power depends your future position. If you use it only for the objects of the present, you will break down when the circumstances of the present cease. But if you use it, not only to strengthen your present position, but to secure your future one, you will triumph over all your enemies. If brisk trade and emigration give you power, that power must cease when brisk trade and emigration cease, and unless you secure yourself in the interval, you will be more slaves than ever. [Hear, hear.] But the very sources that cause your strength now will cause your weakness before long. The emigration that makes your labour scarce, will make soon your employment scarcer... The commercial reaction will set in, and now I ask you, how are you preparing to meet it? You are engaged in a noble labour movement for short time and high wages, and you are practically carrying it through to some extent, but mark! you are not carrying it through Parliament. Mark! the game of the employer is this—amuse them with some concessions, but yield to them no law. Don't pass a Wages bill in Parliament, but concede some of its provisions in the factory. [Hear.] The wages slave will then say, 'Never mind a political organisation for a Ten Hours Bill or a Wages measure—we've got it, ay, ourselves, without Parliament.' Yes, but can you keep it without Parliament? What gave it you? Brisk trade. What will take it from you? Dull trade. Your employers know this. Therefore, they shorten your hours of work or raise your wages, or remit their stoppages, in hopes that you will forego the political organisation for these measures. [Cheers.] They shorten the hours of work, well knowing that soon they will run their mills short time—they raise your wages, well knowing that soon they will give thousands of you no wages at all. But they tell you also—the midland manufacturers—that, even if the laws were passed, this would only force them to seek other means of robbing you—that was the plain meaning

of their words. So that in the first place, you can't get the acts passed, because you have not got a People's Parliament. In the second place, if they were passed, they tell you that they would circumvent them. [Loud cries of "hear."] Now, I ask you, how are you preparing for the future? How are you using the vast strength you momentarily possess? That you will be powerless, unless you prepare now—you will lose all you may have gained; and we are here today to show you how to keep it and get more. Some people fancy a Chartist organisation would interfere with the Labour movement. Good Heaven! it is the very thing to make it successful. . . . The employed cannot do without the employer, unless he can employ himself. The employed can never employ himself, unless he can command the means of work—land, credit and machinery. He can never command these, unless he breaks down the landed, moneyed and mercantile monopolies, and these he cannot subvert except by wielding sovereign power. Why do you seek a Ten Hours Bill? If political power is not necessary to secure labour freedom why go to Parliament at all? Why not do in the factory at once? Why, because you know, you feel, you by that very act admit tacitly, that political power is needed to obtain social emancipation. [Loud cheers.] Then I point you to the foundation of political power—I point you to the suffrage—I point you to the Charter. [Enthusiastic applause]. . . . It may be said: 'Why do we not wait till the crisis comes, and the millions rally of their own accord.' Because we want not a movement of excitement and danger, but one of calm reason and moral strength. We will not see you led away by excitement, but guided by judgement—and therefore we bid you now reorganise—that you may rule the storm, instead of being tossed by it. Again, continental revolution will accompany commercial reaction—and we need to raise a strong beacon of Chartism to light us through the chaos of tempest. Today, then, we inaugurate our movement, and to obtain its official recognition, we go through the medium of Parliament—not that we expect them to grant the petition—but because we use them as the most fitting mouthpiece to announce our resurrection to the world. Yes, the very men that proclaimed our death, shall have the unsought pleasure to proclaim our resurrection, and this petition is merely the baptismal register announcing to the world our second birth." [Loud cheers.]⁹¹

Mr. Hooson's resolution and the petition to Parliament were here, as well as at the subsequent meetings during the week, enthusiastically accepted by acclamation.

At the meeting of Blackstone-Edge, Ernest Jones had announced the death of Benjamin Ruston, a working-man who seven years before, had presided at the great Chartist meeting held at the same spot; and he proposed that his funeral should be made a great political demonstration, and be connected with the West Riding meeting for the adoption of the Charter, as the noblest obsequies to be given to

that expired veteran. Never before in the annals of British Democracy has such a demonstration been witnessed, as that which attended the revival of Chartism in the West Riding, and the funeral of Benjamin Ruston, on Sunday last, when upward of 200,000 people were assembled at Halifax, a number unprecedented even in the most excited times. To those who know nothing of English society but its dull, apoplectic surface, it should be recommended to assist at these working men's meetings and to look into those depths where its destructive elements are at work.

The Coalition has gained the preliminary battle on the Indian question, Lord Stanley's motion for delay of legislation having been rejected by a majority of 184 votes. Pressure of matter obliges me to delay my comments upon that division.

Written by K. Marx
on July 1, 1853

Published in the *New-York*
Daily Tribune No. 3819,
July 14, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

**THE FUTURE RESULTS OF THE BRITISH RULE
IN INDIA**

London, Friday, July 22, 1853

I propose in this letter to conclude my observations on India.

How came it that English supremacy was established in India? The paramount power of the Great Mogul was broken by the Mogul Viceroys. The power of the Viceroy was broken by the Mahrattas.⁹² The power of the Mahrattas was broken by the Afghans, and while all were struggling against all, the Briton rushed in and was enabled to subdue them all. A country not only divided between Mohammedan and Hindoo, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste; a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilibrium, resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not the predestined prey of conquest? If we knew nothing of the past history of Hindostan, would there not be the one great and incontestable fact, that even at this moment India is held in English thralldom by an Indian army maintained at the cost of India? India, then, could not escape the fate of being conquered, and the whole of her past history, if it be anything, is the history of the successive conquests she has undergone. Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history. What we call its history, is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society. The question, therefore, is not

whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton.

England has to fulfil a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating—the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia.

Arabs, Turks, Tartars, Moguls, who had successively overrun India, soon became *Hindooised*, the barbarian conquerors being, by an eternal law of history, conquered themselves by the superior civilisation of their subjects. The British were the first conquerors superior, and therefore, inaccessible to Hindoo civilisation. They destroyed it by breaking up the native communities, by uprooting the native industry, and by levelling all that was great and elevated in the native society. The historic pages of their rule in India report hardly anything beyond that destruction. The work of regeneration hardly transpires through a heap of ruins. Nevertheless it has begun.

The political unity of India, more consolidated, and extending farther than it ever did under the Great Moguls, was the first condition of its regeneration. That unity, imposed by the British sword, will now be strengthened and perpetuated by the electric telegraph. The native army, organised and trained by the British drill-sergeant, was the *sine qua non* of Indian self-emancipation, and of India ceasing to be the prey of the first foreign intruder. The free press, introduced for the first time into Asiatic society, and managed principally by the common offspring of Hindoo and Europeans, is a new and powerful agent of reconstruction. The *Zemindaree* and *Ryotwar* themselves, abominable as they are, involve two distinct forms of private property in land—the great *desideratum* of Asiatic society. From the Indian natives, reluctantly and sparingly educated at Calcutta, under English superintendence, a fresh class is springing up, endowed with the requirements for government and imbued with European science. Steam has brought India into regular and rapid communication with Europe, has connected its chief ports with those of the whole south-eastern ocean, and has revindicated it from the isolated position which

was the prime law of its stagnation. The day is not far distant when, by a combination of railways and steam vessels, the distance between England and India, measured by time, will be shortened to eight days, and when that once fabulous country will thus be actually annexed to the Western world.

The ruling classes of Great Britain have had, till now, but an accidental, transitory and exceptional interest in the progress of India. The aristocracy wanted to conquer it, the moneyocracy to plunder it, and the millocracy to undersell it. But now the tables are turned. The millocracy have discovered that the transformation of India into a reproductive country has become of vital importance to them, and that, to that end, it is necessary, above all, to gift her with means of irrigation and of internal communication. They intend now drawing a net of railways over India. And they will do it. The results must be inappreciable.

It is notorious that the productive powers of India are paralysed by the utter want of means for conveying and exchanging its various produce. Nowhere, more than in India, do we meet with social destitution in the midst of natural plenty, for want of the means of exchange. It was proved before a Committee of the British House of Commons, which sat in 1848, that

"when grain was selling from 6s. to 8s. a quarter at Kandeish, it was sold at 64s. to 70s. at Poonah, where the people were dying in the streets of famine, without the possibility of gaining supplies from Kandeish because the clay roads were impracticable".

The introduction of railways may be easily made to subserve agricultural purposes by the formation of tanks, where ground is required for embankment, and by the conveyance of water along the different lines. Thus irrigation, the *sine qua non* of farming in the East, might be greatly extended, and the frequently recurring local famines, arising from the want of water, would be averted. The general importance of railways, viewed under this head, must become evident, when we remember that irrigated lands, even in the districts near Ghauts, pay three times as much in taxes, afford ten or twelve times as much employment, and yield twelve or fifteen times as much profit, as the same area without irrigation.

Railways will afford the means of diminishing the amount and the cost of the military establishments. Col. Warren, Town Major of the Fort St. William, stated before a Select Committee of the House of Commons:

"The practicability of receiving intelligence from distant parts of the country in as many hours as at present it requires days and even weeks, and of sending instructions with troops and stores, in the more brief period are considerations which cannot be too highly estimated. Troops could be kept at more distant and healthier stations than at present, and much loss of life from sickness would by this means be spared. Stores could not to the same extent be required at the various dépôts, and the loss by decay, and the destruction incidental to the climate, would also be avoided. The number of troops might be diminished in direct proportion to their effectiveness."

We know that the municipal organisation and the economical basis of the village communities have been broken up, but their worst feature, the dissolution of society into stereotype and disconnected atoms, has survived their vitality. Their village isolation produced the absence of roads in India, and the absence of roads perpetuated the village isolation. On this plan a community existed with a given scale of low conveniences, almost without intercourse with other villages, without the desires and efforts indispensable to social advance. The British having broken up this self-sufficient *inertia* of the villages, railways will provide the new want of communication and intercourse. Besides,

"one of the effects of the railway system will be to bring into every village affected by it such knowledge of the contrivances and appliances of other countries, and such means of obtaining them, as will first put the hereditary and stipendiary village artisanship of India to full proof of its capabilities, and then supply its defects". (Chapman, *The Cotton and Commerce of India*.⁹³)

I know that the English millocracy intend to endow India with railways with the exclusive view of extracting at diminished expenses the cotton and other raw materials for their manufactures. But when you have once introduced machinery into the locomotion of a country, which possesses iron and coals, you are unable to withhold it from its fabrication. You cannot maintain a net of railways over an immense country without introducing all those industrial processes necessary to meet the immediate and current wants of

railway locomotion, and out of which there must grow the application of machinery to those branches of industry not immediately connected with railways. The railway system will therefore become, in India, truly the forerunner of modern industry. This is the more certain as the Hindoos are allowed by British authorities themselves to possess particular aptitude for accommodating themselves to entirely new labour, and acquiring the requisite knowledge of machinery. Ample proof of this fact is afforded by the capacities and expertness of the native engineers in the Calcutta mint, where they have been for years employed in working the steam machinery, by the natives attached to the several steam-engines in the Hurdwar coal districts, and by other instances. Mr. Campbell himself, greatly influenced as he is by the prejudices of the East India Company, is obliged to avow

"that the great mass of the Indian people possesses a great *industrial energy*, is well fitted to accumulate capital, and remarkable for a mathematical clearness, of head, and talent for figures and exact sciences". "Their intellects," he says, "are excellent."⁹⁴

Modern industry, resulting from the railway system, will dissolve the hereditary divisions of labour, upon which rest the Indian castes, those decisive impediments to Indian progress and Indian power.

All the English bourgeoisie may be forced to do will neither emancipate nor materially mend the social condition of the mass of the people, depending not only on the development of the productive powers, but on their appropriation by the people. But what they will not fail to do is to lay down the material premises for both. Has the bourgeoisie ever done more? Has it ever effected a progress without dragging individuals and peoples through blood and dirt, through misery and degradation?

The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindoos themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether. At all events, we may safely expect to see, at a more or less remote period, the regen-

eration of that great and interesting country, whose gentle natives are, to use the expression of Prince Saltykov, even in the most inferior classes, "*plus fins et plus adroits que les Italiens*",⁹⁵ whose submission even is counterbalanced by a certain calm nobility, who, notwithstanding their natural languor, have astonished the British officers by their bravery, whose country has been the source of our languages, our religions, and who represent the type of the ancient German in the *Jat* and the type of the ancient Greek in the Brahmin.⁹⁶

I cannot part with the subject of India without some concluding remarks.

The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilisation lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked. They are the defenders of property, but did any revolutionary party ever originate agrarian revolutions like those in Bengal, in Madras, and in Bombay? Did they not, in India, to borrow an expression of that great robber, Lord Clive himself, resort to atrocious extortion, when simple corruption could not keep pace with their rapacity? While they prated in Europe about the inviolable sanctity of the national debt, did they not confiscate in India the dividends of the *rayahs*, who had invested their private savings in the Company's own funds? While they combated the French revolution under the pretext of defending "our holy religion", did they not forbid, at the same time, Christianity to be propagated in India, and did they not, in order to make money out of the pilgrims streaming to the temples of Orissa and Bengal, take up the trade in the murder and prostitution perpetrated in the temple of Juggernaut?⁹⁷ These are the men of "Property, Order, Family, and Religion".

The devastating effects of English industry, when contemplated with regard to India, a country as vast as Europe, and containing 150 millions of acres, are palpable and confounding. But we must not forget that they are only the organic results of the whole system of production as it is now constituted. That production rests on the supreme rule of capital. The centralisation of capital is essential to the existence of capital as an independent power. The destructive influence

of that centralisation upon the markets of the world does but reveal, in the most gigantic dimensions, the inherent organic laws of political economy now at work in every civilised town. The bourgeois period of history has to create the material basis of the new world—on the one hand the universal intercourse founded upon the mutual dependency of mankind, and the means of that intercourse; on the other hand the development of the productive powers of man and the transformation of material production into a scientific domination of natural agencies. Bourgeois industry and commerce create these material conditions of a new world in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth. When a great social revolution shall have mastered the results of the bourgeois epoch, the market of the world and the modern powers of production, and subjected them to the common control of the most advanced peoples, then only will human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.

Written by K. Marx
on July 22, 1853

Published in the *New-York*
Daily Tribune No. 3840,
August 8, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

LORD PALMERSTON

FIRST ARTICLE

Ruggiero is again and again fascinated by the false charms of Alcine,* which he knows to disguise an old witch—Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything, and the knight-errant cannot withstand falling in love with her anew whom he knows to have transmuted all her former adorers into asses and other beasts. The English public is another Ruggiero, and Palmerston is another Alcine. Although a septuagenarian, and since 1807 occupying the public stage almost without interruption, he contrives to remain a novelty, and to evoke all the hopes that used to centre on an untried and promising youth. With one foot in the grave, he is supposed not yet to have begun his true career. If he were to die tomorrow, all England would be surprised at learning that he has been a Secretary of State half this century.

If not a good statesman of all work, he is at least a good actor of all work. He succeeds in the comic as in the heroic—in pathos as in familiarity—in the tragedy as in the farce: although the latter may be more congenial to his feelings. He is no first-class orator, but he is an accomplished debater. Possessed of a wonderful memory, of great experience, of a consummate tact, of a never-failing *présence d'esprit*, of a gentlemanlike versatility, of the most minute knowledge of Parliamentary tricks, intrigues, parties, and men, he handles difficult cases in an admirable manner and with a pleasant volubility, sticking to the prejudices and susceptibilities of

* Ruggiero and Alcine are characters in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*.
—Ed.

his public, secured from any surprise by his cynic impudence, from any self-confession by his selfish dexterity, from running into a passion by his profound frivolity, his perfect indifference, and his aristocratic contempt. Being an exceedingly happy joker, he ingratiates himself with everybody. Never losing his temper, he imposes on an impassioned antagonist. When unable to master a subject, he knows how to play with it. If wanting of general views, he is always ready to tissue elegant generalities.

Endowed with a restless and indefatigable spirit, he abhors inactivity, and pines for agitation, if not for action. A country like England allows him, of course, to busy himself in every corner of the earth. What he aims at is not the substance, but the mere appearance of success.

If he can do nothing, he will devise anything. Where he dares not interfere, he intermeddles. Not able to vie with a strong enemy, he improvises a weak one.

Being no man of deep designs, pondering on no combinations of long standing, pursuing no great object, he embarks on difficulties with a view to disentangle himself in a showy manner. He wants complications to feed his activity, and when he finds them not ready, he will create them. He exults in show conflicts, show battles, show enemies, diplomatical notes to be exchanged, ships to be ordered to sail, the whole movement ending for him in violent parliamentary debates which are sure to prepare him an ephemeral success, the constant and the only object of all his exertions.* He manages international conflicts like an artist, driving matters to a certain point, retreating when they threaten to become se-

* In the German version of this article printed in the *Neue Oder Zeitung* of February 19, 1855, Marx changed this phrase as follows: "No British Foreign Secretary ever displayed such activity in every corner of the earth: blockades of the Scheldt, the Tagus, the Douro; blockades of Mexico and Buenos Aires. Naples expeditions, Pacific expeditions, expeditions to the Persian Gulf, wars in Spain to establish 'liberty' and in China to introduce opium; North American border disputes, Afghanistan campaigns, St. Jean d'Acre bombardment, West African right of search wrangles, strife even in the 'Pacific'; and all this accompanied and supplemented by a host of threatening notes and sheaves of protocols and diplomatic protests. As a rule, all this noise ends in violent parliamentary debates which assure the noble lord ever so many ephemeral triumphs."—*Ed.*

rious, but having got, at all events, the dramatic excitement he wants. In his eyes, the movement of history itself is nothing but a pastime, expressly invented for the private satisfaction of the noble Viscount Palmerston of Palmerston.

Yielding to foreign influence in facts, he opposes it in words. Having inherited from Canning England's mission to propagate Constitutionalism on the Continent, he is never in need of a theme to pique the national prejudices, and to counteract revolution abroad, and, at the same time, to hold awake the suspicious jealousy of foreign powers. Having succeeded in this easy manner to become the *bête noire* of the continental courts, he could not fail in being set up as the truly English minister at home. Although a Tory by origin, he has contrived to introduce into the management of foreign affairs all the shams and contradictions that form the essence of Whiggism. He knows how to conciliate a democratic phraseology with oligarchic views, how to cover the peace-mongering policy of the middle classes with the haughty language of England's aristocratic past—how to appear as the aggressor, where he connives, and as the defender where he betrays—how to manage an apparent enemy, and how to exasperate a pretendant ally—how to find himself, at the opportune moment of the dispute, on the side of the stronger against the weak, and how to utter brave words in the act of running away.

Accused by the one party of being in the pay of Russia, he is suspected by the other of Carbonarism. If, in 1848, he had to defend himself against the motion of impeachment for having acted as the minister of Nicholas, he had, in 1850, the satisfaction of being persecuted by a conspiracy of foreign ambassadors, which was successful in the House of Lords, but baffled in the House of Commons. If he betrayed foreign peoples, he did it with great politeness—politeness being the small coin of the devil, which he gives in change for the life-blood of his dupes. If the oppressors were always sure of his active support, the oppressed did never want a great ostentation of his rhetorical generosity. Poles, Italians, Hungarians, Germans found him in office, whenever they were crushed, but their despots always suspected him of

secret conspiracy with the victims he had already allowed them to make.

Till now, in all instances, it was a probable chance of success to have him for one's adversary, and a sure chance of ruin to have him for one's friend. But, if this art of diplomacy does not shine in the actual results of his foreign negotiations, it shines the more brilliantly in the construction he induced the English people to lay upon them, by accepting phrases for facts, phantasies for realities, and high sounding pretexts for shabby motives.

Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston, deriving his title from a peerage of Ireland, was nominated Lord of the Admiralty, in 1807, on the formation of the Duke of Portland's Administration. In 1809, he became Secretary at War and he continued to hold this office till May 1828. In 1830, he went over, very skilfully too, to the Whigs, who made him their permanent Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Excepting the intervals of Tory administration, from November 1834 to April 1835, and from 1841 to 1846, he is responsible for the whole foreign policy England has pursued from the revolution of 1830 to December 1851.

Is it not a very curious thing to find, at first view, that Quixote of "free institutions", and that Pindar of the "glories of the constitutional system", a permanent and an eminent member of the Tory administrations of Mr. Perceval, the Earl of Liverpool, Mr. Canning, Lord Goderich, and the Duke of Wellington, during the long epoch of the Jacobin war carried on, the monster-debt contracted, the Corn Laws promulgated, foreign mercenaries stationed on the English soil,⁹⁸ the people—to borrow an expression from his colleague, Lord Sidmouth—"bled", from time to time, the press gagged, meetings suppressed, the mass of the nation disarmed, individual liberty suspended together with regular jurisdiction, the whole country placed as it were in a state of siege—in one word, during the most infamous and most reactionary epoch of English history?

His *debut* in parliamentary life is a characteristic one. On February 3, 1808, he rose to defend—what?—secrecy in the working of diplomacy, and the most disgraceful act ever committed by one nation against another nation, viz., the

bombardment of Copenhagen, and the capture of the Danish fleet, at the time when England professed to be in profound peace with Denmark.⁹⁹ As to the former point, he stated that,

"In this particular case, his Majesty's Ministers are pledged [by whom?] to secrecy";

but he went farther:

"I also object generally to making public the working of diplomacy, because it is the tendency of disclosures in that department to shut up future sources of information."

Vidocq would have defended the identical cause in the identical terms. As to the act of piracy, while admitting that Denmark had evidenced no hostility whatever towards Great Britain, he contended that they were right in bombarding its capital and stealing its fleet, because they had to prevent Danish neutrality from being, perhaps, converted into open hostility by the compulsion of France. This was the new law of nations, proclaimed by my Lord Palmerston.

When again speechifying, we find that English minister *par excellence* engaged in the defence of foreign troops, called over from the Continent to England, with the express mission of maintaining forcibly the oligarchic rule, to establish which William had, in 1688, come over from Holland, with his Dutch troops. Palmerston answered to the well-founded "apprehensions for the liberties of the Country", originating from the presence of the King's German Legion, in a very flippant manner. Why should we not have 16,000 of those foreigners at home; while you know, that we employ "a far larger proportion of foreigners abroad". (*House of Commons*, March 10, 1812.)

When similar apprehensions for the constitution arose from the large standing army, maintained since 1815, he found "a sufficient protection of the constitution in the very constitution of our army", a large proportion of its officers being "men of property and connexions". (*House of Commons*, March 8, 1816.)

When the large standing army was attacked from a financial point of view, he made the curious discovery that "much of our financial embarrassments had been caused by our

former low peace establishment". (*House of Commons*, April 25, 1816.)

When the "burdens of the country", and the "misery of the people" were contrasted with the lavish military expenditure, he reminded Parliament that those burdens and that misery "were the price which we [viz., the English oligarchy] agreed to pay for our freedom and independence". (*House of Commons*, May 16, 1820.)

If in his eyes, military despotism was to be apprehended, it was only from the exertions of

"those self-called but misled reformers, who demand that sort of reform in the country which, according to every just principle of government, must end, if it were acceded to, in a military despotism". (*House of Commons*, June 14, 1820.)

While large standing armies were thus his panacea for maintaining the constitution of the country, flogging was his panacea for maintaining the constitution of the army. He defended it in the debates on the Mutiny Bill,¹⁰⁰ on the 5th of March, 1824, he declared it to be "absolutely indispensable" on March 11, 1825, he recommended it again on March 10, 1828; he stood by it in the debates of April 1833, and he proved an amateur of flogging on every subsequent occasion.

There existed no abuse in the army he did not find plausible reasons for, if it happened to foster the interests of aristocratic parasites. Thus, for instance, in the debates on the Sale of Commissions. (*House of Commons*, March 12, 1828.)

Lord Palmerston likes to parade his constant exertions for the establishment of religious liberty. Now, he voted against Lord Russell's motion for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Act. Why? Because he was "a warm and zealous friend to religious liberty", and could, therefore, not allow the Dissenters to be relieved from "imaginary grievances, while real afflictions pressed upon the Catholics". (*House of Commons*, Feb. 26, 1828.)

In proof of his zeal for religious liberty, he informs us of his "regret to see the increasing numbers of the Dissenters. It is my wish that the Established Church should be the predominant Church in this country", and it is his wish "that the Established Church should be fed at the expense of the

misbelievers". His jocose lordship accuses the rich Dissenters of affording churches for the poor ones, while

"with the Church of England it is the poor alone who feel the want of Church accommodation.... It would be preposterous to say that the poor ought to subscribe for churches out of their small earnings". (*House of Commons*, April 9, 1824.)

It would be, of course, more preposterous yet to say that the rich members of the Established Church ought to subscribe for the church out of their large earnings.

Let us look now at his exertions for Catholic Emancipation, one of his great "claims" on the gratitude of the Irish people. I shall not dwell upon the circumstances that, having declared himself for Catholic Emancipation, when a member of the Canning Ministry, he entered, nevertheless, the Wellington Ministry, avowedly hostile to that emancipation. Perhaps Lord Palmerston considered religious liberty as one of the Rights of Man, not to be intermeddled with by Legislature. He may answer for himself,

"Although I wish the Catholic claims to be considered, I never will admit those claims to stand upon the ground of right.... If I thought the Catholics were asking for their right, I, for one, would not go into the committee." (*House of Commons*, March 1, 1813.)

And why is he opposed to their asking their right?

"Because the Legislature of a country has the right to impose such political disabilities upon any class of the community, as it may deem necessary for the safety and the welfare of the whole.... This belongs to the fundamental principles on which civilised government is founded." (*House of Commons*, March 1, 1813.)

There you have the most cynic confession ever made, that the mass of the people have no rights at all, but that they may be allowed that amount of immunities, the Legislature—or, in other words, the ruling class—may deem fit to grant them. Accordingly, Lord Palmerston declared in plain words, "Catholic Emancipation to be a measure of grace and favour." (*House of Commons*, Feb. 10, 1829.)

It was then entirely upon the ground of expediency that he condescended to discontinue the Catholic disabilities. And what was lurking behind this expediency?

Being himself one of the great Irish proprietors, he wanted to entertain the delusion, that other remedies for Irish evils

than Catholic Emancipation are impossible, that it would cure absenteeism, and prove a substitute for Poor Laws. (*House of Commons*, March 18, 1829.)

The great philanthropist, who afterwards cleared his Irish estates of their Irish natives, could not allow Irish misery to darken, even for a moment, with its inauspicious clouds, the bright sky of the landlords and money-lords.*

"It is true," he said, "that the peasantry of Ireland do not enjoy all the comforts which are enjoyed by all the peasantry of England" (only think of all the comforts enjoyed by a family at the rate of 7s. a week). Still, he continues, "still, however, the Irish peasant has his comforts. He is well supplied with fuel and is seldom" (only four days out of six) "at a loss for food."

What a comfort! But this is not all the comfort he has—"he has a greater cheerfulness of mind than his English fellow-sufferer!" (*House of Commons*, May 7, 1829.)

As to the extortions of Irish landlords, he deals with them in as pleasant a way as with the comforts of the Irish peasantry.

It is said that the Irish landlord insists on the highest possible rent that can be extorted. Why, Sir, I believe that is not a singular circumstance; certainly in England the landlord does the same thing. (*House of Commons*, March 7, 1829.)

Are we then to be surprised that the man, so deeply initiated in the mysteries of the "glories of the English constitution", and the "comforts of her free institutions", should aspire at spreading them all over the Continent?

Written by K. Marx
on October 4, 1853

Published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* No. 3902,
October 19, 1853 and
in *The People's Paper* No. 77,
October 22, 1853
Signed: Dr. Marx

Printed according
to the text of *The People's Paper*

* In the version of this article which appeared in the *New-York Daily Tribune* of October 19, 1853, Marx worded the end of the sentence as follows: "the bright sky over the Parliament of landlords and money-lords".—Ed.

KARL MARX

THE LABOUR QUESTION

London, Friday, November 11, 1853

Golden Opportunities, and the Use Made of Them, is the title of one of the most tragicomical effusions of the grave and profound *Economist*.¹⁰¹ The "golden opportunities" were, of course, afforded by Free Trade, and the "use" or rather "abuse" made of them refers to the working classes.

"The working classes, for the first time, had their future in their own hands! The population of the United Kingdom began actually to *diminish*, the emigration carrying off more than its natural increase. How have the working men used their opportunity? What have they done? Just what they used to do formerly, on every recurrence of temporary sunshine, married and multiplied as fast as possible. At this rate of increase it will not be long before emigration is effectually counterbalanced, and the golden opportunity thrown away."

The golden opportunity of *not* marrying and *not* multiplying, except at the orthodox rate allowed by Malthus and his disciples! Golden morality this! But, till now, according to the *Economist* itself, population has diminished, and has not yet counterbalanced emigration. Over-population, then, will not account for the disasters of the times.

"The next use the labouring classes should have made of their rare occasion ought to have been to accumulate savings and become capitalists. In scarcely one instance do they seem to have risen, or begun to rise, into the rank of capitalists. They have thrown away their opportunity."

The opportunity of becoming capitalists! At the same time the *Economist* tells the working men that, after they had at last obtained ten per cent on their former earnings, they were able to pocket 16s. 6d. a week instead of 15s. Now, the mean wages are too highly calculated at 15s. per week. But never mind. How to become a capitalist out of 15 shillings a week! That is a problem worthy of study. The working men had the false idea that in order to ameliorate their situation they must try to ameliorate their incomes. "They have struck," says the *Economist*, "for more than would have done them any service." With 15 shillings a week they had the very opportunity of becoming *capitalists*, but with 16s. 6d. this opportunity would be gone. On the one hand working men must keep hands scarce and capital abundant, in order to be able to force on the capitalists a rise of wages. But if capital turns out to be abundant and labour to be scarce, they must by no means avail themselves of that power for the acquisition of which they were to stop marrying and multiplying. "They have lived more luxuriously." Under the Corn Laws, we are told by the same *Economist*, they were but half fed, half clothed, and more or less starved. If they were then to live at all, how could they contrive to live less luxuriously than before? The tables of importation were again and again unfolded by the *Economist*, to prove the growing prosperity of the people and the soundness of the business done. What was thus proclaimed as a test of the unspeakable blessings of free trade, is now denounced as a proof of the foolish extravagance of the working classes. We remain, however, at a loss to understand how importation can go on increasing with a decreasing population and a declining consumption; how exportation can continue to rise with diminishing importation, and how industry and commerce can expand themselves with imports and exports contracted.

"The third use made of the golden opportunity should have been to procure the best possible education for themselves and their children, so as to fit themselves for the improvement in their circumstances, and to learn how to turn it to the best account. Unhappily, we are obliged to state that schools have seldom been so ill attended, or school fees so ill paid."

Is there anything marvellous in this fact? Brisk trade was synonymous with enlarged factories, with increased application of machinery, with more adult labourers being replaced by women and children, with prolonged hours of work. The more the mill was attended by the mother and the child, the less could the school be frequented. And, after all, of what sort of education would you have given the opportunity to the parents and their children? The opportunity of learning how to keep population at the pace described by Malthus, says the *Economist*. Education, says Mr. Cobden, would show the men that filthy, badly ventilated, overstocked lodgings, are not the best means of conserving health and vigour. As well might you save a man from starving by telling him that the laws of Nature demand a perpetual supply of food for the human body. Education, says the *Daily News*, would have informed our working classes how to extract nutritive substance out of dry bones—how to make tea cakes of starch, and how to boil soup with devil's dust.

If we sum up then the golden opportunities which have thus been thrown away by the working classes, they consist of the golden opportunity of *not* marrying, of the opportunity of living *less* luxuriously, of not asking for higher wages, of becoming capitalists at 15 shillings a week, and of learning how to keep the body together with coarser food, and how to degrade the soul with the pestiferous doctrines of Malthus.

On Friday last Ernest Jones visited the town of Preston to address the factory-hands locked out of the mills, on the labour question. By the appointed time at least 15,000 persons (*The Preston Pilot*¹⁰² estimates the number at 12,000) had assembled on the ground, and Mr. Jones, on proceeding to the spot, was received with an enthusiastic welcome. I give some extracts from his speech:

"Why have these struggles been? Why are they now? Why will they return? Because the fountains of your life are sealed by the hand of capital, that quaffs its golden goblet to the lees and gives the dregs to you. Why are you locked out of life when you are locked out of the factory? Because you have no other factory to go to—no other means of working for your bread. What gives the capitalist this tremendous power? That he holds all the means of employment. . . . The means of work is, therefore, the hinge on which the future of the people turns. . . .

It is a mass movement of all trades, a national movement of the working classes, that can alone achieve a triumphant result. . . . Sectionalise and localise your struggle and you may fail—nationalise it and you are sure to win.”¹⁰³

Mr. George Cowell in very complimentary terms moved, and Mr. John Matthews seconded, a vote of thanks to Ernest Jones for his visit to Preston and the services he was rendering to the cause of labour.

Great exertions had been made on the part of the manufacturers to prevent Ernest Jones visiting the town; no hall could be had for the purpose, and bills were accordingly printed in Manchester convening an open-air meeting. The report had been industriously circulated by some self-interested parties, that Mr. Jones was going to oppose the strike, and sow division among the men, and letters had been sent that it would not be personally safe for him to visit Preston.

Written by K. Marx
on November 11, 1853

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 3936,
November 28, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

LETTER TO THE LABOUR PARLIAMENT¹⁰⁴

London, March 9, 1854
Dean Street 28, Soho

I regret deeply to be unable, for the moment at least, to leave London, and thus to be prevented from expressing verbally my feelings of pride and gratitude on receiving the invitation to sit as Honorary Delegate at the Labour Parliament. The mere assembling of such a Parliament marks a new epoch in the history of the world. The news of this great fact will arouse the hopes of the working classes throughout Europe and America.

Great Britain, of all other countries, has seen developed on the greatest scale, the despotism of Capital and the slavery of Labour. In no other country have the intermediate stations between the millionaire commanding whole industrial armies and the wages-slave living only from hand to mouth so gradually been swept away from the soil. There exist here no longer, as in continental countries, large classes of peasants and artisans almost equally dependent on their own property and their own labour. A complete divorce of property from labour has been effected in Great Britain. In no other country, therefore, the war between the two classes that constitute modern society has assumed so colossal dimensions and features so distinct and palpable.

But it is precisely from these facts that the working classes of Great Britain, before all others, are competent and called for to act as leaders in the great movement that must finally result in the absolute emancipation of Labour. Such they are

from the conscious clearness of their position, the vast superiority of their numbers, the disastrous struggles of their past, and the moral strength of their present.

It is the working millions of Great Britain who first have laid down the real basis of a new society—modern industry, which transformed the destructive agencies of nature into the productive power of man. The English working classes, with invincible energies, by the sweat of their brows and brains, have called to life the material means of ennobling labour itself, and of multiplying its fruits to such a degree as to make general abundance possible.

By creating the inexhaustible productive powers of modern industry they have fulfilled the first condition of the emancipation of Labour. They have now to realise its other condition. They have to free those wealth-producing powers from the infamous shackles of monopoly, and subject them to the joint control of the producers, who, till now, allowed the very products of their hands to turn against them and be transformed into as many instruments of their own subjugation.

The labouring classes have conquered nature; they have now to conquer man. To succeed in this attempt they do not want strength, but the organisation of their common strength, organisation of the labouring classes on a national scale—such, I suppose, is the great and glorious end aimed at by the Labour Parliament.

If the Labour Parliament proves true to the idea that called it to life, some future historian will have to record that there existed in the year 1854 two Parliaments in England, a Parliament at London, and a Parliament at Manchester—a Parliament of the rich, and a Parliament of the poor—but that men sat only in the Parliament of the men and not in the Parliament of the masters.

Yours truly,
Karl Marx

Written on March 9, 1854

Published in *The People's Paper*
No. 98, March 18, 1854

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

THE ENGLISH MIDDLE CLASS

The present splendid brotherhood of fiction-writers in England, whose graphic and eloquent pages have issued to the world more political and social truths than have been uttered by all the professional politicians, publicists and moralists put together, have described every section of the middle class from the "highly genteel" annuitant and Fundholder who looks upon all sorts of business as vulgar, to the little shopkeeper and lawyer's clerk. And how have Dickens and Thackeray, Miss Brontë and Mrs. Gaskell painted them? As full of presumption, affectation, petty tyranny and ignorance; and the civilised world have confirmed their verdict with the damning epigram that it has fixed to this class that "they are servile to those above, and tyrannical to those beneath them".

The cramped and narrow sphere in which they move is to a certain degree due to the social system of which they form a part. As the Russian nobility live uneasily betwixt the oppression of the Czar above them and the dread of the enslaved masses below them, so the English middle class are hemmed in by the aristocracy on the one hand and the working classes on the other. Since the peace of 1815, whenever the middle class have wished to take action against the aristocracy, they have told the working classes that their grievances were attributable to some aristocratic privilege and monopoly. By this means the middle class roused the

working classes to help them in 1832 when they wanted the Reform Bill, and, having got a Reform Bill *for themselves*, have ever since refused one to the working classes—nay, in 1848, actually stood arrayed against them armed with special constable staves. Next, it was the repeal of the Corn Laws that would be the panacea for the working classes. Well, this was won from the aristocracy, but the “good time” was not yet come, and last year, as if to take away the last possibility of a similar policy for the future, the aristocracy were compelled to accede to a tax on the succession to real estate—a tax which the same aristocracy had selfishly exempted themselves from in 1793, while they imposed it on the succession to personal estate. With this rag of a grievance vanished the last chance of gulling the working classes into the belief that their hard lot was due solely to aristocratic legislation. The eyes of the working classes are now fully opened: they begin to cry: “Our St. Petersburg is at Preston!” Indeed, the last eight months have seen a strange spectacle in the town—a standing army of 14,000 men and women subsidised by the trades unions and workshops of all parts of the United Kingdom, to fight out a grand social battle for mastery with the capitalists, and the capitalists of Preston, on their side, held up by the capitalists of Lancashire.

Whatever other shapes this social struggle may hereafter assume, we have seen only the beginning of it. It seems destined to nationalise itself and present phases never before seen in history; for it must be borne in mind that though temporary defeat may await the working classes, great social and economical laws are in operation which must eventually ensure their triumph. The same industrial wave which has borne the middle class up against the aristocracy, is now assisted as it is and will be by emigration bearing the working classes up against the middle classes. Just as the middle class inflict blows upon the aristocracy, so will they receive them from the working classes. It is the instinctive perception of this fact that already fetters the action of that class against the aristocracy. The recent political agitations of the working classes have taught the middle class to hate and fear overt political movements. In their cant, “respectable men

don't join them, Sir". The higher middle classes ape the aristocracy in their modes of life, and endeavour to connect themselves with it. The consequence is that the feudalism of England will not perish beneath the scarcely perceptible dissolving processes of the middle class; the honour of such a victory is reserved for the working classes. When the time shall be ripe for their recognised entry upon the stage of political action, there will be within the lists three powerful classes confronting each other—the first representing the land; the second, money; the third, labour. And as the second is triumphing over the first, so, in its turn, it must yield before its successor in the field of political and social conflict.

Published as a leading article
in the *New-York Daily Tribune*
No. 4145, August 1, 1854

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION

London, March 2. While the British Constitution was foundering in detail on every point on which the war had put it to the test, the coalition cabinet at home, the most constitutional of all the cabinets English history has produced, fell apart. Forty thousand British soldiers died on the shores of the Black Sea, victims of the British Constitution! Officers, General Staff, commissariat, the medical department, the transport services, the Admiralty, the Horse Guards, the ordnance office, the army and the navy—all collapsed and discredited themselves in the esteem of the world; but all had the satisfaction of knowing that they had done their duty in the eyes of the British Constitution! The *Times* came nearer the truth than it suspected, when with reference to this general bankruptcy it declared: "It is the British Constitution itself that is on trial." It has faced trial and has been found guilty.

But what is the British Constitution? Does its essence lie in a representative system and a limitation of the power of the executive? These features distinguish it neither from the Constitution of the United States of North America nor from the constitutions of the numerous British joint-stock companies which know "their business". The British Constitution is, in fact, merely an out-of-date, superannuated, obsolete compromise between the bourgeoisie, who are *not officially* but actually *ruling* in all decisive spheres of bourgeois society,

and the landed aristocracy, who are *governing officially*. Originally, after the "glorious" revolution of 1688, only a section of the bourgeoisie, the *financial aristocracy*, was included in the compromise. The Reform Bill of 1831 admitted another section, the *millocracy*, as the English call them, that is, the high dignitaries of the *industrial* bourgeoisie. The history of legislation since 1831 is the history of concessions made to the industrial bourgeoisie, ranging from the Poor Law to the repeal of the Corn Laws, and from the repeal of the Corn Laws to the death-duties on real estate.

If the bourgeoisie—even only the top layer of the middle classes—has been generally recognised as the *ruling class* in *political respects*, this has been done only on the condition that the entire administration in all details, even the executive functions of legislative power, that is, the actual legislation in both Houses of Parliament, should remain in the hands of the landed aristocracy. In the 1830s the bourgeoisie preferred the renewal of the compromise with the landed aristocracy to a compromise with the mass of the English people. The aristocracy, subjected to certain principles laid down by the bourgeoisie, now ruled exclusively in the Cabinet, in Parliament, in the Administration, in the Army and the Navy; this one half, and relatively the most important half, of the British nation is now compelled to sign its own death sentence, and to admit in the eyes of the whole world that it no longer has the ability to rule England. We only need to consider the attempts to galvanise its corpse. Cabinet upon cabinet is being formed only to dissolve itself after a few weeks in office. The crisis is permanent, the government only provisional. All political activity is suspended, and everyone admits that he is only thinking of how to lubricate the political machine sufficiently to prevent it from coming to a complete halt. The House of Commons no longer recognises itself in the cabinets created in its own image.

In the midst of this general helplessness not only must the war be waged, but an opponent more dangerous than Tsar Nicholas himself must be fought. This opponent is the *trade and industrial crisis*, which since last September has been growing more intense and general every day. Its iron

hand has immediately closed the mouth of those superficial Free Trade apostles, who had been preaching for years that after the repeal of the Corn Laws glutted markets and social crises had been banned for ever to the realm of the past. The glutted markets are here, and now no one shouts more loudly about the lack of prudence which deterred the factory owners from limiting production than these same economists who only five months ago were preaching with dogmatic infallibility that too much could never be produced.

The sickness expressed itself in chronic form already at the time of the strike in Preston.¹⁰⁵ Shortly after, the swamping of the American market brought an outbreak of the crisis in the United States. India and China, although oversupplied like California and Australia, continued to be outlet channels for over-production. Since the English factory owners could no longer sell their goods on the home market without reducing the prices, they resorted to the dangerous method of sending their goods abroad on consignment, especially to India, China, Australia and California. This expedient made it possible for trade to go ahead for a while with less disturbance than if the goods had been thrown upon the market all at once. However, as soon as the goods arrived at their destination, they immediately influenced prices there, and towards the end of September the effect was felt here in England.

The crisis then turned from a chronic into an acute one. The first firms to collapse were the cotton printers, among them old-established firms in and around Manchester. Next in turn were the shipowners and the Australian and Californian merchants, then the Chinese firms and finally the Indian. They all took their turn. Most of them suffered badly, many had to suspend their business, and for none of these branches of trade is the danger over. On the contrary, it is steadily growing. The silk manufacturers were also stricken; instantaneously their industry was reduced to almost nothing, and the areas where their factories operate are afflicted with the greatest misery. Now it is the turn of the cotton spinners and the manufacturers. Some have already gone under and even more will have to share their fate. We saw earlier on that the fine-yarn mills are still only working short time

and soon the coarse-yarn mills will have to resort to the same course. A number of them are already working only a few days in the week. How long can they hold out in this manner?

A few months more, and the crisis in the manufacturing districts will reach the 1842 level, if not surpass it. But as soon as its effect is generally felt by the working classes, the political movement, which among these classes has been more or less drowsing for the past six years and has retained only the cadres for new agitation, will begin again. The conflict between the industrial proletariat and the bourgeoisie will be resumed at the moment when the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy reaches its peak. Then the mask will fall which has up till now hidden the true features of Great Britain's political face from countries abroad. Meanwhile, only those who are unfamiliar with that country's wealth of human and material resources will doubt that it will emerge victorious and rejuvenated from the imminent big crisis.

Written by K. Marx
on March 2, 1855

Published in *Neue Oder-Zeitung*
No. 109, March 6, 1855

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

THE CRISIS IN ENGLAND

Of course, the most interesting feature of the news from Europe by the *Atlantic*¹⁰⁶ must be the death of the Czar¹⁰⁷ and the influence of that event on the pending complications. But important as may be the intelligence on this subject, or on other continental affairs, in its interest for the thoughtful observer it can hardly surpass the gradual indications and developments of that momentous political crisis in which, without any will of their own, the British nation are now involved at home. The last attempt to maintain that antiquated compromise called the British Constitution—a compromise between the class that rule officially and the class that rule non-officially—has signally failed. The coalition ministry, the most constitutional of all, has not only broken down in England but the constitution itself has broken down in detail at every point where it has been tested by the war. Forty thousand British soldiers have died on the shores of the Black Sea, victims to the British Constitution. Officers, Staff, Commissariat, Medical Department, Transport Service, Admiralty, Horse Guards, Ordnance, Army and Navy, all and every one have broken down, have ruined themselves in the estimation of the world; but all and every one have failed with the satisfaction of knowing that they had but done their duty in the eyes of the British Constitution. The London *Times* spoke more truly than it knew, when it said, with respect to this universal

failure, that it was the British Constitution itself which was on its trial!

It has been tried, and found guilty. This British Constitution, what is it but a superannuated compromise, by which the general governing power is abandoned to some sections of the middle class, on condition that the whole of the real Government, the Executive in all its details, even to the executive department of the legislative power—or that is, the actual law-making in the two Houses of Parliament—is secured to the landed aristocracy? This aristocracy which, subject to general principles laid down by the middle class, rules supreme in the Cabinet, the Parliament, the Administration, the Army and the Navy—this very important half of the British Constitution has now been obliged to sign its own death-warrant. It has been compelled to confess its incapacity any longer to govern England. Ministry after Ministry is formed, only to dissolve itself after a few weeks' reign. The crisis is permanent; the Government is but provisional. All political action is suspended; nobody professes to do more than to keep the political machine greased well enough to prevent it from stopping. That pride of the constitutional Englishman, the House of Commons itself, is brought to a dead stand. It knows itself no longer, since it is split up in numberless fractions, attempting all the arithmetical combinations and variations, of which a given number of units is capable. It can no longer recognise itself in the various cabinets, which it makes in its own image, for no other purpose than to unmake them again. The bankruptcy is complete.

And not only has the war had to be carried on in the midst of this national helplessness, which, breaking out like a pestilence in the Crimea, has gradually seized all the branches of the body politic, but there is an opponent to contend with far more dangerous than Russia—an opponent more than a match for all the Gladstones, Cardwells, Russells and Palmerstons of past, present and future cabinets put together. That opponent is the commercial and industrial crisis which, since September last, has set in with a severity, a universality, and a violence, not to be mistaken. Its stern, iron hand at once shut up the mouths of those shallow Free-Traders

who for years had gone on preaching, that since the repeal of the Corn Laws glutted markets were impossible. There the glut is, with all its consequences, and in its most acute form; and in view of it nobody is more eager to accuse the improvidence of manufacturers, in not reducing production, than those very economists, who told them only a few months before that they never could produce too much. We long since called attention to the existence of this disease in a chronic form. It has been aggravated, of course, by the late difficulties in America, and the crisis that depressed our trade. India and China, glutted though they were, continued to be used as outlets—as also California and Australia. When the English manufacturers could no longer sell their goods at home, or would not do so rather than depress prices, they resorted to the absurd expedient of consigning them abroad, especially to India, China, Australia and California. This expedient enabled trade to go on for a while with less embarrassment than if the goods had been thrown at once upon the home market; but when they arrived at their destinations they produced embarrassment at once, and about the end of September last the effect began to be felt in England.

Then the crisis exchanged its chronic form for an acute one. The first houses that felt it were the calico printers; a number of them, including very old established houses in Manchester and that vicinity, broke down. Then came the turn of the shipowners and the Australian and Californian merchants; next came the China traders, and finally the Indian houses. All of them have had their turn; most of them losing severely, while many had to suspend; and for none of them has the danger passed away. On the contrary it is still increasing. The silk manufacturers were equally affected; their trade has been reduced to almost nothing, and the localities where it is carried on have suffered, and still suffer, the greatest distress. Then came the turn of the cotton-spinners and manufacturers. Some of them had already succumbed at our last advices, and a great many more must do so. The spinners of fine yarns, as we also learn, had begun to work only four days a week, and the coarse spinners would shortly have to do the same. But how many of them will be able to stand this for any length of time?

A few months more and the crisis will be at a height which it has not reached in England since 1846, perhaps not since 1842. When its effects begin to be fully felt among the working classes, then will that political movement begin again, which has been dormant for six years. Then will the working men of England rise anew, menacing the middle classes at the very time that the middle classes are finally driving the aristocracy from power. Then will the mask be torn off which has hitherto hid the real political features of Great Britain. Then will the two real contending parties in that country stand face to face—the middle class and the working classes, the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat—and England will at last be compelled to share in the general social evolutions of European society. When England entered into the French Alliance she finally abandoned that isolated character which her insular position had created for her, but which the commerce of the world, and the increasing facilities for intercourse, had long since undermined. Henceforth she can hardly help undergoing the great internal movements of the other European nations.

It is also a striking fact that the last moments of the British Constitution are as prolific in evidences of a corrupt social state as the last moments of Louis Philippe's monarchy. We have before referred to the Parliamentary and Government scandals, to the Stonor, the Sadleir, the Lawley scandals; but, to crown all, came the Handcock and De Burgh revelations, with Lord Clanricarde, a peer of the realm, as a principal though indirect party to a most revolting deed. No wonder that this should seem to complete the parallel, and that people, on reading the damning details, should involuntarily exclaim "The Duc de Praslin! The Duc de Praslin!" England has arrived at her 1847; who knows when and what will be her 1848?

Written by K. Marx
on March 2, 1855

Published as a leading article
in the *New-York Daily Tribune*
No. 4346, March 24, 1855

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

A MEETING

London, 20th March. For months the *Morning Advertiser* has been trying to initiate a society called the "National and Constitutional Association" for the purpose of agitating for the overthrow of the oligarchic regime. After much preliminary work had been done, many appeals made, subscriptions received, and so on, a public meeting was finally called for last Friday at the London Tavern.¹⁰⁸ It was to be the birthday of the new much advertised Association. Long before the opening of the meeting the great hall was packed with workers and, when the self-elected leaders of the new movement finally appeared, they actually had difficulty in finding room on the platform. Mr. James Taylor, who had been appointed chairman, read aloud letters from Mr. Layard, Sir de Lacy Evans, Mr. Wakley, Sir James Duke, Sir John Shelley and others who affirmed their sympathies for the aims of the Association but at the same time on various pretexts declined the invitation to attend in person. This was followed by the reading of an "Address to the People", in which a strong light was thrown on the war being waged in the East and on the ministerial crisis. Then came the declaration that there were

"practical men of every class, and *especially of the middle class*, with all the attributes for governing the country".

This gauche allusion to the particular claims of the middle class was received with loud hissing.

"The chief aim of this Association," it continued, "will be to destroy the aristocratical monopoly of power and place, which has proved fatal to the best interests of the country. Among its collateral objects will be included the *abolition of secret diplomacy*. The special mission of this association will be to address itself to the constituencies of the United Kingdom, warning and exhorting them to be careful into whose hands they entrust the liberties and resources of the country, and to shrink from bestowing their votes any longer on the mere nonentities of the aristocracy and wealth and their nominees."

Thereupon Mr. *Beales* rose and in a detailed speech tabled the first motion.

"The perilous state of public affairs, and the manifest hopelessness of improvement under the present oligarchical system, which has usurped the functions of government, monopolised place and privilege, and brought disgrace and disaster upon the country, makes it incumbent on the people to unite, in order to prevent a continuation of the existing calamitous system. . . . That an Association be, therefore, now formed; and be called the *National and Constitutional Association*."

Mr. *Nicholay*, one of the intellectuals from Marylebone, seconded the motion, and a Member of Parliament, *Apsley Pellatt*, spoke in the same vein:

"The people will go about the task of reforming the government with determination, temperance, steadiness and the resolution of *Cromwell Ironsides*. Power to rectify every abuse lies in the hands of the English electorate, if they are determined to send honest men to Parliament *gratis*. But they could never expect to be honestly represented whilst a man like Lord Ebrington from Marylebone is returned to Parliament at an expense of £ 5,000, while his unsuccessful rival had only £ 3,000 to spend."

Mr. *Murrough*, Member of Parliament, now stepped forward, but after considerable opposition was compelled to make room for George Harrison (a worker and Chartist from Nottingham).

"This movement," said Harrison, "is an attempt by the middle classes to gain control of the government, divide amongst themselves the places and the pensions and establish a worse oligarchy than that now in existence."

Then he read aloud an *amendment* wherein he denounced equally the landed and financial aristocracy as enemies of

the people and proclaimed that the only way to regenerate the nation was to introduce a *People's Charter* with five points: universal suffrage, vote by ballot, equal electoral districts, annual Parliaments, no property qualifications.

Ernest Jones (head of the Chartists, who comes from a high-ranking aristocratic family) seconded the amendment and remarked in a similar vein:

"The people would destroy its own position, if it were to support this movement of the middle classes to get into their own hands place and power. On the platform there are undoubtedly many eager prime ministers" (cheers), "many job hunters without office" (cheers). "The people should not, however, ally themselves to the Brights and the Cobdens and the moneyed interests. It is not the landed aristocracy, but money-grabbing that has opposed a humane factory law, rejected the Bill against stoppage of wages (deductions from the nominal wage). It has prevented the passing of a good law of assembly and it is above all the money and factory interests which have tried to hold down and degrade the people. He for his part is ready at any moment to become part of a movement, the purpose of which is to break the influence of the Duke of Devonshire and others, but he does not wish to do so merely to replace it with the influence of the dukes of factory dust and the lords of the spindle." (Cheers and laughter.) "It has been said that the workers' movement, the Chartists' movement is dead. We must here explain to the middle class reformers that the working class is sufficiently alive to kill any movement. They would not allow the middle class to move, in case it resolved not to accept the *People's Charter* and its five points in its programme. The middle class should not deceive itself. Repetition of the old deceptions is out of the question."

After some further discussion, the chairman, amidst considerable commotion, attempted to dispose of the amendment by saying that it was not an amendment. However, he soon realised that he had to alter his decision. The amendment was brought forward and went through with a majority of at least ten to one, amidst loud shouts of approval and waving of hats. After he had declared that the amendment had been passed, the chairman, amidst loud laughter, confirmed that he still believed that the majority of those present were for the founding of the "Constitutional and National Union". They would therefore go ahead with their organisation, and later on another appeal would be addressed to the public, indicating, although indirectly, that in future, to avoid opposition only people with membership cards would be permitted to enter. The Chartists, in the best of moods,

complimented the chairman with a vote of thanks and the meeting was closed.

One cannot deny that logic was on the side of the Chartists, even from the point of view of the publicly proclaimed principles of the Association. The Association wishes to overthrow the oligarchy by means of an appeal from the ministry to Parliament. But what is the ministry? The minion of the parliamentary majority. Or does the Association wish to overthrow Parliament by means of an appeal to the voters? But what is Parliament? The freely elected representative of the voters. The only solution that remains is to increase the number of voters. If one refuses to increase the electorate to the dimensions of the people itself through acceptance of the People's Charter, then one is admitting to an attempt to replace the old aristocracy with a new one. Faced with the present oligarchy one would like to speak *in the name of the people*, but at the same time avoid the people appearing in person when one calls.

Written by K. Marx
on March 20, 1855

Published in *Neue Oder-Zeitung*
No. 141, March 24, 1855

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

THE ASSOCIATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM.—
[PEOPLE'S CHARTER]

London, June 5. The Association for Administrative Reform has gained a victory in Bath. Its candidate, Mr. Tite, has been elected a Member of Parliament by a large majority against the Tory candidate. This victory, won on the terrain of a "legal" country, is being celebrated as a great event by today's Liberal papers. Bulletins about the poll are being published with no less ostentation than those about the bloodless successes on the Sea of Azov. Bath and Kerch! is the motto of the day. What the press—pro-reform and anti-reform, Ministerial, Opposition, Tory, Whig and Radical papers alike—says nothing about is the defeats and disillusionments which the Association for Administrative Reform has suffered in the last few days in London, Birmingham and Worcester. To be sure, this time the battle was not fought on the limited terrain of a privileged electoral body. Nor were its results such as to draw cries of triumph from the opponents of the City reformers.

The first truly *public* meeting (i. e., one *without* admission tickets) which the Reform Association held in *London* took place in Marylebone last Wednesday. One of the Chartists countered the resolutions of the City reformers by moving the amendment

"that the money aristocracy represented by the City men is as bad as the landed aristocracy; that, under the pretext of reform, it is merely

striving to vote its way, on the shoulders of the people, into Downing Street, and there to share offices, salaries and ranks with the oligarchs; that the Charter with its five points is the only programme of the people's movement".

The chairman of the meeting, one of the City illuminati, voiced a number of doubts: first, whether he should put the amendment to the vote at all, then, whether he should first take a vote on the resolution or on the amendment, and lastly, *how* he should take the vote. The audience, being tired of his indecision, tactical considerations and unpleasant manoeuvres, declared him incapable of presiding further, called on Ernest Jones to replace him in the chair, and voted by a vast majority against the resolution *and* for the amendment.

In *Birmingham*, the City Association called a public meeting in the Town Hall with the Mayor in the chair. The Association resolution was countered by an amendment similar to that moved in London. The Mayor, however, flatly refused to put the amendment to the vote unless the word "Charter" was replaced by a less objectionable one. If not, he would withdraw from the chair, he said. The word "*Charter*" was therefore replaced by "*universal suffrage* and voting by ballot". Thus edited, the amendment was passed by a majority of 10 votes. In *Worcester*, where the City reformers called a public meeting, the victory of the Chartists and the defeat of the Administrative Reformers were even more complete. There the *Charter* was proclaimed without more ado.

The very doubtful success of these large meetings in London, Birmingham and Worcester decided the Administrative Reformers to circulate in all the bigger and more populous towns petitions to be signed by their partisans, rather than to make public appeals to the *vox populi*. The City notables' manifold links with the lords of commerce in the United Kingdom, and the influence these gentlemen exert upon their clerks, warehousemen and "minor" commercial friends will no doubt enable them to fill the petitions with names very quietly, behind the back of the public, and then to send them to the "Honourable House" with the label, *Voice of the People of England*. But they are mistaken if they think they can

intimidate the Government with signatures collected by wheedling, intrigue and stealth. The Government looked on with ironical self-satisfaction at the Administrative Reformers being hissed out of the *theatrum mundi*. Its organs are silent for the time being, partly because they would otherwise have to register the successes of Chartism, and partly because the ruling class is already toying with the idea of putting itself at the head of the "Administrative Reformers" should the people's movement become importunate. They keep a "misunderstanding" in reserve should this danger set in: ever again to regard the Administrative Reformers as the spokesmen of the masses will be due to a "misunderstanding". Such misunderstandings constitute the capital joke of England's "historical" development, and no one is more familiar with handling them than the free-thinking Whigs.

The *Charter* is a very laconic document; besides the demand for *universal suffrage*, it contains only the following five points, and as many conditions for its exercise: 1) voting through the ballot (box); 2) *no* property qualifications for Members of Parliament; 3) remuneration of Members of Parliament; 4) yearly Parliaments; 5) equal constituencies. After the experiments which destroyed faith in the *universal suffrage of 1848* in France,¹⁰⁹ the continentals are prone to underrate the importance and meaning of the English *Charter*. They overlook the fact that two-thirds of French society are peasants and over one-third townspeople, while in England more than two-thirds live in the towns and less than one-third in the countryside. In England the results of universal suffrage must thus be in the same *inverse* proportion to its results in France as town and country are in the two empires. This explains the diametrically opposite character which the demand for universal suffrage has assumed in France and England. In France it was a demand made by political ideologues, one that every "educated" person could share to a greater or lesser extent, depending on his convictions. In England it forms the broad boundary between aristocracy and bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the classes of the people, on the other. There it is regarded as a political question and here, as a social one. In England agitation

for universal suffrage had gone through a period of historical development before it became the catchword of the masses. In France, it was *first* introduced and *then* started on its historical path. In France it was the practice of universal suffrage that failed, while in England it was its ideology. In the early decades of this century, universal suffrage of Sir Francis Burdett, Major Cartwright and Cobbett still had an utterly indefinite idealistic character, which made it the pious wish of all sections of the population that did not belong directly to the ruling classes. For the bourgeoisie, it was really no more than an eccentric, generalised expression of what it had attained through the parliamentary reform of 1831. In England the demand for universal suffrage did not assume its true, specific character even after 1838. Proof: Hume and O'Connell were among those who signed the Charter. In 1842 the last illusions were gone. At that time Lovett made a last but futile attempt to formulate universal suffrage as a *common* demand of the so-called Radicals and the masses of the people.¹¹⁰ Since that day there has no longer been any doubt as to the meaning of universal suffrage. Nor as to its name. It is the *Charter* of the classes of the people and implies the assumption of political power as a means of meeting their social requirements. That is why universal suffrage, a watchword of universal fraternisation in the France of 1848, is taken as a war slogan in England. There the immediate content of the revolution was universal suffrage; here, the immediate content of universal suffrage is the revolution. He who goes over the history of universal suffrage in England will see that it casts off its idealistic character as modern society with its endless contradictions develops here, contradictions born of industrial progress.

Alongside the official and semi-official parties, as well as alongside the Chartists, there is another clique of "wise men" emerging in England, who are discontented with the Government and the ruling classes as much as with the Chartists. What do the Chartists want? they exclaim. They want to increase and extend the omnipotence of Parliament by elevating it to people's power. They are not breaking up parliamentarism but are raising it to a higher power. The right thing to do is to break up the representative system!

A wise man from the East, *David Urquhart*, heads that clique. He wants to revert to England's common law. He wants to squeeze Statute Law back into its bounds. He wants to localise rather than centralise. He wants to dig up again from the rubbish "the true old legal sources of Anglo-Saxon times". Then they will gush forth of themselves and will water and fertilise the surrounding country. But David is at least consistent. He also wants to return modern division of labour and concentration of capital to the old Anglo-Saxon or, better still, to the Oriental state. A Highlander by birth, Circassian by naturalisation and Turk by free choice, he is capable of condemning civilisation with all its evils, and from time to time even of passing judgement on it himself. But he is not insipid like the sublime ones who separate modern forms of the state from modern society, and who indulge in wishful thinking about local autonomy combined with concentration of capital, and about individualisation combined with the anti-individualising division of labour. David is a prophet facing backwards, and fascinated like an antiquarian by the vista of old England. He should therefore think it normal for new England to pass him by and leave him standing where he is, however urgent and deeply convinced he may be in exclaiming: "David Urquhart is the only man who can save you!" Which is what he did but a few days ago, at a meeting in Stafford.

Written by K. Marx
on June 5, 1855

Published in *Neue Oder-Zeitung*
No. 261, June 8, 1855

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

**ANTI-CHURCH MOVEMENT.—
(DEMONSTRATION IN HYDE PARK)**

London, June 25. It is an old and historically established maxim that obsolete social forces, nominally still in possession of all the attributes of power and continuing to vegetate long after the basis of their existence has rotted away, inasmuch as the heirs are quarrelling among themselves over the inheritance even before the obituary notice has been printed and the testament read—that these forces once more summon all their strength before their agony of death, pass from the defensive to the offensive, challenge instead of giving way, and seek to draw the most extreme conclusions from premises which have not only been put in question but already condemned. Such is today the English oligarchy. Such is the *Church*, its twin sister. Countless attempts at reorganisation have been made within the Established Church, both the High and the Low, attempts to come to an understanding with the Dissenters and thus to set up a compact force to oppose the profane mass of the nation. There has been a rapid succession of measures of religious coercion. The pious Earl of Shaftesbury, formerly known as Lord Ashley, bewailed the fact in the House of Lords that in England alone five million had become wholly alienated not only from the Church but from Christianity altogether. "*Compelle intrare*,"* replies the Established Church. It leaves

* Initial Latin words of the biblical phrase: "...compel them to come in, that my house may be filled."—*Ed.*

it to Lord Ashley and similar dissenting, sectarian and hysterical pietists to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for it.

The first measure of religious coercion was the Beer Bill, which shut down all places of public entertainment on Sundays, except between 6 and 10 p. m. This bill was smuggled through the House at the end of a sparsely attended sitting, after the pietists had bought the support of the big public-house owners of London by guaranteeing them that the license system would continue, that is, that big capital would retain its monopoly. Then came the Sunday Trading Bill, which has now passed on its third reading in the Commons and separate clauses of which have just been debated in the Committee of the whole House.¹⁴¹ This new coercive measure too was ensured the vote of big capital, because only small shopkeepers keep open on Sunday and the proprietors of the big shops are quite willing to do away with the Sunday competition of the small fry by parliamentary means. In both cases there is a conspiracy of the Church with monopoly capital, but in both cases there are religious penal laws against the lower classes to set the conscience of the privileged classes at rest. The *Beer Bill* was as far from hitting the aristocratic clubs as the *Sunday Trading Bill* is from hitting the Sunday occupations of genteel society. The workers get their wages late on Saturday; they are the only ones for whom shops open on Sundays. They are the only ones compelled to make their purchases, small as they are, on Sundays. The new bill is therefore directed against them alone. In the eighteenth century the French aristocracy said: For us, Voltaire; for the people, the mass and the tithes. In the nineteenth century the English aristocracy says: For us, pious phrases; for the people, Christian practice. The classical saint of Christianity mortified *his* body for the salvation of the souls of the masses; the modern, educated saint mortifies *the bodies of the masses* for the salvation of his own soul.

This alliance of a dissipated, degenerating and pleasure-seeking aristocracy with a church propped up by the filthy profits calculated upon by the big brewers and monopolising wholesalers was the occasion yesterday of a *mass demonstration* in Hyde Park, the like of which London has not seen

since the death of George IV, "the first gentleman of Europe". We were spectators from beginning to end and do not think we are exaggerating in saying that the *English Revolution began yesterday in Hyde Park*. The latest news from the Crimea acted as an effective ferment upon this "unparliamentary", "extraparliamentary", and "anti-parliamentary" demonstration.

Lord Robert Grosvenor, who fathered the Sunday Trading Bill, when reproached on the score of this measure being directed solely against the poor and not against the rich classes, retorted that

"the aristocracy was largely refraining from employing its servants and horses on Sundays".

The last few days of the past week the following poster, put out by the *Chartists* and affixed to all the walls of London, announced in huge letters:

"*New Sunday Bill* prohibiting newspapers, shaving, smoking, eating and drinking and all kinds of recreation and nourishment, both corporal and spiritual, which the *poor people* still enjoy at the present time. *An open-air meeting* of artisans, workers and 'the lower orders' generally of the capital will take place in Hyde Park on Sunday afternoon to see how religiously the aristocracy is observing the Sabbath and how anxious it is not to employ its servants and horses on that day, as Lord Robert Grosvenor said in his speech. The meeting is called for three o'clock on the right bank of the Serpentine [a small river in Hyde Park], on the side towards Kensington Gardens. Come and bring your wives and children in order that they may profit by the example their 'betters' set them!"

It should be borne in mind, of course, that what *Long-champs** means to the Parisians, the road along the Serpentine in Hyde Park means to English high society—the place where of an afternoon, particularly on Sunday, they parade their magnificent horses and carriages with all their trappings, followed by swarms of lackeys. It will be realised from the above placard that the struggle against clericalism assumes the same character in England as every other serious struggle there—the character of a *class struggle* waged by the poor against the rich, the people against the aristocracy, the "lower orders" against their "betters".

* A hippodrome on the outskirts of Paris.—Ed.

At 3 o'clock approximately 50,000 people had gathered at the spot announced on the right bank of the Serpentine in Hyde Park's immense meadows. Gradually the assembled multitude swelled to a total of at least 200,000 due to additions from the other bank. Milling groups of people could be seen shoved about from place to place. The police, who were present in force, were obviously endeavouring to deprive the organisers of the meeting of what Archimedes had asked for to move the earth, namely, a place to stand upon. Finally a rather large crowd made a firm stand and Bligh the Chartist constituted himself chairman on a small eminence in the midst of the throng. No sooner had he begun his harangue than Police Inspector Banks at the head of 40 truncheon-swinging constables explained to him that the Park was the private property of the *Crown* and that no meeting might be held in it. After some *pourparlers* in which Bligh sought to demonstrate to him that parks were public property and in which Banks rejoined he had strict orders to arrest him if he should insist on carrying out his intention. Bligh shouted amidst the bellowing of the masses surrounding him:

"Her Majesty's police declare that Hyde Park is private property of the Crown and that Her Majesty is unwilling to let her land be used by the people for their meetings. So let's move to Oxford Market."

With the ironical cry: "God save the Queen!" the throng broke up to journey to Oxford Market. But meanwhile *Finlen*, a member of the Chartist Executive,¹¹² rushed to a tree some distance away followed by a crowd who in a twinkling formed so close and compact a circle around him that the police abandoned their attempt to get at him.

"Six days a week," he said, "we are treated like slaves and now Parliament wants to rob us of the bit of freedom we still have on the seventh. These oligarchs and capitalists allied with sanctimonious parsons wish to do *penance* by mortifying us instead of themselves for the unconscionable murder in the Crimea of the sons of the people."

We left this group to approach another where a speaker stretched out on the ground addressed his audience from this horizontal position. Suddenly shouts could be heard on all sides: "Let's go to the road, to the carriages!" The heaping

of insults upon horse riders and occupants of carriages had meanwhile already begun. The constables, who constantly received reinforcements from the city, drove the promenading pedestrians off the carriage road. They thus helped to bring it about that either side of it was lined deep with people, from Apsley House up Rotten-Row along the Serpentine as far as Kensington Gardens—a distance of more than a quarter of an hour. The spectators consisted of about two-thirds workers and one-third members of the middle class, all with women and children. The procession of elegant ladies and gentlemen, “commoners and Lords”, in their high coaches-and-four with liveried lackeys in front and behind, joined, to be sure, by a few mounted venerables slightly under the weather from the effects of wine, did not this time pass by in review but played the role of involuntary actors who were made to run the gauntlet. A Babel of jeering, taunting, discordant ejaculations, in which no language is as rich as English, soon bore down upon them from both sides. As it was an improvised concert, instruments were lacking. The chorus therefore had only its own organs at its disposal and was compelled to confine itself to vocal music. And what a devils’ concert it was: a cacophony of grunting, hissing, whistling, squeaking, snarling, growling, croaking, shrieking, groaning, rattling, howling, gnashing sounds! A music that could drive one mad and move a stone. To this must be added outbursts of genuine old-English humour peculiarly mixed with long-contained seething wrath. “Go to church!” were the only articulate sounds that could be distinguished. One lady soothingly offered a prayer book in orthodox binding from her carriage in her outstretched hand. “Give it to your horses to read!” came the thundering reply, echoing a thousand voices. When the horses started to shy, rear, buck and finally run away, jeopardising the lives of their genteel burdens, the contemptuous din grew louder, more menacing, more ruthless. Noble lords and ladies, among them Lady Granville, the wife of a minister who presided over the Privy Council, were forced to alight and use their own legs. When elderly gentlemen rode past wearing broad-brimmed hats and otherwise so apparelled as to betray their special claim to perfectitude in matters of belief, the strident

outbursts of fury were extinguished, as if in obedience to a command, by inextinguishable laughter. One of these gentlemen lost his patience. Like Mephistopheles he made an impolite gesture, sticking out his tongue at the enemy. "He is a windbag, a parliamentary man! He fights with his own weapons!" someone shouted on one side of the road. "He is a psalm-singing saint!" was the anti-strophe from the opposite side. Meanwhile the metropolitan electric telegraph had informed all police stations that a riot was about to break out in Hyde Park and the police were ordered to the theatre of military operations. Soon one detachment after another marched at short intervals through the double file of people, from Apsley House to Kensington Gardens, each received with the popular ditty:

*"Where are gone the geese?
Ask the police!"*

This was a hint at a notorious theft of geese recently committed by a constable in Clerkenwell.

The spectacle lasted three hours. Only English lungs could perform such a feat. During the performance opinions such as "This is only the beginning!" "That is the first step!" "We hate them!" and the like were voiced by the various groups. While rage was inscribed on the faces of the workers, such smiles of blissful self-satisfaction covered the physiognomies of the middle classes as we had never seen there before. Shortly before the end the demonstration increased in violence. Canes were raised in menace of the carriages and through the welter of discordant noises could be heard the cry of "you rascals!" During the three hours zealous Chartists, men and women, ploughed their way through the throng distributing leaflets which stated in big type:

"Reorganisation of Chartism!

"A big public meeting will take place next Tuesday, June 26th, in the Literary and Scientific Institute in Friar Street, Doctors' Commons, to elect delegates to a conference for the reorganisation of Chartism in the capital. Admission free."

Most of the London papers carry today only a brief account of the events in Hyde Park. No leading articles as

yet, except in Lord Palmerston's *Morning Post*. It claims that

"a spectacle both disgraceful and dangerous in the extreme has taken place in Hyde Park, an open violation of law and decency—an illegal interference by physical force in the free action of the Legislature". It urges that "this scene must not be allowed to be repeated the following Sunday, as was threatened".

At the same time, however, it declares that the "fanatical" Lord Grosvenor is solely "responsible" for this mischief, being the man who provoked the "just indignation of the people!" As if Parliament had not adopted Lord Grosvenor's bill in three readings! or perhaps he too brought his influence to bear "by physical force on the free action of the Legislature"?

Written by K. Marx
on June 25, 1855

Published in *Neue Oder-Zeitung*
No. 295, June 28, 1855

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

LORD JOHN RUSSELL

London, July 25, 1855

Lord John Russell was fond of quoting an old Whig axiom that parties were like snails, for with them it is the tail that moves the head. He hardly could have surmised that to save itself the tail will strike off the head. If not the head of the "*last of the Whig cabinets*", he was indisputably the head of the *Whig party*. Burke said once that

the number of estates, country-houses, castles, forest lands and the like which the *Russells* had wrested away from the English people was "*quite incredible*".¹¹³

Still more incredible would be the great reputation in which Lord John Russell has been held and the prominent role which he has ventured to play for over a quarter of a century if the "number of estates" which his family has usurped did not furnish the clue to the puzzle.

Lord John seems to have spent his whole life solely in quest of *posts* and to have been holding on so tight to the posts he captured as to have forfeited all claim to *power*. So it was in 1836-41 when the post of leader of the House of Commons fell to his lot. So in 1846-52 when he could call himself Prime Minister. The semblance of power that enveloped him as the leader of an opposition assaulting the national exchequer disappeared each time on the day he came to power. As soon as he changed from an Out to an In

he was *done for*. No other English statesman ever suffered so keen a transition from potency to impotence. But, on the other hand, no other knew so well as he how to raise his impotence to potency.

Apart from the influence exerted by the family of the Duke of Bedford, whose younger son he was, the sham power Lord John Russell periodically wielded was reinforced by a lack of all the qualities which generally fit a person to rule over others. The pettiness of his views on all things spread to others like a contagion and contributed more to confuse the judgement of his hearers than the most ingenious perversion could have done. His real talent consists in his capacity to reduce everything that he touches to his own Lilliputian dimensions, to shrink the external world to an infinitesimal size and to transform it into a vulgar microcosm of his own invention. His instinct to belittle the magnificent is excelled only by the skill with which he can make the petty appear grand.

Lord John Russell's entire life has been lived on false pretences: the false pretence of parliamentary reform, the false pretence of religious freedom, the false pretence of Free Trade. So honest was his belief in the sufficiency of false pretences that he considered it quite feasible to become, on false pretences, not only a British statesman but also a poet, thinker and historian. Only this can account for the existence of such stuff and nonsense as his tragedy *Don Carlos, or Persecution*, or his *Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution, from the Reign of Henry VII to the Present Time*, or his *Memoirs of the Affairs of Europe from the Peace of Utrecht*.¹¹⁴ To the egoistic narrowness of his mind every object is nothing but a *tabula rasa* on which he is at liberty to write his own name. His opinions never depended upon the realities of the case; on the contrary, as far as he was concerned the facts depended on the order in which he arranged them into locutions. As a speaker he has bequeathed to posterity not a single noteworthy idea, not a single profound maxim, not a single penetrating observation, no vivid description, no beautiful thought, no poignant allusion, no humorous depiction, no true emotion. A "*sheer mediocrity*", as Roebuck admits in

his history of the Reform Ministry,¹¹⁵ he never surprised his audience, not even when he performed the greatest deed of his public life: when he introduced his so-called Reform Bill in the House of Commons. He has a peculiar way of combining his dry, drawling, monotonous, auctioneerlike delivery with schoolboy illustrations from history and a certain-solemn gibberish on "the beauty of the Constitution", the "universal liberties of the country", "civilisation", and "progress". He gets really heated only when personally provoked or goaded by his opponents into abandoning his pretended attitude of arrogance and self-complaisance and into betraying all the symptoms of impassioned feebleness. In England it is generally agreed that his numerous misses are to be explained by a certain innate impetuosity. As a matter of fact this impetuosity, too, is only a false pretence. It may be reduced to the inevitable friction between subterfuges and expedients calculated to meet the emergency of the hour, on the one hand, and the unfavourable signs of the next hour. Russell is not instinctive but calculating; petty, however, like the man, are his calculations—they are always mere makeshifts to last for an hour. Hence constant wavering and dodging, rapid advances, disgraceful retreats, insolent words wisely retracted, haughty commitments shabbily kept, and, if nothing else will avail, sobs and tears to move the world to pity. His whole life can be viewed, therefore, either as a systematic sham or as one uninterrupted blunder.

It may seem astonishing that a public figure should have survived such a host of stillborn measures, killed projects and abortive schemes. But just as a polyp thrives on amputation, so Lord John Russell on abortion. Most of his plans were advanced solely for the purpose of assuaging the ill-humour of his allies, the so-called Radicals, while an understanding with his adversaries, the Conservatives, ensured the "*burking*" of these plans. Ever since the days of the Reformed Parliament who could name a single one of his "wide and liberal measures", of his great reforms "on the instalment plan", on the fate of which he would have staked the fate of his cabinet? On the contrary. The proposal of measures to satisfy the Liberals and their withdrawal to

satisfy the Conservatives contributed more than anything else to maintain and prolong his ministry. There were times when Peel deliberately kept him at the helm in order not to be compelled to *do* things which he knew Russell would only *prattle* about. In such periods of secret understanding with the official opponent Russell exhibited impudence *vis-à-vis* his official allies. He became bold—on false pretences.

We shall cast a glance in retrospect upon his performance from 1830 until the present day. So much this *genius of mediocrity* has deserved.

Written by K. Marx
on July 25, 1855

Published in *Neue Oder-Zeitung*
No. 347, July 28, 1855

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

LORD JOHN RUSSELL

London, August 1, 1855

"If I was a painter," said old Cobbett, "there would I place the old oak (the British Constitution), corroded at the root, his top dead, his trunk hollow, loosened at his base, rocking with every blast, and there would I place Lord John Russell, in the person of a tomtit, endeavouring to put all right by picking at a nest of animalculae seated in the half-rotten bark of one of the meanest branches. There are some who even think that he is eating the buds while he pretends to clear the tree of injurious insects."

So minute were Lord John Russell's reform efforts during his antediluvian career from 1813 to 1830; but minute as they were, they were not sincere, and he did not hesitate to retreat from them whenever they clashed with the attainment or retention of place.

Since 1807 the Whigs had pined in vain for a bite at the rich cherry of official salary and plunder, when in 1827 the formation of Canning's Cabinet, with whom they pretended to agree on the subject of commerce and of foreign policy, seemed to afford them the long-sought-for opportunity. Russell, at that time, had given notice of one of his tomtit parliamentary reform motions. But upon Canning's stern declaration that he should oppose Parliamentary reform to the end of his life, up rose Lord John in great haste and withdrew his motion, declaring that

"Parliamentary reform was a question on which there was a great diversity of opinion among those who advocated it, and to which the leaders of the Whigs were always unwilling to be pledged as to a party

question. It was now for *the last time* that he brought forward this question. The people no longer wished for reform."

While sitting at Canning's back, he, who had made a merit of his noisy opposition to Castlereagh's six gagging acts,¹¹⁶ refrained from voting on Mr. Hume's motion for the repeal of one of those six acts which made a man liable to banishment for life for uttering in print anything which had even a "tendency" to bring either house of Parliament into contempt. Thus, at the conclusion of the first period of his parliamentary life, we find him fully concurring with the opinion of that Whig prototype, Horace Walpole, that "popular bills are never really proposed but as an engine of party, and not as a pledge for the realisation of any such extravagant ideas".

It was, then, by no means Lord J. Russell's fault that the motion for Parliamentary reform, instead of being brought forward for the "last" time in 1827, was to make its reappearance four years later, on March 1st, 1831, in the shape of the famous bill. This bill, which he still exhibits as his great claim to the admiration of the world in general, and the gratitude of the English nation in particular, he had not even the merit of being the author of. In its principal features—the breaking up of the nomination boroughs, the addition of county members, the enfranchisement of copyholders, lease-holders,¹¹⁷ and some of the chief commercial towns—it was copied from the Reform Bill which Lord Grey (the chief of the Reform Ministry in 1831) had moved in the House of Commons as far back as the year 1797, and which he had taken good care to drop when a member of the Fox Cabinet in 1806. It was the identical bill, slightly modified.

The ejection of Wellington from office, because he had declared against Reform; the French Revolution of July; the threatening political unions formed by the middling and working classes at Birmingham, Manchester, London, and elsewhere; the rural war; the "bonfires" all over the most fertile counties of England¹¹⁸ ("Out of the fires came the Reform," says a celebrated writer)—all these circumstances absolutely compelled the Whigs to propose some measure of Reform. It was their only means of rushing into office. They gave way grudgingly, slowly, and after vainly reiterated

efforts at one time to shuffle out of the only liberal clauses of their own measure, and again to abandon it altogether, and to keep their places by a compromise with the Tories. They were prevented by the formidable attitude of the people, and the uncompromising opposition of the Tories. Hardly, however, had the Reform Bill become law, and begun to work, when, to quote Mr. Bright's words, "the people began to feel that they had been cheated". Never, perhaps, had a mighty, and, to all appearances, successful popular movement been turned into such a mock result. Not only were the working classes altogether excluded from any political influence, but the middle classes themselves discovered that Lord Althorp, the soul of the Reform cabinet, had not used a rhetorical figure when telling his Tory adversaries that.

"the Reform Bill was the most aristocratic act ever offered to the nation".

The new country representation still largely preponderated over that of the towns. The franchise of the tenants-at-will occupying at an annual value of £50, rendered the counties, still more efficiently than before, the tools of the aristocracy. The substitution of the £10 householders for the payers of scot and lot, actually disfranchised a great number of former town voters. The new arrangements were, on the whole, calculated not for increasing middle-class influence, but for the exclusion of Tory and the promotion of Whig patronage. By a series of the most extraordinary tricks, frauds, and juggles, the inequality of the electoral districts was maintained, the monstrous disproportion between representation and constituency reconstructed. If some fifty-six rotten boroughs, each with a handful of inhabitants, were extinguished, whole counties and populous towns were transformed into rotten boroughs. Lord John Russell himself confesses, in his letter to the electors of Stroud, on the principles of the Reform Act, that "the £10 franchise was fettered by regulation, and the annual registration was made a source of vexation and expense". Intimidation and patronage, where they could not be perpetuated, were replaced by bribery, which, from the passage of the Reform Bill, became the main prop of the British Constitution. Such was the Reform of

which Lord John was the mouthpiece, but not the author. The only clauses since proved to be due to his invention are that which compels all freeholders,¹¹⁹ except parsons, to have had a year of possession, and the other clause preserving Tavistock, the family rotten borough of the Russells. Russell was but a subordinate member of the Reform Ministry, without a vote in the cabinet, viz.: Paymaster of the Forces, from November 1830 to November 1834. He was, perhaps, the most insignificant man among them. But from his being the son of the mighty Duke of Bedford he was singled out for the honour of introducing the bill into the House of Commons.

Beside the Reform Bill discussion, Lord John distinguished himself by the acrimony and virulence with which he opposed all inquiry into the pension-list. Some years later, when all the prominent members of the original Reform cabinet, having been removed to the Lords, died out, or separated from the Whigs, Lord John not only entered upon their inheritance, but soon passed in the eyes of the country as the natural father of the bill of which he had been but the godfather by courtesy. On bringing in the Reform Bill, he said:

"There can be no doubt that the *ballot* has much to recommend it; the arguments which I have heard advanced in its favour are as ingenious as any that I ever heard on any subject." As to Short Parliaments, "that was a question of the utmost importance, which he left to be brought before the House by some other member at a future time, in order not to embarrass the great subject with details".

On the 7th June, 1833, he pretended to have

"refrained from bringing forward those two measures in order to avoid a collision with the Lords, although opinions deeply seated in his heart. He was convinced of their being most essential to the happiness, prosperity and welfare of this country".

Whether in consequence of this deeply-seated conviction or not, he proved during his whole ministerial career the constant and relentless adversary of the ballot and Short Parliaments. But when these declarations were made they served as expedients, in the first place, to allay the suspicious democrats in the House of Commons, and in the second, to frighten the refractory aristocrats in the House of Lords.

But as soon as he had got possession of the new Court of Queen Victoria and fancied himself an immortal place-holder, out he came with his declaration of November, 1837, wherein he justified the "extreme" length to which the "Reform Bill had gone" on the plea of barring the possibility of ever going further. He stated coolly that

"the object of the Reform Bill was to increase the predominance of the landed interest, and it was intended as a *permanent settlement* of a great constitutional question".

From this finality statement he earned the *soubriquet* of Finality-John. But this finality was as false a pretence as his reform itself. It is true, he resisted Hume's motion for Parliamentary Reform in 1848. With the combined forces of Whigs, Tories, and Peelites, he again defeated Hume on a similar motion in 1849. Emboldened by his conservative army of reserve, he then most haughtily spoke to the purport that

"in framing and proposing the Reform Bill, what we wished was to adapt the representation of this House to the other powers of the State, and keep it in harmony with the Constitution. Mr. Bright and those who agree with him are so exceedingly narrow-minded, they have intellect and understanding bound up in such a narrow round, that it is quite impossible to get them to understand the great principles on which our ancestors founded the Constitution of the country, and which we, their successors, humbly admire and endeavour to follow. The existing system, though somewhat anomalous, worked well: the better for the anomalies."

However, being defeated in 1851 in his opposition to Locke King's bill for extending the country franchise to £10 occupiers, and even forced to resign for some days, Lord John suddenly made up his large mind on the necessity of a new Reform Bill. He did not state what his measure was to be, but he gave a promissory note payable at the next session of Parliament. How this move was judged of by his own confederates may be seen from *The Westminster Review*:

"The pretence of the present Ministry to office had become a byword of scorn and reproach; and at length, when its exclusion and party annihilation seemed imminent, forth comes Lord John with the promise of a new Reform Bill for 1852. Keep me in office, he says, till that time, and I will satisfy your longings by a large and liberal measure of reform. The Reformers of the House of Commons yielded to that reasoning."

In 1852 he indeed proposed a Reform Bill, this time of his own invention, but of such Lilliputian features that neither the Conservatives thought it worthwhile to attack nor the Liberals to support it. Still, it afforded the little man a pretext when resigning his ministry for throwing in his flight a Scythian dart at Lord Derby, by uttering the pompous threat that he would "insist on the extension of the suffrage". Hardly out of office, this child of expediency, now emphatically called by his own followers Foul-Weather Jack, summoned to his private residence at Cheshamplace the different sections of the Liberal Party to make solemn asseverations of his own large-mindedness, and to hand to them another promissory bill of a larger amount of reform. When a member of the Coalition Cabinet, he amused the House with a Reform Bill which he knew would prove another Iphigenia, to be sacrificed by himself, another Agamemnon, for the benefit of another Trojan war. He performed the sacrifice indeed in true melodramatic style, his eyes filled with tears, but these soon passed away.

Another of the false pretences on which he sought a niche in the temple of fame was his efforts on behalf of Ireland. Since the anti-Jacobin war, the Whigs, feeling themselves at an extremely low ebb in England, endeavoured to fortify their position by an offensive and defensive alliance with Ireland. Stepping into office in 1806, they introduced and carried through the second reading a small Irish Emancipation Bill, which they then withdrew to flatter the bigot idiocy of George III. Before and during the Reform agitation they fawned upon O'Connell, and the hopes raised in Ireland served them as powerful engines of party. Yet their first act at the first meeting of the Reformed Parliament was a declaration of civil war against Ireland, a "brutal and bloody measure", the Irish Coercion "Red-Coat Tribunal Bill", according to which men were to be tried in Ireland by military officers, instead of by Judges and Juries. O'Connell was prosecuted for sedition. The Whigs fulfilled their ancient promises with "fire, imprisonment, transportation and even with death". They carried, however, the Coercion Bill only on the express stipulation that they would bring in and carry an Irish Church bill, with a clause stipulating that a certain

portion of the revenues of the Established Church in Ireland should be placed at the disposal of Parliament, with the view to employ it for the benefit of Ireland. This clause was important from acknowledging the principle that Parliament had the power of expropriating the Established Church, a principle John Russell ought to be convinced of, the whole immense property of his family being formed of church plunder. Having engaged to stand or fall by that bill, they hastened, on the ground of avoiding a collision with the Lords, to take out that very clause, the only part in the bill of any value at all. They then voted against and defeated their own measure. But when Peel came in, at the end of 1834, their Irish sympathisers were roused again as by an electric shock. John Russell was the principal agent in bringing about, in 1835, the Lichfield House compact,¹²⁰ through which the Whigs surrendered to O'Connell the Irish patronage, and O'Connell secured to them the Irish votes. But there was wanting a pretext for ejecting the Tories. John, with characteristic impudence, chose as battle-field the Ecclesiastical Revenues of Ireland. He attacked and turned out Sir Robert Peel because of his resistance to that very clause, now called the appropriation clause, which the Reform Ministry themselves had abandoned. The Melbourne cabinet was formed, and Lord John became leader in the House of Commons. He now began to boast on the one hand of his mental firmness, because although now in office he still adhered to his opinions on the appropriation clause; and on the other hand of his moral moderation in not acting upon those same opinions. He never acted upon them. In 1846, when Premier, he contrived to get rid of the opinions too. He professed that he could not conceive a more fatal measure than the disestablishment of the Church, and declined to take any further notice of the project of 1835.

In February 1833, John Russell as a member of the Reform Ministry denounced Irish Repeal, and stated that the real object of the agitation was

"to overturn at once the United Parliament, and to establish, in place of King, Lords, and Commons of the United Kingdom, some parliament of which Mr. O'Connell was to be the leader and the chief".

In February 1834, the Repeal agitation was again denounced in the King's speech, and the Reform Ministry proposed an address

"to record in the most solemn manner the fixed determination of Parliament to maintain unimpaired and undisturbed the legislative union".

Immediately on being shifted to the opposition benches, the very same John Russell declared that,

"with respect to the repeal of the union, the subject was open to amendment or question, like any other act of the Legislature".

In March 1846, Lord J. Russell in strange alliance with the Tories, then burning with the passion to punish Peel for the repeal of the Corn Laws, broke up Peel's administration by an unconditional opposition to their Irish Arms Bill. He became Premier, and the first act of his Government was an attempt to renew that same bill. In 1844 he had denounced Peel for "having filled Ireland with troops, and with not governing but militarily occupying that country". In 1848 he occupied Ireland militarily, passed the felony acts, proclaimed the suspension of the habeas corpus, and gloried in the vigorous measures of the Clarendon reign.

Let us now look at his free-trade pretences. The Corn Laws had been enacted in 1815, by the concurrence of Tories and Whigs. At the parliamentary elections of 1835 and 1837, John Russell stigmatised Corn Law reform as "mischievous, absurd, impracticable and unnecessary". Since he came into office he had resisted all such demands, "at first contemptuously, and then vehemently". He was a more thorough advocate for high Corn duties than Sir Robert Peel. During the prospect of dearth (1838-39), he and Melbourne did not contemplate any alterations in the existing duties. The deficit, however, in the Whig exchequer rising to £7,500,000, and Palmerston's foreign policy threatening to involve England in a war with France, induced the House of Commons to pass, on June 4, 1841, upon the motion of Sir Robert Peel, a vote of no-confidence in the Melbourne cabinet. The Whigs, always as eager to grasp at places as unable to fill and unwilling to leave them, endeavoured, although in vain, to escape their fate by a dissolution of Parliament. Then in the

deep soul of Lord John awoke the idea of stultifying the Anti-Corn Law agitation, as he had hoped to stultify the Reform movement. He declared himself all at once in favour of a moderate fixed duty—friend of moderate political chastity and of moderate reforms as he is. He had even the effrontery to parade himself through the streets of London in a procession of the Government candidates carrying banners, on which were exhibited in contrast two loaves, a loaf of a two-penny size inscribed the Peel Loaf, and a loaf of a 1s. size inscribed the Russell Loaf. The nation, however, knew from experience that the Whigs were wont to promise bread and to give stones, and, notwithstanding Russell's ridiculous street theatricals, the new election left the Whig cabinet in a minority of 76, and they were forced to decamp at last.

During the years 1841-45, the Anti-Corn Law League became formidable. In the autumn of 1845, it found new and terrible allies in the famine in Ireland, the corn-dearth in England, and the failure of the harvest all over Europe. Sir Robert Peel therefore at the end of October, and between the 1st and the 6th November, held a series of cabinet councils, in which he proposed the suspension of the Corn Laws, and even hinted at the necessity of repealing them altogether. A delay in the resolutions of the cabinet was caused by the unexpected resistance of Lord Stanley, the colleague of Sir Robert Peel. John Russell, then on a pleasure trip at Edinburgh, got scent of what passed in Peel's cabinet council. He resolved at once to improve the delay caused by Stanley's opposition, to cheat Peel out of a popular position by anticipating him, to give himself the appearance of having forced Free Trade upon Peel, and thus deprive the acts of his rival of all their moral weight. Accordingly, on November 22, 1845, he addressed from Edinburgh a letter to his city electors full of malignant imputations against Sir Robert Peel, on the pretext that the cabinet was adjourning its action concerning the Irish distress. The periodical Irish famines of 1831, '35, '37 and '39, had never induced Lord John and his colleagues so much as to reconsider the Corn Laws. But now he was all fire. Such a terrible disaster as the famine of two nations conjured nothing before the eyes of that little man but visions of claptraps against his rival

place-holder. In his letter he tried to conceal the real motive of his sudden conversion to Free Trade under a shabby confession, sneered at in all England:

"I confess that on the general subject my views have, in the course of twenty years, undergone a great alteration. I used to be of opinion that corn was an exception to the general rules of political economy; but observation and experience have convinced me that we ought to abstain from all interference with the supply of food."

In the same letter, the little man urged that it was the duty of Sir Robert Peel to interfere with the supply of food for Ireland.

Lord John Russell is supposed to have opened his career with efforts for religious tolerance, and closed it with the anti-Popery cry. It is true that he brought forward in 1828 a motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; but, as we learn from a contemporaneous author, "*to the astonishment* of the mover himself, the motion was carried by a majority of 44". The acts had, in fact, become a dead letter, and the Tory Ministry that carried, in the year after, the Catholic Emancipation Bill, was glad to get rid of the Dissenters' disabilities. Russell defended his measure on the ground that "he was fully convinced that it would tend to the security of the Church of England as by law established". When in office, he always opposed the separation of Church and State—the great thing the Dissenters prayed for. He even opposed the small concession of abolishing the church-rates. His anti-Popery cry is still more characteristic of the shallowness of the man and the littleness of his motives. We have seen that in 1848 and 1849 he baffled the reform motions of his allies by the support of the Tories. His tenure of office, therefore, had become very precarious, because dependent on the sufferance of his opponents. Such was his position in 1850, at the time when the Pope's bull for the erection of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England and the nomination of Cardinal Wiseman to the Archbishopric of Westminster was creating a factitious excitement among the shallow-headed, stupid and hypocritical portion of the English people. As to John himself, the Pope did not take him by surprise. His father-in-law, Lord Minto, was still at Rome when the *Roman Gazette* in January 1848, published

the nomination of Wiseman to the Archbishopric. We know further, from Wiseman's letter to the English people, that the same Lord Minto had in the same year shown to him by the Pope the bull for the establishment of the hierarchy in England. Under Russell's Premiership Clarendon and Grey had officially given the Catholic Bishops in Ireland and the Colonies the titles they pretended to. In 1845, when out of office, John Russell declared:

"I believe that we may repeal those disallowing clauses which prevent a Roman Catholic Bishop from assuming a title held by a Bishop of the Establishment. Nothing can be more *absurd and puerile* than to keep such distinctions."

But now, considering the weakness of his Cabinet, recollecting that the Whig cabinet of 1807 had been expelled by the anti-Popery cry, fearing lest Lord Stanley might be tempted to imitate Perceval's example and outgeneral him during the recess of Parliament, as he had endeavoured to outgeneral Peel by his own Edinburgh letter, he flew suddenly into an unbounded Protestant passion, and addressed his scurrilous letter to the Bishop of Durham on the 4th November, 1850—just the day before the anniversary of Guy Fawkes. In this letter he tells the Bishop:

"I agree with you in considering the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism as insolent and insidious, and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject."

He speaks of "the laborious endeavours which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul". He calls the Catholic ceremonies "mummeries of superstition, upon which the great mass of the nation looks with contempt"; and he finally promises to enact new laws against the Papal assumption, in case the old ones should not prove sufficient. In 1851 he brought forward his Ecclesiastical Titles Bill¹²¹; but, being beaten on Locke King's motion, by a combination of the Irish Brigade with the Radicals, Manchester men and Peelites, he recanted and promised an alteration of his bill, which died of consumption before it had come out of the House. Some months later, being ejected from office, he fawned again on what he had called the Pope's minions.

As his anti-Popery zeal was a false pretence, so was his Jewish Emancipation zeal. His Jewish Disabilities bill has obtained reputation as an annual farce enacted to secure to Lord John the city votes at the disposal of the Austrian Baron Rothschild. His colonial reforms, educational schemes, anti-slavery moves, were false pretences all.

"Your opposition," writes Lord Brougham to him in 1839, "to all the motions in favour of the Negroes, and your resistance even to the attempts for stopping the newly established slave trade, widened the breach between you and the country. The fancy that the opposers of all the motions on the slave trade in 1838, the enemies of every interference with the Assemblies, should all of a sudden have become so enamoured of the Negro cause as almost to risk their tenure of place upon a bill for its furtherance in 1839, would argue a strange aptitude for being gulled."

His legal Reform attempts—false pretences! After the expulsion of the Melbourne cabinet had become imminent, upon the vote of no-confidence passed against them on June 4, 1841, John Russell endeavoured to hurry through the House a Chancery bill, in order

"to remedy one of the most urgent evils of our legal system, the delays in the Courts of Equity, by the creation of two new Equity Judges".

He announced this bill as "a large installment of legal reform". His real intention was to appoint two of his followers to places in a tribunal not yet created before the Tories had yet come in. Sir Edward Sugden, to ward him off, carried a motion that the bill should not take effect before the 10th of October. Although no change whatever was made in the substance of his large and most urgent Legal Reform installment, John Russell, without any kind of excuse, threw up the whole bill at once. His tenderness for the liberty of the subject, his belief in the public press, and, as we have lately seen and shown, his warlike enthusiasm and his peace-loving moderation—false pretences, all!

The whole man is one false pretence, his whole life one great lie, his whole activity a chain of minute intrigues for shabby ends, the swallowing of the public money and the usurpation of the mere show of power. No other man has verified to such a degree the truth of the Biblical axiom that no man is able to add one inch to his natural height.

Placed by birth, connections and social accidents on a colossal pedestal, he always remained the same *homunculus*—a malignant and distorted dwarf on the top of a pyramid. The history of the world exhibits, perhaps, no other man so great in littleness.

Written by K. Marx
in August 1855

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 4479,
August 28, 1855
and an enlarged version
in *Neue Oder-Zeitung*,
August 4, 7, 8, 10 and 15, 1855

Printed according to the
text of the *New-York
Daily Tribune*

KARL MARX

**SPEECH AT THE ANNIVERSARY
OF THE "PEOPLE'S PAPER"**

DELIVERED IN LONDON, APRIL 14, 1856¹²²

The so-called Revolutions of 1848 were but poor incidents—small fractures and fissures in the dry crust of European society. However, they denounced the abyss. Beneath the apparently solid surface, they betrayed oceans of liquid matter, only needing expansion to rend into fragments continents of hard rock. Noisily and confusedly they proclaimed the emancipation of the Proletarian, i.e., the secret of the nineteenth century, and of the revolution of that century.

That social revolution, it is true, was no novelty invented in 1848. Steam, electricity, and the self-acting mule were revolutionists of a rather more dangerous character than even citizens Barbès, Raspail and Blanqui. But, although the atmosphere in which we live, weighs upon everyone with a 20,000 lb, force, do you feel it? No more than European society before 1848 felt the revolutionary atmosphere enveloping and pressing it from all sides.

There is one great fact, characteristic of this our nineteenth century, a fact which no party dares deny. On the one hand, there have started into life industrial and scientific forces, which no epoch of the former human history had ever suspected. On the other hand, there exist symptoms of decay, far surpassing the horrors recorded of the latter times of the Roman Empire.

In our days everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and overworking it. The new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem to be bought by the loss of character. At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance. All our invention and progress seem to result in endowing material forces with intellectual life, and in stultifying human life into a material force. This antagonism between modern industry and science on the one hand, modern misery and dissolution on the other hand; this antagonism between the productive powers and the social relations of our epoch is a fact, palpable, overwhelming, and not to be controverted. Some parties may wail over it; others may wish to get rid of modern arts, in order to get rid of modern conflicts. Or they may imagine that so signal a progress in industry wants to be completed by as signal a regress in politics. On our part, we do not mistake the shape of the shrewd spirit that continues to mark all these contradictions. We know that to work well the new-fangled forces of society, they only want to be mastered by new-fangled men—and such are the working men. They are as much the invention of modern time as machinery itself. In the signs that bewilder the middle class, the aristocracy and the poor prophets of regression, we do recognise our brave friend, Robin Goodfellow, the old mole that can work in the earth so fast, that worthy pioneer—the Revolution. The English working men are the first-born sons of modern industry. They will then, certainly, not be the last in aiding the social revolution produced by that industry, a revolution, which means the emancipation of their own class all over the world, which is as universal as capital-rule and wages-slavery. I know the heroic struggles the English working class have gone through since the middle of the last century—struggles less glorious, because they are shrouded in obscurity, and burked by the middle-class historian. To revenge the misdeeds of the ruling class, there existed in the

Middle Ages, in Germany, a secret tribunal, called the "*Uehmgericht*". If a red cross was seen marked on a house, people knew that its owner was doomed by the "*Uehm*". All the houses of Europe are now marked with the mysterious red cross. History is the judge—its executioner, the proletarian.

Published in *The People's Paper*
No. 207, April 19, 1856

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

[ANGLO-PERSIAN WAR]

The declaration of war against Persia, by England or rather by the East India Company,¹²³ is the reproduction of one of those cunning and reckless tricks of Anglo-Asiatic diplomacy, by virtue of which England has extended her possessions on that Continent. So soon as the Company casts a greedy look on any of the independent sovereigns, or on any region whose political and commercial resources or whose gold and jewels are valued, the victim is accused of having violated this or that ideal or actual convention, transgressed an imaginary promise or restriction, committed some nebulous outrage, and then war is declared, and the eternity of wrong, the perennial force of the fable of the wolf and the lamb, is again incarnadined in national history.

For many years England has coveted a position in the Persian Gulf, and above all the possession of the Island of Kareg, situated in the northern part of those waters. The celebrated Sir John Malcolm, several times Ambassador to Persia, expatiated on the value of that island to England, and affirmed that it could be made one of her most flourishing establishments in Asia, being in the neighbourhood of Bushire, Bandar Rig, Basra, Grien Barberia and Elkatif. Accordingly, the island and Bushire are already in the possession of England. Sir John considered it a central point for the commerce of Turkey, Arabia and Persia. The

climate is excellent, and it contains all the facilities for becoming a flourishing spot. The Ambassador more than thirty-five years ago submitted his observations to Lord Minto, then Governor-General, and both sought to carry out the scheme. Sir John, in fact, received the command of an expedition to take the island, and had already set out, when he received orders to return to Calcutta, and Sir Harford Jones was sent on a diplomatic mission to Persia. During the first siege of Herat by Persia, in 1837-38, England, under the same ephemeral pretence as now—that is, to defend the Afghans, with whom she has constantly a deadly feud—seized upon Kareg, but was forced by circumstances, by the interference of Russia, to surrender her prey. The lately renewed and successful attempt of Persia against Herat has afforded England an occasion to accuse the Shah of violation of good faith toward her, and to take the island as a first step toward hostilities.

Thus, for half a century, England has striven continually, but rarely with success, to establish her preponderance in the Cabinet of the Persian Shahs. The latter, however, are a match for their wheedling foes, and squirm out of such treacherous embraces. Aside from having under their eyes English dealings in India, the Persians very likely keep in view this advice, given to Feth Ali Shah, in 1805: "Distrust the counsel of a nation of greedy merchants, which in India traffics with the lives and crowns of sovereigns." Set a thief to catch a thief. In Teheran, the capital of Persia, English influence is very low; for, not counting Russian intrigues there, France occupies a prominent standing, and of the three flibusters, Persia may most dread of the British. At the present moment an embassy from Persia is on the way to or has already reached Paris, and there very likely the Persian complication will be the subject of diplomatic disputes. France, indeed, is not indifferent to the occupation of the island in the Persian Gulf. The question is rendered yet more knotty by the fact that France disentombs some buried parchment by which Kareg has already been twice ceded to her by the Persian Shahs—one so far back as in 1708, under Louis XIV, and then in 1808—on both occasions conditionally, it is true, but in terms sufficient to constitute

some rights, or justify pretensions from the present imitator of those sovereigns, who were sufficiently anti-English.

In a recent answer to the *Journal des Débats*, the London *Times* gives up in the name of England to France every pretension to the leadership in European affairs, reserving for the English nation the indisputed direction of the affairs of Asia and America, where no other European power must interfere. It may, nevertheless, be doubted if Louis Bonaparte will accept this division of the world. At any rate, French diplomacy in Teheran during the late misunderstandings did not heartily support England; and the French press exhuming and ventilating Gallic pretensions to Kareg seems to foreshadow that England will not find it an easy game to attack and dismember Persia.

Written by K. Marx
on October 30, 1856

Published as a leading
article in the *New-York*
Daily Tribune No. 4904,
January 7, 1857

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

THE ENGLISH ELECTION

London, March 20, 1857

The coming historian who is to write the history of Europe from 1848 to 1858, will be struck by the similarity of the appeal made to France by Bonaparte in 1851 and the appeal to the United Kingdom made by Palmerston in 1857. Both pretended to appeal from Parliament to the nation, from treacherous party coalition to the unsophisticated public mind. Both set forth analogous pleas. If Bonaparte was to save France from a social, Palmerston is to save England from an international crisis. Palmerston, like Bonaparte, is to vindicate the necessity of a strong executive against the empty talk and the intermeddling importunity of the legislative power. Bonaparte addressed himself at once to the conservatives¹²⁴ and the revolutionists; to the former as the enemy of the aristocrats, to the latter as the enemy of middle-class usurpation. Palmerston, has he not insulted every despotic Government? Can he be obnoxious to any liberal? On the other hand, has he not betrayed every revolution? Must he not be the chosen of the conservatives? He opposed every reform, and the conservatives should not stand by him! He keeps the Tories out of office, and the liberal place-hunters should desert him! Bonaparte bears a name terrible to the foreigner, and identical with French glory. And does not Palmerston do the same with respect to the United Kingdom? At least, save some slight interruptions, he has kept the Foreign Office

since 1830, since the days of reformed England, and, therefore, since the beginning of its modern history. Consequently, the international existence of England, however "terrible" or "glorious" it may happen to appear to foreign eyes, centres in the person of Lord Palmerston. Bonaparte by one stroke set at naught all the official great men of France, and does Palmerston not "kick into atoms" the Russells, the Grahams, the Gladstones, the Roebucks, the Cobdens, the Disraelis, and *tutti quanti*? Bonaparte stood on no principle, he had no impediment, but he promised to give the country what it wanted, a man. And so does Palmerston. He is a man. His worst enemies dare not accuse him of being a principle.

The regime of the Assemblée Legislative—was it not the regime of a coalition composed of Legitimists and Orleanists,¹²⁵ with a sprinkling of bourgeois Republicans? Their very coalition proved the dissolution of the parties they represented, while the old party traditions did not allow them to merge in any but a negative unity. Such a negative unit is unfit for action; its acts can only be negative; it can only stop the way; hence the power of Bonaparte. Is the case not the same with Palmerston? The Parliament that has sat since 1852, was it not a coalition Parliament? and was it, therefore, from the outset, not incarnated in a Coalition Cabinet? The Assemblée Nationale, when it was forcibly shut up by Bonaparte, ceased to possess a working majority. So did the House of Commons when Palmerston proclaimed its final dissolution. But here the simile ends. Bonaparte made his *coup d'état* before he appealed to the nation. Restrained by constitutional fetters, Palmerston must appeal to the nation before he attempts a *coup d'état*. In this respect it cannot be denied all the odds are on the side of Bonaparte. The massacres of Paris, the dragonnades in the provinces, the general state of siege, the proscriptions and deportations *en masse*, the bayonet placed behind and the cannon placed before the electoral urn, gave to the argumentations of the Bonapartist press (the only one not swept away by the December deluge) a sinister eloquence which its shallow sophistry, its abominable logic, and its nauseous floridness of adulation, were unable to deprive of

persuasive force. Palmerston's case, on the contrary, grows the weaker the more his myrmidons inflate their lungs. Great diplomatist as he is, he has forgotten to bid his slaves be aware of the prescript of the lame who liked to lead the blind, to impress upon them Talleyrand's "*pas de zèle*". And, indeed, they have overdone their part. Take, for instance, the following diphrymbic uttered by a metropolitan organ:

"Palmerston for ever! is a cry which we hope to hear resounded from every hustings. . . . The most devoted allegiance to Lord Palmerston is the first tenet to be insisted upon in the profession of faith of every candidate. . . . It is indispensable that liberal candidates will be compelled to admit that Lord Palmerston as Premier is a political necessity of the hour. It is requisite that he should be recognised as the man of the time, not only as the coming man, but as the man that has come; not only as the man for the crisis, but as the man and the only living man for those conjunctures which are evidently impending upon our country. . . . He is the idol of the hour, the pet of the people, the ascending as well as the risen sun."¹²⁶

No wonder that John Bull should prove reluctant to stand this, and that a reaction against the Palmerstonian fever should have set in.

Palmerston's person being proclaimed a policy, no wonder that his adversaries have made it a policy to sift his person. Indeed, we find that Palmerston, as if by magic, has worked the revival from the dead of all the fallen grandeurs of parliamentary England. In proof of this assertion, the spectacle of Lord John Russell's (the Whig's) appearance before the metropolitan electors assembled at the London Tavern; the exhibition made by Sir James Graham, the Peelite, before his Carlisle constituency; and lastly, the performance of Richard Cobden, the representative of the Manchester School, before the crowded meeting in the Free-Trade Hall at Manchester. Palmerston has not acted like Hercules. He has not killed a giant by lifting him up to the air,¹²⁷ but he has reinvigorated dwarfs by throwing them back upon the earth. If any man had sunk in public estimation, it was certainly Lord John Russell, the father of all legislative abortions, the hero of expediency, the negotiator of Vienna,¹²⁸ the man in whose hand everything fatally dwindled to nothingness. Now look at

his triumphal appearance before the London electors. Whence this change? It resulted simply from the circumstances in which Palmerston had put him. I, he said, am the father of the Test and Corporation Act, of the parliamentary Reform Bill, of the municipal corporation reform, of the tithes-question's settlement,¹²⁹ of some liberal acts with respect to the Dissenters, of others with respect to Ireland. In one word, I engross the substance of whatever was progressive in Whig policy. Are you to sacrifice me to a man who represents Whigism Minus its popular elements, who represents Whigism not as a political party, but only as a place-hunting faction? And then he turned his very shortcomings to his advantage. I have always been an adversary of the ballot. Do you expect me now, because I am proscribed by Palmerston, to degrade myself by recanting my convictions and by pledging myself to radical reforms? No, shouted his auditory. Lord John ought at this moment not to be pledged to the ballot. It is greatness in the little man to confess himself, under present circumstances, a bit-by-bit reformer. Three cheers, and one more for John Russell without the ballot! And then he gave the last turn to the scale, by asking his audience whether they would allow a small coterie of opium dealers, at the bidding of Palmerston, to constitute themselves into an electioneering body to impose their government-hatched conclusions on the free electors of the metropolis, and to proscribe himself, Lord John Russell, their friend of 16 years' standing, at the bidding of Palmerston! No, no, shouted the auditory—down with the Coterie! Long life to Lord John Russell! And he is now likely not only to be returned, but to head the poll in London.

The case of Sir James Graham was still more curious. If Lord John Russell had become ridiculous, Graham had become contemptible. But, said he to his Carlisle constituents, shall I be snuffed out like a candle that is burned down to the socket, or shall I slink sway like a dog hunted off a race-course, because, once in my life, I acted conscientiously, and risked rather my political position than stoop to the dictation of a man? You have returned me as your representative in spite of all my infamies. Are you to dismiss me for one

single good action I have committed? Certainly not, rehearsed the Carlisle electors.

In contradistinction to Russell and Graham, Mr. Cobden had, at Manchester, not to confront his own electors, but the electors of Bright and Gibson. He spoke not for himself, but for the Manchester School. His position waxed from this circumstance. The Palmerstonian cry at Manchester was more factitious than at any other place. The interests of the industrial capitalists differ essentially from those of the opium-smuggling merchants of London and Liverpool. The opposition raised at Manchester against Bright and Gibson was not founded upon the material interests of the community, while the cry raised for Palmerston was antagonistic to all its traditions. It proceeded from two sources—from the high-priced press, endeavouring to revenge itself for the abolition of the newspaper stamp and the reduction of the advertisement duty,¹³⁰ and from that portion of rich and snobbish manufacturers who, jealous of the political eminency of Bright, try at playing the bourgeois gentil-hommes, and think that it would be fashionable and *bon ton* to rally under the aristocratic banner of Palmerston rather than under the sober programme of Bright. This peculiar character of the Palmerstonian coterie at Manchester enabled Cobden, for the first time since the Anti-Corn Law League agitation, to take up again the position of a plebeian leader and to summon again the labouring classes to his banners. Masterly he improved that circumstance. The high ground he took up in his attack upon Palmerston may be judged from the following extract:

"Well, now there is a great question involved in this, which I think the people of this country ought to take very much to heart. Do you want the members of the House of Commons to look after your interests, and watch the expenditure—[yes, yes]—and to guard you from getting into needless and expensive wars? [Yes.] Well, but you are not going the right way to work, if what I learn in your newspapers is going to be verified in the course of the election, for I am told that those members who joined in that vigilant care of your interests, and voted according to the evidence before us on the question of that war are all to be ostracised—sent into private life—and that you are going to send up other men—[no, no]—to do what? to look after your interests? No! to go and do the humble dirty work of the minister of the hour. [Loud cheers.] In fact, that you are going to constitute Lord Palmerston the

despotic ruler of this country. [No, no.] Well, but if he is not checked by Parliament—if the moment Parliament does check him he dissolves Parliament, and instead of sending up men who are independent enough to assert their and your rights, you send up mere creatures of his will, what is that but investing him with the powers of a despot? Ay, and let me tell you that it is a despotism of the clumsiest, most expensive kind, and at the same time the most irresponsible on the face of the earth; because you surround the minister with the sham appearance of a representative form of government; you cannot get at him while he has got a Parliament beneath whose shield he can shelter himself; and if you don't do your duty in your elections in sending men up to the House of Commons who will vigilantly watch the minister of the day, then, I say, you are in a worse plight, because governed in a more irresponsible way than if under the King of Prussia or the Emperor of the French. [Loud cheers.]”

It will now be understood why Palmerston hurries on the elections. He can only vanquish by surprise, and time baffles surprise.

Written by K. Marx
on March 20, 1857

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 4980,
April 6, 1857

Printed according
to the newspaper text

FREDERICK ENGELS

PERSIA AND CHINA¹³¹

London, May 22, 1857

The English have just concluded an Asiatic war, and are entering upon another.¹³² The resistance offered by the Persians, and that which the Chinese have so far opposed to British invasion, form a contrast worth our attention. In Persia, the European system of military organisation has been engrafted upon Asiatic barbarity; in China, the rotting semi-civilisation of the oldest State in the world meets the Europeans with its own resources. Persia has been signally defeated, while distracted, half-dissolved China has hit upon a system of resistance which, if followed up, will render impossible repetition of the triumphal marches of the first Anglo-Chinese war.

Persia was in a state similar to that of Turkey during the war of 1828-29 against Russia.¹³³ English, French, Russian officers had in turns tried their hands at the organisation of the Persian army. One system had succeeded another, and each in its turn had been thwarted by the jealousy, the intrigues, the ignorance, the cupidity and corruption of the Orientals whom it was to form into European officers and soldiers. The new regular army had never had an opportunity of trying its organisation and strength in the field. Its only exploits had been confined to a few campaigns against Kurds, Turcomans and Afghans, where it served as a sort of nucleus or reserve to the numerous irregular cavalry of Persia. The latter did most of the actual fighting;

the regulars had generally but to impose upon the enemy by the demonstrative effect of their seemingly formidable arrays. At last, the war with England broke out.

The English attacked Bushire, and met with a gallant though ineffective resistance. But the men who fought at Bushire were not regulars; they were composed of the irregular levies of the Persian and Arab inhabitants of the coast. The regulars were only concentrating, some sixty miles off, in the hills. At last they advanced. The Anglo-Indian army met them half-way; and, though the Persians used their artillery with credit to themselves, and formed their squares on the most approved principles, a single charge of one single Indian cavalry regiment swept the whole Persian army, guards and line, from the field. And to know what these Indian regular cavalry are considered to be worth in their own service, we have only to refer to Capt. Nolan's book on the subject.¹³⁴ They are, among Anglo-Indian officers, considered worse than useless, and far inferior to the irregular Anglo-Indian cavalry. Not a single action can Capt. Nolan find where they were creditably engaged. And yet, these were the men, six hundred of whom drove ten thousand Persians before them! Such was the terror spread among the Persian regulars that never since have they made a stand anywhere—the artillery alone excepted. At Mohammerah, they kept out of harm's way, leaving the artillery to defend the batteries, and retired as soon as these were silenced; and when, on a reconnaissance, the British landed three hundred riflemen and fifty irregular horsemen, the whole of the Persian host marched off, leaving baggage, stores and guns in the possession of the—victors you cannot call them—the invaders.

All this, however, neither brands the Persians as a nation of cowards, nor condemns the introduction of European tactics among Orientals. The Russo-Turkish wars of 1806-12¹³⁵ and 1828-29 offer plenty of such examples. The principal resistance offered to the Russians was made by the irregular levies both from the fortified towns and from the mountain provinces. The regulars, wherever they showed themselves in the open field, were at once upset by the Russians, and very often ran away at the first shot;

while a single company of Arnaut¹³⁶ irregulars, in a ravine at Varna, successfully opposed the Russian siege operations for weeks together. Yet, during the late war, the Turkish regular army have defeated the Russians in every single engagement from Oltenitza and Cetata to Kars and to Ingur.¹³⁷

The fact is that the introduction of European military organisation with barbaric nations is far from being completed when the new army has been subdivided, equipped and drilled after the European fashion. That is merely the first step toward it. Nor will the enactment of some European military code suffice; it will no more ensure European discipline than a European set of drill regulations will produce, by itself, European tactics and strategy. The main point, and at the same time the main difficulty, is the creation of a body of officers and sergeants, educated on the modern European system, totally freed from the old national prejudices and reminiscences in military matters, and fit to inspire life into the new formation. This requires a long time, and is sure to meet with the most obstinate opposition from Oriental ignorance, impatience, prejudice, and the vicissitudes of fortune and favour inherent to Eastern courts. A Sultan or Shah is but too apt to consider his army equal to anything as soon as the men can defile in parade, wheel, deploy and form column without getting into hopeless disorder. And as to military schools, their fruits are so slow in ripening that under the instabilities of Eastern governments they can scarcely ever be expected to show any. Even in Turkey, the supply of educated officers is but scanty, and the Turkish army could not have done at all, during the late war, without the great number of renegades¹³⁸ and the European officers in its ranks.

The only arm which everywhere forms an exception is the artillery. Here the Orientals are so much at fault and so helpless that they have to leave the whole management to their European instructors. The consequence is that as in Turkey, so in Persia, the artillery was far ahead of the infantry and cavalry.

That under these circumstances the Anglo-Indian army, the oldest of all Eastern armies organised on the European

system, the only one that is subject not to an Eastern, but an exclusively European government, and officered almost entirely by Europeans—that this army, supported by a strong reserve of British troops and a powerful navy, should easily disperse the Persian regulars, is but a matter of course. The reverse will do the Persians the more good the more signal it was. They will now see, as the Turks have seen before, that European dress and parade-drill is no talisman in itself, and maybe, twenty years hence, the Persians will turn out as respectable as the Turks did in their late victories.

The troops which conquered Bushire and Mohammerah will, it is understood, be at once sent to China. There they will find a different enemy. No attempts at European evolutions, but the irregular array of Asiatic masses, will oppose them there. Of these they no doubt will easily dispose; but what if the Chinese wage against them a national war, and if barbarism be unscrupulous enough to use the only weapons which it knows how to wield?

There is evidently a different spirit among the Chinese now to what they showed in the war of 1840 to 1842. Then, the people were quiet; they left the Emperor's soldiers to fight the invaders, and submitted after a defeat with Eastern fatalism to the power of the enemy. But now, at least in the southern provinces, to which the contest has so far been confined, the mass of the people take an active, nay, a fanatical part in the struggle against the foreigners. They poison the bread of the European community at Hong-kong by wholesale, and with the coolest premeditation. (A few loaves have been sent to Liebig for examination. He found large quantities of arsenic pervading all parts of them, showing that it had already been worked into the dough. The dose, however, was so strong that it must have acted as an emetic, and thereby counteracted the effects of the poison.) They go with hidden arms on board trading steamers, and, when on the journey, massacre the crew and European passengers and seize the boat. They kidnap and kill every foreigner within their reach. The very coolies emigrating to foreign countries rise in mutiny, and, as if by concert, on board every emigrant ship, fight for its

possession, and, rather than surrender, go down to the bottom with it, or perish in its flames. Even out of China, the Chinese colonists, the most submissive and meek of subjects hitherto, conspire and suddenly rise in nightly insurrection, as at Sarawak; or, as at Singapore, are held down by main force and vigilance only. The piratical policy of the British Government has caused this universal outbreak of all Chinese against all foreigners, and marked it as a war of extermination.

What is an army to do against a people resorting to such means of warfare? Where, how far, is it to penetrate into the enemy's country, how to maintain itself there? Civilisation-mongers who throw hot shell on a defenceless city and add rape to murder, may call the system cowardly, barbarous, atrocious; but what matters it to the Chinese if it be only successful? Since the British treat them as barbarians, they cannot deny to them the full benefit of their barbarism. If their kidnappings, surprises, midnight massacres are what we call cowardly, the civilisation-mongers should not forget that according to their own showing they could not stand against European means of destruction with their ordinary means of warfare.

In short, instead of moralising on the horrible atrocities of the Chinese, as the chivalrous English press does, we had better recognise that this is war *pro aris et focis*, a popular war for the maintenance of Chinese nationality, with all its overbearing prejudice, stupidity, learned ignorance and pedantic barbarism if you like, but yet a popular war. And in a popular war the means used by the insurgent nation cannot be measured by the commonly recognised rules of regular warfare, nor by any other abstract standard, but by the degree of civilisation only attained by that insurgent nation.

The English are this time placed in a difficult position. Thus far, the national Chinese fanaticism seems to extend no further than over those southern provinces which have not adhered to the great rebellion.¹³⁹ Is the war to be confined to these? Then it would certainly lead to no result, no vital point of the Empire being menaced. At the same time, it would be a very dangerous war for the English if

the fanaticism extends to the people of the interior. Canton may be totally destroyed and the coasts nibbled at in all possible points, but all the forces the British could bring together would not suffice to conquer and hold the two provinces of Kwangtung and Kwangsi. What, then, can they do further? The country north of Canton, as far as Shanghai and Nanking, is in the hands of the Chinese insurgents, whom it would be bad policy to offend; and north of Nanking the only point an attack on which might lead to a decisive result is Peking. But where is the army to form a fortified and garrisoned base of operations on the shore, to overcome every obstacle on the road, to leave detachments to secure the communications with the shore, and to appear in anything like formidable strength before the walls of a town, the size of London, a hundred miles from its landing place? On the other side, a successful demonstration against the capital would shake to its groundworks the very existence of the Chinese Empire—accelerate the upsetting of the Ch'ing dynasty and pave the way, not for British, but for Russian progress.

The new Anglo-Chinese war presents so many complications that it is utterly impossible to guess the turn it may take. For some months the want of troops, and for a still longer time the want of decision, will keep the British pretty inactive except, perhaps, on some unimportant point, to which under actual circumstances Canton too may be said to belong.

One thing is certain, that the death-hour of old China is rapidly drawing nigh. Civil war has already divided the South from the North of the Empire, and the Rebel King seems to be as secure from the Imperialists (if not from the intrigues of his own followers) at Nanking, as the Heavenly Emperor from the rebels at Peking. Canton carries on, so far, a sort of independent war with the English, and all foreigners in general; and while British and French fleets and troops flock to Hongkong, slowly but steadily the Siberian-line Cossacks advance their stanitzas from the Daurian mountains to the banks of the Amur, and the Russian marines close in by fortifications the splendid harbours of Manchuria. The very fanaticism of the southern

Chinese in their struggle against foreigners seems to mark a consciousness of the supreme danger in which old China is placed; and before many years pass away, we shall have to witness the death-struggle of the oldest empire in the world, and the opening day of a new era for all Asia.

Written by F. Engels
about May 20, 1857

Published in the *New-York*
Daily Tribune No. 5032,
June 5, 1857

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

THE REVOLT IN THE INDIAN ARMY¹⁴⁰

The Roman *divide et impera* was the great rule by which Great Britain, for about one hundred and fifty years, contrived to retain the tenure of her Indian Empire. The antagonism of the various races, tribes, castes, creeds and sovereignties the aggregate of which forms the geographical unity of what is called India, continued to be the vital principle of British supremacy. In later times, however, the conditions of that supremacy have undergone a change. With the conquest of Scinde and the Punjab, the Anglo-Indian Empire had not only reached its natural limits, but it had trampled out the last vestiges of independent Indian states. All warlike native tribes were subdued, all serious internal conflicts were at an end, and the late incorporation of Oudh¹⁴¹ proved satisfactorily that the remnants of the so-called independent Indian principalities exist on sufferance only. Hence a great change in the position of the East India Company. It no longer attacked one part of India by the help of another part, but found itself placed at the head, and the whole of India at its feet. No longer conquering, it had become *the* conqueror. The armies at its disposition no longer had to extend its dominion, but only to maintain it. From soldiers they were converted into policemen; 200,000,000 natives being curbed by a native army of 200,000 men, officered by Englishmen, and that native army, in its turn, being kept in check by an

English army numbering 40,000 only. On first view, it is evident that the allegiance of the Indian people rests on the fidelity of the native army, in creating which the British rule simultaneously organised the first general centre of resistance which the Indian people was ever possessed of. How far that native army may be relied upon is clearly shown by its recent mutinies, breaking out as soon as the war with Persia had almost denuded the Presidency of Bengal of its European soldiers. Before this there had been mutinies in the Indian army, but the present revolt¹⁴² is distinguished by characteristic and fatal features. It is the first time that sepoy regiments have murdered their European officers; that Mussulmans and Hindus, renouncing their mutual antipathies, have combined against their common masters; that "disturbances beginning with the Hindus, have actually ended in placing on the throne of Delhi a Mohammedan Emperor"; that the mutiny has not been confined to a few localities; and lastly, that the revolt in the Anglo-Indian army has coincided with a general disaffection exhibited against English supremacy on the part of the great Asiatic nations, the revolt of the Bengal army being, beyond doubt, intimately connected with the Persian and Chinese wars.

The alleged cause of the dissatisfaction which began to spread four months ago in the Bengal army was the apprehension on the part of the natives lest the Government should interfere with their religion. The serving out of cartridges, the paper of which was said to have been greased with the fat of bullocks and pigs, and the compulsory biting of which was, therefore, considered by the natives as an infringement of their religious prescriptions, gave the signal for local disturbances. On the 22nd of January an incendiary fire broke out in cantonments a short distance from Calcutta. On the 25th of February the 19th Native Regiment mutinied at Berhampore, the men objecting to the cartridges served out to them. On the 31st of March that regiment was disbanded; at the end of March the 34th Sepoy Regiment, stationed at Barrackpore, allowed one of its men to advance with a loaded musket upon the parade-ground in front of the line, and, after having called

his comrades to mutiny, he was permitted to attack and wound the Adjutant and Sergeant-Major of his regiment. During the hand-to-hand conflict, that ensued, hundreds of sepoys looked passively on, while others participated in the struggle, and attacked the officers with the butt ends of their muskets. Subsequently that regiment was also disbanded. The month of April was signalised by incendiary fires in several cantonments of the Bengal army at Allahabad, Agra, Ambala, by a mutiny of the 3rd Regiment of Light Cavalry at Meerut, and by similar appearances of disaffection in the Madras and Bombay armies. At the beginning of May an *émeute* was preparing at Lucknow, the capital of Oudh, which was, however, prevented by the promptitude of Sir H. Lawrence. On the 9th of May the mutineers of the 3rd Light Cavalry of Meerut were marched off to jail to undergo the various terms of imprisonment to which they were sentenced. On the evening of the following day the troopers of the 3rd Cavalry, together with the two native regiments, the 11th and 20th, assembled upon the parade-ground, killed the officers endeavouring to pacify them, set fire to the cantonments, and slew all the Englishmen they were able to lay hands on. Although the British part of the brigade mustered a regiment of infantry, another of cavalry, and an overwhelming force of horse and foot artillery, they were not able to move until nightfall. Having inflicted but little harm on the mutineers, they allowed them to betake themselves to the open field and to throw themselves into Delhi, some forty miles distant from Meerut. There they were joined by the native garrison, consisting of the 38th, 54th and 74th regiments of infantry, and a company of native artillery. The British officers were attacked, all Englishmen within reach of the rebels were murdered, and the heir of the late Mogul¹⁴³ of Delhi proclaimed King of India. Of the troops sent to the rescue of Meerut, where order had been re-established, six companies of native sappers and miners, who arrived on the 15th of May, murdered their commanding officer, Major Frazer, and made at once for the open country, pursued by troops of horse artillery and several of the 16th Dragon Guards. Fifty or sixty of the mutineers were shot, but the rest

contrived to escape to Delhi. At Ferozepore, in the Punjab, the 57th and 45th Native Infantry regiments mutinied, but were put down by force. Private letters from Lahore state the whole of the native troops to be in an undisguised state of mutiny. On the 19th of May, unsuccessful efforts were made by the sepoys stationed at Calcutta to get possession of Fort St. William.¹⁴⁴ Three regiments arrived from Bushire at Bombay were at once dispatched to Calcutta.

In reviewing these events, one is startled by the conduct of the British commander at Meerut—his late appearance on the field of battle being still less incomprehensible than the weak manner in which he pursued the mutineers. As Delhi is situated on the right and Meerut on the left bank of the Jumna—the two banks being joined at Delhi by one bridge only—nothing could have been easier than to cut off the retreat of the fugitives.

Meanwhile, martial law has been proclaimed in all the disaffected districts; forces, consisting of natives mainly, are concentrating against Delhi from the north, the east and the south; the neighbouring princes are said to have pronounced for the English; letters have been sent to Ceylon to stop Lord Elgin and Gen. Ashburnham's forces, on their way to China; and finally, 14,000 British troops were to be dispatched from England to India in about a fortnight. Whatever obstacles the climate of India at the present season, and the total want of means of transportation, may oppose to the movements of the British forces, the rebels at Delhi are very likely to succumb without any prolonged resistance. Yet, even then, it is only the prologue of a most terrible tragedy that will have to be enacted.

Written by K. Marx
on June 30, 1857

Published as a leading article
in the *New-York Daily*
Tribune No. 5065,
July 15, 1857

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

From THE INDIAN QUESTION

London, July 28, 1857

Mr. Disraeli's speech on the Indian revolt might be published in the tracts of the Society for the Propagation of Useful Knowledge, or it might be delivered to a mechanics' institution, or tendered as a prize essay to the Academy of Berlin. This curious impartiality of his speech as to the place where, and the time when, and the occasion on which it was delivered, goes far to prove that it fitted neither place, time, nor occasion. A chapter on the decline of the Roman Empire which might read exceedingly well in Montesquieu or Gibbon¹⁴⁵ would prove an enormous blunder if put in the mouth of a Roman Senator, whose peculiar business it was to stop that very decline. It is true that in our modern parliaments, a part lacking neither dignity nor interest might be imagined of an independent orator who, while despairing of influencing the actual course of events, should content himself to assume a position of ironical neutrality. Such a part was more or less successfully played by the late M. Garnier-Pagès—not the Garnier-Pagès of Provisional Government memory in Louis Philippe's Chamber of Deputies; but Mr. Disraeli, the avowed leader of an obsolete faction,¹⁴⁶ would consider even success in this line as a supreme failure. The revolt of the Indian army afforded certainly a magnificent opportunity for oratorical display.

But, apart from his dreary manner of treating the subject, what was the gist of the motion which he made the pretext for his speech? It was no motion at all. He feigned to be anxious for becoming acquainted with two official papers, the one of which he was not quite sure to exist, and the other of which he was sure not immediately to bear on the subject in question. Consequently his speech and his motion lacked any point of contact save this, that the motion heralded a speech without an object, and that the object confessed itself not worth a speech. Still, as the highly elaborated opinion of the most distinguished out-of-office statesman of England, Mr. Disraeli's speech ought to attract the attention of foreign countries. I shall content myself with giving in his *ipsissima verba* a short analysis of his "considerations on the decline of the Anglo-Indian Empire".

"Does the disturbance in India indicate a military mutiny, or is it a national revolt? Is the conduct of the troops the consequence of a sudden impulse, or is it the result of an organised conspiracy?"

Upon these points Mr. Disraeli asserts the whole question to hinge. Until the last ten years, he affirmed, the British Empire in India was founded on the old principle of *divide et impera*—but that principle was put into action by respecting the different nationalities of which India consisted, by avoiding to tamper with their religion, and by protecting their landed property. The sepoy army served as a safety-valve to absorb the turbulent spirits of the country. But of late years a new principle has been adopted in the government of India—the principle of destroying nationality. The principle has been realised by the forcible destruction of native princes, the disturbance of the settlement of property, and the tampering with the religion of the people. In 1848 the financial difficulties of the East India Company had reached that point that it became necessary to augment its revenues one way or the other. Then a minute in Council¹⁴⁷ was published, in which was laid down the principle, almost without disguise, that the only mode by which an increased revenue could be obtained was by enlarging the British territories at the expense of

the native princes. Accordingly, on the death of the Rajah of Satara,* his adoptive heir was not acknowledged by the East India Company, but the Raj absorbed in its own dominions. From that moment the system of annexation was acted upon whenever a native prince died without natural heirs. The principle of adoption—the very corner-stone of Indian society—was systematically set aside by the Government. Thus were forcibly annexed to the British Empire the Rajs of more than a dozen independent princes from 1848-54. In 1854 the Raj of Berar, which comprised 80,000 square miles of land, a population from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000, and enormous treasures, was forcibly seized. Mr. Disraeli ends the list of forcible annexations with Oudh, which brought the East Indian Government in collision not only with the Hindus, but also with the Mohammedans. Mr. Disraeli then goes on showing how the settlement of property in India was disturbed by the new system of government during the last ten years.

"The principle of the law of adoption," he says, "is not the prerogative of princes and principalities in India, it applies to every man in Hindustan who has landed property, and who professes the Hindu religion."

I quote a passage:

"The great feudatory, or jagheerdar, who holds his lands by public service to his lord; and the enamdar,¹⁴⁸ who holds his land free of all land tax, who corresponds, if not precisely, in a popular sense, at least, with our freeholder—both of these classes—classes most numerous in India—always, on the failure of their natural heirs, find in this principle the means of obtaining successors to their estates. Those classes were all touched by the annexation of Satara, they were touched by the annexation of the territories of the ten inferior but independent princes to whom I have already alluded, and they were more than touched, they were terrified to the last degree, when the annexation of the Raj of Berar took place. What man was safe? What feudatory, what freeholder who had not a child of his own loins was safe throughout India? (Hear, hear.) These were not idle fears; they were extensively acted upon and reduced to practice. The resumption of jagheers and of inams commenced for the first time in India. There have been, no doubt, impolitic moments when attempts have been made to inquire into titles, but no one had ever dreamt of abolishing the law of adoption; therefore, no authority, no government had ever been in a position to resume jagheers

* Appa Sahib.—*Ed.*

and inams the holders of which had left no natural heirs. Here was a new source of revenue; but while all these things were acting upon the minds of these classes of Hindus, the government took another step to disturb the settlement of property, to which I must now call the attention of the House. The House is aware, no doubt, from reading the evidence taken before the Committee of 1853, that there are great portions of the land of India which are exempt from the land tax. Being free from land tax in India is far more than equivalent to freedom from the land tax in this country, for speaking generally and popularly, the land tax in India is the whole taxation of the state.

"The origin of these grants is difficult to penetrate, but they are undoubtedly of great antiquity. They are of different kinds. Besides the private freeholds, which are very extensive, there are large grants of land free from the land tax with which mosques and temples have been endowed."

On the pretext of fraudulent claims of exemption, the British Governor-General* took upon himself to examine the titles of the Indian landed estates. Under the new system, established in 1848,

"that plan of investigating titles was at once embraced, as a proof of a powerful Government, a vigorous Executive, and most fruitful source of public revenue. Therefore commissions were issued to inquire into titles to landed estates in the Presidency of Bengal and adjoining country. They were also issued in the Presidency of Bombay, and surveys were ordered to be made in the newly settled provinces, in order that these commissions might be conducted, when the surveys were completed, with due efficiency. Now there is no doubt that, during the last nine years, the action of these commissions of inquiry into the freehold property of landed estates in India has been going on at an enormous rate, and immense results have been obtained."

Mr. Disraeli computes that the resumption of estates from their proprietors is not less than £500,000 a year in the Presidency of Bengal; £370,000 in the Presidency of Bombay; £200,000 in the Punjab, etc. Not content with this one method of seizing upon the property of the natives, the British Government discontinued the pensions to the native grandees, to pay which it was bound by treaty.

"This," says Mr. Disraeli, "is confiscation by a new means, but upon a most extensive, startling and shocking scale."

Mr. Disraeli then treats the tampering with the religion of the natives, a point upon which we need not dwell. From

* Dalhousie.—*Ed.*

all his premises he arrives at the conclusion that the present Indian disturbance is not a military mutiny, but a national revolt, of which the sepoys are the acting instruments only. He ends his harangue by advising the Government to turn their attention to the internal improvement of India, instead of pursuing its present course of aggression.

Written by K. Marx
on July 28, 1857

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 5091,
August 14, 1857

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

[BRITISH INCOMES IN INDIA]

The present state of affairs in Asia suggests the inquiry, What is the real value of their Indian dominion to the British nation and people? Directly, that is in the shape of tribute, or surplus of Indian receipts over Indian expenditures, nothing whatever reaches the British Treasury. On the contrary, the annual outgo is very large. From the moment that the East India Company entered extensively on the career of conquest—now just about a century ago—their finances fell into an embarrassed condition, and they were repeatedly compelled to apply to Parliament, not only for military aid to assist them in holding the conquered territories, but for financial aid to save them from bankruptcy. And so things have continued down to the present moment, at which so large a call is made for troops on the British nation, to be followed, no doubt, by corresponding calls for money. In prosecuting its conquests hitherto, and building up its establishments, the East India Company has contracted a debt of upward of £50,000,000 sterling, while the British Government has been at the expense, for years past, of transporting to and from and keeping up in India, in addition to the forces, native and European, of the East India Company, a standing army of thirty thousand men. Such being the case, it is evident that the advantage to Great Britain from her Indian Empire must be limited to the profits and benefits which accrue to

individual British subjects. These profits and benefits, it must be confessed, are very considerable.

First, we have the stock-holders in the East India Company, to the number of about 3,000 persons, to whom under the recent Charter¹⁴⁹ there is guaranteed, upon a paid-up capital of six millions of pounds sterling, an annual dividend of ten and a half per cent, amounting to £630,000 annually. As the East India stock is held in transferable shares, anybody may become a stock-holder who has money enough to buy the stock, which, under the existing Charter, commands a premium of from 125 to 150 per cent. Stock to the amount of £ 500, costing say \$ 6,000, entitles the holder to speak at the proprietors' meetings, but to vote he must have £ 1,000 of stock. Holders of £ 3,000 have two votes, of £ 6,000 three votes, and of £ 10,000 or upward four votes. The proprietors, however, have but little voice, except in the election of the Board of Directors, of whom they choose twelve, while the Crown appoints six; but these appointees of the Crown must be qualified by having resided for ten years or more in India. One-third of the Directors go out of office each year, but may be re-elected or re-appointed. To be a Director, one must be a proprietor of £ 2,000 of stock. The Directors have a salary of £ 500 each, and their Chairman and Deputy Chairman twice as much; but the chief inducement to accept the office is the great patronage attached to it in the appointment of all Indian officers, civil, and military—a patronage, however, largely shared, and, as to the most important offices, engrossed substantially, by the Board of Control. This Board consists of six members, all Privy Councillors, and in general two or three of them Cabinet Ministers, the President of the Board being always so, in fact a Secretary of State for India.

Next come the recipients of this patronage, divided into five classes—civil, clerical, medical, military and naval. For service in India, at least in the civil line, some knowledge of the languages spoken there is necessary, and to prepare young men to enter their civil service, the East India Company has a college at Haileybury. A corresponding college for the military service, in which, however, the

rudiments of military science are the principal branches taught, has been established at Addiscombe, near London. Admission to these colleges was formerly a matter of favour on the part of the Directors of the Company, but under the latest modifications of the Charter it has been opened to competition in the way of a public examination of candidates. On first reaching India, a civilian is allowed about \$ 150 a month, till having passed a necessary examination in one or more of the native languages (which must be within twelve months after his arrival), he is attached to the service with emoluments which vary from \$ 2,500 to nearly \$ 50,000 per annum. The latter is the pay of the members of the Bengal Council; the members of the Bombay and Madras Councils* receive about \$ 30,000 per annum. No person not a member of Council can receive more than about \$ 25,000 per annum, and, to obtain an appointment worth \$ 20,000 or over, he must have been a resident in India for twelve years. Nine years' residence qualifies for salaries of from \$ 15,000 to \$ 20,000, and three years' residence for salaries of from \$ 7,000 to \$ 15,000. Appointments in the civil service go nominally by seniority and merit, but really to a great extent by favour. As they are the best paid, there is great competition to get them, the military officers leaving their regiments for this purpose whenever they can get a chance. The average of all the salaries in the civil service is stated at about \$ 8,000, but this does not include prerequisites and extra allowances, which are often very considerable. These civil servants are employed as Governors, Councillors, Judges, Ambassadors, Secretaries, Collectors of the Revenue, etc.—the number in the whole being generally about 800. The salary of the Governor-General of India is \$ 125,000, but the extra allowances often amount to a still larger sum. The church service includes three bishops and about one hundred and sixty chaplains. The Bishop of Calcutta has \$ 25,000 a year; those of Madras and Bombay half as much; the chaplains from \$ 2,500 to 7,000, besides fees. The medical service includes some 800 physicians and surgeons, with salaries of from \$ 1,500 to \$ 10,000.

* Councils under the British Governor-Generals.—*Ed.*

The European military officers employed in India, including those of the contingents which the dependent princes are obliged to furnish, number about 8,000. The fixed pay in the infantry is, for ensigns, \$ 1,080; lieutenants, \$ 1,344; captains, \$ 2,226; majors, \$ 3,810; lieutenant-colonels, \$ 5,520; colonels, \$ 7,680. This is the pay in cantonment. In active service, it is more. The pay in the cavalry, artillery and engineers, is somewhat higher. By obtaining staff situations or employments in the civil service, many officers double their pay.

Here are about ten thousand British subjects holding lucrative situations in India, and drawing their pay from the Indian service. To these must be added a considerable number living in England, whither they have retired upon pensions, which in all the services are payable after serving a certain number of years. These pensions, with the dividends and interest on debts due in England, consume some fifteen to twenty millions of dollars drawn annually from India, and which may in fact be regarded as so much tribute paid to the English Government indirectly through its subjects. Those who annually retire from the several services carry with them very considerable amounts of savings from their salaries, which is so much more added to the annual drain on India.

Besides those Europeans actually employed in the service of the Government, there are other European residents in India to the number of 6,000 or more, employed in trade or private speculation. Except a few indigo, sugar and coffee planters in the rural districts, they are principally merchants, agents and manufacturers, who reside in the cities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, or their immediate vicinity. The foreign trade of India, including imports and exports to the amount of about fifty million dollars of each, is almost entirely in their hands, and their profits are no doubt very considerable.

It is thus evident that individuals gain largely by the English connection with India, and of course their gain goes to increase the sum of the national wealth. But against all this a very large offset is to be made. The military and naval expenses paid out of the pockets of the people of

England on Indian account have been constantly increasing with the extent of the Indian dominion. To this must be added the expense of Burmese,¹⁵⁰ Afghan, Chinese and Persian wars. In fact, the whole cost of the late Russian war may fairly be charged to the Indian account, since the fear and dread of Russia, which led to that war, grew entirely out of jealousy as to her designs on India. Add to this the career of endless conquest and perpetual aggression in which the English are involved by the possession of India, and it may well be doubted whether, on the whole, this dominion does not threaten to cost quite as much as it can ever be expected to come to.

Written by K. Marx
at the beginning
of September 1857

Published as a leading article
in the *New-York Daily Tribune*
No. 5123, September 21, 1857

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

[POLITICAL PARTIES IN ENGLAND]

England offers at this moment the curious spectacle of dissolution appearing at the summit of the State, while at the base of society all seems immovable. There is no audible agitation among the masses, but there is a visible change among their rulers. Shall we believe that the upper strata are liquefying, while the lower remain in the same dull solidity? We are, of course, not alluding to the cynical attempts of Palmerston and his compeers to "loot" the Treasury.¹⁵¹ The battles between the exiles and their proscribers form no more a standing feature in the medieval annals of Italian towns than the conflicts between the Ins and Outs in the Parliamentary history of England. But now we have the Tory leader in the House of Commons winding up a speech with the ominous declaration that

"there is one bond of union between us" (the Radicals and Tories) "in this House and in this country; and that is, that we shall not any longer be the tools or the victims of an obsolete oligarchy!"

There is the House of Lords passing one point of the People's Charter—the abolition of the property qualification for the members of the Commons; there is Lord Grey, the descendant of the Whig Reformer, warning his noble compeers that they are drifting to "a total revolution in the whole system of their Government and in the character of their Constitution"; there is the Duke of Rutland frightened out of his senses by the vista of having to swallow "the

whole hog of the five points of the Charter, and something more". And then the London *Times* in sinister accents one day cautions the middle classes that Disraeli and Bulwer wish them no good, and, in order to master them, may ally themselves with the vile multitude; and then, the very next day, it warns the landed aristocracy that they are to be swamped by the shopocracy, to be enthroned through Locke King's bill, which has just passed through its second reading in the Lower House, for the extension of the elective franchise to the £ 10 occupiers in the counties.

The fact is that the two ruling oligarchic parties of England were long ago transformed into mere factions, without any distinctive principles. Having in vain tried first a coalition and then a dictatorship, they are now arrived at the point where each of them can only think of obtaining a respite of life by betraying their common interest into the hands of their common foe, the radical middle-class party, who are powerfully represented in the Commons by John Bright. Till now, the Tories have been aristocrats ruling in the name of the aristocracy, and the Whigs aristocrats ruling in the name of the middle class; but the middle class having assumed the rule in their own name, the business of the Whigs is gone. In order to keep the Whigs out of office, the Tories will yield to the encroachments of the middle-class party until they have worried out Whig patience and convinced those oligarchs that, in order to save the interests of their order, they must merge in the conservative ranks and forsake their traditional pretensions to represent the liberal interest or form a power of their own. Absorption of the Whig faction into the Tory faction, and their common metamorphosis into the party of the aristocracy, as opposed to the new middle-class party, acting under its own chiefs, under its own banners, with its own watchwords—such is the consummation we are now witnessing in England.

Written by K. Marx
on June 11, 1858

Published as a leading article
in the *New-York Daily Tribune*
No. 5359, June 24, 1858

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

THE INDIAN BILL¹⁵²

The latest Indian bill has passed through its third reading in the House of Commons, and since the Lords, swayed by Derby's influence, are not likely to show fight, the doom of the East India Company appears to be sealed. They do not die like heroes, it must be confessed; but they have bartered away their power, as they crept into it, bit by bit, in a businesslike way. In fact, their whole history is one of buying and selling. They commenced by buying sovereignty, and they have ended by selling it. *They have fallen*, not in a pitched battle, but under the hammer of the auctioneer, into the hands of the highest bidder. In 1693 they procured from the Crown a charter for twenty-one years by paying large sums to the Duke of Leeds and other public officers. In 1767 they prolonged their tenure of power for two years by the promise of annually paying £ 400,000 into the Imperial Exchequer. In 1769 they struck a similar bargain for five years; but soon after, in return for the Exchequer's foregoing the stipulated annual payment and lending them £ 1,400,000 at 4 per cent, they alienated some parcels of sovereignty, leaving to Parliament in the first instance the nomination of the Governor-General and four Councillors, altogether surrendering to the Crown the appointment of the Lord Chief Justice and his three Judges, and agreeing to the conversion of the Court of Proprietors from a democratic into an oligarchic

body.¹⁵³ In 1858, after having solemnly pledged themselves to the Court of Proprietors to resist by all Constitutional "means" the transfer to the Crown of the governing powers of the East India Company, they have accepted that principle, and agreed to a bill penal as regards the Company, but securing emolument and place to its principal Directors. If the death of a hero, as Schiller says, resembles the setting of the sun,* the exit of the East India Company bears more likeness to the compromise effected by a bankrupt with his creditors.

By this bill the principal functions of administration are entrusted to a Secretary of State in Council,¹⁵⁴ just as at Calcutta the Governor-General in Council manages affairs. But both these functionaries—the Secretary of State in England and the Governor-General in India—are alike authorised to disregard the advice of their assessors and to act upon their own judgement. The new bill also invests the Secretary of State with all the powers at present exercised by the President of the Board of Control, through the agency of the Secret Committee—the power, that is, in urgent cases, of dispatching orders to India without stopping to ask the advice of his Council. In constituting that Council it has been found necessary, after all, to resort to the East India Company as the only practicable source of appointments to it other than nominations by the Crown. The elective members of the Council are to be elected by the Directors of the East India Company from among their own number.

Thus, after all, the name of the East India Company is to outlive its substance. At the last hour it was confessed by the Derby Cabinet that their bill contains no clause abolishing the East India Company, as represented by a Court of Directors, but that it becomes reduced to its ancient character of a company of stock-holders, distributing the dividends guaranteed by different acts of legislation. Pitt's bill of 1784 virtually subjected their government to the sway of the Cabinet under the name of the Board of Control. The act of 1813 stripped them of their monopoly of com-

* Schiller, *The Robbers*, Act III, Scene 2.—Ed.

merce, save the trade with China. The act of 1834 destroyed their commercial character altogether, and the act of 1854 annihilated their last remnant of power, still leaving them in possession of the Indian Administration. By the rotation of history the East India Company, converted in 1612 into a joint-stock company, is again clothed in its primitive garb, only that it represents now a trading partnership without trade, and a joint-stock company which has no funds to administer, but only fixed dividends to draw.

The history of the Indian bill is marked by greater dramatic changes than any other act of modern Parliamentary legislation. When the sepoy insurrection broke out, the cry of Indian Reform rang through all classes of British society. Popular imagination was heated by the torture reports; the Government interference with the native religion was loudly denounced by Indian general officers and civilians of high standing; the rapacious annexation policy of Lord Dalhousie, the mere tool of Downing Street; the fermentation recklessly created in the Asiatic mind by the piratical wars in Persia and China—wars commenced and pursued on Palmerston's private dictation—the weak measures with which he met the outbreak, sailing ships being chosen for transport in preference to steam vessels, and the circuitous navigation around the Cape of Good Hope instead of transportation over the Isthmus of Suez—all these accumulated grievances burst into the cry for Indian Reform—reform of the Company's Indian Administration, reform of the Government's Indian policy. Palmerston caught at the popular cry, but resolved upon turning it to his exclusive profit. Because both the Government and the Company had miserably broken down, the Company was to be killed in sacrifice, and the Government to be rendered omnipotent. The power of the Company was to be simply transferred to the dictator of the day, pretending to represent the Crown as against the Parliament, and to represent Parliament as against the Crown, thus absorbing the privileges of the one and the other in his single person. With the Indian army at his back, the Indian Treasury at his command, and the Indian patronage in

his pocket, Palmerston's position would have become impregnable.

His bill passed triumphantly through the first reading, but his career was cut short by the famous Conspiracy Bill, followed by the advent of the Tories to power.

On the very first day of their official reappearance on the Treasury benches, they declared that, out of deference for the decisive will of the Commons, they would forsake their opposition to the transfer from the Company to the Crown of the Indian Government. Lord Ellenborough's legislative abortion seemed to hasten Palmerston's restoration, when Lord John Russell, in order to force the dictator into a compromise, stepped in, and saved the Government by proposing to proceed with the Indian bill by way of Parliamentary resolution, instead of by a governmental bill. Then Lord Ellenborough's Oudh dispatch, his sudden resignation, and the consequent disorganisation in the ministerial camp, were eagerly seized upon by Palmerston. The Tories were again to be planted in the cold shade of opposition, after they had employed their short lease of power in breaking down the opposition of their own party against the confiscation of the East India Company. Yet it is sufficiently known how these fine calculations were baffled. Instead of rising on the ruins of the East India Company, Palmerston has been buried beneath them. During the whole of the Indian debates, the House seemed to indulge the peculiar satisfaction of humiliating the *Civis Romanus*.¹⁵⁵ All his amendments, great and small, were ignominiously lost; allusions of the most unsavoury kind, relating to the Afghan war, the Persian war, and the Chinese war, were continually flung at his head; and Mr. Gladstone's clause, withdrawing from the Indian Minister the power of originating wars beyond the boundaries of India, intended as a general vote of censure on Palmerston's past foreign policy, was passed by a crushing majority, despite his furious resistance. But although the man has been thrown overboard, his principle, upon the whole, has been accepted. Although somewhat checked by the obstructive attributes of the Board of Council, which, in fact, is but the well-paid spectre of the old Court of Directors, the power of the executive has, by the

formal annexation of India, been raised to such a degree that, to counterpoise it, democratic weight must be thrown into the Parliamentary scale.

Written by K. Marx
on July 9, 1858

Published as a leading article
in the *New-York Daily Tribune*
No. 5384, July 24, 1858

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

THE OPIUM TRADE¹⁵⁶

The news of the new treaty¹⁵⁷ wrung from China by the allied Plenipotentiaries has, it would appear, conjured up the same wild vistas of an immense extension of trade which danced before the eyes of the commercial mind in 1845, after the conclusion of the first Chinese war. Supposing the Petersburg wires to have spoken truth, is it quite certain that an increase of the Chinese trade must follow upon the multiplication of its emporiums? Is there any probability that the war of 1857-58 will lead to more splendid results than the war of 1841-42? So much is certain that the treaty of 1843, instead of increasing American and English exports to China, proved instrumental only in precipitating and aggravating the commercial crisis of 1847. In a similar way, by raising dreams of an inexhaustible market and by fostering false speculations, the present treaty may help preparing a new crisis at the very moment when the market of the world is but slowly recovering from the recent universal shock. Beside its negative result, the first opium war succeeded in stimulating the opium trade at the expense of legitimate commerce, and so will this second opium war do, if England be not forced by the general pressure of the civilised world to abandon the compulsory opium cultivation in India and the armed opium propaganda to China. We forbear dwelling on

the morality of that trade, described by Montgomery Martin, himself an Englishman, in the following terms:

"Why, the slave-trade was merciful compared with the opium trade: We did not destroy the bodies of the Africans, for it was our immediate interest to keep them alive; we did not debase their nature, corrupt their minds, nor destroy their souls. But the opium seller slays the body after he has corrupted, degraded and annihilated the moral being of unhappy sinners, which every hour is bringing new victims to a Moloch which knows no satiety, and where the English murderer and Chinese suicide vie with each other in offerings at his shrine."¹⁵⁸

The Chinese cannot take both goods and drug; under actual circumstances, extension of the Chinese trade resolves into extension of the opium trade; the growth of the latter is incompatible with the development of legitimate commerce—these propositions were pretty generally admitted two years ago. A Committee of the House of Commons, appointed in 1847 to take into consideration the state of British commercial intercourse with China, reported thus:

"We regret that the trade with that country has been for some time in a very unsatisfactory condition, and that the *result of our extended intercourse has by no means realised the just expectations* which had naturally been founded in a *free access to so magnificent a market*. We find that the difficulties of the trade do not arise from any want of demand in China for articles of British manufactures, or from the increasing competition of other nations; *the payment for opium* absorbs the silver to the great inconvenience of the general traffic of the Chinese, and tea and silk must in fact pay the rest."

The Friend of China, of July 28, 1849, generalising the same proposition, says in set terms:

"The opium trade progresses steadily. The increased consumption of teas and silk in Great Britain and the United States would merely result in the increase of the opium trade; the case of the manufacturers is hopeless."

One of the leading American merchants in China reduced, in an article inserted in Hunt's *Merchant's Magazine*,¹⁵⁹ for January, 1850, the whole question of the trade with China to this point:

"Which branch of commerce is to be suppressed, the opium trade or the export trade of American or English produce?"

The Chinese themselves took exactly the same view of the case. Montgomery Martin narrates:

"I inquired of the Taotai* at Shanghai which would be the best means of increasing our commerce with China, and his first answer to me, in presence of Capt. Balfour, Her Majesty's Consul, was: 'Cease to send us so much opium and we will be able to take your manufactures.'"

The history of general commerce during the last eight years has, in a new and striking manner, illustrated these positions; but, before analysing the deleterious effects on legitimate commerce of the opium trade, we propose giving a short review of the rise and progress of that stupendous traffic, which, whether we regard the tragical collisions forming, so to say, the axis round which it turns, or the effects produced by it on the general relations of the Eastern and Western worlds, stands solitary on record in the annals of mankind.

Previous to 1767 the quantity of opium exported from India did not exceed 200 chests, the chest weighing about 133 lbs. Opium was legally admitted in China on the payment of a duty of about \$ 3 per chest, as a medicine; the Portuguese, who brought it from Turkey, being its almost exclusive exporters into the Celestial Empire.

In 1773, Colonel Watson and Vice-President Wheeler—persons deserving to take a place among the Hermentiers, Palmers and other poisoners of world-wide fame—suggested to the East India Company the idea of entering upon the opium traffic with China. Consequently, there was established a depot for opium in vessels anchored in a bay to the southwest of Macao. The speculation proved a failure. In 1781 the Bengal Government sent an armed vessel, laden with opium, to China; and, in 1794, the Company stationed a large opium vessel at Whampoa, the anchorage for the port of Canton. It seems that Whampoa proved a more convenient depot than Macao, because, only two years after its selection, the Chinese Government found it necessary to pass a law which threatens Chinese smugglers of opium to be beaten with a bamboo and exposed in the streets with wooden collars around their necks. About 1798, the East

* High official.—*Ed.*

India Company ceased to be direct exporters of opium, but they became its producers. The opium monopoly was established in India, while the Company's own ships were hypocritically forbidden from trafficking in the drug, the licences it granted for private ships trading to China contained a provision which attached a penalty to them if freighted with opium of other than the Company's own make.

In 1800, the import into China had reached the number of 2,000 chests. Having, during the eighteenth century, borne the aspect common to all feuds between the foreign merchant and the national custom house, the struggle between the East India Company and the Celestial Empire assumed, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, features quite distinct and exceptional; while the Chinese Emperor, in order to check the suicide of his people, prohibited at once the import of the poison by the foreigner, and its consumption by the natives, the East India Company was rapidly converting the cultivation of opium in India, and its contraband sale to China, into internal parts of its own financial system. While the semi-barbarian stood on the principle of morality, the civilised opposed the principle of self. That a giant empire, containing almost one-third of the human race, vegetating in the teeth of time, insulated by the forced exclusion of general intercourse, and thus contriving to dupe itself with delusions of Celestial perfection—that such an empire should at last be overtaken by the fate on occasion of a deadly duel, in which the representative of the antiquated world appears prompted by ethical motives, while the representative of overwhelming modern society fights for the privilege of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest markets—this, indeed, is a sort of tragical couplet, stranger than any poet would ever have dared to fancy.

Written by K. Marx
on August 31, 1858

Published as a leading article
in the *New-York Daily Tribune*
No. 5433, September 20, 1858

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

From **POLITICAL REVIEW**

London. The building workers' strike, or to be more accurate, the master builders' lockout,¹⁶⁰ is continuing without an essential change taking place in the irreconcilable position of the two sides. On Tuesday the workers' delegates held a meeting that was also attended by representatives of other trades, at which it was unanimously decided not to accept employment from any master who might demand a promise not to participate in the "society". Simultaneously, a meeting was held by the "associated" masters in the Freemason's Tavern, to which no newspaper reporters were admitted. As it was later to emerge, these furtive gentlemen had, after a stormy consultation, agreed that no member of the association should open his workshop until the building workers have expressly renounced the "society" and until "Mr. Trollope's workers have put an end to their strike". The last point will probably soon be wound up, for Mr. Trollope has recently entered into negotiations with the workers and has given most firm assurances to the effect that the accusations that are being raised against him (the dismissal of a worker who had handed him the petition for a nine-hour working day, etc.) were the result of a misunderstanding. As regards the other condition, the "locked-out" will on no account consent to it, unless they are compelled to do so by dire necessity; they feel that to renounce the "society", to renounce all organisa-

tions, would mean making themselves regular serfs of the capitalists and casting away the little scrap of independence that is still left to the modern proletarians. The obstinacy of the masters, who lay claim to an authority over their "hands" similar to that of the American plantation owner over his slaves, has evoked the disapproval even of a section of the bourgeois reporters. Naturally, we have no cause to be dissatisfied with the building masters. After all they are doing everything in their power to widen the already wide gulf between labour and capital and to intensify the concentrated, conscious class hatred which is the best guarantee for a social upheaval.

In London there are over 1,000 builders' workshops in all. Only 88 of them, the biggest, are closed. The number of lockouts (dismissed workers) amounts to 19,000-20,000, not 40,000, as was maintained initially. Generous money contributions are streaming into the "society" from all parts of the country, but so far the unemployed workers have refused to draw on these. Honour to the brave! Would the bourgeoisie be capable of such sacrifice for the sake of *its* class interests?

In the last days of the session, which ended on Saturday, the House of Commons concerned itself with practically nothing apart from the election scandals, which spring up like mushrooms from the ground bespattering all the walls of the House of Parliament. There was a horrible stench of corruption, which blended excellently with the smells of the Thames and which would have made the honourable members vomit were they not used to that sort of thing. Now it had to do with individuals who had openly (and *therein* lay the crime) bought and sold flocks of British electors like so many sheep, now with a poor fellow who voluntarily gave up his seat bought at great expense because he could not defend it against an election petition which would have cost at least 3,000 pounds sterling—but we are digressing. Why rummage in filth? We should merely like to add that almost all members who were convicted of bribery belonged to the Liberal party.

There is hardly anything to say about the Queen's speech. It is a thoroughly insignificant official document. As regards

the projected European congress, it notes that Her Majesty has not yet reached a definite decision. That is a lie. Immediately after the conclusion of the Villafranca Peace Treaty, Lord Palmerston told the Russian Government that he was ready to send delegates to the congress *proposed by Russia*. This means that he had already "reached a definite decision" four weeks ago.

Written by K. Marx
about August 19, 1859

Published in *Das Volk* No. 16,
August 20, 1859

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

THE LONDON "TIMES" AND LORD PALMERSTON

London, October 5, 1861

"English people participate in the government of their own country by reading the *Times* newspaper." This judgement, passed by an eminent English author* on what is called British self-government, is only true so far as the foreign policy of the Kingdom is concerned. As to measures of domestic reform, they were never carried by the support of the *Times*, but the *Times* never ceased attacking and opposing them until after it had become aware of its utter inability to any longer check their progress. Take, for instance, the Catholic Emancipation, the Reform Bill, the abolition of the Corn Laws, the Stamp Tax, and the Paper Duty.¹⁶¹ When victory had unmistakably declared on the side of the Reformers, the *Times* wheeled round, deserted the reactionary camp, and managed to find itself, at the decisive moment, on the winning side. In all these instances, the *Times* gave not the direction to public opinion, but submitted to it, ungraciously, reluctantly, and after protracted, but frustrated, attempts at rolling back the surging waves of popular progress. Its real influence on the public mind is, therefore, confined to the field of foreign policy. In no part of Europe are the mass of the people, and especially of the middle classes, more utterly ignorant of the foreign policy of their own country than in England, an ignorance springing from two great sources. On the one hand, since

* Robert Lowe.—*Ed.*

the glorious Revolution of 1688, the aristocracy has always monopolised the direction of foreign affairs in England. On the other hand, the progressive division of labour has, to a certain extent, emasculated the general intellect of the middle-class men by the circumscription of all their energies and mental faculties within the narrow spheres of their mercantile, industrial and professional concerns. Thus it happened that, while the aristocracy *acted* for them, the press *thought* for them in their foreign or international affairs; and both parties, the aristocracy and the press, very soon found out that it would be their mutual interest to combine. One has only to open *Cobbett's Political Register*¹⁶² to convince himself that, since the beginning of this century, the great London papers have constantly played the part of attorneys to the heaven-born managers of English foreign policy. Still, there were some intermediate periods to be run through before the present state of things had been brought about. The aristocracy, that had monopolised the management of foreign affairs, first shrunk together into an oligarchy, represented by a secret conclave, called the cabinet, and, later on, the cabinet was superseded by one single man, Lord Palmerston, who, for the last thirty years, has usurped the absolute power of wielding the national forces of the British Empire, and determining the line of its foreign policy. Concurrently with this usurpation, by the law of concentration, acting in the field of newspaper-mongering still more rapidly than in the field of cotton-spinning, the *London Times* had attained the position of being the national paper of England, that is to say, of representing the English mind to foreign nations. If the monopoly of managing the foreign affairs of the nation had passed from the aristocracy to an oligarchic conclave, and from an oligarchic conclave to one single man, the Foreign Minister of England, viz., Lord Palmerston, the monopoly of thinking and judging for the nation, on its own foreign relations, and representing the public mind in regard to these relations, had passed from the press to one organ of the press, to the *Times*. Lord Palmerston, who secretly and from motives unknown to the people at large, to Parliament and even to his own colleagues, managed the foreign affairs of the British Empire,

must have been very stupid if he had not tried to possess himself of the one paper which had usurped the power of passing public judgement in the name of the English people on his own secret doings. The *Times*, in whose vocabulary the word virtue was never to be found, must, on its side, have boasted more than Spartan virtue not to ally itself with the absolute ruler in fact of the national power of the Empire. Hence, since the French *coup d'état*, when the Government by faction was in England superseded by the Government by the coalition of factions, and Palmerston, therefore, found no longer rivals endangering his usurpation, the *Times* became his mere slave. He had taken care to smuggle some of its virtue into the subordinate posts of the cabinet, and to cajole others by their admission into his social circle. Since that time, the whole business of the *Times*, so far as the foreign affairs of the British Empire are concerned, is limited to manufacturing a public opinion to conform to Lord Palmerston's foreign policy. It has to prepare the public mind for what he intends doing, and to make it acquiesce in what he has done. The slavish drudgery which, in fulfilling this work, it has to undergo, was best exemplified during the last session of Parliament. That session proved anything but favourable to Lord Palmerston. Some independent members of the House of Commons, Liberals and Conservatives, rebelled against his usurped dictatorship, and, by an exposure of his past misdeeds, tried to awaken the nation to a sense of the danger of continuing the same uncontrolled power in the same hands. Mr. Dunlop, opening the attack by a motion for a Select Committee on the Afghan Papers, which Palmerston had laid on the table of the House in 1839, proved that Palmerston had actually forged these papers.¹⁶³ The *Times*, in its Parliamentary report, suppressed all the passages of Mr. Dunlop's speech which it considered most damaging to its master. Later on, Lord Montague, in a motion for the publication of all papers relating to the Danish Treaty of 1852, accused Palmerston of having been the principal in the manoeuvres intended to alter the Danish succession in the interest of a foreign power,¹⁶⁴ and of having misled the House of Commons by deliberate misstatements. Palmerston, however, had

come to a previous understanding with Mr. Disraeli to baffle Lord Montague's motion by a count-out of the House, which in fact put a stop to the whole proceeding. Still, Lord Montague's speech had lasted one hour and a half before it was cut off by the count-out. The *Times* having been informed by Palmerston that the count-out was to take place, its editor specially charged with the task of mutilating and cooking the parliamentary reports had given himself a holiday, and thus Lord Montague's speech appeared un mutilated in the *Times's* columns. When, on the following morning, the mistake was discovered, a leader was prepared telling John Bull that the count-out was an ingenious institution for suppressing bores, that Lord Montague was a regular bore, and that the business of the nation could not be carried on if Parliamentary bores were not disposed of in the most unceremonious way. Again Palmerston stood on his trial last session, when Mr. Hennessy moved for a production of the Foreign Office dispatches during the Polish revolution of 1831. Again the *Times* recurred, as in the case of Mr. Dunlop's motion, to the simple process of suppression. Its report of Mr. Hennessy's speech is quite an edition in *usum delphini*.¹⁶⁵ If one considers how much painstaking it must cause to run through the immense Parliamentary reports the same night they are forwarded to the newspaper office from the House of Commons, and in the same night mutilate, alter, falsify them so as not to tell against Palmerston's political purity, one must concede that whatever emoluments and advantages the *Times* may reap from its subserviency to the noble Viscount, its task is no pleasant one.

If, then, the *Times* is able by misstatement and suppression thus to falsify public opinion in regard to events that happened but yesterday in the British House of Commons, its power of misstatement and suppression in regard to events occurring on a distant soil, as in the case of the American war, must, of course, be unbounded. If in treating of American affairs it has strained all its forces to exasperate the mutual feelings of the British and Americans, it did not do so from any sympathy with the British Cotton Lords nor out of regard for any real or supposed English interest. It simply executed the orders of its master. From the altered tone of

the London *Times* during the past week, we may, therefore, infer that Lord Palmerston is about to recede from the extremely hostile attitude he had assumed till now against the United States. In one of its today leaders, the *Times*, which for months had exalted the aggressive powers of the Secessionists, and expatiated upon the inability of the United States to cope with them, feels quite sure of the military superiority of the North. That this change of tone is dictated by the master, becomes quite evident from the circumstance that other influential papers, known to be connected with Palmerston, have simultaneously veered round. One of them, the *Economist*, gives rather a broad hint to the public opinion-mongers that the time has come for "carefully watching" their pretended "feelings toward the United States". The passage in the *Economist* which I allude to, and which I think worth quoting as a proof of the new orders received by Palmerston's pressmen, runs thus:

"On one point we frankly avow that the Northerners have a right to complain, and on one point also we are bound to be more upon our guard than perhaps we have uniformly been. Our leading journals have been too ready to quote and present as embodying the sentiments and representing the position of the United States, newspapers notorious at all times for their disreputable character and feeble influence, and now more than suspected of being Secessionists at heart, of sailing under false colours, and professing extreme Northern opinions while writing in the interests and probably the pay of the South. Few Englishmen can, for example, with any decent fairness, pretend to regard *The N. Y. Herald* as representing either the character or views of the Northern section of the Republic. Again: we ought to be very careful lest our just criticism of the Unionists should degenerate by insensible gradation into approval and defence of the Secessionists. The tendency in all ordinary minds to *partisanship* is very strong. Now, however warmly, we may resent much of the conduct and the language of the North, we must never forget that the Secession of the South was forced on with designs and inaugurated with proceedings which have our heartiest and most rooted disapprobation. We, of course, must condemn the protective tariff of the Union as an oppressive and benighted folly. Of course, we reciprocate the wish of the South for low duties and unfettered trade. Of course, we are anxious that the prosperity of States which produce so much raw material and want so many manufactured goods should suffer no interruption or reverse. But, at the same time, it is impossible for us to lose sight of the indisputable fact that the real aim and ultimate motive of secession was *not* to defend their right to hold slaves in their own territory (which the Northerners were just as ready to concede as they to claim), but to extend slavery over a vast, undefined district,

hitherto free from that curse, but into which the planters fancied they might hereafter wish to spread. This object we have always regarded as unwise, unrighteous and abhorrent. The state of society introduced in the Southern States by the institution of domestic servitude appears to English minds more and more detestable and deplorable the more they know of it. And the Southerners should be made aware that no pecuniary or commercial advantage which this country might be supposed to derive from the extended cultivation of the virgin soils of the planting States, and the new Territories which they claim, will ever in the slightest degree modify our views on these points, or interfere with the expression of those views, or warp or hamper our action whenever action shall become obligatory or fitting. It is believed that they (the Secessionists) still entertain the extraordinary notion that by *starving* France and England—by the loss and suffering anticipated as the consequences of an entire privation of the American supply—they will compel those Governments to interfere on their behalf, and force the United States to abandon the blockade.... There is not the remotest chance that either Power would feel justified for a moment in projecting such an act of decided and unwarrantable hostility against the United States.... We are less dependent on the South than the South is upon us, as they will ere long begin to discover. We, therefore, pray them to believe that Slavery, so long as it exists, must create more or less of a moral barrier between us, and that even tacit approval is as far from our thoughts as the impertinence of an open interference; that Lancashire is not England; and, for the honour and spirit of our manufacturing population, be it said also, that even if it were, *Cotton would not be King.*"

All I intended to show for the present was that Palmerston, and consequently the London press, working to his orders, is abandoning his hostile attitude against the United States. The causes that have led to this *revirement*,* as the French call it, I shall try to explain in a subsequent letter. Before concluding, I may still add that Mr. Forster, M. P. for Bradford, delivered last Tuesday, in the theatre of Bradford Mechanics' Institute, a lecture "On the Civil War in America", in which he traced the true origin and character of that war, and victoriously refuted the misstatements of the Palmerstonian press.

Written by K. Marx
on October 5, 1861

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 6411,
October 21, 1861

Printed according
to the newspaper text

* Sudden change.—Ed.

KARL MARX

THE CRISIS IN ENGLAND

Today, as fifteen years ago, England faces a catastrophe which threatens to undermine the foundation of her entire economic system. *Potatoes* were the staple food of the Irish and of a considerable part of the English working population when the potato blight of 1845 and 1846 struck the Irish root of life with rot. The results of that big catastrophe are well known. The Irish population decreased by two million, some of whom starved, while others fled across the Atlantic. At the same time, this enormous calamity promoted the victory of the English Free-Trade Party; the English landed aristocracy was compelled to sacrifice one of its most profitable monopolies, and the repeal of the Corn Laws ensured a wider and sounder basis for the reproduction and maintenance of the working millions.

What the *potato* was to Irish agriculture, *cotton* is to the dominant branch of Great Britain's industry. On its processing depends the subsistence of a mass of the population which is greater than the whole population of Scotland or two-thirds of the present population of Ireland. According to the 1861 census, the population of Scotland was 3,061,117, and that of Ireland only 5,764,543, while more than four million people in England and Scotland depend directly or indirectly on the cotton industry for their livelihood. True,

the cotton plant has not been hit by any blight. Neither is its production the monopoly of a few areas of the world. On the contrary, no other plant providing material for clothing thrives on such extensive areas in America, Asia and Africa. The cotton monopoly of the slave-owning states of the American Union is not a natural phenomenon, but one that has been historically shaped. It grew up and developed at the same time as the monopoly of the English cotton industry on the world market. In 1793, shortly after the beginning of the industrial revolution in England, Ely Whitney, a Quaker in Connecticut, invented the cotton-gin that separates cotton fibre from cotton seed. Before this invention a Negro working at his very hardest for a whole day could barely separate a pound of cotton fibre from the seed. After the invention of the cotton-gin, however, an old Negro woman could easily clean 50 pounds of cotton fibre a day, and gradual improvements have since doubled the productivity of the machine. This meant that the fetters on the cultivation of cotton had now been smashed in the United States. Hand in hand with the English cotton industry, it grew quickly into a big commercial power. In the course of this development England seemed now and then to take fright at the American cotton monopoly which she saw as a menacing apparition. Such a moment set in, for example, when the emancipation of the Negroes in the English colonies was achieved at the cost of 20,000,000 pounds sterling. It was considered suspect that the industry in Lancashire and Yorkshire rested on the sovereignty of the slave whip in Georgia and Alabama, while the English nation made such great sacrifices to abolish slavery in its own colonies. But philanthropy does not make history, commercial history least of all. Similar misgivings emerged whenever there happened to be a bad harvest in the United States, and when such a natural calamity was moreover exploited by the slave-owners in order artificially to raise the price of cotton still higher by manipulation. The English cotton spinners and weavers then threatened to rebel against "King Cotton". Manifold projects for importing supplies of cotton from Asian and African sources appeared. This happened, for example, in 1850. Meanwhile the subsequent good harvests in the United

States victoriously suppressed such hankering after emancipation. Indeed, the American cotton monopoly has in recent years assumed a previously almost inconceivable range, partly because of the free trade legislation, which lifted the former differential customs duty on cotton cultivated by slaves, and partly because of the gigantic progress made by both the English cotton industry and American cotton-growing during the past decade. In 1857 cotton consumption in England had already reached almost 1,500 million pounds.

Suddenly the American Civil War threatens this mainstay of English industry. While the Union blockades the ports of the Southern States to prevent the export of this year's cotton harvest and thereby cuts off the Secessionists' main source of income, it is the Confederation which first imparts compulsive force to this blockade merely by its decision not to export a single bale of cotton voluntarily and, moreover, to force England to come and fetch cotton herself from the southern ports. England is to be driven to break through the blockade by force, to declare war on the Union, and thus to throw her sword on the scales in favour of the slave-owning states.

Since the beginning of the American Civil War the price of cotton has been constantly rising in England, for a long time, however, in a smaller proportion than was to have been expected. On the whole, the English business world seemed to regard the American crisis with great apathy. The reason for this calm view of things was obvious. The whole of last year's American harvest had been brought to Europe long ago. A new crop is never shipped before the end of November, and these shipments rarely acquire significant volume before the end of December. Until then it, therefore, did not make much difference whether the cotton bales were kept at the plantations or delivered immediately after packing to the southern ports. If the blockade should stop some time before the end of the year, England could expect with certainty that she would receive her usual cotton supply in March or April, just as if there had never been a blockade. The English business world, for the most part deceived by the English press, fell prey to the delusion that even a show

of war lasting for about six months would end in recognition of the Confederation by the U.S.A. By the end of August, however, the North Americans appeared on the Liverpool market in order to purchase cotton there, partly for speculation in Europe, partly for reshipment to North America. This unheard-of event opened the eyes of the English. They began to understand the seriousness of the situation. Since then the Liverpool cotton market has been gripped by feverish excitement; cotton prices were soon pushed up to 100 per cent above average, speculation in cotton assumed the same wild proportions that had marked speculation in railways in 1845. The spinning and weaving mills in Lancashire and other centres of the British cotton industry cut down their working time to three days a week, some of them stopped their machines altogether; calamitous repercussions in other branches of industry did soon set in, and at the moment the whole of England is shaking with fear in expectation of the greatest economic catastrophe that has ever threatened her.

The consumption of *Indian* cotton is naturally growing and rising prices will secure a still greater acceleration of imports from the ancient home of cotton. Meanwhile, it continues to be impossible, at only a few months' notice, as it were, radically to change the production conditions and the course of trade. England is now really paying for her long mismanagement of India. Her present convulsive attempts to replace American by Indian cotton run up against two major obstacles: the lack of means of communications and transport in India and the bitter plight of the Indian peasant, which does not enable him to make use of the present favourable circumstances. But apart from this, and apart from the fact that Indian cotton still has to go through a process of refinement before it can take the place of American supplies, *years* will be needed, even under the most favourable circumstances, before India is able to produce the required quantity of cotton for export. Within *four months*, however, and this has been established statistically, the cotton reserves in Liverpool will have been used up. They will last that long only if the restriction of working time to three days a week and the complete stoppage of part of the ma-

chinery are carried out by the British cotton spinners and weavers on a larger scale than heretofore. Such procedure subjects the factory districts to the greatest social sufferings. But if the American blockade should go on after January, what then?!

Written by K. Marx
about November 1, 1861

Published in *Die Presse*
No. 305, November 6, 1861

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

THE OPINION OF THE NEWSPAPERS
AND THE OPINION OF THE PEOPLE

London, December 25, 1861

Continental politicians, who imagine that in the London press they possess a thermometer for determining the temper of the English people, are inevitably drawing false conclusions at the present time. With the first news of the *Trent* Affair English national pride flared up and the call for war with the United States resounded from almost all sections of society. The London press, on the other hand, affected moderation and even the *Times* doubted whether a *casus belli* existed at all. Whence this phenomenon? Palmerston was uncertain whether the Crown lawyers were in a position to dig up some legal pretext for war. It appears that a week and a half before the arrival of the *La Plata* at Southampton, agents of the Southern Confederacy had addressed themselves from Liverpool to the English Cabinet, reported the intention of American cruisers to put out from *English* ports and intercept Messrs. Mason, Slidell, etc., on the high seas, and demanded the intervention of the British Government. In accordance with the opinion of its Crown lawyers, the latter refused the request. Hence, in the beginning, the peaceful and moderate tone of the London press in contrast to the bellicose impatience of the people. As soon, however, as the Crown lawyers—the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General, both themselves members of the Cabinet—had contrived a *technical* pretext for a quarrel with the United States, the

respective attitudes of the people and the press turned into their opposites. The war fever increased in the press in the same measure as it abated among the people. At the present moment a war with America is as unpopular with all sections of the English people, the friends of cotton and the country squires excepted, as the clamour for war in the press is overwhelming.

But now, consider the London press! At its head stands the *Times*, whose senior editor, *Bob Lowe*, was formerly a demagogue in Australia, where he agitated for separation from England. He is a subordinate member of the Cabinet, a kind of minister for education, and a mere creature of Palmerston. *Punch* is the court jester of the *Times* and transforms its *sesquipedalia verba** into primitive jokes and flat caricatures. A senior editor of *Punch* was given a post in the Board of Health by Palmerston at an annual salary of a thousand pound sterling.

The *Morning Post* is in part Palmerston's private property. Another part of this singular institution is sold to the French Embassy. The rest belongs to high society and supplies the most exact reports for court toadies and ladies' tailors. Among the English people the *Morning Post* is accordingly notorious as the *Jenkins* of the Press.

The *Morning Advertiser* is the joint property of the "licensed victuallers", i.e., of the public-houses, which, besides beer, may also sell spirits. It is furthermore the organ of the English *Pietists* and ditto of the *sporting characters*, i.e., of the people who make a business of horse-racing, betting, boxing and the like. The editor of this sheet, Mr. *Grant*, previously employed as a stenographer by the newspapers and a quite uneducated man as far as literature is concerned, has had the honour to get invited to Palmerston's private *soirées*. Since then he has been enthusiastic for the "truly English minister"¹⁶⁶ whom, on the outbreak of the Russian war, he had denounced as a "Russian agent". It must be added that the pious patrons of this liquor journal stand under the high command of the Earl of Shaftesbury and that the latter is Palmerston's son-in-law. Shaftesbury is the

* Words a foot and a half long.—*Ed.*

pope of the low church men, who graft the *Sanctus Spiritus* on to the profane spirits of the honest *Advertiser*.

The *Morning Chronicle*! *Quantum mutatus ab illo!** For well-nigh half a century the great organ of the Whig party and the not unfortunate rival of the *Times*, its star paled after the Whig war.¹⁶⁷ It went through metamorphoses of all sorts, turned into a *penny paper*¹⁶⁸ and sought to live on "sensations", as, for example, by taking the part of the poisoner *Palmer*. It subsequently sold itself to the French Embassy, which, however, soon regretted throwing away its money. It then switched to anti-Bonapartism, but with no better success. Finally, it found its long-sought buyer in Messrs. Yancey and Mann—the London agents of the Southern Confederacy.

The *Daily Telegraph* is the private property of a certain *Levy*. His sheet is branded by the English press itself as *Palmerston's* mob paper. Besides this function it conducts a *chronique scandaleuse*. It is characteristic of this *Telegraph* that, on the arrival of the news about the *Trent*, it declared on orders from above that *war was impossible*. The dignity and moderation dictated to it seemed so strange to it itself that since then it has published half a dozen articles about these qualities it displayed on that occasion. As soon, however, as the order for a *volte-face* reached it, the *Telegraph* sought to compensate itself for the constraint that had been put upon it by outyelling all its comrades in the clamour for war.

The *Globe* is the ministerial evening paper which receives official subsidies from all Whig ministries.

The Tory papers *Morning Herald* and *Evening Standard*, both belonging to the same outfit, are governed by a double motive: on the one hand, hereditary hatred for "the *revolted* English colonies"; on the other hand, a chronic ebb in their finances. They know that a war with America must shatter the present coalition cabinet and pave the way for a Tory cabinet. With the Tory cabinet official subsidies for the *Herald* and the *Standard* would return. And so we see that hungry wolves cannot howl louder for prey than these

* How changed from what it was!—*Ed.*

Tory papers do for an American war with its ensuing shower of gold.

Of the London daily press, the *Daily News* and the *Morning Star* are the only papers left that are worth mentioning; both oppose the trumpeters of war. The *Daily News* is restricted in its movements by a connection with Lord John Russell; the influence of the *Morning Star* (the organ of Bright and Cobden) is diminished by its character as a "peace-at-any-price" paper.

Most of the London weeklies are mere echoes of the daily press, hence overwhelmingly warlike. The *Observer* is in the ministry's pay. The *Saturday Review* is in quest of *esprit* and believes it has attained it by affecting a cynical superiority to "humanitarian" prejudices. To show "*esprit*", the corrupt lawyers, parsons and schoolmasters that write for this sheet have scoffingly approved of the slave-holders ever since the outbreak of the American Civil War. Naturally, they subsequently blew the war trumpet together with the *Times*. They are already drawing up plans for a campaign against the United States which display an ignorance that is atrocious.

The *Spectator*, the *Examiner* and particularly *Macmillan's Magazine*¹⁶⁹ must be mentioned as more or less respectable exceptions.

One sees that on the whole the London press—except for the cotton organs the provincial papers form a commendable contrast—represents nothing but Palmerston, over and over again. Palmerston wants war; the English people don't. The events of the immediate future will show who will win in this duel, Palmerston or the people. In any case, he is playing a more dangerous game than Louis Bonaparte did at the beginning of 1859.¹⁷⁰

Written by K. Marx
on December 25, 1861

Published in *Die Presse* No. 359,
December 31, 1861

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

A PRO-AMERICAN MEETING

London, January 1, 1862

The anti-war movement is gaining from day to day in energy and range amidst the *English people*. Public *meetings* all over the country are insisting on a settlement of the dispute between England and America by *arbitration*. Memoranda to this effect are showering on the Head of the Cabinet, and the independent *provincial press* is almost unanimous in its opposition to the war cry of the London press.

A detailed report of a meeting held last Monday in *Brighton* is given below. It was started by the working class and the chief speakers, Mr. *Conningham* and Mr. *White*, are influential Members of Parliament, who both sit on the *government* side of the House.

Mr. *Wood* (a worker) proposed the first motion in the following manner:

"that the dissension between England and America had arisen out of a misinterpretation of the right of the people and not from an intentional insult against the British flag; that this meeting was thus of the opinion that the whole controversial question should be referred to a neutral power for an arbitrational verdict; that in the present situation a war with America could not be justified and, what is more, would earn the condemnation of the English people."

In support of his proposal Mr. Wood noted among other things:

"It has been said that this latest insult is merely the last link in a chain of insults which America has offered England. Assuming that this were true, what justification would it offer for the war cry at the

present moment? It would merely prove that as long as America were united and strong, we would calmly take its insults. But now in its hour of danger we would make use of this propitious situation to avenge the insult. Would such behaviour not brand us as cowards in the eyes of the civilised world?"

Mr. Conningham now spoke:

"...At this moment a pronounced *policy of emancipation* is developing in the heart of the Union itself (applause) and I pronounce the most earnest hope that no intervention on the part of the English Government will be permitted. (Applause.)... You, Englishmen who were born free, do you wish to allow yourselves to be involved in an anti-republican war? For this is the intention of the *Times* and the party which stands behind it... I appeal to the workers of England, who have the greatest interest in the preservation of peace, to raise their voices and, if necessary, their hands to prevent such a serious crime. (Loud applause.)... The *Times* has used every means available to incite the bellicose spirit of the country and by means of bitter derision and invective to breed a hostile frame of mind among the Americans... I do not belong to the so-called Peace Party. The *Times* favours Russia's policy and (in 1853) summoned up all her powers to mislead our country into calmly looking on at the military encroachments of Russian barbarism in the East. I was one of those who raised their voices against this incorrect policy. At the time of the bringing in of the *Conspiracy Bill*, which was to make the extradition of political refugees easier, the *Times*, it appeared, would go to any lengths to push this Bill through the House. I belonged to the ninety-nine members of the House who withstood this encroachment upon the freedom of the English nation and overthrew the minister. (Applause.) This minister is now at the head of the Cabinet. I prophesy for him that should he seek to involve our land in a war with America without good and sufficient reasons, his plan will suffer ignominious failure. I promise him a new humiliating defeat, a greater defeat than the one that fell to his lot on the occasion of the *Conspiracy Bill*. (Loud applause.)... I do not know the contents of the official communication which has been sent to Washington; but the opinion prevails that the lawyers for the Crown have recommended that the Government take up the very narrow legal position that the envoys from the South may not be arrested without the ship which is carrying them. This would mean that the extradition of Slidell and Mason should be demanded as a *conditio sine qua non*.

"Let us suppose that the nation on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean does not allow its Government this extradition. Do you want to be drawn into a war for the sake of the bodies of these two messengers of the slave-dealers?... In this country there exists a party in favour of war against the republic. Call to mind the last Russian war. Through the publication in St. Petersburg of secret dispatches it became clear beyond the slightest possibility of doubt that the articles published by the *Times* in 1853 were written by a person who had access to the secret papers and documents of the Russian state. At that time Mr. Layard

read out the striking parts in the House of Commons, and the *Times* in its consternation immediately altered its tone and the next morning was blowing the trumpet of war. . . . The *Times* has repeatedly attacked the Emperor Napoleon and supported our Government in its demand for unlimited credits for land fortification and floating batteries. After the *Times* has done this and raised the alarm against France, does it want us to expose our coasts to the French Emperor by involving our country in a transatlantic war. . . . It is to be feared that the present massive war preparations not only have nothing to do with the *Trent* incident but are being mounted for the eventuality of the Government's recognising the slave states. If England does this, she will cover herself with an eternal shame."

Mr. *White*:

"The observation must be made that the working class is responsible for the holding of this meeting and that all the costs of organisation will be borne by its committee. . . . The present government never had the discretion to deal with the people honestly and truthfully. . . . I have never for a moment believed in the remotest possibility that a war could develop from the *Trent* incident. I have told more than one member of the government to his face that not a single member of the government believes in the possibility of a war on account of the *Trent* incident. Then why these mighty preparations? I believe that England and France have come to an agreement to recognise the independence of the Southern States next spring. By that time Great Britain will have an overwhelming fleet in American waters. Canada will be completely armed for defence. Then should the states of the North feel inclined to make a *casus belli* out of the recognition of the states of the South, Great Britain will be prepared. . . ."

The speaker then proceeded to expand on the dangers of a war with the United States. He called to mind the sympathy which America had shown on the death of General Havelock and the help which American sailors had given to English ships during the unfortunate fighting in Peiho,¹⁷¹ etc. He concluded with the remark that the Civil War would end with the abolition of slavery, and that England should therefore unquestioningly stand on the side of the North.

After the original motion had been passed unanimously, a memorandum from the meeting to Palmerston was submitted, debated and accepted.

Written by K. Marx
on January 1, 1862

Published in *Die Presse* No. 5,
January 5, 1862

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

ENGLISH PUBLIC OPINION

London, January 11, 1862

The news of the pacific solution of the Trent conflict¹⁷² was, by the bulk of the English people, saluted with an exultation proving unmistakably the unpopularity of the apprehended war and the dread of its consequences. It ought never to be forgotten in the United States that at least the *working classes* of England, from the commencement to the termination of the difficulty, have never forsaken them. To them it was due that, despite the poisonous stimulants daily administered by a venal and reckless press, not one single public war meeting could be held in the United Kingdom during all the period that peace trembled in the balance. The only war meeting convened on the arrival of the *La Plata*, in the cotton salesroom of the Liverpool Stock Exchange, was a corner meeting where the cotton jobbers had it all to themselves. Even at Manchester, the temper of the working classes was so well understood that an insulated attempt at the convocation of a war meeting was almost as soon abandoned as thought of.

Wherever public meetings took place in England, Scotland, or Ireland, they protested against the rabid war cries of the press, against the sinister designs of the Government, and declared for a pacific settlement of the pending question. In this regard, the two last meetings held, the one at Paddington, London, the other at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, are characteristic. The former meeting applauded Mr. Washing-

ton Wilkes's argumentation that England was not warranted in finding fault with the seizure of the Southern Commissioners; while the Newcastle meeting almost unanimously carried the resolution—firstly, that the Americans had only made themselves guilty of a *lawful* exercise of the right of search and seizure; secondly, that the captain of the *Trent* ought to be punished for his violation of English neutrality, as proclaimed by the Queen. In ordinary circumstances, the conduct of the British working men might have been anticipated from the natural sympathy the popular classes all over the world ought to feel for the only popular Government in the world.

Under the present circumstances, however, when a great portion of the British working classes directly and severely suffers under the consequences of the Southern blockade; when another part is indirectly smitten by the curtailment of the American commerce, owing, as they are told, to the selfish "protective policy" of the Republicans; when the only remaining democratic weekly, *Reynolds's Paper*, has sold itself to Messrs. Yancey and Mann, and week after week exhausts its horse-powers of foul language in appeals to the working classes to urge the Government, for their own interests, to war with the Union—under such circumstances, simple justice requires to pay a tribute to the sound attitude of the British working classes, the more so when contrasted with the hypocritical, bullying, cowardly, and stupid conduct of the official and well-to-do John Bull.

What a difference in this attitude of the people from what it had assumed at the time of the Russian complication*! Then the *Times*, *The Post*, and the other Yellowplushes of the London press, whined for peace, to be rebuked by tremendous war meetings all over the country. Now they have howled for war, to be answered by peace meetings denouncing the liberticide schemes and the Pro-Slavery sympathy of the Government. The grimaces cut by the augurs of public opinion at the news of the pacific solution of the *Trent* case are really amusing.

In the first place, they must needs congratulate them-

* The Crimean War.—Ed.

selves upon the dignity, common sense, good will, and moderation, daily displayed by them for the whole interval of a month. They *were* moderate for the first two days after the arrival of the *La Plata*, when Palmerston felt uneasy whether any legal pretext for a quarrel was to be picked. But hardly had the crown lawyers hit upon a legal quibble, when they opened a charivari unheard-of since the anti-Jacobin war. The dispatches of the English Government left Queenstown in the beginning of December. No official answer from Washington could possibly be looked for before the commencement of January. The new incidents arising in the interval told all in favour of the Americans. The tone of the Transatlantic Press, although the Nashville¹⁷³ affair might have roused its passions, was calm. All facts ascertained concurred to show that Capt. Wilkes had acted on his own hook. The position of the Washington Government was delicate. If it resisted the English demands, it would complicate the civil war by a foreign war. If it gave way, it might damage its popularity at home, and appear to cede to pressure from abroad. And the Government thus placed, carried, at the same time, a war which must enlist the warmest sympathies of every man, not a confessed ruffian, on its side.

Common prudence, conventional decency, ought, therefore, to have dictated to the London press, at least for the time separating the English demand from the American reply, to anxiously abstain from every word calculated to heat passion, breed ill will, complicate the difficulty. But no! That "inexpressibly mean and grovelling" press, as William Cobbett, and he was a *connoisseur*, calls it, really boasted of having, when in fear of the compact power of the United States, humbly submitted to the accumulated slights and insults of Pro-Slavery Administrations for almost half a century, while now, with the savage exultation of cowards, they panted for taking their revenge on the Republican Administration, distracted by a civil war. The record of mankind chronicles no self-avowed infamy like this.

One of the yellowplushes, Palmerston's private *Moniteur*—the *Morning Post*—finds itself arraigned on a most ugly charge from the American papers. John Bull has never been informed—or information carefully withheld from him by

the oligarchs that lord it over him—that Mr. Seward, without awaiting Russell's dispatch, had disavowed any participation of the Washington Cabinet in the act of Capt. Wilkes. Mr. Seward's dispatch arrived at London on December 19. On the 20th December, the rumour of this "secret" spread on the Stock Exchange. On the 21st, the yellowplush of *The Morning Post* stepped forward to gravely herald that "the dispatch in question does not in any way whatever refer to the outrage on our mail packet".

In the *Daily News*, the *Morning Star*, and other London journals, you will find yellowplush pretty sharply handled, but you will not learn from them what people out of doors say. They say that the *Morning Post* and the *Times*, like the *Patrie* and the *Pays*, duped the public not only to politically mislead them, but to fleece them in the monetary line on the Stock Exchange, in the interest of their patrons.

The brazen *Times*, fully aware that during the whole crisis it had compromised nobody but itself, and given another proof of the hollowness of its pretensions of influencing the real people of England, plays today a trick which here, at London, only works upon the laughing muscles, but on the other side of the Atlantic, might be misinterpreted. The "popular classes" of London, the "mob", as the yellowplush call them, have given unmistakable signs—have even hinted in newspapers—that they should consider it an exceedingly seasonable joke to treat Mason (by the by, a distant relative of Palmerston, since the original Mason had married a daughter of Sir W. Temple), Slidell & Co. with the same demonstrations Haynau received on his visit at Barclay's brewery. The *Times* stands aghast at the mere idea of such a shocking incident, and how does it try to parry it? It admonishes the people of England not to overwhelm Mason, Slidell & Co. with any sort of public *ovation*! The *Times* knows that its today's article will form the laughing-stock of all the tap-rooms of London. But never mind! People on the other side of the Atlantic may, perhaps, fancy that the magnanimity of the *Times* has saved them from the affront of public ovations to Mason, Slidell & Co., while, in point of fact, the *Times* only intends saving those gentlemen from public insult!

So long as the *Trent* affair was undecided, the *Times*, *The Post*, the *Herald*, the *Economist*, *The Saturday Review*, in fact the whole of the fashionable, hireling press of London, had tried its utmost to persuade John Bull that the Washington Government, even if it willed, would prove unable to keep the peace, because the Yankee mob would not allow it, and because the Federal Government was a mob Government. Facts have now given them the lie direct. Do they now atone for their malignant slanders against the American people? Do they at least confess the errors which yellowplush, in presuming to judge of the acts of a free people, could not but commit? By no means. They now unanimously discover that the American Government, in not anticipating England's demands, and not surrendering the Southern traitors as soon as they were caught, missed a great occasion, and deprived its present concession of all merit. Indeed, yellowplush! Mr. Seward disavowed the act of Wilkes before the arrival of the English demands, and at once declared himself willing to enter upon a conciliatory course; and what did you do on similar occasions? When, on the pretext of impressing English sailors on board American ships—a pretext not at all connected with maritime belligerent rights, but a downright, monstrous usurpation against all international law—the *Leopard* fired its broadside at the *Chesapeake*, killed six, wounded twenty-one of her sailors, and seized the pretended Englishmen on board the *Chesapeake*, what did the English Government do? That outrage was perpetrated on the 20th of June, 1807. The real satisfaction, the surrender of the sailors, &c., was only offered on November 8, 1812, five years later. The British Government, it is true, disavowed at once the act of Admiral Berkeley, as Mr. Seward did in regard to Capt. Wilkes; but, to punish the Admiral, it removed him from an inferior to a superior rank. England, in proclaiming her Orders in Council, distinctly confessed that they were outrages on the rights of neutrals in general, and of the United States in particular; that they were forced upon her as measures of retaliation against Napoleon, and that she would feel but too glad to revoke them whenever Napoleon should revoke his encroachments on neutral rights. Napoleon did revoke them, as far as the United States was concerned,

in the spring of 1810. England persisted in her avowed outrage on the maritime rights of America. Her resistance lasted from 1806 to 23rd of June, 1812—after, on the 18th of June, 1812, the United States had declared war against England. England abstained, consequently, in this case for six years, not from atoning for a confessed outrage, but from discontinuing it. And these people talk of the magnificent occasion missed by the American Government! Whether in the wrong or in the right, it was a cowardly act on the part of the British Government to back a complaint grounded on pretended technical blunder, and a mere error of procedure, by an ultimatum, by a demand for the surrender of the prisoners. The American Government might have reasons to accede to that demand; it could have none to anticipate it.

By the present settlement of the *Trent* collision, the question underlying the whole dispute, and likely to again occur—the belligerent rights of a maritime power against neutrals—has not been settled. I shall, with your permission, try to survey the whole question in a subsequent letter. For the present, allow me to add that, in my opinion, Messrs. Mason and Slidell have done great service to the Federal Government. There was an influential war party in England, which, what for commercial, what for political reasons, showed eager for a fray with the United States. The *Trent* affair put that party to the test. It has failed. The war passion has been discounted on a minor issue, the steam has been let off, the vociferous fury of the oligarchy has raised the suspicions of English democracy, the large British interests connected with the United States have made a stand, the true character of the civil war has been brought home to the working classes, and last, not least, the dangerous period when Palmerston rules single-headed without being checked by Parliament, is rapidly drawing to an end. That was the only time in which an English war for the slaveocrats might have been hazarded. It is now out of question.

Written by K. Marx
on January 11, 1862

Published in the *New-York
Daily Tribune* No. 6499,
February 1, 1862

Printed according
to the newspaper text

KARL MARX

A LONDON WORKERS' MEETING

London, January 28, 1862

As everyone knows, the working class, which is such a predominating constituent of a society that since time immemorial has not had a *peasant estate*, is not represented in Parliament. Still, it is not without political influence. No important innovation, no decisive measure has ever been carried out in this country without *pressure from without*. Either the opposition needed such pressure against the Government or the Government needed it against the opposition. By *pressure from without* the Englishman means great, extra-parliamentary popular demonstrations, which naturally cannot be staged without the active participation of the working class. *Pitt* knew how to use the masses against the Whigs in his anti-Jacobin war. The Catholic Emancipation, the Reform Bill, the repeal of the Corn Laws, the Ten Hours Bill, the war against Russia and the rejection of Palmerston's Conspiracy Bill¹⁷⁴ were all the fruit of stormy extra-parliamentary demonstrations, in which the working class, sometimes artificially incited, sometimes acting spontaneously, now as *persona dramatis*, now as the chorus, played either the main part or, if the circumstances so demanded, the noisy part. So much the more striking is the attitude of the English working class in regard to the American Civil War.

Unbelievable and daily increasing distress exists among the workers in the northern manufacturing districts, caused

by the mills being closed or put on part-time, the blockade of the slave States serving *as a pretext*. The other sections of the working class do not suffer to the same extent; but they suffer keenly from the repercussion of the crisis in the cotton industry on the other industries, from the drop in exports of their own products to the northern United States as a result of the Morrill tariff and from the complete cessation of this export to southern United States as a result of the blockade. At the present moment, English intervention in America has accordingly become a bread-and-butter question for the working class. Moreover, no means of inflaming its wrath against the United States is scorned by its "*natural superiors*". The only large and widely circulating workers' organ still in existence, *Reynolds's Newspaper*, was bought six months ago for the express purpose of reiterating weekly in raging diatribes the *caeterum censeo*¹⁷⁵ of English intervention. The working class is therefore fully aware that the Government is only waiting for the intervention cry from below, the *pressure from without* to put an end to the American blockade and to distress in England. Under these circumstances, one cannot but admire the obstinacy with which the working class keeps silent, or breaks its silence only to raise its voice against intervention and *for* the United States. This is a new, splendid proof of the indestructible thoroughness of the English popular masses, that thoroughness which is the secret of England's greatness and which, to speak in the hyperbolic language of Mazzini, made the English private seem a demigod during the Crimean War and the Indian insurrection.

The following report of a mass *meeting of workers* held yesterday in Marylebone, the most populous borough of London, may serve to characterise the "policy" of the working class:

Mr. *Steadman*, the chairman, opened the meeting with the remark that the business before them was to decide how the English people were to *receive* Mr. *Mason* and Mr. *Slidell*.

They had to consider whether these gentlemen came here to free the slaves from their chains or to forge a new link for these chains.

Mr. Yates:

"On the present occasion the working class ought not to keep silent. The two gentlemen who are sailing across the Atlantic to our land are agents of tyrannical slave-holding states. They are in open rebellion against the lawful constitution of their country and come here to induce our government to recognise the independence of the slave states. It is the duty of the working class to voice its opinion now, if the English Government is not to believe that its foreign policy is a matter of indifference to us. We must show that the money expended by this people on the emancipation of the slaves cannot be allowed to go to waste. If our government were acting honestly, it would be supporting the Northern States heart and soul in the suppression of this terrible rebellion."

After a detailed defence of the Northern States and the observation that "Mr. Lovejoy's violent tirade against England was provoked by the slanders of the English press", the speaker proposed the following motion:

"This meeting resolves that Mason and Slidell, agents of the rebels, now en route from America to England, are wholly unworthy of the moral sympathies of the working class of this country, since they are slave-holders as well as the confessed agents of the despotic faction that at this moment is engaged in rebellion against the republic of the United States and is the sworn enemy of the social and political rights of the working class in all countries."

Mr. Whyhne seconded the motion, declaring, however, that as a matter of course every personal insult to Mason and Slidell was to be avoided during their stay in London.

Mr. Nichols, a resident "*of the extreme North of the United States*", as he himself announced, was in fact sent to the meeting by Mr. Yancey and Mr. Mann as the *advocatus diaboli*. He objected to the motion:

"I am here, because you have free speech here. In our country the Government has not permitted anybody to open his mouth for the last three months. Liberty has been crushed not only in the South, but also in the North. Many Northerners are opposed to the war, but they dare not say so. No less than two hundred newspapers have been suppressed or their premises wrecked by mobs. The Southern States have the same right to secede from the North as the United States had to separate from England."

Despite Mr. Nichols's eloquence the first motion was carried unanimously. He then rose once more to state that if they held it against Mr. Mason and Mr. Slidell that they

were slave-holders, the same reproach would apply to Washington, Jefferson, etc.

Mr. *Beales* refuted Nichols in a detailed speech and then moved a second motion:

"Whereas the *Times* and other misleading journals are making ill-concealed attempts to misrepresent English public opinion on all American affairs, to involve us in war with millions of our kinsmen on any pretext whatever, and to take advantage of the dangers now imperilling the republic to defame democratic institutions—

"therefore this meeting considers it the particular duty of the workers, since they are not represented in the Senate of the nation, to declare their sympathy with the United States in its gigantic struggle for the maintenance of the Union, to denounce the base dishonesty and advocacy of slave-holding indulged in by the *Times* and kindred aristocratic journals, to express themselves most emphatically in favour of a policy of strictest non-intervention in the affairs of the United States, in favour of settling all disputes that may arise by commissioners or courts of arbitration appointed by both sides, to protest against the war policy of the organ of the stock-exchange sharks, and to manifest the warmest sympathy with the endeavours of the Abolitionists to bring about a final solution of the problem of slavery."

This motion was unanimously adopted, as was the concluding proposal "to transmit copies of the resolutions adopted to the American Government through Mr. Adams as an expression of the sentiments and opinions of the working class of England".

Written by K. Marx
on January 28, 1862

Published in *Die Presse*
No. 32, February 2, 1862

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

THE MOOD AGAINST INTERVENTION

London, January 31, 1862

Liverpool derives its commercial greatness from the *slave trade*. The only contributions with which Liverpool has enriched England's poetry are odes in praise of the slave trade. Fifty years ago *Wilberforce* could only set foot in Liverpool at the risk of his life. Like the slave trade in the past century, so in this century trade in cotton, produced by slaves, has formed the material basis of Liverpool's greatness. No wonder, therefore, that Liverpool is the centre of the British secession supporters. It is indeed the *only* city in the United Kingdom where it was possible during the last crisis to create a quasi-public meeting in favour of a war against the United States. And what does Liverpool say now? Let us look at one of its big daily papers—the *Daily Post*.¹⁷⁶

An editorial entitled "The Cute Yankee" says among other things:

"The Yankees have, with their usual adroitness, turned an apparent loss into a real gain and have used England to their advantage.... Great Britain has really displayed her might, but to what purpose? Since the foundation of the United States the Yankees have always claimed the privilege for a neutral flag that passengers sailing under it are protected against all interference and attack from belligerents. We resolutely contested that privilege during the anti-Jacobin war, the Anglo-American war of 1812-14 and but recently in 1842, during the negotiations between Lord Ashburton and Secretary of State, Daniel Webster. Now our opposition must cease. *The Yankee principle is virtually recognised*. Mr. Seward records this fact, saying that we yield on princip-

le and that by means of the *Trent* affair the United States is obtaining a concession from us for the attainment of which they had up to now exhausted all diplomatic and military means in vain."

More important still is the admission of the *Daily Post* about the change of public opinion in Liverpool itself.

"The Confederates," it says, "have certainly done nothing to diminish the good opinion entertained of them—quite the contrary. They have fought manfully and made dreadful sacrifices; even if they do not obtain independence it is competent for anyone to think that they deserve it. Public opinion, however, has now ran counter to their claims. They are no longer the fine fellows they were four weeks ago. They are now pronounced a very sorry set. . . . Reaction has indeed commenced. The anti-slavery people, who shrank into their shoes in the presence of popular excitement, now come forth to thunder big words against man-selling and rebellious slave-owners! . . . Are not even the walls of our town posted with big placards full of denunciations and angry invectives against Messrs. Mason and Slidell, the authors of the accursed Fugitive Slave Law? . . . The Confederates have lost by the *Trent* affair. It was to be their gain, it has been their ruin. The sympathy of this country has been withdrawn from them, and they will have to realise as soon as possible their peculiar situation. They have been very ill used, but there will be no redress."

This admission of the pro-secessionist Liverpool daily clearly explains the new language some of Palmerston's influential organs have suddenly begun to use before the opening of Parliament. Thus, the *Economist* printed on Saturday last an article under the heading "Shall the Blockade be Respected?"

It proceeds initially from the *axiom* that the blockade is only a *paper blockade* and that its violation is therefore permissible under international law. France is said to be demanding it be lifted by force. The decision therefore practically rests with England, which has important and urgent motives for undertaking such a step. Namely, she needs American cotton. Let it be noted in passing that it is not quite clear how "only a paper blockade" can impede the shipment of cotton.

"Yet," the *Economist* appeals, "England *must* respect the blockade." After listing a number of reasons that would motivate this view it finally comes to the heart of the matter.

"In that case," it says, "the Government would have to have the whole country behind it. But the great body of the English people are

not yet *prepared* for any interposition which would even have the semblance of aiding the establishment of a Slave Republic. The social system of the Confederate States is based on slavery: the Federalists have done what they could to persuade us that slavery lay at the root of secession movement, that they were hostile to slavery—and slavery is our especial horror and detestation. . . . The real error of popular sentiment is here. The dissolution, not the restoration of the Union, independence, not the defeat of the South, is the only sure way to achieve the emancipation of the slaves. We hope to make this clear to our readers on some future occasion. But *it is not clear yet. The majority of Englishmen still think otherwise.* As long as they persist in this prejudice, any intervention on the part of our Government, which should place us in a condition of actual opposition to the North, and inferential alliance with the South, would scarcely be supported by the hearty co-operation of the British nation."

In other words: an attempt at such intervention would bring down the government, and this explains also why the *Times* speaks out so firmly against all intervention and for England's neutrality.

Written by K. Marx
on January 31, 1862

Published in *Die Presse*
No. 34, February 4, 1862

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

**INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE WORKING MEN'S
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION**

ESTABLISHED SEPTEMBER 28, 1864
AT A PUBLIC MEETING HELD AT ST. MARTIN'S HALL,
LONG ACRE, LONDON¹⁷⁷

Working Men,

It is a great fact that the misery of the working masses has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled for the development of its industry and the growth of its commerce. In 1850, a moderate organ of the British middle class, of more than average information, predicted that if the exports and imports of England were to rise 50 per cent, English pauperism would sink to zero. Alas! On April 7, 1864, the Chancellor of the Exchequer delighted his parliamentary audience by the statement that the total import and export trade of England had grown in 1863 "to £443,955,000! that astonishing sum about three times the trade of the comparatively recent epoch of 1843!" With all that, he was eloquent upon "poverty". "Think," he exclaimed, "of those who are on the border of that region," upon "wages . . . not increased"; upon "human life . . . in nine cases out of ten but a struggle of existence!"¹⁷⁸ He did not speak of the people of Ireland, gradually replaced by machinery in the north, and by sheep-walks in the south, though even the sheep in that unhappy country are decreasing, it is true, not at so rapid a rate as the men. He did not repeat what then had been just betrayed by the highest representatives of the upper ten thousand in a sudden fit of terror. When the garrotte¹⁷⁹ panic had reached a certain

height, the House of Lords caused an inquiry to be made into, and a report to be published upon, transportation and penal servitude. Out came the murder in the bulky Blue Book of 1863,¹⁸⁰ and proved it was, by official facts and figures, that the worst of the convicted criminals, the penal serfs of England and Scotland, toiled much less and fared far better than the agricultural labourers of England and Scotland. But this was not all. When, consequent upon the Civil War in America, the operatives of Lancashire and Cheshire were thrown upon the streets, the same House of Lords sent to the manufacturing districts a physician commissioned to investigate into the smallest possible amount of carbon and nitrogen, to be administered in the cheapest and plainest form, which on an average might just suffice to "avert starvation diseases". Dr. Smith, the medical deputy, ascertained that 28,000 grains of carbon, and 1,330 grains of nitrogen were the weekly allowance that would keep an average adult . . . just over the level of starvation diseases, and he found furthermore that quantity pretty nearly to agree with the scanty nourishment to which the pressure of extreme distress had actually reduced the cotton operatives. But now mark! The same learned Doctor was later on again deputed by the medical officer of the Privy Council to inquire into the nourishment of the poorer labouring classes. The results of his researches are embodied in the "Sixth Report on Public Health", published by order of Parliament in the course of the present year.¹⁸¹ What did the Doctor discover? That the silk weavers, the needle women, the kid gloves, the stocking weavers, and so forth, received, on an average, not even the distress pittance of the cotton operatives, not even the amount of carbon and nitrogen "just sufficient to avert starvation diseases".

"Moreover," we quote from the report, "as regards the examined families of the agricultural population, it appeared that more than a fifth were with less than the estimated sufficiency of carbonaceous food, that more than one-third were with less than the estimated sufficiency of nitrogenous food, and that in three counties (Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Somersetshire) insufficiency of nitrogenous food was the average local diet." "It must be remembered," adds the official report, "that privation of food is very reluctantly borne, and that, as a rule, great poorness of diet will only come when other privations have preceded it. . . . Even

cleanliness will have been found costly or difficult, and if there still be self-respectful endeavours to maintain it, every such endeavour will represent additional pangs of hunger." "These are painful reflections, especially when it is remembered that the poverty to which they advert is not the deserved poverty of idleness; in all cases it is the poverty of working populations. Indeed, the work which obtains the scanty pittance of food is for the most part excessively prolonged."

The report brings out the strange, and rather unexpected fact, "That of the divisions of the United Kingdom", England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, "the agricultural population of England", the richest division, "is considerably the worst fed", but that even the agricultural labourers of Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Somersetshire, fare better than great numbers of skilled indoor operatives of the East of London.

Such are the official statements published by order of Parliament in 1864, during the millennium of free trade, at a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House of Commons that

"the average condition of the British labourer has improved in a degree we know to be extraordinary and unexampled in the history of any country or any age".

Upon these official congratulations jars the dry remark of the official Public Health Report:

"The public health of a country means the health of its masses, and the masses will scarcely be healthy unless, to their very base, they be at least moderately prosperous."

Dazzled by the "Progress of the Nation" statistics dancing before his eyes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims in wild ecstasy:

"From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent; in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has increased from the basis taken in 1853 by 20 per cent! the fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible!... This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power," adds Mr. Gladstone, "is entirely confined to classes of property!"¹⁸²

If you want to know under what conditions of broken health, tainted morals and mental ruin, that "intoxicating

augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was, and is being produced by the classes of labour, look to the picture hung up in the last "Public Health Report"¹⁸³ of the workshops of tailors, printers and dressmakers! Compare the "Report of the Children's Employment Commission" of 1863, where it is stated, for instance, that:

"The potters as a class, both men and women, represent a much degenerated population, both physically and mentally", that "the unhealthy child is an unhealthy parent in his turn", that "a progressive deterioration of the race must go on", and that "the degenerescence of the population of Staffordshire would be even greater were it not for the constant recruiting from the adjacent country, and the intermarriages with more healthy races."¹⁸⁴

Glance at Mr. Tremenheere's Blue Book on the "Grievances Complained of by the Journeymen Bakers!"¹⁸⁵ And who has not shuddered at the paradoxical statement made by the inspectors of factories, all illustrated by the Registrar General, that the Lancashire operatives, while put upon the distress pittance of food, were actually improving in health, because of their temporary exclusion by the cotton famine from the cotton factory, and that the mortality of the children was decreasing, because their mothers were now at last allowed to give them, instead of Godfrey's cordial, their own breasts.

Again reverse the medal! The Income and Property Tax Returns laid before the House of Commons on July 20, 1864, teach us that the persons with yearly incomes, valued by the tax-gatherer at £ 50,000 and upwards, had, from April 5, 1862 to April 5, 1863, been joined by a dozen and one, their number having increased in that single year from 67 to 80. The same returns disclose the fact that about 3,000 persons divide amongst themselves a yearly income of about £ 25,000,000 sterling, rather more than the total revenue doled out annually to the whole mass of the agricultural labourers of England and Wales. Open the census of 1861, and you will find that the number of the male landed proprietors of England and Wales had decreased from 16,934 in 1851, to 15,066 in 1861, so that the concentration of land

had grown in 10 years 11 per cent. If the concentration of the soil of the country in a few hands proceed at the same rate, the land question will become singularly simplified, as it had become in the Roman Empire, when Nero grinned at the discovery that half the Province of Africa was owned by six gentlemen.

We have dwelt so long upon these "facts so astonishing to be almost incredible", because England heads the Europe of commerce and industry. It will be remembered that some months ago one of the refugee sons of Louis Philippe publicly congratulated the English agricultural labourer on the superiority of his lot over that of his less florid comrade on the other side of the Channel. Indeed, with local colours changed, and on a scale somewhat contracted, the English facts reproduce themselves in all the industrious and progressive countries of the Continent. In all of them there has taken place, since 1848, an unheard-of development of industry, and an undreamed-of expansion of imports and exports. In all of them "the augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was truly "intoxicating". In all of them, as in England, a minority of the working classes got their real wages somewhat advanced; while in most cases the monetary rise of wages denoted no more a real access of comforts than the inmate of the metropolitan poor-house or orphan asylum, for instance, was in the least benefited by his first necessities costing £ 9 15s. 8d. in 1861 against £ 7 7s. 4d. in 1852. Everywhere the great mass of the working classes were sinking down to a lower depth, at the same rate at least, that those above them were rising in the social scale. In all countries of Europe it has now become a truth demonstrable to every unprejudiced mind, and only denied by those, whose interest it is to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery, no appliance of science to production, no contrivances of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening of markets, no free trade, nor all these things put together, will do away with the miseries of the industrious masses; but that, on the present false base, every fresh development of the productive powers of labour must tend to deepen social contrasts and point social antagonisms. Death of starvation

rose almost to the rank of an institution, during this intoxicating epoch of economical progress, in the metropolis of the British Empire. That epoch is marked in the annals of the world by the quickened return, the widening compass, and the deadlier effects of the social pest called a commercial and industrial crisis.

After the failure of the Revolutions of 1848, all party organisations and party journals of the working classes were, on the Continent, crushed by the iron hand of force, the most advanced sons of labour fled in despair to the Transatlantic Republic, and the short-lived dreams of emancipation vanished before an epoch of industrial fever, moral marasme, and political reaction. The defeat of the Continental working classes, partly owed to the diplomacy of the English Government, acting then as now in fraternal solidarity with the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, soon spread its contagious effects to this side of the Channel. While the rout of their Continental brethren unmanned the English working classes, and broke their faith in their own cause, it restored to the landlord and the money-lord their somewhat shaken confidence. They insolently withdrew concessions already advertised. The discoveries of new goldlands led to an immense exodus, leaving an irreparable void in the ranks of the British proletariat. Others of its formerly active members were caught by the temporary bribe of greater work and wages, and turned into "political blacks". All the efforts made at keeping up, or remodelling, the Chartist movement, failed signally; the press organs of the working class died one by one of the apathy of the masses, and, in point of fact, never before seemed the English working class so thoroughly reconciled to a state of political nullity. If, then, there had been no solidarity of action between the British and the Continental working classes, there was, at all events, a solidarity of defeat.

And yet the period passed since the Revolutions of 1848 has not been without its compensating features. We shall here only point to two great facts.

After a thirty years' struggle, fought with most admirable perseverance, the English working classes, improving a momentaneous split between the landlords and money-

lords, succeeded in carrying the Ten Hours Bill. The immense physical, moral and intellectual benefits hence accruing to the factory operatives, half-yearly chronicled in the reports of the inspectors of factories, are now acknowledged on all sides. Most of the Continental governments had to accept the English Factory Act in more or less modified forms, and the English Parliament itself is every year compelled to enlarge its sphere of action. But besides its practical import, there was something else to exalt the marvellous success of this working men's measure. Through their most notorious organs of science, such as Dr. Ure, Professor Senior, and other sages of that stamp, the middle class had predicted, and to their heart's content proved, that any legal restriction of the hours of labour must sound the death knell of British industry, which, vampirelike, could but live by sucking blood, and children's blood, too. In olden times, child murder was a mysterious rite of the religion of Moloch, but it was practised on some very solemn occasions only, once a year perhaps, and then Moloch had no exclusive bias for the children of the poor. This struggle about the legal restriction of the hours of labour raged the more fiercely since, apart from frightened avarice, it told indeed upon the great contest between the blind rule of the supply and demand laws which form the political economy of the middle class, and social production controlled by social foresight, which forms the political economy of the working class. Hence the Ten Hours Bill was not only a great practical success; it was the victory of a principle; it was the first time that in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class.

But there was in store a still greater victory of the political economy of labour over the political economy of property. We speak of the co-operative movement, especially the co-operative factories raised by the unassisted efforts of a few bold "hands". The value of these great social experiments cannot be over-rated. By deed, instead of by argument, they have shown that production on a large scale, and in accord with the behests of modern science, may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a

class of hands; that to bear fruit, the means of labour need not be monopolised as a means of dominion over, and of extortion against, the labouring man himself; and that, like slave labour, like serf labour, hired labour is but a transitory and inferior form, destined to disappear before associated labour plying its toil with a willing hand, a ready mind, and a joyous heart. In England, the seeds of the co-operative system were sown by Robert Owen; the working men's experiments, tried on the Continent, were, in fact, the practical upshot of the theories, not invented, but loudly proclaimed, in 1848.

At the same time, the experience of the period from 1848 to 1864 has proved beyond doubt that, however excellent in principle, and however useful in practice, co-operative labour, if kept within the narrow circle of the casual efforts of private workmen, will never be able to arrest the growth in geometrical progression of monopoly, to free the masses, nor even to perceptibly lighten the burden of their miseries. It is perhaps for this very reason that plausible noblemen, philanthropic middle-class spouters, and even keen political economists, have all at once turned nauseously complimentary to the very co-operative labour system they had vainly tried to nip in the bud by deriding it as the Utopia of the dreamer, or stigmatising it as the sacrilege of the Socialist. To save the industrious masses, co-operative labour ought to be developed to national dimensions, and consequently, to be fostered by national means. Yet, the lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way of the emancipation of labour. Remember the sneer with which, last session, Lord Palmerston put down the advocates of the Irish Tenants' Right Bill. The House of Commons, cried he, is a house of landed proprietors.¹⁸⁶

To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes. They seem to have comprehended this, for in England, Germany, Italy, and France there have taken place simultaneous revivals, and simultaneous efforts

are being made at the political reorganisation of the working men's party.

One element of success they possess—numbers; but numbers weigh only in the balance, if united by combination and led by knowledge. Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts. This thought prompted the working men of different countries assembled on September 28, 1864, in public meeting at St. Martin's Hall, to found the International Association.

Another conviction swayed that meeting.

If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure? It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic.¹⁸⁷ The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling a prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia; the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every cabinet of Europe, have taught the working classes the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.

The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.
Proletarians of all countries, Unite!

Written by K. Marx
between October 21-27, 1864

Published in the pamphlet
*Address and Provisional Rules
of the Working Men's
International Association,
Established September 28, 1864,
at a Public Meeting held
at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre,
London*, printed in London in
November 1864. The authorised
translation into German
was printed in *Der Social-Demokrat*
Nos. 2 and 3, December 21
and 30, 1864

Printed according
to the text of the
English pamphlet

KARL MARX

THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT
AND THE FENIAN PRISONERS¹⁸⁸

London, February 21, 1870

I

The silence observed by the European press about the infamies committed by the British oligarchic bourgeois government is due to several reasons.

To begin with, the British Government is *rich*, and the press, as you know, is *incorruptible*. Furthermore, the British Government is a model government, recognised as such by the landlords, by the capitalists of the Continent, and even by Garibaldi (see his book¹⁸⁹): hence, one should not speak ill of that ideal government. Finally, the French republicans are so narrow-minded and egoistic that they reserve all their wrath for the Empire. It would be a crime against freedom of speech to inform their compatriots that *in a country of bourgeois freedom* people are sentenced to 20 years of hard labour for things punishable with 6 months' imprisonment *in the country of cantonments*. Here follow a few details taken from English dailies about the treatment of Fenian prisoners:

Mulcahy, sub-editor of *The Irish People*,¹⁹⁰ condemned for having taken part in a Fenian conspiracy, had an iron collar put round his neck at Dartmoor and was hitched to a cart loaded with stones.

O'Donovan Rossa, proprietor of *The Irish People*, was for 35 days kept in a dungeon with his arms chained behind his back night and day. He was not even unshackled to take

his food—the meagre brew that was left for him on the prison floor.

Although *Kickham*, one of the editors of *The Irish People*, did not have the use of his right hand owing to an abscess, he was made to sit with his companions on a pile of rubbish in the fog and cold of November and to break stones and bricks with his left hand. For the night he was taken back to his cell, and had nothing more to sustain him than six ounces of bread and a pint of warm water.

O'Leary, an old man of sixty or seventy, was while in prison put on bread and water for three weeks because he did not want to renounce his *paganism* (that, evidently, is what the gaoler calls freethinking) and to become either papist, protestant, presbyterian, or even Quaker, or embrace one of the numerous religions which the governor of the prison offered for the Irish pagan's choice.

Martin H. Carey is incarcerated in an insane asylum at Mill-Bank; the silence that was imposed on him and other ill treatment made him lose his reason.

Colonel Rickard Burke is in no better condition. One of his friends writes that his reason is affected, that he has lost his memory and that his ways, his manners and his speech indicate insanity.

Political prisoners are transferred from one prison to another as though they were wild beasts. The company of the vilest rogues is imposed on them; they are obliged to scour utensils which were used by these miserables, to wear the shirts and flannels of these criminals, many of whom are afflicted with the most disgusting diseases, and to wash in water which these latter had already used. All these criminals were allowed to speak with visitors until the arrival of the Fenians to Portland. A visiting cage was installed for the Fenian prisoners. It consisted of three compartments separated by thick iron bars; the gaoler occupies the central compartment, and the prisoner and his friends cannot see each other but through this double row of bars.

There are prisoners in the docks who eat all the snails, and frogs are considered a delicacy of Chatham. General Thomas Burke declares that he was not surprised to see a dead mouse floating in the soup. The condemned say that it

was an unhappy day for them when the Fenians were brought to the prisons. (The routine has become much stricter.)

I shall add a few words to the above:

Last year *Mr. Bruce*, Minister for the Interior, grand Liberal, grand policeman, grand proprietor of mines in Wales, and a fierce exploiter of labour, was interpellated on the bad treatment of Fenian prisoners and especially O'Donovan Rossa. At first he denied everything; later he was compelled to admit it. Then Mr. Moore, Irish member of the House of Commons, demanded an investigation. It was flatly refused by that *radical ministry* of which that demi-saint (he has been publicly compared to Jesus Christ) Mr. Gladstone is head and the old bourgeois demagogue John Bright is one of the most influential members.

Lately, after the rumours of bad treatment were renewed, a few M.P.s demanded permission from Minister Bruce to visit the prisoners, in order *to be able to state the falsity of these rumours*. Mr. Bruce refused the permission because, he said, the governors of the prisons feared that the prisoners would be excited by visits of that kind.

Last week the Minister for the Interior was again interpellated. He was asked whether it was true that after his nomination as deputy for Tipperary O'Donovan Rossa received corporal punishment (i.e., was whipped); the Minister declared that this did not happen after 1868 (which goes to say that in the course of two to three years the political prisoner was indeed whipped).

I am also sending you extracts concerning Michael Terbert, a Fenian, who was sentenced like all the others to hard labour and who served his sentence at Spike Island Convict Prison, Cork County, Ireland. You will see that the coroner himself attributes his death to tortures. The inquest took place last week.

In the course of two years *more than twenty* Fenian workers died or lost their reason by grace of the philanthropy of these good bourgeois, supported by those good landlords.

You probably know that the English press professes a chaste horror of the abominable general emergency laws which embellish beautiful France. But it is general emergency

laws that—brief intervals excepted—make up the Irish Charter. Ever since 1793 the English Government has for every possible reason regularly and periodically suspended the operation of the Habeas Corpus Bill (the law which guarantees freedom of person)¹⁹¹ in Ireland and, in effect, every law save that of brutal force. In this manner thousands of people *suspected of being Fenian supporters* were taken into custody in Ireland without trial or judgement, without even being formally charged. Not content with depriving them of their liberty, the English Government subjected them to most savage tortures. Here is an example:

One of the prisons where suspected Fenians were buried alive is *Mountjoy Prison* in Dublin. The inspector of that prison, Murray, is a wild beast. He has maltreated prisoners in a manner so savage that a few of them went out of their minds. The prison doctor, O'Donnell, an excellent man (who has played an honourable part in the inquest of Michael Terbert's death), wrote letters of protest for some months, which he at first addressed to Murray himself. Since Murray did not reply to them, he addressed his reports to the superior authorities, but Murray, an expert gaoler, intercepted them.

Finally O'Donnell addressed himself directly to Lord Mayo, then Viceroy of Ireland. This was at the time when the Tories (Derby-Disraeli) were in power. What were the results of these actions? The documents related to the affair were published by order of Parliament and... Doctor O'Donnell was dismissed from his post!!! As for Murray, he kept his.

Then came the so-called radical ministry of Gladstone, that delicate, that unctuous, that magnanimous Gladstone who shed such hot and sincere tears over the lot of Poerio and the other bourgeois maltreated by King Bomba.¹⁹² What did this idol of the progressive bourgeoisie do? While insulting the Irish with his insolent rejection of their amnesty demands, he not only confirmed the Monster Murray in his functions, but in gratitude added a fat sinecure to his post of chief gaoler! Such is the apostle of bourgeois philanthropy!

But dust had to be thrown in the eyes of the public; one had to create the impression that something was being done

for Ireland, and with grand fanfare he announced a law to regulate the land question (the Land Bill¹⁹³). But all this is nothing but deceit with the ultimate object of creating an impression in Europe, of enticing the Irish judges and barristers with prospects of endless litigations between landlords and farmers, attracting the landlords with promises of subventions, and luring the richer farmers with some half-concessions.

In the lengthy introduction to his grandiloquent and confused discourse, Gladstone confessed that even the "benevolent" laws which Liberal England had granted Ireland in the last hundred years have unfailingly led to that country's deterioration.¹⁹⁴ And after that naïve confession the selfsame Gladstone persists in torturing the men who want to end this wrongful and imbecile legislation.

Written by K. Marx
on February 21, 1870

Published in *L'Internationale*
No. 59, February 27, 1870

Translated from the French

KARL MARX

From THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL
OF FRENCH SWITZERLAND

4) *Question of the separation of the General Council from the Federal Council for England.*

Long before the foundation of *L'Egalité* this proposal was made periodically in the General Council itself by one or two of its English members. It has always been rejected almost unanimously.

Whilst the revolutionary *initiative* comes probably from France, England alone can serve as a *lever* for a serious *economic* revolution. It is the only country where there are no more peasants and where real estate is concentrated in a few hands. It is the only country where the *capitalist form*—i.e., labour combined on a large scale under capitalist masters—has taken over almost all production. It is the only country *where the large majority of the population consists of wage-labourers*. It is the only country where the class struggle and the organisation of the working class by the *Trades*

Unions have acquired a certain measure of maturity and universality. It is the only country where each revolution in economic matters would, because of its domination of the world market, immediately affect the whole world. If land-lordism and capitalism have their classical headquarters in this country, as a repercussion the *material conditions* for their *destruction* are the most ripe. Therefore the General Council is now in the *fortunate* position of *having a hand directly on the great lever of the proletarian revolution*, what folly, we would almost say what a crime to let it fall into entirely English hands!

The English have all the *material prerequisites* for the social revolution. What they lack is a *spirit for generalisation and revolutionary fervour*. It is only the General Council that can supply it, thus accelerating the truly revolutionary movement in this country and consequently *everywhere*. The great success which we have already had in this respect is witnessed by those newspapers which are the most intelligent and most enjoy the confidence of the ruling classes, as e.g., the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Spectator* and the *Fortnightly Review*, not to mention those so-called radical members of the *Commons* and *Lords* who, a short time ago, still exercised considerable influence on the leaders of the English workers. They publicly accuse us of having poisoned and almost extinguished the *English spirit* of the working class and of having pushed it towards revolutionary socialism.

The only way of effecting this change is by acting as the *General Council of the International Association*. As General Council we can initiate measures (e.g., the foundation of the *Land and Labour League*¹⁹⁵) which will later bear fruit before the public as spontaneous movements of the English working class.

If a *Regional Council* were set up outside the *General Council*, what would be the immediate consequences? Standing between the *General Council* and the *General Trades Union Council* the *Regional Council* would not possess any authority. On the other hand, the *General Council* would lose control of *this great lever*. If we wanted to substitute the fanfare of the stage for serious, inconspicuous action,

we would perhaps have committed the error of replying publicly to *L'Egalité's* question as to why the *General Council* tolerates such an "irritating cumulation of functions".

England must not simply be treated as a country like any other country. It must be treated as the *metropolis of capital*.

5) *Question on the Resolution of the General Council with reference to the Irish amnesty.*

If England is the bulwark of European landlordism and capitalism, the only point where the great blow can be delivered at official England is *Ireland*.

In the first place Ireland is the *bulwark* of English landlordism. If it collapses in Ireland it will collapse in England. The operation is a hundred times easier in Ireland, because the *economic struggle there is concentrated exclusively on landed property*, because this struggle there is at the same time national, and because the people there are more revolutionary and more embittered than in England. Landlordism in Ireland is maintained solely by the *English army*. As soon as the *forced union* between the two countries has ceased, a social revolution will immediately break out there although in an outmoded form. English landlordism will not only lose a large source of its riches, but also its *largest moral force*, namely, that of *representing the domination of England over Ireland*. On the other hand, by maintaining the power of their landlords in Ireland the English proletariat makes them invulnerable in England itself.

In the second place, the English bourgeoisie has not only exploited Irish destitution to worsen the conditions of the working class in England by the *forced immigration* of poor Irish, but it has also divided the proletariat into two hostile camps. The revolutionary fervour of the Celtic worker does not fit in with the solid but slow temperament of the Anglo-Saxon worker, on the contrary, in all the *large industrial centres of England* there is profound antagonism between the Irish proletarian and the English proletarian. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who causes a drop in wages and the *standard of life*. He feels national and religious antipathy towards him. He re-

gards him in almost the same way as the *poor whites* of the Southern States of North America regarded black slaves. This antagonism between the proletarians of England itself, is artificially nourished and maintained by the bourgeoisie. It knows that the true secret of the preservation of its power lies in this split.

This antagonism is also found on the other side of the Atlantic. The Irish, driven from their native land by *oxen* and sheep, find themselves in North America where they form a considerable and constantly growing section of the population. Their one thought, their one passion, is the hatred of England. The English Government and the American Government (that is to say the classes which they represent) feed these passions to prolong the clandestine struggle between the United States and England, and by so doing they prevent any sincere and serious alliance, and consequently the emancipation of the working classes on both sides of the Atlantic.

Moreover, Ireland is the English government's sole pretext for maintaining a *large standing army* which, in case of need, as has been seen, is used against the English workers after having obtained its military practice in Ireland.

Finally what we have been shown by Ancient Rome on a monstrous scale, is being repeated in England of the present day. The nation which subjugates another nation forges its own chains.

Thus the position of the International Association vis-à-vis the Irish question is very clear. Its first need is to encourage the social revolution in England. To this end the great blow must be delivered in Ireland.*

The resolution of the General Council on the Irish amnesty serves only to introduce other resolutions which will affirm that quite apart from the question of international justice, the transformation of the present *forced Union* (that is to say the slavery of Ireland) into an *equal and free Confed-*

* After the words "in Ireland" the following has been deleted in the manuscript: "and the economic and national struggle in Ireland must be exploited in all possible ways".—Ed.

eration, if possible, or into complete Separation, if necessary, is a *preliminary condition* of the emancipation of the English working class.*

Written by K. Marx
about January 1, 1870

This version which follows
a copy written by Jenny Marx
and corrected by the author
was published for the first time
in the second Russian edition
of Marx-Engels, *Collected
Works*, Vol. 16

Translated from the French

* After the words "the English working class" the following has been deleted in the manuscript: "The difficulties and even personal dangers which the General Council faces by taking up this stand can be judged simply by the fact that the *Beehive* in its reports of our meetings not only suppressed *our resolutions* but also the fact that the General Council considered the Irish question, which forced the Council to have its resolutions printed in order to send them to all the *Trade Unions* separately. Now the way is open to *L'Egalité* to say that it is a '*local political movement*', that it would very much like to allow a Federal Council to deal with these trifles, and that one must not '*improve* the present governments'. It could have said with the same right that we intended to *improve* the Belgian government by denouncing its massacres."—Ed.

FREDERICK ENGELS
LETTERS FROM LONDON¹⁹⁶

I

[STRIKE OF ENGLISH FARM WORKERS]

London, April 20

The labour movement in England has made a tremendous advance in the last few days: it has established itself, very firmly, among the agricultural workers. It is well known that in Great Britain all the land belongs to an extremely limited number of large landowners the poorest of whom receive an annual income from rents of 100,000 lire, and the richest many million. The Marquis of Westminster has an annual income of over ten million.

The land is divided into large plots, farmed by very few labourers, aided by machinery, on behalf of tenant farmers. There are no small farmers; the number of farm labourers, small as it is in relation to the area they cultivate, is decreasing yearly due to the introduction of new machinery; and thus, ignorant and tied to the soil as never before, and at the same time victims of competition, the English farm labourers constitute the worst-paid class of the population. They have rebelled against their hard lot on several occasions: in 1831, in the south of England, they set fire to the tenant farmers' haystacks and wheat; a few years ago they did the same in Yorkshire; from time to time they have tried to form resistance societies, but without much success. But the present movement has in the course of a few weeks assumed proportions that ensure it a tremendous success. The

movement began among the farm workers of Warwickshire, who demanded a wage increase from 11 or 12 shillings (13 or 14 francs) a week to 16 shillings (19 francs), and in order to achieve it, formed a resistance society and went on strike.¹⁹⁷ The landowners, tenant farmers and conservatives of the county were horror-stricken: after over a thousand years the labourers, slaves in body and spirit, had dared to rebel against their masters' authority! And rebel they did, going on strike, and with such success that within two or three weeks it had spread from Warwickshire to all eight neighbouring counties. The farm workers' union became for the terrified landowners and tenant farmers what the International is for the reactionary governments of Europe—a bogey the very name of which sets them quaking. They opposed it, but in vain: the Union, aided by the advice and experience of the resistance society of the industrial workers, waxed in strength and spread daily, and even had the support of bourgeois public opinion. The bourgeoisie, despite its political alliance with the aristocracy is constantly waging a kind of small economic war against it; and since it is at present experiencing great industrial prosperity and many workers are needed, almost all the labourers on strike found themselves transported to the towns where they were employed and paid far better than they could have been in agriculture. Thus, the strike was so successful that the landowners and tenant farmers throughout England spontaneously raised the farm workers' wages from 25 to 30 per cent. This first great victory marks the beginning of a new era in the intellectual and social life of the rural proletariat, which has joined *en masse* the movement of the town proletarians against the tyranny of capital.

Last week the English Parliament discussed the *International*. Mr. Cochrane, a rabid reactionary, accused the terrible workers' organisation of having ordered the Paris Commune to assassinate the archbishop and set fire to the city. He went on to demand repressive measures against the General Council at present established in London. Naturally, the government replied that the members of the International, like all the inhabitants of England, are only responsible to the law, and that since they have not yet broken it, there

were no grounds for measures to be taken against them. The General Council of the Association can be expected to reply to Mr. Cochrane's false allegations.

Written by F. Engels
on April 20, 1872

Published in *La Plebe* No. 48,
April 24, 1872
Signed: *F. E.*

Translated from the Italian

FREDERICK ENGELS

LETTERS FROM LONDON

III

(MEETING IN HYDE PARK)

London, November 14

The *Liberal* English Government has at the moment no less than 42 Irish political prisoners in its prisons and treats them with quite exceptional cruelty, far worse than thieves and murderers. In the good old days of King Bomba,* the head of the present *Liberal* cabinet, Mr. Gladstone, travelled to Italy and visited political prisoners in Naples; on his return to England he published a pamphlet which disgraced the Neapolitan Government before Europe for its unworthy treatment of political prisoners.¹⁹⁸

This does not prevent this selfsame Mr. Gladstone from treating in the very same way the Irish political prisoners, whom he continues to keep under lock and key.

The Irish members of the International in London decided to organise a *giant* demonstration in Hyde Park (the largest public park in London, where all the big popular meetings take place during political campaigns) to demand a general amnesty. They contacted all London's democratic organisations and formed a committee which included MacDonnell (an Irishman), Murray (an Englishman) and Lessner (a German)—all members of the last General Council of the International.

A difficulty arose: at the last session of Parliament the Government passed a law which gave it the right to regu-

* Ferdinand II.—*Ed.*

late public meetings in London's parks. It made use of this and had the regulation posted up to warn those who wanted to hold such a public meeting that they must give a written notification to the police two days prior to calling it, indicating the names of the speakers.¹⁹⁹ This regulation carefully kept hidden from the London press destroyed with one stroke of the pen one of the most precious rights of London's working people—the right to hold meetings in parks when and how they please. To submit to this regulation would be to sacrifice one of the people's rights.

The Irish, who represent the most revolutionary element of the population, were not men to display such weakness. The committee unanimously decided to act as if it did not know of the existence of this regulation and to hold their meeting in defiance of the Government's decree.

Last Sunday at about three o'clock in the afternoon two enormous processions with bands and banners marched towards Hyde Park. The bands played Irish songs and the *Marseillaise*; almost all the banners were Irish (green with a gold harp in the middle) or red. There were only a few police agents at the entrances to the park and the columns of demonstrators marched in without meeting with any resistance. They assembled at the appointed place and the speeches began.

The spectators numbered at least thirty thousand and at least half had a green ribbon or a green leaf in their button-hole to show they were Irish; the rest were English, German and French. The crowd was too large for all to be able to hear the speeches, and so a second meeting was organised nearby with other orators speaking on the same theme. Forceful resolutions were adopted demanding a general amnesty and the repeal of the coercion laws which keep Ireland under a permanent state of siege. At about five o'clock the demonstrators formed up into files again and left the park, thus having flouted the regulation of Gladstone's Government.

This is the first time an Irish demonstration has been held in Hyde Park; it was very successful and even the London bourgeois press cannot deny this. It is also the first time the English and Irish sections of our population have united in friendship. These two elements of the working class, whose

enmity towards each other was so much in the interests of the Government and wealthy classes, are now offering one another the hand of friendship; this gratifying fact is due principally to the influence of the last General Council of the International, which has always directed all its efforts to unite the workers of both peoples on a basis of complete equality. This meeting, of the 3rd November, will usher in a new era in the history of London's working-class movement.

You might ask: "What is the Government doing? Can it be that it is willing to reconcile itself to this slight? Will it allow its regulation to be flouted with impunity?"

Well, this is what it has done: it placed two police inspectors and two agents by the platforms in Hyde Park and they took down the names of the speakers. On the following day, these two inspectors brought a suit against speakers before the *Justice of the Peace*. The Justice sent them a summons and they have to appear before him next Saturday. This course of action makes it quite clear that they don't intend to undertake extensive proceedings against them. The Government seems to have admitted that the Irish or, as they say here, the Fenians have beaten it and will be satisfied with a small fine. The debate in court will certainly be interesting and I shall inform you of it in my next letter. Of one thing there can be no doubt: the Irish, thanks to their energetic efforts, have saved the right of the people of London to hold meetings in parks when and how they please.

Written by F. Engels
on November 14, 1872

Published in *La Plebe* No. 117,
November 17, 1872
Signed: F. Engels

Translated from the Italian

FREDERICK ENGELS

THE ENGLISH ELECTIONS

London, February 22, 1874

The English parliamentary elections are now over. The brilliant Gladstone, who could not govern with a majority of sixty-six, suddenly dissolved Parliament, ordered elections within eight to fourteen days, and the result was—a majority of more than fifty *against* him. The second Parliament elected under the Reform Bill of 1867 and the first by secret ballot has yielded a *strong conservative majority*.²⁰⁰ And it is particularly the big industrial cities and factory districts, where the workers are now absolutely in the majority, that send Conservatives to Parliament. How is this?

This is primarily the result of Gladstone's attempt to effect a *coup d'état* by means of the elections. The election writs were issued so soon after the dissolution that many towns had hardly five days, most of them hardly eight, and the Irish, Scotch and rural electoral districts at most fourteen days for reflection. Gladstone wanted to stampede the voters, but *coup d'état* simply won't work in England and attempts to stampede rebound upon those who engineer them. In consequence, the entire mass of apathetic and wavering voters voted solidly against Gladstone.

Moreover, Gladstone had ruled in a way that directly flouted John Bull's traditional usage. There is no denying that John Bull is dull-witted enough to consider his government to be not his lord and master, but his servant, and at

that the only one of his servants whom he can discharge forthwith without giving any notice. Now, if the party in office time and again allows its ministry, for very practical reasons, to spring a big surprise with theatrical effect on occasions when taxes are reduced or other financial measures instituted, it permits this sort of thing only by way of exception in case of important legislative measures. But Gladstone had made these legislative stage tricks the rule. His major measures were mostly as much of a surprise to his own party as to his opponents. These measures were practically foisted upon the Liberals, because if they did not vote for them they would immediately put the opposition party in power. And if the contents of many of these measures, *e.g.*, the Irish Church Bill²⁰¹ and the Irish Land Bill, were for all their wretchedness an abomination to many old liberal-conservative Whigs, so to the whole of the party was the manner in which these bills were forced upon it. But this was not enough for Gladstone. He had secured the abolition of the purchase of army commissions by appealing without the slightest need to the authority of the Crown instead of Parliament,²⁰² thereby offending his own party. In addition he had surrounded himself with a number of importunate mediocrities who possessed no other talent than the ability to make themselves needlessly obnoxious. Particular mention must be made here of Bruce, Minister of Home Affairs, and Ayrton, the real head of the London local government. The former was distinguished for his rudeness and arrogance towards workers' deputations; the latter ruled London in a wholly Prussian manner, for instance, in the case of the attempt to suppress the right to hold public meetings in the parks. But since such things simply can't be done here, as is shown by the fact that the Irish immediately held a huge mass meeting in Hyde Park right under Mr. Ayrton's nose in spite of the Park ordinance, the Government suffered a number of minor defeats and increasing unpopularity in consequence.

Finally, the secret ballot has enabled a large number of workers who usually were politically passive to vote with impunity against their exploiters and against the party in which they rightly see that of the big barons of industry,

namely, the Liberal Party. This is true even where most of these barons, following the prevailing fashion, have gone over to the Conservatives. If the Liberal Party in England does not represent large-scale industry as opposed to big landed property and high finance, it represents nothing at all.

Already the previous Parliament ranked below the average in its general intellectual level. It consisted mainly of the rural gentry and the sons of big landed proprietors, on the one hand, and of bankers, railway directors, brewers, manufacturers and sundry other rich upstarts, on the other; in between, a few statesmen, jurists and professors. Quite a number of the last-named representatives of the "intelligentsia" failed to get elected this time, so that the new Parliament represents big landed property and the money-bags even more exclusively than the preceding one. It differs, however, from the preceding one in comprising two new elements: two workers* and about fifty Irish Home Rulers.

As regards the workers it must be stated, to begin with, that no separate political working-class party has existed in England since the downfall of the Chartist Party in the fifties. This is understandable in a country in which the working class has shared more than anywhere else in the advantages of the immense expansion of its large-scale industry. Nor could it have been otherwise in an England that ruled the world market; and certainly not in a country where the ruling classes have set themselves the task of carrying out, parallel with other concessions, one point of the Chartists' programme, the People's Charter, after another. Of the six points of the Charter two have already become law: the secret ballot and the abolition of property qualifications for the suffrage. The third, universal suffrage, has been introduced, at least approximately; the last three points are still entirely unfulfilled: annual parliaments, payment of members, and, most important, equal electoral areas.

Whenever the workers lately took part in general politics in particular organisations they did so almost exclusively as

* A. Macdonald and T. Burt.—*Ed.*

the extreme left wing of the "great Liberal Party" and in this role they were duped at each election according to all the rules of the game by the great Liberal Party. Then all of a sudden came the Reform Bill²⁰³ which at one blow changed the political status of the workers. In all the big cities they now form the majority of the voters and in England the Government as well as the candidates for Parliament are accustomed to court the electorate. The chairmen and secretaries of Trade Unions and political working men's societies, as well as other well-known labour spokesmen who might be expected to be influential in their class, had overnight become important people. They were visited by Members of Parliament, by lords and other well-born rabble, and sympathetic enquiry was suddenly made into the wishes and needs of the working class. Questions were discussed with these "labour leaders" which formerly evoked a supercilious smile or the mere posture of which used to be condemned; and one contributed to collections for working-class purposes. It thereupon quite naturally occurred to the "labour leaders" that they should get themselves elected to Parliament, to which their high-class friends gladly agreed in general, but of course only for the purpose of frustrating as far as possible the election of workers in each particular case. Thus the matter got no further.

Nobody holds it against the "labour leaders" that they would have liked to get into Parliament. The shortest way would have been to proceed at once to form anew a strong workers' party with a definite programme, and the best political programme they could wish for was the People's Charter. But the Chartists' name was in bad odour with the bourgeoisie precisely because theirs had been an outspokenly proletarian party, and so, rather than continue the glorious tradition of the Chartists, the "labour leaders" preferred to deal with their aristocratic friends and be "respectable", which in England means acting like a *bourgeois*. Whereas under the old franchise the workers had to a certain extent been compelled to figure as the tail of the radical bourgeoisie, it was inexcusable to make them go on playing that part after the Reform Bill had opened the door of Parliament to at least sixty working-class candidates.

This was the turning point. In order to get into Parliament the "labour leaders" had recourse, in the first place, to the votes and money of the bourgeoisie and only in the second place to the votes of the workers themselves. But by doing so they ceased to be workers' candidates and turned themselves into bourgeois candidates. They did not appeal to a working-class party that still had to be formed but to the bourgeois "great Liberal Party". Among themselves they organised a mutual election assurance society, the Labour Representation League,²⁰⁴ whose very slender means were derived in the main from bourgeois sources. But this was not all. The radical bourgeois has sense enough to realise that the election of workers to Parliament is becoming more and more inevitable; it is therefore in their interest to keep the prospective working-class candidates under their control and thus postpone their actual election as long as possible. For that purpose they have their Mr. *Samuel Morley*, a London millionaire, who does not mind spending a couple of thousand pounds in order, on the one hand, to be able to act as the commanding general of this sham labour general staff and, on the other, with its assistance to let himself be hailed by the masses as a friend of labour, out of gratitude for his duping the workers. And then, about a year ago, when it became ever more likely that Parliament would be dissolved, Morley called his faithful together in the London Tavern. They all appeared, the Potters, Howells, Odgers, Haleses, Mottersheads, Cremers, Eccariuses and the rest of them—a conclave of people every one of whom had served, or at least had offered to serve, during the previous parliamentary elections, in the pay of the bourgeoisie, as an agitator for the "great Liberal Party". Under Morley's chairmanship this conclave drew up a "labour programme" to which any bourgeois could subscribe and which was to form the foundation of a mighty movement to chain the workers politically still more firmly to the bourgeoisie and, as these gentry thought, to get the "founders" into Parliament. Besides, dangling before their lustful eyes these "founders" already saw a goodly number of Morley's five-pound notes with which they expected to line their pockets before the election campaign was over. But the whole movement fell

through before it had fairly started. Mr. Morley locked his safe and the founders once more disappeared from the scene.

Four weeks ago Gladstone suddenly dissolved Parliament. The inevitable "labour leaders" began to breathe again: either they would get themselves elected or they would again become well-paid itinerant preachers of the cause of the "great Liberal Party". But alas! the day appointed for the elections was so close that they were cheated out of both chances. True enough, a few did stand for Parliament; but since in England every candidate, before he can be voted upon, must contribute two hundred pounds (1,240 thaler) towards the election expenses and the workers had almost nowhere been organised for this purpose, only such of them could stand as candidates seriously as obtained this sum from the bourgeoisie, i.e., as acted *with its gracious permission*. With this the bourgeoisie had done its duty and in the elections themselves allowed them all to suffer a complete fiasco.

Only two workers got in, both miners from coal pits. This trade is very strongly organised in three big unions, has considerable means at its disposal, controls an indisputed majority of the voters in some constituencies and has worked systematically for direct representation in Parliament ever since the Reform Acts were passed. The candidates put up were the secretaries of the three *Trade Unions*. The one, Halliday, lost out in Wales; the other two came out on top: *Macdonald* in *Stafford* and *Burt* in *Morpeth*. Burt is little known outside of his constituency. Macdonald, however, betrayed the workers of his trade when, during the negotiations on the last mining law,²⁰⁵ which he attended as the representative of his trade, he sanctioned an amendment which was so grossly in the interests of the capitalists that even the Government had not dared to include it in the draft.

At any rate, the ice has been broken and two workers now have seats in the most fashionable debating club of Europe, among those who have declared themselves the first gentlemen of Europe.

Alongside of them sit at least fifty Irish Home Rulers. When the Fenian (Irish-republican) rebellion of 1867 had

been quelled and the military leaders of the Fenians had either gradually been caught or driven to emigrate to America, the remnants of the Fenian conspiracy soon lost all importance. Violent insurrection had no prospect of success for many years, at least until such time as England would again be involved in serious difficulties abroad. Hence a legal movement remained the only possibility, and such a movement was undertaken under the banner of the Home Rulers, who wanted the Irish to be "masters in their own house". They made the definite demand that the Imperial Parliament in London should cede to a special Irish Parliament in Dublin the right to legislate on all purely Irish questions; very wisely nothing was said meanwhile about what was to be understood as a purely Irish question. This movement, at first scoffed at by the English press, has become so powerful that Irish M.P.s of the most diverse party complexions—Conservatives and Liberals, Protestants and Catholics (Butt, who leads the movement, is himself a Protestant) and even a native-born Englishman sitting for Galway—have had to join it. For the first time since the days of O'Connell, whose repeal movement collapsed in the general reaction about the same time as the Chartist movement, as a result of the events of 1848—he had died in 1847—a well-knit Irish party once again has entered Parliament, but under circumstances that hardly permit it constantly to compromise à la O'Connell with the Liberals or to have individual members of it sell themselves retail to liberal governments, as after him has become the fashion.

Thus both motive forces of English political development have now entered Parliament: on the one side the workers, on the other the Irish as a well-knit national party. And even if they may hardly be expected to play a big role in this Parliament—the workers will certainly not—the elections of 1874 have indisputably ushered in a new phase in English political development.

Written by F. Engels
on February 22, 1874

Published in *Der Volksstaat*
No. 26, March 4, 1874

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS

TRADES UNIONS

I

In our last issue we considered the action of Trades Unions as far as they enforce the economical law of wages against employers. We return to this subject, as it is of the highest importance that the working classes generally should thoroughly understand it.

We suppose no English working-man of the present day needs to be taught that it is the interest of the individual capitalist as well as of the capitalist class generally, to reduce wages as much as possible. The produce of labour, after deducting all expenses, is divided, as David Ricardo has irrefutably proved, into two shares: the one forms the labourer's wages, the other the capitalist's profits. Now, this net produce of labour being, in every individual case, a given quantity, it is clear that the share called profits cannot increase without the share called wages decreasing. To deny that it is the interest of the capitalist to reduce wages, would be tantamount to say that it is not his interest to increase his profits.

We know very well that there are other means of temporarily increasing profits, but they do not alter the general law, and therefore need not trouble us here.

Now, how can the capitalists reduce wages when the rate of wages is governed by a distinct and well-defined law of social economy? The economical law of wages is there, and is irrefutable. But, as we have seen, it is elastic, and it is so in two ways. The rate of wages can be lowered, in a particular trade, either directly, by gradually accustoming the workpeople of that trade to a lower standard of life, or, indirectly, by increasing the number of working-hours per

day (or the intensity of work during the same working-hours) without increasing the pay.

And the interest of every individual capitalist to increase his profits by reducing the wages of his workpeople receives a fresh stimulus from the competition of capitalists of the same trade amongst each other. Each one of them tries to undersell his competitors, and unless he is to sacrifice his profits he must try and reduce wages. Thus, the pressure upon the rate of wages brought about by the interest of every individual capitalist is increased tenfold by the competition amongst them. What was before a matter of more or less profit, now becomes a matter of necessity.

Against this constant unceasing pressure unorganised labour has no effective means of resistance. Therefore, in trades without organisation of the workpeople, wages tend constantly to fall and the working-hours tend constantly to increase. Slowly, but surely, this process goes on. Times of prosperity may now and then interrupt it, but times of bad trade hasten it on all the more afterwards. The workpeople gradually get accustomed to a lower and lower standard of life. While the length of working day more and more approaches the possible maximum, the wages come nearer and nearer to their absolute minimum—the sum below which it becomes absolutely impossible for the workman to live and to reproduce his race.

There was a temporary exception to this about the beginning of this century. The rapid extension of steam and machinery was not sufficient for the still faster increasing demand for their produce. Wages in these trades, except those of children sold from the workhouse to the manufacturer, were as a rule high; those of such skilled manual labour as could not be done without were very high; what a dyer, a mechanic, a velvet-cutter, a hand-mule spinner used to receive now sounds fabulous. At the same time the trades superseded by machinery were slowly starved to death. But newly invented machinery by-and-by superseded these well-paid workmen; machinery was invented which made machinery, and that at such a rate that the supply of machine-made goods not only equalled, but exceeded, the demand. When the general peace, in 1815, re-established

regularity of trade, the decennial fluctuations between prosperity, over-production, and commercial panic began. Whatever advantages the workpeople had preserved from old prosperous times, and perhaps even increased during the period of frantic over-production, were now taken from them during the period of bad trade and panic; and soon the manufacturing population of England submitted to the general law that the wages of unorganised labour constantly tend towards the absolute minimum.

But in the meantime the Trades Unions, legalised in 1824, had also stepped in, and high time it was. Capitalists are always organised. They need in most cases no formal union, no rules, officers, etc. Their small number, as compared with that of the workmen, the fact of their forming a separate class, their constant social and commercial intercourse stand them in lieu of that; it is only later on, when a branch of manufacturers has taken possession of a district, such as the cotton trade has of Lancashire, that a formal capitalist's Trades Union becomes necessary. On the other hand, the workpeople from the very beginning cannot do without a strong organisation, well-defined by rules and delegating its authority to officers and committees. The Act of 1824 rendered these organisations legal. From that day labour became a power in England. The formerly helpless mass, divided against itself, was no longer so. To the strength given by union and common action soon was added the force of a well-filled exchequer—"resistance money", as our French brethren expressively call it. The entire position of things now changed. For the capitalist it became a risky thing to indulge in a reduction of wages or an increase of working-hours.

Hence the violent outbursts of the capitalist class of those times against Trades Unions. That class had always considered its long-established practice of grinding down the working class as a vested right and lawful privilege. That was now to be put a stop to. No wonder they cried out lustily and held themselves at least as much injured in their rights and property as Irish landlords do nowadays.²⁰⁶

Sixty years' experience of struggle have brought them round to some extent. Trades Unions have now become

acknowledged institutions, and their action as one of the regulators of wages is recognised quite as much as the action of the Factories and Workshops Acts as regulators of the hours of work. Nay, the cotton masters in Lancashire have lately even taken a leaf out of the workpeople's book, and now know how to organise a strike, when it suits them, as well or better than any Trades Union.

Thus it is through the action of Trades Unions that the law of wages is enforced as against the employers, and that the workpeople of any well-organised trade are enabled to obtain, at least approximately, the full value of the working-power which they hire to their employer; and that, with the help of State laws, the hours of labour are made at least not to exceed too much that maximum length beyond which the working-power is prematurely exhausted. This, however, is the utmost Trades Unions, as at present organised, can hope to obtain, and that by constant struggle only, by an immense waste of strength and money; and then the fluctuations of trade, once every ten years at least, break down for the moment what has been conquered, and the fight has to be fought over again. It is a vicious circle from which there is no issue. The working class remains what it was, and what our Chartist forefathers were not afraid to call it, a class of wages-slaves. Is this to be the final result of all this labour, self-sacrifice, and suffering? Is this to remain for ever the highest aim of British workmen? Or is the working class of this country at last to attempt breaking through this vicious circle, and to find an issue out of it in a movement for the ABOLITION of the WAGE SYSTEM ALTOGETHER?

Next week we shall examine the part played by Trades Unions as organisers of the working class.

II

So far we have considered the functions of Trades Unions as far only as they contribute to the regulation of the rate of wages and ensure to the labourer, in his struggle against capital, at least some means of resistance. But that aspect does not exhaust our subject.

The struggle of the labourer against capital, we said. That struggle does exist, whatever the apologists of capital may say to the contrary. It will exist so long as a reduction of wages remains the safest and readiest means of raising profits; nay, so long as the wages-system itself shall exist. The very existence of Trades Unions is proof sufficient of the fact; if they are not made to fight against the encroachments of capital what are they made for? There is no use in mincing matters. No milksop words can hide the ugly fact that present society is mainly divided into two great antagonistic classes—into capitalists, the owners of all the means for the employment of labour, on one side; and working-men, the owners of nothing but their own working-power, on the other. The produce of the labour of the latter class has to be divided between both classes, and it is this division about which the struggle is constantly going on. Each class tries to get as large a share as possible; and it is the most curious aspect of this struggle that the working class, while fighting to obtain a share only of its own produce, is often enough accused of actually robbing the capitalist!

But a struggle between two great classes of society necessarily becomes a political struggle. So did the long battle between the middle or capitalist class and the landed aristocracy; so also does the fight between the working class and these same capitalists. In every struggle of class against class, the next end fought for is political power; the ruling class defends its political supremacy, that is to say its safe majority in the Legislature; the inferior class fights for, first a share, then the whole of that power, in order to become enabled to change existing laws in conformity with their own interests and requirements. Thus the working class of Great Britain for years fought ardently and even violently for the People's Charter, which was to give it that political power; it was defeated, but the struggle had made such an impression upon the victorious middle class that this class, since then, was only too glad to buy a prolonged armistice at the price of ever-repeated concessions to the working people.

Now, in a political struggle of class against class, organisation is the most important weapon. And in the same measure as the merely political or Chartist Organisation fell to

pieces, in the same measure the Trades Unions Organisation grew stronger and stronger, until at present it has reached a degree of strength unequalled by any working-class organisation abroad. A few large Trades Unions, comprising between one and two millions of working men, and backed by the smaller or local Unions, represent a power which has to be taken into account by any Government of the ruling class, be it Whig or Tory.

According to the traditions of their origin and development in this country, these powerful organisations have hitherto limited themselves almost strictly to their function of sharing in the regulation of wages and working-hours, and of enforcing the repeal of laws openly hostile to the workmen. As stated before, they have done so with quite as much effect as they had a right to expect. But they have attained more than that—the ruling class, which knows their strength better than they themselves do, has volunteered to them concessions beyond that. Disraeli's Household Suffrage²⁰⁷ gave the vote to at least the greater portion of the organised working class. Would he have proposed it unless he supposed that these new voters would show a will of their own—would cease to be led by middle-class liberal politicians? Would he have been able to carry it if the working people, in the management of their colossal Trade Societies, had not proved themselves fit for administrative and political work?

That very measure opened out a new prospect to the working class. It gave them the majority in London and in all manufacturing towns, and thus enabled them to enter into the struggle against capital with new weapons, by sending men of their own class to Parliament. And here, we are sorry to say, the Trades Unions forgot their duty as the advanced guard of the working class. The new weapon has been in their hands for more than ten years, but they scarcely ever unsheathed it. They ought not to forget that they cannot continue to hold the position they now occupy unless they really march in the van of the working class. It is not in the nature of things that the working class of England should possess the power of sending forty or fifty working men to Parliament and yet be satisfied for ever to

be represented by capitalists or their clerks, such as lawyers, editors, & c.

More than this, there are plenty of symptoms that the working class of this country is awakening to the consciousness that it has for some time been moving in the wrong groove; that the present movements for higher wages and shorter hours exclusively, keep it in a vicious circle out of which there is no issue; that it is not the lowness of wages which forms the fundamental evil, but the wages-system itself. This knowledge once generally spread amongst the working class, the position of Trades Unions must change considerably. They will no longer enjoy the privilege of being the only organisations of the working class. At the side of, or above, the Unions of special trades there must spring up a general Union, a political organisation of the working class as a whole.

Thus there are two points which the organised Trades would do well to consider, firstly, that the time is rapidly approaching when the working class of this country will claim, with a voice not to be mistaken, its full share of representation in Parliament. Secondly, that the time also is rapidly approaching when the working class will have understood that the struggle for high wages and short hours, and the whole action of Trades Unions as now carried on, is not an end in itself, but a means, a very necessary and effective means, but only one of several means towards a higher end: the abolition of the wages-system altogether.

For the full representation of Labour in Parliament, as well as for the preparation of the abolition of the wages-system, organisations will become necessary, not of separate Trades, but of the working class as a body. And the sooner this is done the better. There is no power in the world which could for a day resist the British working class organised as a body.

Written by F. Engels
about May 20, 1881

Published as a leading article
in *The Labour Standard*
(London) Nos. 4 and 5, May 28
and June 4, 1881

Printed according
to the newspaper text

FREDERICK ENGELS

A WORKING MEN'S PARTY

How often have we not been warned by friends and sympathisers, "Keep aloof from party politics!" And they were perfectly right, as far as present English party politics are concerned. A labour organ must be neither Whig nor Tory, neither Conservative nor Liberal, or even Radical, in the actual party sense of that word. Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals, all of them represent but the interests of the ruling classes, and various shades of opinion predominating amongst landlords, capitalists, and retail tradesmen. If they do represent the working class, they most decidedly misrepresent it. The working class has interests of its own, political as well as social. How it has stood up for what it considers its social interests, the history of the Trades Unions and the Short Time movement shows. But its political interests it leaves almost entirely in the hands of Tories, Whigs and Radicals, men of the upper class, and for nearly a quarter of a century the working class of England has contented itself with forming, as it were, the tail of the "Great Liberal Party".

This is a political position unworthy of the best organised working class of Europe. In other countries the working men have been far more active. Germany has had for more than ten years a Working Men's Party (the Social-Democrats), which owns ten seats in Parliament, and whose

growth has frightened Bismarck into those infamous measures of repression of which we give an account in another column. Yet in spite of Bismarck, the Working-Men's Party progresses steadily; only last week it carried sixteen elections for the Mannheim Town Council and one for the Saxon Parliament. In Belgium, Holland, and Italy the example of the Germans has been imitated; in every one of these countries a Working Men's Party exists, though the voters' qualification there is too high to give them a chance of sending members to the Legislature at present. In France the Working Men's Party is just now in full process of organisation; it has obtained the majority in several Municipal Councils at the last elections, and will undoubtedly carry several seats at the general election for the Chamber next October. Even in America where the passage of the working class to that of farmer, trader, or capitalist, is still comparatively easy, the working men find it necessary to organise themselves as an independent party. Everywhere the labourer struggles for political power, for direct representation of his class in the Legislature—everywhere but in Great Britain.

And yet there never was a more widespread feeling in England than now, that the old parties are doomed, that the old shibboleths have become meaningless, that the old watchwords are exploded, that the old panaceas will not act any longer. Thinking men of all classes begin to see that a new line must be struck out, and that this line can only be in the direction of democracy. But in England, where the industrial and agricultural working class forms the immense majority of the people, democracy means the dominion of the working class, neither more nor less. Let, then, that working class prepare itself for the task in store for it,—the ruling of this great empire; let them understand the responsibilities which inevitably will fall to their share. And the best way to do this is to use the power already in their hands, the actual majority they possess in every large town in the kingdom, to send to Parliament men of their own order. With the present household suffrage, forty or fifty working men might easily be sent to St. Stephen's, where such an infusion of entirely new blood

is very much wanted indeed. With only that number of working men in Parliament, it would be impossible to let the Irish Land Bill become, as is the case at present, more and more an Irish Land Bill, namely, an Irish Landlords' Compensation Act; it would be impossible to resist the demand for a redistribution of seats, for making bribery really punishable, for throwing election expenses, as is the case everywhere but in England, on the public purse, & c.

Moreover, in England a real democratic party is impossible unless it be a working men's party. Enlightened men of other classes (where they are not so plentiful as people would make us believe) might join that party and even represent it in Parliament after having given pledges of their sincerity. Such is the case everywhere. In Germany, for instance, the working-men representatives are not in every case actual working men. But no democratic party in England, as well as elsewhere, will be effectively successful unless it has a distinct working-class character. Abandon that, and you have nothing but sects and shams.

And this is even truer in England than abroad. Of Radical shams there has been unfortunately enough since the break-up of the first working men's party which the world ever produced—the Chartist Party. Yes, but the Chartists were broken up and attained nothing. Did they, indeed? Of the six points of the People's Charter, two, vote by ballot and no property qualification, are now the law of the land. A third, universal suffrage, is at least approximately carried in the shape of household suffrage; a fourth, equal electoral districts, is distinctly in sight, a promised reform of the present Government. So that the breakdown of the Chartist movement has resulted in the realisation of fully one-half of the Chartist programme. And if the mere recollection of a past political organisation of the working class could effect these political reforms, and a series of social reforms besides, what will the actual presence of a working men's political party do, backed by forty or fifty representatives in Parliament? We live in a world where everybody is bound to take care of himself. Yet the English working class allows the landlord, capitalist, and retail trading classes, with their tail of lawyers, newspaper

writers, &c., to take care of its interests. No wonder reforms in the interests of the workman come so slow and in such miserable dribbles. The workpeople of England have but to will, and they are the masters to carry every reform, social and political, which their situation requires. Then why not make that effort?

Written by F. Engels
in mid-July 1881

Published as a leading article
in *The Labour Standard*
(London) No. 12, July 23, 1881

Printed according
to the newspaper text

FREDERICK ENGELS

SOCIAL CLASSES—NECESSARY AND SUPERFLUOUS

The question has often been asked, in what degree are the different classes of society useful or even necessary? And the answer was naturally a different one for every different epoch of history considered. There was undoubtedly a time when a territorial aristocracy was an unavoidable and necessary element of society. That, however, is very, very long ago. Then there was a time when a capitalist middle class, a *bourgeoisie* as the French call it, arose with equally unavoidable necessity, struggled against the territorial aristocracy, broke its political power, and in its turn became economically and politically predominant. But, since classes arose, there never was a time when society could be without a working class. The name, the social status of that class has changed; the serf took the place of the slave, to be in his turn relieved by the free working man—free from servitude but also free from any earthly possessions save his own labour force. But it is plain: whatever changes took place in the upper, non-producing ranks of society, society could not live without a class of producers. This class, then, is necessary under all circumstances—though the time must come, when it will no longer be a class, when it will comprise all society.

Now, what necessity is there at present for the existence of each of these three classes?

The landed aristocracy is, to say the least, economically useless in England, while in Ireland and Scotland it has become a positive nuisance by its depopulating tendencies. To send the people across the ocean or into starvation, and to replace them by sheep or deer—that is all the merit that the Irish and Scotch landlords can lay claim to. Let the competition of American vegetable and animal food develop a little further, and the English landed aristocracy will do the same, at least those that can afford it, having large town estates to fall back upon. Of the rest, American food competition will soon free us. And good riddance—for their political action, both in the Lords and Commons, is a perfect national nuisance.

But how about the capitalist middle class, that enlightened and liberal class which founded the British colonial empire and which established British liberty? The class that reformed Parliament in 1831,²⁰⁸ repealed the Corn Laws, and reduced tax after tax? The class that created and still directs the giant manufactures, and the immense merchant navy, the ever spreading railway system of England? Surely that class must be at least as necessary as the working class which it directs and leads on from progress to progress.

Now the economical function of the capitalist middle class has been, indeed, to create the modern system of steam manufactures and steam communications, and to crush every economical and political obstacle which delayed or hindered the development of that system. No doubt, as long as the capitalist middle class performed this function it was, under the circumstances, a necessary class. But is it still so? Does it continue to fulfil its essential function as the manager and expander of social production for the benefit of society at large? Let us see.

To begin with the means of communication, we find the telegraphs in the hands of the Government. The railways and a large part of the sea-going steamships are owned, not by individual capitalists who manage their own business, but by joint-stock companies whose business is managed for them by *paid employees*, by servants whose position is to all intents and purposes that of superior, better

paid workpeople. As to the directors and shareholders, they both know that the less the former interfere with the management, and the latter with the supervision, the better for the concern. A lax and mostly perfunctory supervision is, indeed, the only function left to the owners of the business. Thus we see that in reality the capitalist owners of these immense establishments have no other action left with regard to them, but to cash the half-yearly dividend warrants. The social function of the capitalist here has been transferred to servants paid by wages; but he continues to pocket, in his dividends, the pay for those functions though he has ceased to perform them.

But another function is still left to the capitalist, whom the extent of the large undertakings in question has compelled to "retire" from their management. And this function is to speculate with his shares on the Stock Exchange. For want of something better to do, our "retired" or in reality superseded capitalists, gamble to their hearts' content in this temple of mammon. They go there with the deliberate intention to pocket money which they were pretending to earn; though they say, the origin of all property is labour and saving—the origin perhaps, but certainly not the end. What hypocrisy to forcibly close petty gambling houses, when our capitalist society cannot do without an immense gambling house, where millions after millions are lost and won, for its very centre! Here, indeed, the existence of the "retired" shareholding capitalist becomes not only superfluous, but a perfect nuisance.

What is true for railways and steam shipping is becoming more and more true every day for all large manufacturing and trading establishments. "Floating"—transforming large private concerns into limited companies—has been the order of the day for the last ten years and more. From the large Manchester warehouses of the City to the ironworks and coal-pits of Wales and the North and the factories of Lancashire, everything has been, or is being, floated. In all Oldham there is scarcely a cotton mill left in private hands; nay, even the retail tradesman is more and more superseded by "co-operative stores", the great majority of which are co-operative in name only—but of that another

time. Thus we see that by the very development of the system of capitalists' production the capitalist is superseded quite as much as the hand-loom weaver. With this difference, though, that the hand-loom weaver is doomed to slow starvation, and the superseded capitalist to slow death from overfeeding. In this they generally are both alike, that neither knows what to do with himself.

This, then, is the result: the economical development of our actual society tends more and more to concentrate, to socialise production into immense establishments which cannot any longer be managed by single capitalists. All the trash of "the eye of the master", and the wonders it does, turns into sheer nonsense as soon as an undertaking reaches a certain size. Imagine "the eye of the master" of the London and North Western Railway! But what the master cannot do the workman, the wages-paid servants of the Company, *can* do, and do it successfully.

Thus the capitalist can no longer lay claim to his profit as "wages of supervision", as he supervises nothing. Let us remember that when the defenders of capital drum that hollow phrase into our ears.

But we have attempted to show, in our last week's issue, that the capitalist class had also become unable to manage the immense productive system of this country; that they on the one hand expanded production so as to periodically flood all the markets with produce, and on the other became more and more incapable of holding their own against foreign competition. Thus we find that, not only can we manage very well without the interference of the capitalist class in the great industries of the country, but that their interference is becoming more and more a nuisance.

Again we say to them, "Stand back! Give the working class the chance of a turn."

Written by F. Engels
on August 1-2, 1881

Published as a leading article
in *The Labour Standard*
(London) No. 14, August 6, 1881

Printed according
to the newspaper text

FREDERICK ENGELS

ENGLAND IN 1845 AND IN 1885

Forty years ago England stood face to face with a crisis, solvable to all appearances by force only. The immense and rapid development of manufactures had outstripped the extension of foreign markets and the increase of demand. Every ten years the march of industry was violently interrupted by a general commercial crash, followed, after a long period of chronic depression, by a few short years of prosperity, and always ending in feverish over-production and consequent renewed collapse. The capitalist class clamoured for Free Trade in corn, and threatened to enforce it by sending the starving population of the towns back to the country districts, whence they came: to invade them, as John Bright said, not as paupers begging for bread, but as an army quartered upon the enemy. The working masses of the towns demanded their share of political power—the People's Charter; they were supported by the majority of the small trading class, and the only difference between the two was whether the Charter should be carried by physical or by moral force. Then came the commercial crash of 1847 and the Irish famine, and with both the prospect of revolution.

The French Revolution of 1848 saved the English middle class. The socialistic pronunciamientos of the victorious French workmen frightened the small middle class of England and disorganised the narrower, but more matter-of-fact, movement of the English working class. At the very moment Chartism was bound to assert itself in its full strength, it collapsed internally, before even it collapsed externally on the 10th of April 1848.²⁰⁹ The action of the

working class was thrust into the background. The capitalist class triumphed along the whole line.

The Reform Bill of 1831 had been the victory of the whole capitalist class over the landed aristocracy. The repeal of the Corn Laws was the victory of the manufacturing capitalists not only over the landed aristocracy, but over those sections of capitalists too whose interests were more or less bound up with the landed interest: bankers, stock-jobbers, fundholders, etc. Free Trade meant the readjustment of the whole home and foreign commercial and financial policy of England in accordance with the interests of the manufacturing capitalists—the class which now represented the nation. And they set about this task with a will. Every obstacle to industrial production was mercilessly removed. The tariff and the whole system of taxation were revolutionised. Everything was made subordinate to one end, but that end was of the utmost importance to the manufacturing capitalist: the cheapening of all raw produce, and especially of the means of living of the working class; the reduction of the cost of raw material, and the keeping down—if not as yet the *bringing down*—of wages. England was to become the “workshop of the world”; all other countries were to become for England what Ireland already was—markets for her manufactured goods, supplying her in return with raw materials and food. England is the great manufacturing centre of an agricultural world, with an ever increasing number of corn and cotton-growing Irelands, revolving around her, the industrial sun. What a glorious prospect!

The manufacturing capitalists set about the realisation of this their great object with that strong common sense and that contempt for traditional principles which have ever distinguished them from their more narrow-minded compeers on the Continent. Chartism was dying out. The revival of commercial prosperity, natural after the revulsion of 1847 had spent itself, was put down altogether to the credit of Free Trade. Both these circumstances had turned the English working class, politically, into the tail of the great Liberal Party, the party led by the manufacturers. This advantage, once gained, had to be perpetuated. And the manufacturing capitalists, from the Chartist opposition not to Free Trade,

but to the transformation of Free Trade into the one vital national question, had learnt and were learning more and more that the middle class can never obtain full social and political power over the nation except by the help of the working class. Thus a gradual change came over the relations between both classes. The Factory Acts, once the bugbear of all manufacturers, were not only willingly submitted to, but their expansion into acts regulating almost all trades, was tolerated. Trades Unions, lately considered inventions of the devil himself, were now petted and patronised as perfectly legitimate institutions and as useful means of spreading sound economical doctrines amongst the workers. Even strikes, than which nothing had been more nefarious up to 1848, were now gradually found out to be occasionally very useful, especially when provoked by the masters themselves, at their own time. Of the legal enactments, placing the workman at a lower level or at a disadvantage with regard to the master, at least the most revolting were repealed. And, practically, that horrid "People's Charter" actually became the political programme of the very manufacturers who had opposed it to the last. "The Abolition of the Property Qualification"²¹⁰ and "Vote by Ballot" are now the law of the land. The Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884²¹¹ make a near approach to "universal suffrage" at least such as it now exists in Germany; the Redistribution Bill now before Parliament creates "equal electoral districts"—on the whole not more unequal than those of France or Germany; "payment of members" and shorter, if not actually "annual parliaments" are visibly looming in the distance—and yet there are people who say that Chartism is dead.

The Revolution of 1848, not less than many of its predecessors, has had strange bedfellows and successors. The very people who put it down, have become, as Karl Marx used to say, its testamentary executors. Louis Napoleon had to create an independent and united Italy, Bismarck had to revolutionise Germany and to restore Hungarian independence, and the English manufacturers had to enact the People's Charter.

For England, the effects of this domination of the manufacturing capitalists were at first startling. Trade revived

and extended to a degree unheard-of even in this cradle of modern industry; the previous astounding creations of steam and machinery dwindled into nothing compared with the immense mass of productions of the twenty years from 1850 to 1870, with the overwhelming figures of exports and imports, or wealth accumulated in the hands of capitalists and of human working power concentrated in the large towns. The progress was indeed interrupted, as before, by a crisis every ten years, in 1857 as well as in 1868; but these revulsions were now considered as natural, inevitable events, which must be fatalistically submitted to, and which always set themselves right in the end.

And the condition of the working class during this period? There was temporary improvement even for the great mass. But this improvement always was reduced to the old level by the influx of the great body of the unemployed reserve, by the constant superseding of hands by new machinery, by the immigration of the agricultural population, now, too, more and more superseded by machines.

A permanent improvement can be recognised for two "protected" sections only of the working class. Firstly, the factory hands. The fixing by Act of Parliament of their working day within relatively rational limits, has restored their physical constitution and endowed them with a moral superiority, enhanced by their local concentration. They are undoubtedly better off than before 1848. The best proof is that out of ten strikes they make, nine are provoked by the manufacturers in their own interests, as the only means of securing a reduced production. You can never get the masters to agree to work "short time", let manufactured goods be ever so unsaleable; but get the workpeople to strike, and the masters shut their factories to a man.

Secondly, the great Trades Unions. They are the organisations of those trades in which the labour of *grown-up men* predominates, or is alone applicable. Here the competition neither of women and children nor of machinery has so far weakened their organised strength. The engineers, the carpenters and joiners, the bricklayers are each of them a power, to that extent that, as in the case of the bricklayers and bricklayers' labourers, they can even success-

fully resist the introduction of machinery. That their condition has remarkably improved since 1848 there can be no doubt, and the best proof of this is in the fact that for more than fifteen years not only have their employers been with them, but they with their employers, upon exceedingly good terms. They form an aristocracy among the working class; they have succeeded in enforcing for themselves a relatively comfortable position, and they accept it as final. They are the model working men of Messrs. Leone Levi and Giffen, and they are very nice people indeed nowadays to deal with, for any sensible capitalist in particular and for the whole capitalist class in general.

But as to the great mass of the working people, the state of misery and insecurity in which they live now is as low as ever, if not lower. The East End of London is an ever spreading pool of stagnant misery and desolation, of starvation when out of work, and degradation, physical and moral, when in work. And so in all other large towns—abstraction made of the privileged minority of the workers; and so in the smaller towns and in the agricultural districts. The law which reduces the *value* of labour-power to the value of the necessary means of subsistence, and the other law which reduces its *average price* as a rule to the minimum of those means of subsistence: these laws act upon them with the irresistible force of an automatic engine, which crushes them between its wheels.

This, then, was the position created by the Free Trade policy of 1847, and by twenty years of the rule of the manufacturing capitalists. But then a change came. The crash of 1866 was, indeed, followed by a slight and short revival about 1873; but that did not last. We did not, indeed, pass through the full crisis at the time it was due, in 1877 or 1878; but we have had, ever since 1876, a chronic state of stagnation in all dominant branches of industry. Neither will the full crash come; nor will the period of longed-for prosperity, to which we used to be entitled before and after it. A dull depression, a chronic glut of all markets for all trades, that is what we have been living in for nearly ten years. How is this?

The Free Trade theory was based upon the assumption: that England was to be the one great manufacturing centre of an agricultural world. And the actual fact is that this assumption has turned out to be a pure delusion. The conditions of modern industry, steam-power and machinery, can be established wherever there is fuel, especially coals. And other countries beside England, France, Belgium, Germany, America, even Russia, have coals. And the people over there did not see the advantage of being turned into Irish pauper farmers merely for the greater wealth and glory of English capitalists. They set resolutely about manufacturing, not only for themselves but for the rest of the world; and the consequence is, that the manufacturing monopoly enjoyed by England for nearly a century is irretrievably broken up.

But the manufacturing monopoly of England is the pivot of the present social system of England. Even while that monopoly lasted the markets could not keep pace with the increasing productivity of English manufacturers; the decennial crises were the consequence. And new markets are getting scarce every day, so much so that even the negroes of the Congo are now to be forced into the civilisation attendant upon Manchester calicoes, Staffordshire pottery, and Birmingham hardware. How will it be when Continental, and especially American goods, flow in the ever increasing quantities—when the predominating share, still held by British manufactures, will become reduced from year to year? Answer, Free Trade, thou universal panacea?

I am not the first to point this out. Already, in 1883, at the Southport meeting of the British Association, Mr. Inglis Palgrave, the President of the Economical section, stated plainly that

"the days of great trade profits in England were over, and there was a pause in the progress of several great branches of industrial labour. *The country might almost be said to be entering the non-progressive state.*"²¹²

But what is to be the consequence? Capitalist production *cannot* stop. It must go on increasing and expanding, or it must die. Even now, the mere reduction of England's lion's share in the supply of the world's markets means stagnation, distress, excess of capital here, excess of unemployed work-

people there. What will it be when the increase of yearly production is brought to a complete stop?

Here is the vulnerable place, the heel of Achilles, for capitalist production. Its very basis is the necessity of constant expansion, and this constant expansion now becomes impossible. It ends in a deadlock. Every year England is brought nearer face to face with the question: either the country must go to pieces, or capitalist production must. Which is it to be?

And the working class? If even under the unparalleled commercial and industrial expansion, from 1848 to 1868, they have had to undergo such misery; if even then the great bulk of them experienced at best a temporary improvement of their condition, while only a small, privileged, "protected" minority was permanently benefited, what will it be when this dazzling period is brought finally to a close; when the present dreary stagnation shall not only become intensified, but this its intensified condition shall become the permanent and normal state of English trade?

The truth is this: during the period of England's industrial monopoly the English working class have to a certain extent shared in the benefits of the monopoly. These benefits were very unequally parcelled out amongst them; the privileged minority pocketed most, but even the great mass had at least a temporary share now and then. And that is the reason why since the dying-out of Owenism there has been no Socialism in England. With the breakdown of that monopoly the English working class will lose that privileged position; it will find itself generally—the privileged and leading minority not excepted—on a level with its fellow-workers abroad. And that is the reason why there will be Socialism again in England.

Written in mid-February 1885

Published in the magazine
The Commonwealth No. 2,
March 1, 1885 and the
authorised translation in the
journal *Die Neue Zeit* No. 6,
June 1885
Signed: *Frederick Engels*

Printed according
to the magazine text

FREDERICK ENGELS

THE ABDICATION OF THE BOURGEOISIE

Of the national bourgeoisie in the various countries, it is the English that has undoubtedly up to now preserved a keener class sense, that is, political sense, than any other. Our German bourgeoisie is stupid and cowardly; it has not even been able to seize and hold the political power the working class won for it in 1848; in Germany the working class must first sweep away the remnants of feudalism and of patriarchal absolutism, which our bourgeoisie should have eradicated long ago. The French bourgeoisie, the most mercenary and pleasure-seeking of all, is blinded to its future interests by its own avarice; it lives only the day; in its frenzied thirst for profits it falls into the most scandalous corruption, declares that income tax is socialist high treason, can find no way of countering any strike but with infantry salvoes, and thus brings it about that in a republic in which there is universal suffrage revolution by means of force is about the only means of victory left to the workers. The English bourgeoisie is neither as greedily stupid as the French, nor as pusillanimously stupid as the German. During the period of its greatest triumphs it has constantly made concessions to the workers; even the most narrow-minded part of it, the conservative landed and finance aristocracy, did not hesitate to give the urban workers suffrage on such a scale that it is purely the fault of the workers themselves that since 1868 they have not had 40 to

50 representatives of their own in Parliament. And since then the entire bourgeoisie—the Conservatives and the Liberals combined—has extended this wider suffrage to the counties as well, as roughly adjusted the size of the wards and thereby placed at least another thirty wards at the disposal of the working class. Whereas the German bourgeoisie has never had the ability to lead and represent the nation as its ruling class, whereas the French proves day in day out—and at the present elections again²¹³—that it has completely lost this ability—and yet there was a time when it possessed that ability to a higher degree than any other middle class—the English bourgeoisie (in which the so-called aristocracy has been absorbed and assimilated) exhibited until recently a certain talent for upholding its position as leading class at least to some degree.

This now seems to be changing more and more.

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

Since, however, this exploitation took place within the framework of modern capitalist society, it was, despite its

medieval frippery, subject to the laws of that society. The big swallowed the small or at least chained them to their triumphal chariot. The big dock companies became the masters of the guilds of the wharfingers, the lightermen and the watermen and thereby of the whole London port, thus opening up the prospect of unlimited profits for themselves. This prospect blinded them. They threw millions out of the window by building stupid installations; and since there were several such companies, they engaged in a competitive war, which took further millions, led to the building of new senseless structures and pushed the companies to the brink of bankruptcy, until, finally, they came to terms two years ago.

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

Nowhere else in the world would such folly be tolerated. In Liverpool, where similar conditions were shaping, they were nipped in the bud and the entire port constitution was modernised. But in London trade suffers because of it, while trade circles grumble and—help it happen. The bourgeoisie, most of whom have to pay the costs of this absurdity, submit to this monopoly, even if unwillingly, but submit just the same. They no longer have the energy to shake off this burden that in time threatens to stifle the living conditions of all of London.

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

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

Now a different picture. From the medieval Port of London we move on to the modern cotton spinneries of Lancashire. At the moment the cotton harvest of 1888 is exhausted and that of 1889 has not yet been placed on the market, that is, the speculation in raw materials has at present the best prospects. A rich Dutchman named Steenstrand has, with other accomplices, formed a "ring" to buy up all the available cotton and to hoist prices. The cotton spinners can retaliate only by curtailing consumption, that is, by shutting down their mills for several or all days a week, until the new cotton is in sight. This they have been trying to do for six weeks. But now as before it refuses to work. This is because many of the spinners are so heavily indebted that a partial or complete standstill would push them to the brink of ruin. Others even want the majority to stop and thereby to boost the price of cotton yarn; while they themselves intend to

continue operating and to profit from the higher yarn prices. More than ten years' experience has shown that there is only one way to enforce a shut-down of all cotton mills—no matter for what ultimate purpose—namely, by introducing a wage cut of, say, 5 per cent. Then there is a strike, or a lockout by the mill-owners themselves, and then, in the struggle against the workers, there inevitably is unity among the mill-owners, and the mills are shut down even by those who do not know whether they will ever be able to set them going again.

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

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

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

Thus, here too, in the most modern of all modern large-scale industries, the bourgeoisie proves to be as incapable of defending its own class interests, as it is in medieval London. And what is more, it frankly admits it, and by turning to the organised workers with the request that they should defend a major class interest of the mill-owners by resorting to coercion against the mill-owners themselves, it not only abdicates, but recognises in the organised working class its successor, who is called upon to rule and is quite

capable of doing so. It proclaims itself that now while every single mill-owner is able to manage his own mill, it is only and solely the organised workers who are now able to take the management of the entire cotton industry into their own hands. And this means, in plain German, that the only occupation left to the mill-owners is to become paid business managers in the service of the organised workers.

Written between the end
of September and the beginning
of October 1889

Published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*
No. 40, October 5, 1889
Signed: *F. Engels*

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS

(ON THE LONDON DOCK STRIKE)²¹⁴

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

Written by F. Engels
between August 20 and 26, 1889

Published in *The Labour Elector*,
Vol. II, No. 35, August 31, 1889

Printed according
to the newspaper text

FREDERICK ENGELS

MAY 4 IN LONDON²¹⁵

The May Day celebration of the proletariat was epoch-making not only in its universal character, which made it the first international *action* of the militant working class. It also served to register most gratifying advances in the various countries. Friend and foe agree that *on the whole Continent it was Austria, and in Austria it was Vienna, that celebrated the holiday of the proletariat in the most brilliant and dignified manner*, and that the Austrian, above all the Viennese, workers thereby won themselves an entirely different standing in the movement. Only a few years ago the Austrian movement had declined almost to zero, and the workers of the German and Slav crown territories were split into hostile parties wasting their forces on internecine strife. Whoever had affirmed, a mere three years ago, that on May 1, 1890, Vienna and the whole of Austria would set an example for all others of how a proletarian class holiday should be celebrated, would have been laughed at. We shall do well not to forget this fact when judging those squabbles stemming from internal discord in which the workers of other countries are wearing away their forces even today, as for instance, in France. Who will assert that Paris cannot do what Vienna has done?

But on May 4 Vienna was thrown into the shade by London. And I hold it to be the most important and magnificent in the entire May Day celebration that on May 4, 1890, the

English proletariat, rousing itself from forty years of slumber, *re-joined the movement of its class*. To appreciate this, one must look into the events leading up to May 4.

Towards the beginning of last year the world's largest and most wretched working-class district, the East End of London, stirred gradually to action. On April 1, 1889, the Gas Workers' and General Labourers' Union was founded; today it has a membership of some 100,000. Largely with the co-operation of this partner union (many are gas workers in winter and dock workers in summer), the dockers' big strike started on its way and shook even the bottommost section of the East London workers out of stagnation.²¹⁶ As a result, trade union upon trade union began to form among these, mostly unskilled workers, while those already in existence there, which till then had barely kept themselves going, now blossomed forth quickly. But the difference between these new trade unions and the old was very great. The old ones, which admit none but "skilled" workers, are exclusive; they bar all workers who have not been trained according to the statutes of the guild concerned, and thereby even expose themselves to competition from those not in the guild; they are rich, but the richer they become, the more they degenerate into mere sick-funds and burial clubs; they are conservative and they steer clear above all of that "... socialism, as far and as long as they can. The new "unskilled" unions, on the other hand, admit *every* fellow-worker; they are essentially, and the gas workers even exclusively, strike unions and strike funds. And while they are not yet socialists to a man, they insist nevertheless on being led only by socialists. But socialist propaganda had already been going on for years in East End, where it was above all Mrs. E. Marx-Aveling and her husband, Edward Aveling, who had four years earlier discovered the best propaganda field in the "Radical clubs"²¹⁷ consisting almost exclusively of workers, and had worked on them steadily and, as is evident now, with the best of success. During the dock workers' strike Mrs. Aveling was one of the three women in charge of the distribution of relief, and this earned them a slanderous statement from Mr. Hyndman, the runaway of Trafalgar Square,²¹⁸ who alleged that they had had a weekly three

pounds sterling paid to them for it from the strike fund. Mrs. Aveling led almost unaided last winter's strike in Silvertown,²¹⁹ also in East End, and on the gas workers' committee she represents a women's section she has founded there.

Last autumn the gas workers won an eight-hour working day here in London, but lost it again, after an unhappy strike,²²⁰ in the southern part of the city, acquiring sufficient proof that this gain is by no means safe in the northern part either. Is it surprising, then, that they readily accepted Mrs. Aveling's proposal to hold the May Day celebration, decided on by the Paris Congress, in favour of a legalised eight-hour working day in London? In common with several socialist groups, the Radical clubs and the other trade unions in East End, they set up a Central Committee that was to organise a large demonstration for the purpose in Hyde Park. As it turned out that all attempts to hold the demonstration on Thursday, May 1, were bound to fail this year, it was decided to put it off till Sunday, May 4.

To ensure that, as far as possible, *all* London workers took part, the Central Committee invited, with uninhibited naïveté, the London Trades Council as well. This is a body made up of delegates from the London trade unions, mostly from the older corporations of "skilled" workers, a body in which, as might be expected, the anti-socialist elements still command a majority. The Trades Council saw that the movement for an eight-hour day threatened to grow over its head. The old trade unions stand likewise for an eight-hour working day, but not for one to be established by law. By an eight-hour day they mean that normal daily wages should be paid for eight hours—so-and-so much per hour—but that overtime should be allowed any number of hours daily, provided every overtime hour is paid at a higher rate—say, at the rate of one and a half or two ordinary hours. The point therefore was to channel the demonstration into the fairway of this kind of working day, to be won by "free" agreement but certainly not to be made obligatory by parliamentary act. To this end the Trades Council allied itself with the Social-Democratic Federation of the above-mentioned Mr. Hyndman, an association which poses as the only true church

of British Socialism, which had very consistently concluded a life-and-death alliance with the French Possibilists and sent a delegation to their congress and which therefore regarded in advance the May Day celebration decided on by the Marxist Congress as a sin against the Holy Ghost. The movement was growing over the head of the Federation as well; but to adhere to the Central Committee would mean placing itself under "Marxist" leadership; on the other hand, if the Trades Council were to take the matter into its own hands and if the celebration were held on the 4th of May instead of on the 1st, it would no longer be anything like the wicked "Marxist" May Day celebration and so they could join in. Despite the fact that the Social-Democratic Federation calls in its programme for a legalised eight-hour day, it eagerly clasped the hand proffered by the Trades Council.

Now the new allies, strange bedfellows though they were, played a trick on the Central Committee which would, it is true, be considered not only permissible but quite skilful in the political practice of the British bourgeoisie, but which European and American workers will probably find very mean. The fact is that in the case of popular meetings in Hyde Park the organisers must first announce their intention to the Board of Workers and reach an agreement with it on particulars, securing specifically permission to drive over the grass the carts that are to serve as platforms. Besides, regulations say that after a meeting has been announced, no other meeting may be held in the Park on the same day. The Central Committee had not yet made the announcement; but the organisations allied against it had scarcely heard the news when they announced a meeting in the Park for May 4 and obtained permission for seven platforms, doing it behind the backs of the Central Committee.

The Trades Council and the Federation believed thereby to have rented the Park for May 4 and to have victory in their pocket. The former called a meeting of delegates from the trade unions, to which it also invited two delegates from the Central Committee; the latter sent three, including Mrs. Aveling. The Trades Council treated them as if it had been master of the situation. It informed them that *only* trade unions, that is to say, no socialist unions or political clubs,

could take part in the demonstration and carry banners. Just how the Social-Democratic Federation was to participate in the demonstration remained a mystery. The Council had already edited the resolution to be submitted to the meeting, and had *deleted* from it the demand for a *legalised* eight-hour day; discussion on a proposal for putting that demand back in the resolution was not allowed, nor was it voted on. And lastly, the Council refused to accept Mrs. Aveling as a delegate because, it said, she was no manual worker (which is not true), although its own President, Mr. Shipton, had not moved a finger in his own trade for fully fifteen years.

The workers on the Central Committee were outraged by the trick played on them. It looked as if the demonstration had been finally put into the hands of two organisations representing only negligible minorities of London workers. There seemed to be no remedy for it but to storm the platforms of the Trades Council as the gas workers had threatened. Then Edward Aveling went to the Ministry and secured, contrary to regulations, permission for the Central Committee as well to bring seven platforms to the Park. The attempt to juggle with the demonstration in the interest of the minority failed; the Trades Council pulled in its horns and was glad to be able to negotiate with the Central Committee on an equal footing over arrangements for the demonstration.

One has to know this background to appreciate the nature and significance of the demonstration. Prompted by the East End workers who had recently joined in the movement, the demonstration found such a universal response that the two organisations—which were no less hostile to each other than both of them together were to the fundamental idea of the demonstration—had to ally themselves in order to seize the leadership and use the meeting to their own advantage. On the one hand, a conservative Trades Council preaching equal rights for capital and labour; on the other, a Social-Democratic Federation playing at radicalism, and talking of social revolution whenever it is safe to do so, and the two allied to do a mean trick with an eye to capitalising on a demonstration thoroughly hateful to both. Owing to these incidents, the May 4 meeting was split into two parts. On one side

were the conservative workers, whose horizon does not go beyond the wage-labour system, flanked by a narrow-minded but ambitious socialist sect; on the other side, the great bulk of workers who had recently joined in the movement and who do not want to hear any more of the Manchesterism of the old trade unions²²¹ and want to win their complete emancipation by themselves, jointly with allies of their own choice, and not with those imposed by a small socialist coterie. On one side was stagnation represented by trade unions that have not yet quite freed themselves from the guild spirit, and by a narrow-minded sect backed by the meanest allies; on the other, the living free movement of the re-awakening British proletariat. And it was apparent even to the blindest where there was fresh life in that two-faced gathering and where stagnation. Around the seven platforms of the Central Committee were dense, immense crowds, marching up with music and banners, over a hundred thousand in the procession, reinforced by almost as many who had come severally; everywhere was harmony and enthusiasm, and yet order and organisation. At the platforms of the combined reactionaries, on the other hand, everything seemed dull; their procession was much weaker than the other, poorly organised, disorderly and mostly belated, so that in some places things got under way there only when the Central Committee was already through. While the Liberal leaders of some Radical clubs, and the officials of several trade unions rallied to the Trades Council, the members of the very same unions—in fact, four entire branches of the Social-Democratic Federation—marched with the Central Committee. For all that, the Trades Council succeeded in winning some attention, but the decisive success was achieved by the Central Committee.

What the numerous onlooking bourgeois politicians took home with them as the overall effect was the certainty that the English proletariat, which for fully forty years had trailed behind the big Liberal party and served it as voting cattle, had awakened at last to new, independent life and action. There can be no doubt about that: on May 4, 1890, the English working class joined the great international army. And that is an epoch-making fact. The English pro-

letariat has its roots in most advanced industrial development and, moreover, possesses the greatest freedom of political movement. Its long slumber—a result, on the one hand, of the failure of the Chartist movement of 1836-50 and, on the other hand, of the colossal industrial upswing of 1848-80—is finally broken. The grandchildren of the old Chartists are stepping into the line of battle. For eight years already the wide masses have been stirring now here, now there. Socialist groups have emerged, but none has been able to outgrow the bounds of a sect; agitators and alleged party leaders, including mere speculators and pushers, they have remained officers without soldiers. It has almost always been like the famous Robert Blum column of the Baden campaign of 1849²²²: one colonel, eleven officers, one bugler and one private. And the bickering among those various Robert Blum columns over the leadership of the future proletarian army has been anything but edifying. This will stop before long, just as it has stopped in Germany and in Austria. The powerful movement of the masses will put an end to all these sects and little groups by absorbing the men and showing the officers their proper places. Those who don't like it may sneak away. It won't come off without friction, but come off it will, and the English proletarian army will, much sooner than some expect, be as united, as well organised and as determined as any, and will be jubilantly hailed by all its comrades on the Continent and in America.

Written by F. Engels
between May 5 and 21, 1890

Published in *Arbeiter-Zeitung*
No. 21, May 23, 1890

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS

**[ON CERTAIN PECULIARITIES IN ENGLAND'S
ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT]**

Owing to its eternal compromises, the kind of gradual, peaceful political development that takes place in England gives rise to a situation full of contradictions; because of its overwhelming advantages this situation can be practically tolerated within certain limits, but its logical absurdities cause much anguish to the thinking mind. Hence, the need of all "state-supporting" parties for a theoretical cloak, a justification, which, naturally, can be provided only through sophisms, distortions, and *enfin* by dubious tricks. Thus, a literature is being cultivated in the political field that repeats all the wretched hypocrisy and untruthfulness of theological apologetics, and which also transplants the theological intellectual vices to a mundane soil. Thus the soil of the specific liberal hypocrisy is fertilised, sown and cultivated by the Conservatives themselves. And thus is theological apologetics offered an argument, produced by ordinary minds, which it lacks in other lands. What of it if the facts related in the gospel and the dogmas preached in the New Testament in general contradict each other? Does that make them untrue? The English Constitution contains many more inconsistencies and constantly contradicts itself, but continues to exist and, hence, is true!

The absence of crises since 1868 is also due to the expansion of the world market, which distributes the surplus English, respectively European, capital in transport invest-

ment, etc., *throughout the world* and also among a whole mass of other *branches* of investment. This has made a crisis impossible owing to excessive speculation in railways, banking, etc., or in specifically American investments, or in *Indian* trade, but small crises, such as the Argentinian, have become possible for the past three years. But all this proves that a *giant crisis* is in the making.

Written on September 12, 1892

Translated from the German

NOTES

- ¹ Engels has in mind the discoveries of the Scottish scientist Black, who initiated pneumatic chemistry, the English scientist Priestley, who discovered oxygen in an empirical manner, and the French scientist Lavoisier, who explained this discovery theoretically and repudiated the theory of phlogiston. p. 10
- ² When Engels wrote his article, the history of agrarian relations in England had not yet been studied. Later historical research has established that from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries the mass of the English peasantry, which had by then freed itself from personal bondage, were copyholders (tenants possessing tenure by copy, that is, lease-holders with lifelong and hereditary leases, who paid a feudal rent). The terms villains, bordars and cottars refer to various categories of serfs in medieval England. p. 15
- ³ See Note 13. p. 18
- ⁴ The *People's Charter*, containing the demands of the Chartists, was published on May 8, 1838, as a Bill to be presented to Parliament. It consisted of six points: universal suffrage (for men over twenty-one years of age), annual Parliaments, vote by ballot, equal representation, abolition of the property qualification for a seat in Parliament and payment of M.P.s. p. 18
- ⁵ In 1892 Engels made the following addition to the analogous note in the book *The Condition of the Working-Class in England*: "The historical essay on the industrial revolution given here is not accurate in a number of details, but in 1843-44 there were no better sources." p. 28
- ⁶ William Godwin, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness*, Vol. 1-2, London, 1793. p. 29

- ⁷ This refers to a book by the German reactionary historian, Friedrich Raumer, entitled *England im Jahre 1835*, published in Leipzig in two parts in 1836. p. 33
- ⁸ The *Test-Act* of 1673 demanded recognition of the dogmas of the Church of England by persons occupying governmental positions. In its time directed against Catholic reaction, this Act subsequently became a weapon against various religious sects and trends which deviated to some extent or other from the dogmas of the official, Established Church.
- The *Habeas Corpus Act* was passed by the British Parliament in 1679. For the provisions of the Act see page 50 of this book.
- The *Bill of Rights*, passed by the British Parliament in 1689, restricted the rights of the King in Parliament and confirmed the compromise between the landed aristocracy and the upper financial and commercial bourgeoisie which had been achieved as a result of the *coup d'état* of 1688. p. 34
- ⁹ The English lawyer, William Blackstone, published his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* in 1765-69, the Swiss lawyer Jean Louis Delolme's *Constitution de l'Angleterre* appeared in 1771. p. 35
- ¹⁰ *Magna Charta* (the Great Charter)—a document presented to King John (Lackland) by the powerful feudal lords who had rebelled and had the support of the knights and the townspeople. The Charter, signed on June 15, 1215, restricted the rights of the King, mainly in the interests of the influential feudal lords and contained some concessions to knighthood and to the towns. To the large mass of the population, the serfs, the Charter gave no rights whatsoever. p. 36
- ¹¹ This refers to the struggle of the masses for electoral reform in England, which reached its climax in 1831. p. 40
- ¹² The *Reform Bill* was passed by the House of Commons in 1831 and finally ratified by the House of Lords in June 1832. It was directed against the political monopoly of the landed and financial aristocracy and gave representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie access to Parliament. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie who had been the main force in the struggle for this reform were not enfranchised. p. 40
- ¹³ The *Anti-Corn Law League* was founded in 1838 by the Manchester manufacturers Cobden and Bright. The Corn Laws, which were designed to restrict or prohibit the import of corn, had been introduced in the interests of the influential landowners. Putting forward a demand for completely free trade, the League wanted to get the Corn Laws repealed for the purpose of reducing the wages of the workers and weakening the economic and political position of the landed aristocracy. In its struggle against the landowners the League sought to use the working masses. At this time, however, the progressive workers of England turned towards an independent workers' movement with definite political aims—Chartism.

- The struggle between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy over the Corn Laws ended in 1846 with their repeal by Act of Parliament. p. 41
- ¹⁴ The *dissenters* were members of religious sects and trends in England which deviated in various degrees from the dogmas of the official Church of England. p. 45
- ¹⁵ The *Thirty-nine Articles*, which symbolised the faith of the Church of England, were promulgated in 1571. p. 45
- ¹⁶ See Note 8. p. 46
- ¹⁷ The *Corporation Act*, passed by Parliament in 1661, demanded recognition of the dogmas of the Church of England by persons holding governmental posts, particularly in municipal administration. p. 46
- ¹⁸ The *Catholic Emancipation Act* passed by the British Parliament in 1829 abolished the restrictions on the rights of Catholics. The Catholics, the majority of whom were Irish, were granted the right to be elected to Parliament and to hold some governmental offices. At the same time the property qualification for prospective parliamentary candidates was increased fivefold. p. 46
- ¹⁹ The Anglo-Irish Union was imposed on Ireland by the English Government after the suppression of the Irish rebellion in 1798. The Union, which came into force on January 1, 1801, destroyed the last vestiges of autonomy in Ireland and abolished the Irish Parliament. A demand for the repeal of the Union became a highly popular watchword in Ireland in the 1820s. However, the bourgeois liberals who led the national movement (O'Connell and others) looked upon the agitation for the repeal of the Union only as a means of obtaining small concessions for the Irish bourgeoisie from the British Government. In 1835 O'Connell came to terms with the English Whigs and generally put an end to the agitation. Under the influence of a mass movement, however, the Irish liberals were forced to found an *Association of Repealers* (advocates of repeal of the Union). p. 49
- ²⁰ The *Northern Star* was an English weekly newspaper, the central organ of the Chartists, founded in 1837. It continued publication until 1852 (at first in Leeds, but from November 1844, in London). The founder and editor of the newspaper was Feargus O'Connor. During the 1840s the newspaper was also edited by George Harney. From September 1845 to March 1848 it published contributions from Frederick Engels. p. 49
- ²¹ The *New Moral World*—a weekly newspaper of the utopian socialists, founded by Robert Owen in 1834. It was published until 1846 (at first in Leeds, but from October 1841, in London). Frederick Engels contributed to it from November 1843 till May 1845. p. 49
- ²² Marx is referring to the criminal code of Karl V (*Constitutio criminalis Carolina*), which was passed by the Reichstag in Regens-

- burg in 1532. This code was known for the extreme cruelty of the punishments. p. 54
- ²³ John Noakes, *The Right of the Aristocracy of the Soil*, London, 1847. p. 59
- ²⁴ *The Democrat*, which was to be a Chartist daily newspaper, was never published. p. 60
- ²⁵ In England up till 1872 on the day of nomination of candidates a show of hands took place and persons not possessing franchise could take part in the voting. However, on election day, when even a candidate who had been voted down by a show of hands could stand for election, only a very narrow circle of "lawful" voters limited by strict property, residential and other qualifications, could vote. p. 60
- ²⁶ *L'Atelier* (Workshop)—a French monthly, organ of the artisans and workers, which was influenced by the ideas of Christian socialism. It was published in Paris from 1840 until 1850. Representatives of the workers, re-elected every three months, were on the editorial staff. p. 62
- ²⁷ The *Fraternal Democrats*—an international democratic society, founded in London in 1845 by Left-wing Chartists and revolutionary emigrants (members of the League of the Just, and others) for the purpose of establishing close ties between democratic movements in different countries. Marx and Engels took part in the preparations for a meeting of democrats from different countries, held on September 22, 1845, which brought this society into being. Marx and Engels did not attend the meeting in view of their departure from London but they maintained constant contact with the *Fraternal Democrats*.
After the defeat of the Chartists in 1848 the activity of the society declined considerably and in 1853 it ceased to exist. p. 66
- ²⁸ The *International League* or *People's International League* was a society, founded in London in 1847 by the English bourgeois radicals and the liberal supporters of free-trade. A number of bourgeois democrats from among the Italian, Hungarian and Polish emigrants joined the society, in particular G. Mazzini, one of the founders of the League. In 1848 the activity of the League, reduced to the organisation of meetings and lectures on international questions and to the distribution of pamphlets, ceased. p. 66
- ²⁹ *King's County*—the English name for the county of Offaly (Central Ireland), so named in honour of the husband of Queen Mary Tudor, King Philip II of Spain. p. 68
- ³⁰ See Note 19. p. 69
- ³¹ The *Conciliation Hall*—place in Dublin where public meetings were held. p. 72
- ³² This refers to the national petition presented to Parliament by the Chartists in May 1842. Apart from the demand for the acceptance

- of the People's Charter, the petition contained a number of other demands, including a demand for the repeal of the Anglo-Irish Union of 1801. The petition was rejected by Parliament. p. 72
- ³³ The *Ten Hours Bill*, which affected only juveniles and women workers, was passed by the English Parliament on June 8, 1847. In practice, however, many factory owners ignored this law. p. 78
- ³⁴ Marx cites the work of Ricardo in the French edition: *Des principes de l'économie politique et de l'impôt*. Traduit de l'anglais par F. S. Constancio, avec des notes explicatives et critiques par J. B. Say. t. I, Paris, 1835, pp. 178-79 (*The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* translated from English by F. S. Constancio, with notes and criticisms by J. B. Say, Vol. I. Paris, 1835, pp. 178-79). p. 79
- ³⁵ A. Ure, *Philosophie des manufactures, ou économie industrielle*, t. I. Bruxelles, 1836, p. 34 (A. Ure, *The Philosophy of Manufacturing or Industrial Economy*, Vol. I, Brussels, 1836, p. 34). p. 84
- ³⁶ A reference to the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694. Its founders granted the bulk of the capital to the Government in the form of a loan, thereby initiating the national debt. p. 90
- ³⁷ A reference to the popular uprisings against Spanish rule which took place in Lisbon in 1640, in Naples in the years 1647-48 and in Messina in 1674-76. p. 92
- ³⁸ This refers to a number of laws adopted in the 1830s and 1840s under pressure from the industrial bourgeoisie and directed against trading in offices and the granting of sinecures to representatives of aristocratic families. p. 101
- ³⁹ The *Poor Law* was reviewed in the English Parliament in 1833 and passed in 1834.
Under this law only one form of assistance was available to the poor—to be placed in a workhouse, where workers were engaged in unproductive, monotonous and exhaustive work. These workhouses were called "Poor Law Bastilles" by ordinary people. p. 101
- ⁴⁰ The *Navigation Laws*, which were passed in 1651 and subsequent years, forbade the transportation of English goods by foreign vessels. These laws were repealed in 1849. p. 103
- ⁴¹ Marx's contribution to the *New-York Daily Tribune* actually begins with the article "The Elections in England.—Tories and Whigs". Up to that time he had sent the newspaper only articles from the series "Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany" which had been written by Engels.

This and another article, "The Chartists" (see p. 116-24 of this book), were written by Marx in German and sent by him as a single article on August 2, 1852, to Engels in Manchester to be translated into English. Marx's subsequent articles until the end of January 1853, were also, as a rule, translated by Engels. After this

date Marx mastered the English literary language sufficiently well to be able to write his contributions in English. In his translation Engels sometimes divided a long article into two parts, which were then sent by Marx to the newspaper as independent articles. This was done in the case of the two articles mentioned above.

In October 1852 they, together with the articles "Corruption at Elections" (see pp. 125-31 of this book) and "The Results of the Elections", were printed in several issues of *The People's Paper* under the heading "General Elections in Great Britain". In the version of the article "The Chartists" which *The People's Paper* printed, some details which Marx had borrowed from this newspaper were omitted.

The People's Paper, the Chartist weekly, was founded in May 1852 in London by Ernest Jones, one of the leaders of the Left-wing Chartists, a friend of Marx and Engels. Marx and Engels contributed to the newspaper from October 1852 till May 1856. Besides reprints of Marx's most important articles from the *New-York Daily Tribune*, the newspaper published a number of articles specially written for it by Marx and Engels. At this period the newspaper consistently defended the interests of the working class and propagated the ideas of socialism. Jones's inclination towards the bourgeois radicals caused Marx and Engels to stop contributing to *The People's Paper* and led to a temporary break with Jones. In June 1858 the newspaper came under the control of bourgeois interests.

p. 109

⁴² This refers to an article by Marx, "The Results of the Elections", which was written on August 27, 1852.

p. 109

⁴³ The *Manchester School*—a trend in economic thinking which reflected the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. Its supporters, known as the Free-Traders, advocated freedom of trade and non-intervention by the Government in economic life. The centre of the Free-Traders' agitation was Manchester, where the movement was headed by two textile manufacturers, Cobden and Bright, who in 1838 formed the Anti-Corn Law League.

p. 109

⁴⁴ The *High Church*—a trend in the Church of England which found adherents chiefly among the aristocracy. It preserved pompous traditional rites and stressed its continuity with Catholicism. The High Church was counterbalanced by another trend in the Church of England, the *Low Church*, which was supported mainly by the bourgeoisie and the lower ranks of the clergy and stressed the preaching of bourgeois-Christian morality.

p. 109

⁴⁵ The *Whigs*—here refers to a party in the U.S.A. mainly representing the interests of the industrial and financial bourgeoisie, and also supported by some of the plantation owners. The American Whig party existed from 1834 till 1852, when the intensification of the struggle over the question of slavery gave rise to splits and regrouping in the political parties of the country. The majority of the Whigs, together with a section of the Democratic Party and the farmers' party (Free-Soilers), in 1854 formed the Republican Party,

which opposed slavery. The remainder of the Whigs joined the Democratic Party, which defended the interests of the slave-owning planters. p. 111

⁴⁶ G. W. Cooke, *The History of the Parties; from the Rise of the Whig and Tory Factions, in the Reign of Charles II, to the Passing of the Reform Bill*, Vol. 1-3, London, 1836-37. p. 111

⁴⁷ This is an allusion to the nickname "Finality-John" which was given by the radicals to John Russell, the leader of the Whig party, after his speech in 1837, in which he characterised the parliamentary reform of 1832 as the final point of constitutional development in England. p. 112

⁴⁸ In English bourgeois historiography the "Glorious Revolution" was the name given to the *coup d'état* of 1688, after which the constitutional monarchy was established in England. p. 112

⁴⁹ The *Court of Chancery*, or Court of Justice—one of the highest courts of England, which after the judicial reform of 1873 became a division of the Supreme Court of Judicature. The jurisdiction of the court, presided over by the Lord Chancellor, covered matters concerning inheritance, contractual obligations, joint-stock companies, etc. In a number of cases the powers of this court overlapped those of other supreme courts. In counterbalance to the English common law accepted in other courts, the legal proceedings in the Court of Chancery were carried out on the basis of the so-called "law of justice". p. 117

⁵⁰ This refers to the subsidies, granted by the English Parliament in 1846 for the construction of a new building for the Catholic College in Maynooth, and the appropriations for its maintenance. These measures on the part of the English ruling classes were aimed at winning over the Irish Catholic clergy to their side and thus weakening the national liberation movement in Ireland.

For the *dissenters* see Note 14.

p. 124

⁵¹ This refers to an Irish pogrom on June 29 and 30, 1852, in the town of Stockport (Cheshire), which was committed by a crowd of fanatical English Protestants with the connivance of the local authorities and police. The homes of the Irish Catholics, who made up about one-third of the population of the town, were severely damaged. Some of the Irish were killed, and scores wounded. The police arrested more than a hundred innocent Irishmen, supposedly for taking part in the disturbances. The events in Stockport further exacerbated Anglo-Irish discord. p. 127

⁵² According to Greek mythology, the Curetes guarded the infant Zeus on the Island of Crete, where he had been hidden by his mother the goddess Rhea from his father, the titan Cronos, who devoured his children because he feared that they would deprive him of his power. The Curetes drowned the cries of the newly born Zeus by beating on their shields with swords. p. 129

- ⁵³ *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*—a newspaper of a liberal trend, appeared under this name from 1843 till 1918. p. 133
- ⁵⁴ *The Hull Advertiser*—an English newspaper, organ of the bourgeois radicals, published in 1799-1867. p. 133
- ⁵⁵ The *Peace Society*—an organisation founded in London in 1816 by the Quakers. The society was actively supported by the Free-Traders, who thought that in conditions of peace England could by means of free trade make full use of her industrial superiority and thus gain economic and political supremacy. p. 134
- ⁵⁶ The *King's (Queen's) Bench*—a court of law in England, which after the reform of 1873 became a division of the Supreme Court of Judicature. The King's Bench tried criminal and civil cases and had the right to revise the decisions of a number of lower courts. p. 134
- ⁵⁷ This refers to the *Court of Common Pleas*, the chief common law court of England (after the reform of 1873 it became a division of the High Court). Among other questions this court examined appeals against decisions taken by legal inspectors in respect of lists of voters. According to English common law only questions of right, i.e., questions concerning the violation of legal and judicial procedure, could be subject of examination in a court of appeal, while questions of fact, i.e., questions concerning the factual circumstances of a case, were subjects for examination by the jury. p. 135
- ⁵⁸ This refers to the *coup d'état* of 1688 (see Note 48) which led to the overthrow of James II Stuart and the declaration of William III of Orange, ruler of the Netherlands, as King of England. p. 143
- ⁵⁹ J. Steuart, *An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy*. In two volumes. Vol. I, London, 1767, p. 104. p. 145
- ⁶⁰ J. Loch, *An Account of the Improvements on the Estates of the Marquess of Stafford, in the Counties of Stafford and Salop and on the Estate of Sutherland*, London, 1820. p. 145
- ⁶¹ Marx is quoting from the book by J.C.L. Simonde de Sismondi, *Etudes sur l'économie politique* (Studies of Political Economy), Vol. I, Paris, 1873, pp. 230-31, 237. p. 146
- ⁶² J. Dalrymple, *An Essay towards a General History of Feudal Property in Great Britain*, London, 1759. p. 147
- ⁶³ R. Somers, *Letters from the Highlands; or, the Famine of 1847*, London-Edinburgh-Glasgow, 1848, p. 27. p. 147
- ⁶⁴ This article is the first article written by Marx in English. (See Note 41).
This is part of an article which was published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* for February 18, 1853, under the title *Capital*

- Punishment.—Mr. Cobden's Pamphlets.—Regulations of the Bank of England.* p. 149
- ⁶⁵ G.W.F. Hegel, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* (Principles of the Philosophy of Right), Berlin, 1821. p. 151
- ⁶⁶ A. Quetelet, *Sur l'homme et le développement de ses facultés, ou essai de physique sociale* (On Man and the Development of His Faculties, or an Essay on Social Physics), Vols. I-II, Paris, 1835. Marx used the English translation of this book, published in Edinburgh in 1842. p. 151
- ⁶⁷ The title of the article has been changed by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The heading originally given in the *New-York Daily Tribune* "Parliamentary Debates.—The Clergy Opposed to Socialism.—Starvation" was not in keeping with the content. p. 153
- ⁶⁸ See Note 50. p. 153
- ⁶⁹ D. Ricardo, *On the Principles of Political Economy, and Taxation*. The first edition was published in London in 1817. p. 161
- ⁷⁰ J.C.L. Simonde de Sismondi, *Nouveaux principes d'économie politique, ou de la richesse dans ses rapports avec la population* (New Principles of Political Economy, or on Wealth in Respect of the Population), Vols. I-II, Paris, 1819. p. 161
- ⁷¹ This refers to Plato's dialogue, "The Republic", in which is described an ideal state, based on division of labour. According to Plato, poets should be banished from this state as being incapable of any useful function. p. 163
- ⁷² The *Religion of the Lingam*—the worship of the deity Siva. It is especially widespread among the Southern India sect of the Lingayats (from "linga", the symbol of Siva), a Hindu sect which does not recognise caste distinctions and repudiates fasts, sacrifices and pilgrimage.
Juggernaut (Jagannath)—depiction of one of the highest Hindu deities, Vishnu. The cult of the Juggernaut was remarkable for the extraordinary splendour of the ritual and also the extreme religious fanaticism which manifested itself in the self-torture and suicide of its adherents. On days of important festivals some believers would throw themselves under the wheels of the chariot bearing the statue of the Vishnu-Juggernaut. p. 166
- ⁷³ The *Moguls* were conquerors of Turkish origin, who invaded India from the eastern part of Central Asia at the beginning of the sixteenth century. In 1526 they founded the empire of the Great Moguls (after the ruling dynasty of the empire) in northern India. Contemporaries regarded the founders of the Mogul Empire as direct descendants of the Mongol conquerors of the times of *Genghis Khan*; hence the name Mogul. The might of the Moguls

was considerable and by the middle of the seventeenth century their state embraced a large part of India and part of Afghanistan. However, as a result of peasant uprisings, growing opposition to the Moslem conquerors among the peoples of India, constant internecine wars and the increasing separatist tendencies of feudalism, the empire fell into decline and in the first half of the eighteenth century virtually collapsed.

The *Heptarchy* (Government by seven rulers)—a term used in English historiography for the political struggle of England in the early Middle Ages (6th to 8th centuries), when the country was divided up into seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. Here Marx uses this term by analogy to describe the feudal dismemberment of the Deccan (Central and Southern India) before its conquest by the Moslems.

p. 166

⁷⁴ The Island of Salsette, to the north of Bombay, was famed for its one hundred and nine Buddhist temples, which are to be found in caves.

p. 166

⁷⁵ "*Laissez-faire, laissez-aller*" (grant freedom of action)—the slogan of those economists, who advocated Free Trade and non-intervention by the state in the sphere of economic relations.

p. 168

⁷⁶ Marx is quoting from a House of Commons committee report of 1812, cited by G. Campbell in his book *Modern India: a Sketch of the System of Civil Government*, London, 1852, pp. 84-85.

p. 170

⁷⁷ The *Seven Years' War* (1756-63)—fought between two coalitions of European states, the Anglo-Prussian on the one hand and the Franco-Russo-Austrian on the other. One of the chief causes of the war was colonial and commercial rivalry between Britain and France. Besides battles at sea, the war was waged primarily on the territory of the North American and Asian colonies of these two powers. The main theatre of conflict in the East was India, where the French and their puppets from among the local princes were opposed by the British East India Company, which with considerably increased armed forces made use of the war to seize Indian territories. As a result of the Seven Years' War France lost almost all her possessions in India (she was left with only five coastal towns, whose fortifications she was obliged to demolish), Britain's colonial power, on the other hand, considerably increased.

p. 173

⁷⁸ James Mill, *The History of the British India*, the first edition of which appeared in 1818. The passage quoted by Marx is from the 1858 edition, Vol. V, Book VI, pp. 60 and 65. A quotation given above about the functions of the Board of Control is also taken from the 1858 edition, Vol. IV, Book V, p. 395.

p. 175

⁷⁹ Marx enumerates a number of expansionist wars, waged in India by the British East India Company.

The *War in the Carnatic* (a principality in the southeastern part of India) continued with intervals from 1746 to 1763. The

British and French colonialists fought each other for domination of the Carnatic under the guise of supporting the various local pretenders to rule in the principality. Victory went finally to the British, who in January 1761 seized Pondicherry, the chief bastion of the French in the south of India.

In 1756 the nabob of Bengal, in an effort to avert British invasion, began a war against the British by seizing Calcutta, their main base in north-eastern India. However, the troops of the British East India Company under the command of Clive soon recaptured Calcutta, demolished the fortifications built in Bengal by the French, who supported the nabob, and defeated the nabob at Plassey on June 23, 1757. In 1763, in Bengal, which had become a vassal possession of the Company, an uprising blazed up, but was suppressed by the British, who also took possession of Bihar, an area on the middle Ganges that had belonged to the nabob of Bengal. In 1803 the conquest of Orissa, to the south of Bengal, was completed and its feudal principalities came under the control of the Company.

In 1790-92 and 1799 the East India Company waged war against the independent feudal state of Mysore in southern India. The ruler of this state was Tippoo Sahib who had taken part in past campaigns against the British and was an implacable opponent of British expansion. As a result of the first of these wars Mysore lost half of its territory, which was seized by the Company and feudal princes it had turned into its allies. The second war led to the complete defeat of Mysore and the death of Tippoo, and the transformation of Mysore into a vassal principality.

The *subsidiary system*, or the system of so-called *subsidiary agreements*, was one of the methods by which the East India Company turned the potentates of Indian principalities into its vassals. Most widespread were the agreements under which the princes were to maintain (subsidise) the Company's troops stationed in their territory. There were also agreements imposing loans on the princes on extremely onerous terms. When the princes failed to pay, their possessions were confiscated. p. 176

⁸⁰ The *first Anglo-Afghan war of 1838-42* which was undertaken by the British for the purpose of the colonial enslavement of Afghanistan, ended in their defeat.

In 1843, the British marched into Scinde, an area on the frontier with Afghanistan in north-western India. During the Anglo-Afghan war the East India Company had obtained the consent of the feudal rulers of Scinde to the passage of its troops through their territory. Taking advantage of this, in 1843, the British demanded that the local feudal lords proclaim themselves vassals of the Company, and having made short work of the rebelling tribes of the Baluchi (the native population of Scinde), they announced that the whole area had been annexed to British India.

The *Punjab* (northern India) was conquered as a result of British campaigns against the Sikhs (1845-46 and 1848-49).

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Sikh state consisted of the Punjab as a whole and a number of neighbouring regions. In 1845 the British colonialists, with the aid of treacherous elements among the Sikh nobility, provoked a conflict with the Sikhs and in 1846 succeeded in transforming the Sikh state into a vassal principality. A Sikh uprising in 1848 was unsuccessful and in 1849 they were finally subjugated. The conquest of the Punjab culminated in the transformation of the whole of India into a British colony. p. 176

⁸¹ T. M[un], *A Discourse on Trade, from England into the East-Indies: Answering to diverse Objections which are usually made against the same*, London, 1621. p. 177

⁸² [Joshua Child], *A Treatise wherein it is Demonstrated that the East India Trade is the most national of all Foreign Trades*, London, 1681. Printed under the pseudonym of Patriot. p. 177

⁸³ [John Pollexfen], *England and East-India Inconsistent in their Manufactures. Being an answer to a treatise, entitled, an Essay on the East-India Trade*, London, 1697. p. 177

⁸⁴ The British began the conquest of Burma early in the nineteenth century. As a result of the first Burmese war (1824-26) the troops of the East India Company conquered the Province of Assam, which bordered on Bengal, and the coastal provinces of Arakan and Tenasserim. The second Burmese war (1852) led to the British conquest of the Province of Pegu. In 1853 fresh military operations against Burma were expected, since a peace treaty had not been signed upon the termination of the second Burmese war, and the new Burmese King, who had ascended the throne in February 1853, had not acknowledged the seizure of Pegu. p. 180

⁸⁵ J. Dickinson, *The Government of India under a Bureaucracy*, London-Manchester, 1853, p. 50.

Published by the Indian Reform Society, issue VI. p. 180

⁸⁶ The editorial article criticised by Marx was published in *The Times* of June 25, 1853. p. 183

⁸⁷ F.W. Newman, "Lectures on Political Economy", London, 1851, pp. 137, 141. p. 186

⁸⁸ H. Spencer, *Social Statics: or the Conditions Essential to Human Happiness Specified, and the First of Them Developed*, London, 1851, pp. 114-16, 122, 123, 125. p. 187

⁸⁹ This refers to the Executive Committee of the National Charter Association, founded in July 1840. Numbering up to forty thousand members in the years of the rise of Chartism, the Association was the first mass workers' party in the history of the working-class movement. The activities of the Association were adversely affected by lack of ideological and tactical unity among its members and the petty-bourgeois ideology of the majority of the

Chartist leaders. After the defeat of the Chartists in 1848, the progressive representatives of revolutionary Chartism with leanings towards scientific communism, the first and foremost of whom was Ernest Jones, tried to reorganise the Chartist movement on socialist lines at the beginning of the 1850s. This was reflected in the programme accepted by the Chartist Convention of 1851. In the second half of the 1850s, in view of the temporary victory of opportunism in the English labour movement and the decline of Chartism, the Association virtually ceased its activities. p. 191

⁹⁰ This excerpt from the speech of Gammage at the meeting in Blackstone-Edge on June 19, 1853, is quoted according to *The People's Paper* of June 25, 1853. p. 192

⁹¹ Extracts from the speech by Jones at the meeting in Blackstone-Edge on June 19, 1853, are quoted according to *The People's Paper* of June 25, 1853. p. 193

⁹² *Mahrattas*—an Indian people inhabiting the north-western part of the Deccan. In the middle of the seventeenth century they rebelled against the domination of the Mogul feudal lords and dealt a serious blow at the empire of the Great Moguls, which was instrumental in bringing about its disintegration. In the course of the struggle an independent Mahratta state emerged, the feudal leaders of which embarked on a path of expansion. Though weakened by internal strife at the end of the seventeenth century, the Mahratta state revived at the beginning of the eighteenth century and a powerful confederation of Mahratta principalities was formed, headed by a supreme governor, the peshwa. The Mahratta princes waged war against the Afghans for hegemony over India, but suffered a severe defeat in 1761. Weakened by this defeat and by further internal strife, the Mahratta principalities fell prey to the East India Company, which subjugated them as a result of the Anglo-Mahratta War of 1803-05. p. 195

⁹³ J. Chapman, *The Cotton and Commerce of India considered in relation to the interests of Great Britain; with remarks on railway communication in the Bombay presidency*, London, 1851, p. 91. p. 198

⁹⁴ G. Campbell, *Modern India; a Sketch of the System of Civil Government*, London, 1852, pp. 59-60. p. 199

⁹⁵ Marx is quoting from the book by A. D. Saltykov, *Lettres sur l'Inde* (Letters on India), Paris, 1848, p. 61. p. 200

⁹⁶ *Jats*—a caste group in northern India, consisting mainly of peasant farmers and also some military feudal elements. In the seventeenth century the Jat peasants rose repeatedly against the rule of the Moguls.

The *Brahmins*—one of the four ancient castes of India, primarily reserved for privileged members of the priesthood. Subsequently, like many other Indian castes, it admitted people of various professions and social standing, including even impoverished peasants and artisans. p. 200

- ⁹⁷ *The Temple of Juggernaut* in Orissa (Eastern India)—the centre of worship of one of the highest Hindu deities, Vishnu-Juggernaut (see Note 72). The priests of the temple, who were under the patronage of the East India Company, reaped immense profits from mass pilgrimage, while at the same time encouraging temple prostitution, and also from arranging splendid festivities which were accompanied by the suicide and self-torture of fanatical believers. p. 200
- ⁹⁸ Marx is referring to the presence in England of foreign mercenaries who had been recruited into the British army during the Napoleonic wars, mainly from the small German states, in particular from Hannover, then the patrimony of English kings of the Hannoverian dynasty. p. 205
- ⁹⁹ This refers to the British bombardment of Copenhagen in September 1807 to prevent Danish adherence to Napoleon's continental blockade, which forbade the countries of Europe to trade with England. p. 206
- ¹⁰⁰ The *Mutiny Act* was annually passed by Parliament from 1689 to 1881. The law gave the Crown the power to maintain a standing army and navy within certain limits, to introduce military regulations and routine into the army and navy, to institute courts-martial, and to lay down punishments for mutiny, refusal to obey orders, violation of discipline, and so on. The first of these acts was prompted by the general unrest in the British army. p. 207
- ¹⁰¹ The article criticised by Marx was printed in *The Economist* of November 5, 1853. p. 210
- ¹⁰² *The Preston Pilot* was a weekly newspaper published in Preston 1825-88. p. 212
- ¹⁰³ Marx is quoting from the speech made by Jones at a workers' meeting in Preston on November 4, 1853, a detailed account of which was published in *The People's Paper* on November 12, 1853. Since Marx wrote his article on November 11, he must have been able to acquaint himself with the text of this speech before the above-mentioned issue of *The People's Paper* appeared. p. 213
- ¹⁰⁴ The upswing of the mass strike movement of the English proletariat in 1853 prompted a group of Chartists, headed by Jones, to propose the creation of a broad workers' organisation, "The Mass Movement", which was to unite both the trade unions and the non-organised workers, primarily with the aim of co-ordinating strikes in different regions of the country. The organisation was to be headed by a Labour Parliament, which would be summoned periodically. The delegates for this Parliament were to be elected at meetings of the non-organised workers and at conferences of trade unions, affiliated to "The Mass Movement". The Labour Parliament was called in Manchester on March 6, 1854, and met

until March 18. It discussed and adopted a programme for "The Mass Movement" and set up an Executive Committee of five members. Marx, who had been elected an honorary delegate, sent this letter to the Labour Parliament and it was read out to the assembly on March 10. In it Marx formulated the primary task of the British working-class movement as that of creating an independent mass political party of the proletariat. Marx attached great significance to the convocation of the Labour Parliament and saw in this an attempt to lead the British working-class movement out of the narrow framework of trade unionism, a step towards combining the economic struggle with the political.

However, the attempt to organise "The Mass Movement" failed, since the majority of the trade union leaders were against political struggle and did not support the idea of creating a single mass workers' organisation. The abatement of the strike movement by the summer of 1854 also motivated against the mass of the workers taking part in the movement. No further meetings of the Labour Parliament were held after March 1854.

p. 214

- ¹⁰⁵ This refers to one of the biggest strikes staged by English workers in the 1850s. In August 1853 the weavers and spinners from the textile mills of Preston and the surrounding area went on strike for a pay rise of 10 per cent. They were supported by workers from other factories. In September the Employers' Association responded by announcing a lockout, which put twenty-five thousand out of the thirty thousand Preston workers out of work. Thanks to the support of workers in other towns the Preston strikers were able to hold out for more than thirty-six weeks. The Chartists were active in organising the campaign to collect money for the strikers. The lockout was abandoned in February 1854, but the strike continued. In order to break the strike, the Employers' Association began to bring workers from Ireland and from English workhouses into Preston. In March 1854 the leaders of the strike were arrested. With funds running low, the workers were forced to return to work and the strike came to an end in May.

p. 221

- ¹⁰⁶ The editorial staff of the *New-York Daily Tribune* sometimes changed the opening paragraphs of articles by Marx and Engels, in an attempt to make it appear that they had been written in the U.S.A. The first lines of the present article were handled in this way.

p. 223

- ¹⁰⁷ A reference to the death of the Russian emperor, Nicholas I.

p. 223

- ¹⁰⁸ Accounts of this meeting, addressed by Jones, were printed in the *Morning Post* of March 19 and *The People's Paper* of March 24, 1855.

p. 227

- ¹⁰⁹ The alignment of the class forces in France after the February Revolution of 1848 and the defeat of the June uprising of the Paris workers enabled the Bonapartists to take advantage of the right of universal suffrage to secure the election of Louis Bona-

parte as President of the Republic at the presidential elections of December 10, 1848. On May 31, 1850, the right was abrogated by the Legislative Assembly and Louis Bonaparte used this as a demagogic pretext for staging his *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851. Marx gives an analysis of these events in his work *The Class Struggles in France 1848 to 1850*. p. 233

- ¹¹⁰ In 1842 the Radical and Liberal Free-Trade sections of the bourgeoisie made a series of attempts to bring the labour movement under their influence and use it in the interests of agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws and for bourgeois reforms. They put forward the vague demand for what they called "universal suffrage" in order to distract the workers from the struggle for the realisation of the social and political programme of the Chartists. In 1842 with the support of certain conciliatory Chartist leaders (Lovett and others), the bourgeois Radicals secured the convocation in Birmingham of two conferences attended by representatives of the bourgeoisie and the Chartists, at which the question of joint agitation for electoral reform was put forward. However, the proposal to replace the People's Charter by a "Bill of Rights" and by a demand for "universal suffrage" was turned down resolutely by the Chartist majority at the conference. From that moment the Charter became exclusively the demand of the broad mass of the people. p. 234
- ¹¹¹ When reviewing certain matters of importance the House of Commons may according to parliamentary procedure proclaim itself a Committee of the whole House. The duties of Chairman of the Committee at such sessions are carried out by a person chosen from a list of chairmen, who is specially appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons to conduct a given session. p. 237
- ¹¹² This refers to the Executive Committee of the National Charter Association (see Note 89). p. 239
- ¹¹³ "A Letter from the Right Honourable Edmund Burke to a Noble Lord, on the Attacks made upon him and his Pension, in the House of Lords, by the Duke of Bedford and the Earl of Lauderdale, Early in the present Sessions of Parliament", London, 1796, p. 37. p. 243
- ¹¹⁴ Marx is enumerating the following books by Russell: *Don Carlos, or Persecution*, London, 1822; *An Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution, from the Reign of Henry VII to the Present Time*, London, 1821; *Memoirs of the Affairs of Europe from the Peace of Utrecht*, Vols. I-II, London, 1824-29. p. 244
- ¹¹⁵ J. A. Roebuck, *History of the Whig Ministry of 1830, to the Passing of the Reform Bill*, Vol. 2. London, 1852, p. 67. p. 245
- ¹¹⁶ In 1819, following the bloody reprisals against the workers who had attended a meeting near Manchester to discuss a petition for

- universal suffrage, on a motion by Lord Castlereagh, six reactionary, gagging Acts were passed by the British Parliament, abolishing personal immunity and freedom of the press and assembly. p. 248
- ¹¹⁷ *Copyholders*—a category of English peasants, holders of land by copy (an extract from the minutes) on terms of payment of feudal ground rent to the landlord.
Lease-holders—holders of land by right of a lease, the period and terms of which were determined by an agreement between the landlord and the lessee. p. 248
- ¹¹⁸ This refers to the spontaneous movement of farm labourers in a number of counties in South and South-East England between 1830 and 1831, which was provoked by the growing poverty and unemployment among farm labourers due to the economic crisis and the introduction of mechanical threshing machines. The movement was called "swing". The rebel farmhands, who were joined by the most impoverished tenants, burned the estate, ricks and barns of the landlords and farmers and destroyed their threshing machines. These uncoordinated rebellions of the rural proletariat were cruelly put down by troops by order of Lord Grey's Whig Government. p. 248
- ¹¹⁹ The *freeholders*—a category of small landowners which derived its origins from the "freeholders" of the Middle Ages. p. 250
- ¹²⁰ This refers to an agreement concluded with the leaders of the Whig party in 1835 by the leader of the liberal wing of the Irish national movement, O'Connell, who headed the Irish faction in Parliament. As the negotiations took place in the home of Lord Lichfield in London, the agreement was called the Lichfield House Agreement. p. 253
- ¹²¹ *The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*, which became law in August 1851, nullified the Pope's edict of 1850 on the nomination of Catholic bishops and archbishops in England. p. 257
- ¹²² On April 14, 1856, Marx, as official representative of revolutionary émigrés in London, was invited to a banquet organised in honour of the fourth anniversary of the Chartist newspaper, *The People's Paper*. This gave him the right to be first to speak and he gave a speech on the world-historical role of the proletariat. p. 260
- ¹²³ This refers to the Anglo-Persian War of 1856-57. The official cause of the break in diplomatic relations between England and Persia late in 1855 was a quarrel between the English envoy in Teheran and the Persian Prime Minister over the Secretary of the English mission, who was a Persian subject. The *casus belli* was provided by the Persian rulers' attempt to seize the principality of Herat. Herat, the main city of the principality, situated at the junction of several trade routes, was an important strategic point. In the middle of the nineteenth century this city was the bone of contention between Persia, supported by Russia, and Afghanistan, encouraged by

Britain. The seizure of Herat by Persian troops in October 1856 provided the British colonialists with a pretext for armed intervention which aimed at enslaving both Afghanistan and Persia. Having declared war on Persia on November 1, they sent their troops to Herat. However, India's bid for national liberation in 1857-59 induced England to conclude a hasty peace with Persia. In March 1857, under the peace treaty signed in Paris, Persia gave up all her claims to Herat and in 1863 Herat was annexed to the domains of the emir of Afghanistan.

The editorial board of the *New-York Daily Tribune*, which printed this article by Marx two months after it was written brought in additional facts which were connected with the war and which occurred after the article had been written. p. 263

- ¹²⁴ Marx is referring to the demagogic manoeuvres of Louis Bonaparte during the period of preparation and execution of the *coup d'état* of 1851. (See Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Chapters VI and VII.) p. 266

- ¹²⁵ *Legitimists*—supporters of the senior branch of the Bourbon dynasty, which had been overthrown in France in 1792 and which represented the interests of the big hereditary landowners. In 1830, after the second overthrow of this dynasty, the Legitimists united into a political party.

Orleanists—the monarchist party of the financial aristocracy and the big bourgeoisie, supporters of the dukes of Orleans, the junior branch of the Bourbon dynasty, which held power from the July revolution of 1830 until the revolution of 1848. At the time of the Second Republic (1848-51) they formed an alliance with the Legitimists and made up the so-called Party of Order. p. 267

- ¹²⁶ Marx is quoting from an article in the London newspaper, *The Morning Advertiser*. p. 268

- ¹²⁷ An allusion to the myth of Antaeus. p. 268

- ¹²⁸ This refers to Russell's participation in the meetings between representatives of Russia, Austria, France, Great Britain and Turkey, which, on Austria's initiative, took place in Vienna in December 1854. In March 1855 these meetings turned into a conference, lasting till June 1855. The aim of the Vienna Conference was to work out an agreement on the basis of which negotiations for peace between the participants of the Crimean War could be started. The Cabinet in London did not approve Russell's plan to induce Austria to lend the form of an ultimatum to her proposal for the limitation of Russian naval forces in the Black Sea and, when Russia refused to accept this demand and the negotiations broke down, Russell was forced to resign. Palmerston thereby achieved his secret aim of undermining the prestige of his rival. p. 268

- ¹²⁹ The Municipal Corporation Act in Scotland (1833) and the Municipal Corporation Act in England (1835) introduced a unified system of self-government in large towns, except London. In Scotland under

the new laws local government organs were elected by householders with incomes of not less than ten pounds per annum and in England, by all tax payers. Thanks to these Acts the Whig bourgeoisie gained power in the majority of large towns.

The tithe which the indigenous Catholic population of Ireland had been forced to pay to the Established Church of England since the sixteenth century was abolished by Act of Parliament in 1838, due to mass pressure. However, the "abolition" merely affected the form in which it was levied. Instead of payment in kind the Church continued to obtain its income by increasing the rent paid by the Irish peasants for the land they held.

p. 269

- ¹³⁰ *Stamp duty* and *advertisement duty*—two forms of taxation on newspapers in England which were introduced in 1712 to increase state revenue and help the authorities fight the opposition press. The stamp and advertisement duties increased the cost of newspapers substantially, thereby limiting their circulation and making them inaccessible to the mass of the population. As these duties increased in the course of time, they became a formidable obstacle to the developing industrial bourgeoisie, under pressure from which Parliament was forced to lower the stamp duty in 1836 and to abolish it in 1855. Advertisement duty was abolished in 1853. The abolition of these taxes was to the disadvantage of a few expensive newspapers, since it provoked the appearance of a large number of cheap newspapers which competed with the old newspapers and cut their profits.

p. 270

- ¹³¹ In Marx's notebook for 1857 the article is entitled the "Sino-Persian (War)".

p. 272

- ¹³² This refers to the Anglo-Persian War of 1856-57 (see Note 123) and the second "Opium" War against China, 1856-58. The latter broke out over the conflict between the British representatives and the Chinese authorities in Canton. Hostilities in China continued intermittently until June 1858 and ended with the predatory Tientsin Treaty.

p. 272

- ¹³³ The Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29 was started by Nicholas I on the pretext of supporting the national movement of the Christian population of Greece against the Turkish yoke. At the outset Turkish troops, partially reorganised by European instructors and well armed, put up strong opposition to the Russian army, which was concentrated on the Danube (at Silistria, Shumla and Varna) and was badly prepared. However, a successful offensive by the Russians on June 11 (May 30, old style), 1829, defeated the Turkish army, and Turkey, having agreed to all Russia's terms, signed the Adrianople Peace Treaty.

p. 272

- ¹³⁴ L. E. Nolan, *Cavalry; its History and Tactics*. The first edition of the book came out in 1851.

p. 273

- ¹³⁵ The cause of the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-12 was the Russo-Turkish conflict, which was provoked by France in connection with

Turkey's violation of some terms of former Russo-Turkish treaties. For a number of years the war was waged with alternating successes. In 1811 M. I. Kutuzov was appointed commander of the army on the Danube, after which the war swung in favour of Russia. The latter then concluded a peace treaty with Turkey at Bucharest.

p. 273

¹³⁶ *Arnauts* is the Turkish name for the Albanians.

p. 274

¹³⁷ On November 4 (October 23), 1853, at *Oltenitza* (a village on the left bank of the Danube) the Turks won a battle against the Russians due to the inefficient command of General Dannenberg.

In the bloody battle at the village of *Cetata* on January 6, 1854 (December 25, 1853), the Russians, having driven back the Turks as far as *Kalafata*, sustained heavy losses.

On September 29 (17), during the lengthy siege of the Turkish fortress of *Kars* (from June to November 1855), the Russians attempted unsuccessfully to take the fortress by storm. The garrison did not surrender until November 24 (12).

In a battle with superior forces on the River *Ingur* on November 6 (October 25), 1855, the Russian troops sustained heavy losses and retreated from Mingrelia.

p. 274

¹³⁸ In Turkey, former Christians who had become subjects of the Sultan and been converted to Islam, were called renegades.

p. 274

¹³⁹ This refers to the Taiping rebellion. In 1851 an anti-feudal liberation movement developed in China and soon assumed the proportions of a widespread peasant war. The movement, which began in the south, in Kwangsi Province, spread from there to the central provinces and enveloped almost all of the lower and middle *Yangtze* River. In January 1851, with Nanking as the centre, the rebels created the "Celestial Empire" (Taiping tan-ho) from which the movement derived its name, the Taiping movement. Its members massacred the Manchu feudal rulers of China, lifted the taxes and abolished large feudal properties. The rebellion also acquired the religious character typical of present movements, especially in the East, thus striking at the authority of the Buddhist clergy and monasteries, the bulwark of the Manchu dynasty. Though it initiated widespread struggle by the Chinese people against the feudal system and foreign invaders, the movement proved unable to abolish the feudal mode of production in China. The Taiping state developed its own feudal upper crust, which compromised with the ruling classes. This was one of the reasons for the failure of the movement but the main blow against the rebellion came from armed intervention by Britain, the U.S.A. and France, which had been helping the Manchu dynasty all along under cover of "neutrality", and whose troops eventually joined forces with the Chinese feudal lords and put down the Taiping rebellion in 1864.

p. 276

¹⁴⁰ The title is drawn from Marx's notebook for 1857.

p. 279

- ¹⁴¹ In 1856 the British authorities in India, despite the treaties which had been concluded, proclaimed the ruler of Oudh (a principality in northern India) dethroned and annexed his domain to the territory which was under the direct administration of the East India Company. p. 279
- ¹⁴² This refers to the uprising of 1857-59, the greatest of all the Indian people's attempts to win national independence. p. 280
- ¹⁴³ For the Moguls see Note 73. Here the reference is to the Great Mogul, Bahadur Shah II, the son of Akbar II. p. 281
- ¹⁴⁴ *Fort St. William*—an English fortress in Calcutta, which was built in 1696 and named in honour of William III of Orange, King of England. After the conquest of Bengal by the British in 1757, the fortress housed governmental institutions and the name of the fortress came to be used in the sense of the "Government of the Bengal Presidency", and later, the "British Government of India". p. 282
- ¹⁴⁵ Reference to a book by Montesquieu, *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* (Considerations on the Reasons for the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline), the first edition of which appeared anonymously in Amsterdam in 1734; and to Gibbon's well-known *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, the first edition of which came out in London in 1776-88. p. 283
- ¹⁴⁶ This refers to the Tory party. p. 283
- ¹⁴⁷ This refers to the Council of the Governor-General of India. p. 284
- ¹⁴⁸ *Jagheer* or *Jaghirdar*—representative of the Moslem feudal gentry in the empire of the Great Moguls who received a large area of land (*jaghir* or *jagheers*) for temporary use, for which he was obliged to do military service and to supply a contingent of troops. The *jaghirdars* collected land taxes from the peasants living in their *jaghirs* and used them for corvée work. With the collapse of the empire of the Great Moguls the *jaghirdars* became hereditary feudal landowners.
- Enamdar*—the owner of a special kind of feudal estate, *enam* (inam). The *enams* were basically granted to Hindu and Moslem priests and also to religious and charitable institutions. In southern India *enams* were sometimes given to members of the upper stratum of rural communities. An *enam* was either completely or partially exempt from taxation and was inheritable. Under British rule, the term *enamdar* referred to owners of tax-free land. p. 285
- ¹⁴⁹ This refers to the law on the Charter of the East India Company of 1853, by which the monopoly rights of the Company in India were somewhat curtailed. The administration of the East India Company gradually became more and more subordinate to the British Crown. The directors were deprived of the right to appoint officials. The number of directors was cut down from twenty-four

to eighteen, of which six were nominated by the Crown. The President of the Board of Control was given the same status as the Secretary of State for India. However, the shareholders were guaranteed a firm dividend from the Indian taxes. p. 289

¹⁵⁰ This apparently refers to the Anglo-Burmese war of 1852, as a result of which the Burmese province of Pegu was annexed to the possessions of the East India Company. p. 292

¹⁵¹ An allusion to the fact that the Prime Minister of England simultaneously bears the title of the First Lord of the Exchequer. p. 293

¹⁵² The title is drawn from Marx's notebook for 1858. p. 295

¹⁵³ This refers to the Regulation Bill of 1773. The Act reduced the number of shareholders who could participate in deliberations on the affairs of the Company and in the election of the Board of Directors. According to the Act, only shareholders with not less than £1,000 worth of shares could take part in meetings of shareholders (Court of Proprietors) with the right to make decisions. The initial appointment of the Governor-General of India and the members of his Council was made for a period of five years and they could be removed before the expiration of this period only by the King on representation of the Board of Directors of the Company. Subsequently, the Governor-General and his Council were to be appointed by the Company. According to the Act of 1773 a Supreme Court was established in Calcutta, which was composed of the Lord Chief Justice and his three assistant judges. p. 296

¹⁵⁴ This refers to a bill submitted to Parliament by Derby's Cabinet in March and passed in July 1858. The bill became law under the title "Bill for Establishing Certain Regulations for the Better Management of the Affairs of the East India Company". According to this law India came under the authority of the Crown, and the East India Company was dissolved, whereby the shareholders were paid compensation of £3 million. The President of the Board of Control was replaced by a Secretary of State for India and his consultative organ, the Indian Council. The Governor-General of India was named the Viceroy, remaining in effect the executive of the will of the Secretary of State for India in London. p. 296

¹⁵⁵ "*Civis Romanus sum*" (I am a citizen of Rome) was the nickname given to Palmerston after his speech in the House of Commons concerning the case of the merchant Pacifico. p. 298

¹⁵⁶ The title is given in accordance with Marx's notebook for 1858. p. 300

¹⁵⁷ This refers to the inequitable treaties, signed in June 1858 in Tientsin by Britain, France, Russia and the U.S.A. on the one side and China on the other, which concluded the second "Opium" War against China, 1856-58. The treaties made new ports available to foreign commerce: on the River Yangtze, in Manchuria and on the islands of Taiwan and Hainan, also the port of Tientsin. Under

the treaties foreign diplomatic representatives were permitted to reside in Peking; foreigners were allowed to travel freely in the country and sail the inland waters; protection to missionaries was also guaranteed. p. 300

- ¹⁵⁸ Martin R. Montgomery, *China; Political, Commercial and Social*, Vol. 2, London, 1847. p. 301

- ¹⁵⁹ *The Merchant's Magazine* was the abbreviated name of an American journal, *The Merchant's Magazine and Commercial Review*, founded by F. Hunt and published in New York from 1839 to 1850. p. 301

- ¹⁶⁰ In the summer of 1859 a mass movement in support of a nine-hour working day began in England. In London it embraced the building workers, who were organised into trade unions. At the end of July 1859, faced with the employers' refusal to shorten the working day at the same rate of pay, the building workers of the firm of Trollop declared a strike in which carpenters, masons, bricklayers and other workers took part. The strike movement in London and other towns gained in strength, especially after the employers at their joint meeting on July 27 declared open war on the workers' unions by unanimously deciding not to employ workers belonging to trade unions and on August 6 declared a lockout of more than twenty thousand workers. The builders on strike and builders affected by the lockout were aided by workers of other professions, not only in London but in eighty towns throughout the country. The strike continued until February 1860 and was concluded with a compromise: the employers agreed to employ workers who were members of trade unions, but the workers had to give up their demand for a nine-hour working day. p. 304

- ¹⁶¹ *Paper duty* was introduced in England in 1694, its chief aim being to resist the reduction of newspaper prices and hence the democratisation of the English press. The tax which was borne entirely by the working people brought the Government an annual income of about £1.4 million. In 1861 widespread opposition to the tax over many years culminated in its abolition. p. 307

- ¹⁶² This refers to *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, a Radical weekly, published in London from 1802 till 1835. p. 308

- ¹⁶³ In 1839 a Blue Book, containing diplomatic documents relating to Anglo-Persian and Anglo-Afghan relations, was released by the British Parliament. It included the correspondence of the British representative in Kabul, A. Burns. This correspondence, dealing with events connected with the Anglo-Afghan war, was tendentiously screened and falsified by the Foreign Office in order to conceal the provocative role played by Britain in the unleashing of the war. Not long before his death Burns sent a copy of his correspondence to London, and the part of it not included in the Blue Book was published by his family, thus exposing the falsification committed by the British Government. p. 309

- ¹⁶⁴ The *Danish Treaty*—the London protocol of May 8, 1852, on the integrity of the Danish monarchy was signed by representatives of Russia, Austria, Britain, France, Prussia, and Sweden jointly with representatives of Denmark. It was based on the protocol which established the principle of the inseparability of the domains of the Danish king, including the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, and which was accepted on August 2, 1850, by the participants of the London Conference mentioned above (with the exception of Prussia). In the London protocol the tsar of Russia was referred to as one of the lawful pretenders to the throne of Denmark, who had renounced their right in favour of Duke Christian of Gluksburg, who was proclaimed heir to King Frederick VII. This created a precedent for the Russian tsar to lay claim to the Danish throne in the event of the cessation of the Gluksburg dynasty. By signing the London protocol, tsarist Russia was trying to prevent Prussia from taking Schleswig and Holstein away from Denmark and from ruling the Bay of Kiel. Thus the struggle over the question of the integrity of the Danish monarchy concealed the struggle by the European powers for dominion of the Baltic Sea. p. 309
- ¹⁶⁵ *In usum delphini*, meaning literally "for the needs of the Dauphin", in a figurative sense means "with bonds, in a distorted form". This expression became widespread after a collection of the ancient classics in an extremely abridged form was published in 1668 for the heir to the French throne (the Dauphin). p. 310
- ¹⁶⁶ The *truly English minister*—this is what Lord Russell called the Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, at a session of the House of Commons on June 25, 1850, whose arrogant expression "*Civis Romanus sum*" (I am a Roman citizen), uttered at this session was enthusiastically received by the English bourgeoisie. Palmerston declared that similar to the way in which the slogan of Roman citizenship, "*Civis Romanus sum*", provided citizens of Ancient Rome with prestige and general respect, English citizenship should be a guarantee of personal safety and the safekeeping of the belongings of British subjects, irrespective of their whereabouts p. 319
- ¹⁶⁷ The *Whig war* was the name given by Marx to the Crimean War of 1853-56, which was launched by the coalition government under Aberdeen, in which all the key posts were held by Whig leaders. p. 320
- ¹⁶⁸ The *penny paper* was a new type of daily newspaper, circulated in England after the abolition of stamp duty in 1855 (see Note 130). These cheap, mass circulation newspapers were mainly concerned with sensational news and items of scandal. p. 320
- ¹⁶⁹ *Macmillan's Magazine*—bourgeois-liberal in trend, published in London from 1859 until 1907. p. 321
- ¹⁷⁰ This is an allusion to the war scare caused by Napoleon III in January 1859, in connection with the preparation for the Austro-Franco-Italian war. p. 321

- ¹⁷¹ In June 1859 an English squadron and two French vessels attempted to break through to Peking by force. At the mouth of the River Peiho they were stopped by fire from the forts of Taku. Their attempt to capture the forts was unsuccessful and they were forced to withdraw with heavy losses. p. 324
- ¹⁷² In an attempt to avoid further complications with Britain, the U.S. Government decided at a sitting on December 25-26, 1861, to release the emissaries of the Confederation, Mason and Slidell, who had been captured on the mail steamer *Trent*. At the beginning of January 1862, Slidell and Mason together with their secretaries were put aboard a British ship. Upon receiving this news, Russell proclaimed that the British Government was satisfied and considered the incident of the *Trent* closed. p. 325
- ¹⁷³ On November 19, 1861, the Confederate cruiser *Nashville* attacked the North-American merchant vessel *Harvey Birch* at sea and set it alight. On November 21, the *Nashville* took refuge from pursuit in the English port of Southampton. p. 327
- ¹⁷⁴ The *Conspiracy Bill* (Bill on Foreigners), which imposed severe punishment on both political emigrants and Englishmen for participation in political conspiracies, was presented to the House of Commons by Palmerston in February 1858, on the pretext that the French Government had protested against England's offering asylum to political emigrants. Under popular pressure the Bill was voted down by the House of Commons and Palmerston was forced to resign. p. 331
- ¹⁷⁵ "*Caeterum censeo*"—the initial words of a well-known expression of Cato the Elder, with which he usually concluded all his speeches in the Roman Senate: "*Caeterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam*" (However, I consider that Carthage should be destroyed). p. 332
- ¹⁷⁶ *The Daily Post*—organ of English commercial and industrial circles, published in Liverpool from 1855 till 1879. p. 335
- ¹⁷⁷ On September 28, 1864, a large international meeting of workers took place in St. Martin's Hall, London. The meeting had been called by the leaders of the London trade unions jointly with a group of Parisian workers, followers of Proudhon, and attended by representatives of German, Italian and other foreign workers who were living in London at the time, as well as by leaders of the European petty-bourgeois and revolutionary-democratic émigrés. It adopted a resolution on the foundation of the International Working Men's Association (subsequently known as the First International) and elected a Provisional Committee. Karl Marx was elected to this Committee, and also made a member of a commission appointed at the Committee's first session on October 5 to work out the programme documents of the Association. At the first sessions of the commission, in Marx's absence, a document was drawn up which consisted of a preamble written by Weston, a follower of Owen,

and edited by the French petty-bourgeois democrat, Le Lubez, and incorporated the rules of the Italian workers' societies which had been drawn up by Mazzini and translated into English by the Italian Luigi Wolff. Marx first became acquainted with this document at the session of October 18 and criticised it. The document was returned to the commission for final editing. On October 20 the commission entrusted this work to Marx and on October 27 it approved two completely new documents written by him: the Inaugural Address of the International Working Men's Association and the Provisional Rules of the Association. On November 1, 1864, the Address and the Rules were unanimously approved by the Provisional Committee, which constituted itself as the leading body of the Association. This body, which became known in history as the General Council of the International, was usually referred to as the Central Council until the end of 1866.

p. 338

- ¹⁷⁸ Marx is quoting from the press report of a speech by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gladstone, in the House of Commons, on April 7, 1864.

p. 338

- ¹⁷⁹ *Garrotters*—street robbers who throttled their victims. At the beginning of the 1860s this kind of assault began to be a frequent occurrence in London and was the subject of special consideration in Parliament.

p. 338

- ¹⁸⁰ A reference to the "Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Operation of the Acts relating to Transportation and Penal Servitude", Vol. I, London, 1863.

p. 339

- ¹⁸¹ A reference to the "Sixth Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council, 1863", London, 1864.

p. 339

- ¹⁸² This quotation, taken by Marx from a speech which Gladstone made in Parliament on April 16, 1863, became widely known because of the hostile campaign waged against Marx in the 1870s by the German bourgeois economist Brentano. This phrase of Gladstone's was printed as Marx gave it in almost all the reports of this session in the London newspapers (*the Times, Morning Star, Daily Telegraph*) on April 17, 1863, but was omitted in the semi-official Hansard edition of parliamentary debates, the text of which the speakers themselves were allowed to amend. This gave Brentano a pretext for bringing an accusation of scientific laxity against Marx. Marx answered this aspersion in letters to the editorial board of the newspaper *Der Volksstaat* (The People's State), of May 23 and July 28, 1872.

After the death of Marx, in November 1883, this same accusation was repeated by the English bourgeois economist Taylor. The version of the falsification of the quotation was entirely exposed by Eleanor Marx in two letters to the magazine *Today*, in February and March 1884, and also by Engels in June 1890 in the preface to the Fourth German Edition of *Capital* and in 1891 in a pamphlet entitled *Brentano contra Marx*.

p. 340

- ¹⁸³ A reference to the "Sixth Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council, 1863", London, 1864, pp. 25-27. p. 341
- ¹⁸⁴ "Children's Employment Commission (1862). First Report of the Commissioners", London, 1863, p. 24. p. 341
- ¹⁸⁵ This refers to the "Report addressed to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, relative to the Grievances complained of by the Journeymen Bakers", London, 1862. p. 341
- ¹⁸⁶ This refers to a speech by the Prime Minister, Palmerston, on June 23, 1863, during a parliamentary session, at which the rights of Irish tenants were discussed. The Irish members headed by T. Maguire demanded the introduction of legal measures restricting the arbitrary rule of the Landlords in relation to the tenants. It was particularly demanded that on termination of a lease a tenant should be given the right to receive compensation for all expenditures undertaken by them on their plots. In his speech, Palmerston called the demands of the Irish deputies "communist doctrines" and "a violation of the natural rights of the property". p. 345
- ¹⁸⁷ This refers to protest action by British workers between 1861 and 1862 at the time of the American Civil War, against the British Government intervention on the side of the Southern slave-owning states. The workers' struggle blazed up in connection with the so-called *Trent* incident, when the English bourgeoisie tried to use the Northern government's seizure and arrest of the slave-owners' representatives (who were travelling to England on the steamship *Trent*) as a pretext for war against the Northern states. The British workers resolutely supported the North. At numerous meetings they protested against the calls for war and demanded a peaceful solution of the conflict. This mass movement of British workers opposing intervention prevented the reactionaries from dragging Europe into war on the side of the slave-owners and did much to promote the idea of the international solidarity of the proletariat. p. 346
- ¹⁸⁸ At the end of the 1850s, among the Irish immigrants in America, and later in Ireland itself, a secret organisation of Fenians, known as the Irish Revolutionary (or Republican) Brotherhood, sprang up. The Fenians who objectively voiced the interests of the Irish peasantry, came mainly from the urban petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. Owing to their conspiratorial tactics and to mistakes of a sectarian and bourgeois nationalistic nature, the Fenians lost touch with the mass of the Irish people and did not combine their activities with the general democratic movement which was in process in England, in particular with the English workers' electoral reform movement. Marx and Engels who repeatedly emphasised the weak sides of the Fenian movement, nevertheless highly praised its revolutionary nature and sought to guide it onto the path of joint action with the English working class. In February-March 1867 the armed rebellion long prepared by the Fenians suffered a

defeat. Their uncoordinated actions in different counties were put down and many leaders were arrested and brought to trial. On September 18 in Manchester an assault on the prison coach was organised in order to release two of the arrested leaders of the Fenians, Kelly and Deasey. The latter succeeded in escaping but one policeman was killed during the skirmish. The five men who were captured at the scene of the incident were charged with murder and sentenced to death. One of them (Maguire) was then pardoned. In the case of another (Condon) the death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. The others (Larkin, Allin and O'Brien) were executed on November 23, 1867. The death sentence evoked a wave of protest in Ireland and England. p. 348

¹⁸⁹ This refers to the book by Garibaldi, *The Rule of the Monk, or Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1870. p. 348

¹⁹⁰ *The Irish People*—an Irish weekly newspaper, the chief organ of the Fenians, was published in Dublin from 1863 until 1865. It was banned by the British Government and members of its editorial staff were arrested. p. 348

¹⁹¹ This refers to the *Habeas Corpus Act*, passed by the British Parliament in 1679. According to this Act any warrant for arrest must be justified and the detainee has either to appear in court within a short period (from three to twenty days) or be released. The Habeas Corpus Act did not apply to anyone charged with high treason and could be suspended by decision of Parliament. p. 351

¹⁹² This refers to Gladstone's exposure of the cruel treatment of prisoners who had taken part in the national struggle for freedom in 1848-49 by the Neapolitan Government of Ferdinand II, described in the brochure: *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Persecutions of the Neapolitan Government*, London, 1851. p. 351

¹⁹³ The *Land Bill* for Ireland was discussed by the British Parliament in the first half of 1870. The Bill introduced by Gladstone in the name of the British Government, was ostensibly designed to help the Irish tenants, but its numerous reservations and limitations actually left the foundations of the English large landed estates in Ireland intact.

The English landlords retained the right to raise rents and evict tenants from the land, the only stipulation being that certain compensation be paid to the latter for land-reclamation work, for this purpose a definite court procedure was established. The Land Bill was passed in August 1870. The landlords sabotaged the realisation of the Act in every way possible and violated it under various pretexts. To a significant extent the Act promoted the building up of large farms and brought ruin to the small Irish tenant farmers. p. 352

¹⁹⁴ This refers to a speech by Gladstone in the House of Commons on February 15, 1870, published in the *Times* of February 16, 1870. p. 352

- ¹⁹⁵ The *Land and Labour League* was founded in London in October 1869 with the participation of the General Council of the First International. Among the members of its Executive Committee were more than ten members of the General Council. The programme, which had been drawn up by Eccarius on the basis of instructions from Marx, besides some general democratic demands (reform of the finance and tax systems, public education and so on), included demands for nationalisation of the land, a shorter working day, and also the Chartist demands for universal suffrage and the creation of agricultural colonies.

Believing that the League might play a certain role in revolutionising the British working class, Marx saw it as one of the paths leading to the formation of an independent proletarian party in England. However, by the autumn of 1870, the influence of bourgeois elements in the League began to increase and it gradually lost contact with the International. p. 354

- ¹⁹⁶ Engels's regular contributions to the Italian newspaper *La Plebe* began with this article and continued until the end of 1872. Up till this time, in 1871, extracts from letters by Engels and some documents of the General Council of the International which he sent to Italy had been published in the newspaper. By request of the editor E. Bignami, Engels wrote a number of articles for the newspaper which were published as a rule under the heading "Letters from London". The following note was added to the first article: "Under this heading we shall henceforth print letters which one respected citizen has taken upon himself to write to us from London." Engels discontinued his contribution at the beginning of 1873 in view of the state persecution which made the regular publication of the newspaper impossible and in connection with the general decline of the workers' movement. He resumed contributing in 1877.

La Plebe (The People) was published in Lodi under the editorship of E. Bignami from 1868 to 1875 and in Milan from 1875 to 1883. Until the early 1870s it was a bourgeois-democratic newspaper, but later became socialist. In 1872-73 it was the organ of sections of the International. It supported the General Council of the International in its struggle against the anarchists and published the International's documents and articles by Engels. p. 358

- ¹⁹⁷ At the end of March 1872 a Union of Agricultural Labourers was formed in the county of Yorkshire. This Union headed a strike which quickly spread to the neighbouring counties of Central and Eastern England. The strike was supported by the workers' trade unions in the towns. Their financial help and the increased demand for urban workers stimulated by industrial expansion gave the farm workers' struggle a chance of success. In May 1872 the National Union of Agricultural Labourers was set up under the presidency of a worker, Joseph Arch. By the end of 1873 the Union had about one hundred thousand members. The struggle for a shorter working

day and higher wages continued right up to 1874 and in a number of counties ended with a victory for the strikers. p. 359

- ¹⁹⁸ This refers to Gladstone's pamphlet *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Persecutions of the Neapolitan Government*, London, 1851. See Note 192. p. 361

- ¹⁹⁹ This refers to the rules of behaviour in London parks, instituted by Royal command on June 27, 1872. p. 362

- ²⁰⁰ On February 17, 1874, hoping to create a substantial Liberal majority in the House of Commons, Gladstone announced the resignation of his Cabinet and dissolved the House. New elections returned 350 Conservatives, 244 Liberals and 58 Irish members to the new Parliament. On February 21 a Conservative Government was formed under Disraeli.

The Ballot Act was passed by Parliament on July 18, 1872. p. 364

- ²⁰¹ The *Land Bill*. See Note 193.

The *Irish Church Bill* was presented by Gladstone and passed in July 1869. According to this law the Anglican Church was disestablished in Ireland and received equal rights with the Catholic and Presbyterian churches. However, it continued to own vast estates and exploit the Irish peasants. p. 365

- ²⁰² This refers to the law on the reorganisation of the army which was passed in 1871, one of the clauses of which was the prohibition on the sale of commissions. This clause provoked an obstruction in Parliament, after which Gladstone obtained abolition of the sale of commissions by Royal command. p. 365

- ²⁰³ See Note 207. p. 367

- ²⁰⁴ The *Labour Representation League* was founded in 1869. Its members were trade union leaders who tried to get "workers" elected to the House of Commons, even at the price of deals with the Liberal Party. The activity of the League ceased after 1880. p. 368

- ²⁰⁵ This refers to the Mines Regulation Act of 1872. p. 369

- ²⁰⁶ This refers to the dissatisfaction among landlords owning land in Ireland, caused by the attempts of Gladstone's Government to mitigate their tyranny in respect of the tenants and thereby distract the Irish peasantry from the revolutionary struggle which was developing in Ireland. The Land Bill of 1881 restricted the right of the landlord to evict the tenant from his plot as long as he paid the rent on time, the rate of the rent being fixed for a period of fifteen years. Despite the fact that the law of 1881 offered landlords the opportunity of selling land advantageously to the Government and the fixed rent rate remained extraordinarily high, the English landlords opposed the introduction of the law in the hope of preserving their unlimited dominion in Ireland. p. 373

- ²⁰⁷ This refers to the Reform Bill of 1867, which was brought in by the Conservatives under pressure from the masses. The General Council of the First International took an active part in the reform movement. Under the new law, the property qualification in the counties was lowered for tenants to £12 of rent per annum, and the right of franchise in the towns was granted to all householders and tenants of houses, also to flat-dwellers who had lived in a given place for not less than a year and paid a rent for their apartment of not less than £10 sterling per annum. The reform more than doubled the number of voters in England, and a certain number of qualified workers received the franchise. p. 376
- ²⁰⁸ This refers to the Reform Bill passed by the House of Commons in 1831 and finally sanctioned by the House of Lords in June 1832. p. 383
- ²⁰⁹ *April 10, 1848*, was the date fixed by the Chartists for a mass demonstration in London, which was to march to Parliament for the purpose of presenting the third petition on the People's Charter. The Government banned the demonstration, and troops and police were brought to London to prevent its taking place. The Chartist leaders, many of whom displayed vacillation, decided to abandon the demonstration and persuaded the masses to disperse. The forces of reaction took advantage of the unsuccessful demonstration to attack the workers and persecute the Chartists. p. 386
- ²¹⁰ Here and further on in the words in quotation marks Engels is citing the basic demands of the People's Charter. p. 388
- ²¹¹ In 1884 under mass pressure from the agricultural regions a third parliamentary reform was carried out, as a result of which the same conditions for the franchise became effective in the counties as had been established for boroughs in 1867. Even after the third franchise reform a considerable section of the population still remained voteless—the rural and urban proletariat and all women. p. 388
- ²¹² See "Report of the Fifty-Third Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; Held at Southport in September 1883", London, 1884, pp. 608-09. p. 391
- ²¹³ This refers to the first round of elections in the French House of Deputies on September 22, 1889, in which the Republicans obtained 215 seats while various monarchist groups (Legitimists, Bonapartists and Boulangists) obtained 140 seats. p. 394
- ²¹⁴ This is an excerpt from a letter by Engels which was apparently addressed to Eleanor Marx. It was published in the newspaper *Labour Elector* and also printed in a German translation in the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* (New York People's Paper) on September 25, 1889, and in the *Berliner Volks-Tribune* (Berlin People's Tribune) on October 26, 1889.

The *London dockers' strike*, which took place from August 12 to September 14, 1889, was one of the most important events in the history of the British working-class movement at the end of the nineteenth century. Thirty thousand dockers and more than thirty thousand workers of other professions participated in it. The majority of them were unskilled workers who did not belong to trade unions. By their staunchness and organisation the strikers gained satisfaction in their demands for higher wages and better working conditions. The strike encouraged proletarian solidarity (about £50,000 was collected in the strike fund) and promoted the organisation of the working class. A dockers' union and other unions were formed which united a large number of unskilled workers. In the following year the total number of members of trade unions more than doubled.

p. 399

- ²¹⁵ The article "May 4 in London" was written by Engels between May 5 and May 21, 1890. It was devoted to the first international May Day festival of workers, which was celebrated by the Socialist Parties and workers' organisations in accordance with the decision of the International Socialist Workers' Congress held in Paris in 1899. Mass demonstrations and meetings, which took a particularly organised form in Austria, were held under the slogan of the struggle for a legitimately established eight-hour working day.

The first May Day was celebrated in an organised manner by the London workers too. It took place on the first Sunday in May, May 4, 1890, and thus gave a special reason for the writing of the present article. In spite of the attempts of the reformist trade union leaders and of the English opportunist socialist Hyndman, to take control of the demonstration and furnish it with conciliatory slogans, it showed the readiness of the masses of the London workers to carry on the struggle for revolutionary socialist demands. Only a small number of workers from the so-called labour aristocracy supported the reformists. Most of the participants, about two hundred thousand people, supported the slogans proposed by English Marxists. The main role was played by unskilled workers at gasworks and by the London dockers, who in the 1880s had been the first to start the struggle for the creation of new mass trade unions and the establishment of an eight-hour working day. Engels was present at the meeting in Hyde Park which concluded the demonstration. Eminent personalities of the international working-class movement, Eleanor Marx-Aveling, Edward Aveling, Paul Lafargue and also a representative of the Russian revolutionary émigrés S. Kravchinsky (Stepnyak), and others spoke at the meeting.

p. 400

- ²¹⁶ The *Gas Workers and General Labourers' Union* was the first trade union for unskilled workers in the history of the English working-class movement. It came into existence between March and April 1889, when the strike movement was making great progress. Eleanor Marx-Aveling and Edward Aveling played an important role in

the organisation and administration of the Union, which advanced the demand for the establishment of an eight-hour working day. The Union soon won substantial influence among the mass of workers and in the course of a year up to a hundred thousand gas workers joined. It took an active part in the organisation of the London dockers' strike in 1889.

The *London dockers' strike* took place from August 12 to September 14, 1889 and was one of the most important events in the history of the English workers' movement at the end of the nineteenth century. p. 401

²¹⁷ In the second half of the nineteenth century organisations consisting mainly of workers and, as a rule, controlled by representatives of the Liberal bourgeoisie were called *Radical Clubs* in England. The Clubs exerted a certain influence upon the proletariat. At the end of the 1880s in connection with the rise of the working-class movement the number of such Clubs increased, and their members became more and more interested in socialism. p. 401

²¹⁸ An allusion to the behaviour of Hyndman during the demonstration organised by the English socialists in Trafalgar Square, London, on November 13, 1887. The meeting ended with a clash between its participants and the police in which several hundred people were hurt (three fatally) and some of the organisers of the meeting arrested. During these events known in the history of the English working-class movement as the "bloody Sunday" Hyndman hid himself in a cowardly manner. p. 401

²¹⁹ The *strike in Silvertown* (East End), which lasted from September to December 1889, was a strike by the workers engaged in the manufacture of underwater cables and rubber goods. The strikers, who numbered about three thousand, demanded a rise in the hourly pay rate and the piece rate, higher pay for overtime and work during holidays, and an increase in the wages of women and children. Eleanor Marx-Aveling took an active part in the organisation of the strike, in the course of which she founded a union of young women workers. Though it lasted almost three months the strike was unsuccessful because other trade unions did not support it. p. 402

²²⁰ Engels is referring to the strike by workers of the Gas Company in south London, which took place from December 1889 till February 1890. The strike was caused by the Company owners' failure to observe the previously adopted agreement for an eight-hour working day, higher wages and the employment of only workers who were members of the Gas Workers' Union, and so on. The workers lost the strike for lack of active assistance on the part of other unions, in particular from the Dockers' Union, and because of the decline of the strike movement which began in 1890. The eight-hour working day was abolished in the Company's enterprises. p. 402

²²¹ See Note 43.

Speaking of the old trade unions of the Manchester School, Engels is referring to the bourgeois reformist character of their activity. Attempting to limit the tasks of the proletariat by an economic struggle for a shorter working day and higher wages and some change in labour legislation in favour of the workers, the leaders of these trade unions distracted the proletariat from the class aims of the workers' movement, came out against the political struggle of the working class and advocated conciliation and class peace with the bourgeoisie. p. 405

²²² This refers to the Baden-Pfalz uprising in defence of the imperial constitution in May-July 1849, in which Engels took part. See his work on this subject, *The German Campaign for the Imperial Constitution*. p. 406

NAME INDEX

A

Adams, Charles Francis (1807-1886)—American diplomat, ambassador to England (1861-68)—334

Alexander of Macedon (the Great) (356-323 B.C.)—general and statesman—32

Althorp, John Charles Spencer, Viscount (1782-1845)—English statesman, M.P., a Whig leader during the campaign for the Reform Bill of 1832, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1830-34)—249

Anne (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain (1702-1714)—90

Archimedes (c. 287-212 B.C.)—Greek mathematician and physicist—239

Arkwright, Richard (1732-1792)—English manufacturer at the time of the industrial revolution, and inventor of spinning machinery—21, 25

Ashburnham, Thomas (1807-1872)—English general; in 1857 he headed a military expedition to China but because of the Indian mutiny was recalled to India—282

Ashburton, Alexander Baring, Baron (1774-1848)—English banker and politician, who sided with the Tories and was

connected with the U.S. commercial circles—335

Ashley, Lord—see *Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper*

Atholl, George Augustus Frederick John Murray, Duke of (1814-1864)—owner of large estates in Scotland—147, 148

Aveling, Edward (1851-1898)—English socialist, writer and journalist; one of the translators of Marx's *Capital* (Vol. I) into English; an organiser of mass strike action among unskilled workers—401, 404

Ayrton, Acton Smea (1816-1886)—British Liberal politician, M.P. (1857-74), head of the Department of Public Works from 1869 to 1873—365

B

Bacon, Francis, Baron Verulam, (1561-1626)—English philosopher, founder of English materialism, naturalist and historian—12, 33

Barbès, Armand (1809-1870)—French revolutionary, petty-bourgeois democrat, one of the leaders of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy, active participant in the 1848 Revolution in France—260

- Barbour, James* (1831-1853)—criminal, executed for murder in Sheffield—149
- Beales, Edmond* (1803-1881)—English lawyer, bourgeois radical; in 1855 he advocated extension of political rights for the industrial bourgeoisie by means of parliamentary reform; President of the Reform League in 1865-69—228, 334
- Bedford, John Russell, Duke of* (1766-1839)—English aristocrat, father of John Russell—244, 250
- Bentham, Jeremy* (1748-1832)—English sociologist, theoretician of utilitarianism—29, 47
- Beresford, William* (b. 1798)—British statesman, Secretary for War in the Derby cabinet (1852)—120, 123, 126, 127
- Berkeley, Francis Henry Fitzhardinge* (1794-1870)—British Liberal politician, M.P.—123
- Bismarck, Otto, Prince* (1815-1898)—Prussian statesman and diplomat, a representative of Prussia's Junker class; Minister-President of Prussia (1862-71), Chancellor of the German Empire (1871-90), author of the Anti-Socialist Law (1878)—379, 388
- Black, Joseph* (1728-1799)—Scottish chemist and physicist—10
- Blackstone, William* (1723-1780)—English lawyer, advocate of the British constitutional-monarchist system—35
- Blanqui, Louis Auguste* (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian Communist, organiser of several secret political societies and plots; he played an active part in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and was imprisoned several times—260
- Bligh, James*—one of the active Chartists in the 1850s—239
- Blum, Robert* (1807-1848)—German journalist, petty-bourgeois democrat, active in the 1848 Revolution; he was shot after the capture of Vienna by counter-revolutionary troops—406
- Bolingbroke, Henry* (1678-1751)—English deist philosopher and politician, a leading Tory—91
- Bonaparte, Louis.* See *Napoleon III*
- Bowring, John* (1792-1872)—English politician, linguist and man of letters; an advocate of Free Trade; influential colonial official in the 1850s—66, 78, 80, 82-84
- Brammell*—English priest—157
- Bridgewater, Francis Egerton, Duke of* (1736-1803)—big English landowner—27
- Bright, John* (1811-1889)—English industrialist, politician, Free-Trader, one of the founders of the Anti-Corn Law League; from the end of the 1860s, a leader of the Liberal Party, minister in several Liberal governments—157, 229, 249, 251, 270, 294, 321, 350, 386
- Brontë, Charlotte* (1816-1855)—English writer of realist novels—216
- Brougham, Henry Peter, Baron* (1778-1868)—English lawyer and man of letters, prominent Whig leader in the 1820s and 1830s, Lord Chancellor (1830-34); after 1850 he ceased to play a significant role in politics—258
- Bruce, Henry Austin* (1815-1895)—British Liberal politician, Home Secretary (1868-73)—350, 365
- Buffon, George Louis* (1707-1788)—French naturalist—10

Burdett, Francis (1770-1844)—British politician, bourgeois Radical and later Tory M.P.—234

Burgh, de. See *Clanricarde, Ulick John*

Burke, Rickard (d. 1870)—Irish Fenian, officer of the North-American army, an organiser of the 1867 revolt in Ireland; he was arrested in 1867 and died in prison—349

Burke, Thomas (b. 1840)—Irish Fenian, general; he took part in the American Civil War on the side of the Southern States, and organised the 1867 revolt in Ireland; he was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1867—243, 349

Burt, Thomas (1837-1922)—English miner, trade unionist, Secretary of the Miners' Union in Northumberland, M.P. (1874-1918), pursued a Liberal policy—366, 369

Butt, Isaac (1813-1879)—Irish lawyer and Liberal M.P.; in the 1870s an organiser of the Home Rule movement—370

C

Caesar, Gaius Julius (c. 100-44 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman—32

Cambridge, George William Frederick Charles, Duke of (1819-1904)—British general; he took part in the Crimean War and was Commander-in-Chief of the British Army (1856-95)—124

Campbell, George (1824-1892)—British colonial official in India in 1843-74 (with intervals), author of several works on India; Liberal M.P. (1875-92)—199

Canning, George (1770-1827)—British statesman and diplomat; Tory leader; Foreign Secretary (1807-09, 1822-27), Prime Minister (1827)—204, 208, 247, 248

Cardwell, Edward, Viscount (1813-1886)—British statesman; a Peelite leader, who later joined the Liberals. President of the Board of Trade (1852-55), Chief Secretary for Ireland (1859-61), Secretary for the Colonies (1864-66) and Secretary for War (1868-74)—114, 224

Carey, Martin Henley—Irish journalist, Fenian; in 1865 he was sentenced to five years' penal servitude—349

Carlile, Richard (1790-1843)—English radical publicist, publisher of progressive literature—48

Cartwright, Edmund (1743-1823)—English inventor of the power loom—21

Cartwright, John (1740-1824)—English journalist, public and political figure, bourgeois radical; in the press he advocated parliamentary reform on the basis of universal suffrage—234

Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Viscount (1769-1822)—British statesman, Tory, Secretary for War and Colonies (1805-06, 1807-09), Foreign Secretary (1812-22)—248

Catiline (Lucius Sergius Catilina) (c. 108-62 B.C.)—Roman politician, patrician, organiser of a conspiracy against the aristocratic republic—139

Chapman, John (1801-1854)—English publicist; a bourgeois radical and advocate of reforms in India—198

Charles I (1600-1649)—King of England (1625-49), executed

- during the 17th-century bourgeois revolution in England—92, 172
- Charles the Great (Charlemagne)* (c. 742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800) and Holy Roman Emperor (800-14)—146
- Child, Sir Joshua* (1630-1699)—English economist, banker and merchant, Mercantilist; a director (1677) and later governor of the East India Company—177
- Ch'ing*—Manchu dynasty which ruled over the Chinese empire (1644-1912)—277
- Clanricarde, Ulick John de Burgh*, Marquess of (1802-1874)—British politician and diplomat, Whig; ambassador to St. Petersburg (1838-41), Postmaster General (1846-52)—226
- Clarendon, George William Frederick Villiers*, Earl of (1800-1870)—British statesman, Whig and later Liberal; Viceroy of Ireland (1847-52), responsible for crushing the Irish rebellion of 1848; Foreign Secretary (1853-58, 1865-66 and 1868-70)—155, 254, 257
- Clive, Robert* (1725-1774)—British officer who played a prominent part in the establishment of British power in India; Governor of Bengal (1757-60, 1765-67)—175, 200
- Cobbett, William* (1762-1835)—British politician and publicist; a prominent representative of petty-bourgeois radicalism who favoured the democratisation of the British political system—173, 234, 247, 308, 327
- Cobden, Richard* (1804-1865)—English industrialist, politician, advocate of Free Trade, one of the founders of the Anti-Corn Law League—41, 107, 133, 157, 212, 213, 229, 267, 268, 270, 321
- Cochrane-Baillie Alexander Dundas Ross Wishart* (1816-1890)—British politician and author, Conservative M.P.—359, 360
- Conningham, William* (b. 1815)—British Liberal M.P.; he addressed the anti-interventionist meeting in Brighton (December 1861)—322, 323
- Cooke, George Wingrove* (1814-1865)—English Liberal historian and journalist—111
- Cooper, Anthony Ashley* (Earl of Shaftesbury from 1851). See *Shaftesbury Anthony*
- Cowell, George*—English worker, Chartist, a leader of the Preston strike (1853-54)—213
- Cremer, William Randall* (1828-1908)—English trade unionist, reformist, member of the General Council of the First International and its General Secretary (1864-66); he opposed revolutionary tactics and later became a Liberal M.P.—368
- Crompton, Samuel* (1753-1827)—English inventor of the spinning-mule—21
- Cromwell, Oliver* (1599-1658)—leader of the bourgeoisie and the section of the nobility that rallied to the support of the bourgeoisie during the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century; from 1653 he was Lord Protector of the Commonwealth—13, 35, 95, 172, 228
- Crossley, Francis* (1817-1872)—British manufacturer, bourgeois radical M.P.—121, 122, 124

D

Dalhousie, James Andrew Broun-Ramsay, Marquess of (1812-1860)—British statesman,

- Governor-General of India (1848-56), pursued a policy of colonial aggrandizement—286, 297
- Dalrymple, John* (1726-1810)—Scottish lawyer and historian—147
- Delolme, Jean Louis (de Lolme)* (1741-1806)—Swiss statesman and lawyer—35
- Derby, Edward George Geoffrey Smith Stanley*, Earl of (1799-1869)—English statesman, Tory and later Conservative leader; Prime Minister (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68)—121, 127, 133, 134, 135, 138, 252, 295, 296, 351
- Dickens, Charles* (1812-1870)—English realist writer—216
- Disraeli, Benjamin*, Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881)—British statesman and novelist, a Tory and later Conservative Party leader, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68), Prime Minister (1868, 1874-80)—132, 267, 283-86, 294, 310, 351, 376
- Duffy, Charles Gavan* (1816-1903)—Irish politician and publicist, a leader of the Young Ireland party and a founder of the Irish Tenant League, M.P.; in 1855 Duffy left for Australia where he held several government posts—153
- Duke, James* (b. 1792)—British M.P., advocate of Free Trade—227
- Duncombe, Thomas Slingsby* (1796-1861)—British politician, bourgeois radical; member of the Chartist movement in the 1840s—41
- Dunlop, Alexander Murray* (1798-1870)—English lawyer and politician, Liberal M.P.—309, 310

E

- Ebrington, Hugh*, Viscount (1818-1905)—British politician, Whig and later Liberal M.P.—228
- Eccarius, Johann George* (1818-1889)—prominent figure in both the German and international working-class movement; a worker publicist and trade unionist, a tailor by trade; member of the General Council of the First International (1864-72), General Secretary of the Council (1867-May 1871); until 1872 he supported Marx, but in the spring of 1872 joined the reformist leaders of the English trade unions—368
- Elgin, James Bruce*, Earl of (1811-1863)—Scottish diplomat; Governor-General of Canada (1846-54), plenipotentiary to China (1857-58, 1860-61) and Governor-General of India (1862-68)—282
- Elizabeth I* (1533-1603)—Queen of England (1558-1603)—39, 47, 48, 172
- Ellenborough, Edward Law*, Earl of (1790-1871)—British statesman, Tory M.P., Governor-General of India (1842-44), First Lord of the Admiralty (1846), President of the Board of Control (1858)—298
- Evans, George de Lacy* (1787-1870)—British general, who in 1854 commanded a division in the Crimea; Liberal politician and M.P.—227
- Ewart, William* (1798-1869)—British politician, M.P. A follower of Peel and advocate of Free Trade—123

F

- Ferdinand II* (1810-1859)—King of the Two Sicilies (1830-59),

- nicknamed "King Bomba" for bombarding Messina in 1848—351, 361
- Feth Ali Shah* (1762-1834)—Shah of Persia (1797-1834)—264
- Fielden, John* (1784-1849)—English manufacturer, bourgeois philanthropist, advocate of factory laws—156
- Finlen, James*—prominent figure in the Chartist movement, in 1852-58 member of the executive committee of the National Charter Association—239
- Fonblanque, Albany William* (1793-1872)—English liberal journalist—54
- Forster, William Edward* (1818-1886)—English industrialist and politician, Liberal M.P.—312
- Fox, Charles James* (1749-1806)—British statesman and Whig leader; in 1783 he was Foreign Secretary in Portland's coalition cabinet (Fox-North Cabinet)—174, 175, 248
- Frederick II* (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86)—91
- Frost, John* (1784-1877)—British petty-bourgeois radical; in 1838 he joined the Chartist movement; transported to Australia for life for organising the miners' revolt in Wales in 1839, was subsequently pardoned and in 1856 returned to England—123, 138

G

- Gammage, Robert George* (1815-1888)—Chartist; saddler and cobbler; author of *History of Chartist Movement* (1854)—140, 192
- Garibaldi, Giuseppe* (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary democrat, leader of the Italian national liberation movement—348
- Garnier-Pagès, Étienne Joseph Louis* (1801-1841)—French politician, bourgeois democrat; head of the Republican opposition after the 1830 revolution and a member of the Chamber of Deputies (1831-34, 1835-41)—282
- Garnier-Pagès, Louis Antoine* (1803-1878)—French politician; a moderate bourgeois Republican and member of the Provisional Government (1848)—282
- Gaskell, Elizabeth* (1810-1865)—English novelist whose finest works were of a realist trend—216
- George I* (1660-1727)—King of England (1714-27)—20, 34, 90, 178
- George II* (1683-1760)—King of England (1727-60)—90, 178
- George III* (1738-1820)—King of England (1760-1820)—20, 161, 174, 178, 252
- George IV* (1762-1830)—Prince Regent (1811-20) and King of England (1820-30)—238
- Gibbon, Edward* (1737-1794)—English historian, author of the voluminous work *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*—282
- Gibson, Thomas Milner* (1806-1884)—British politician, a prominent Free-Trader, Liberal, President of the Board of Trade (1859-66)—48, 270
- Giffen, Robert* (1837-1910)—Scottish economist and statistician, finance expert and head of the statistical department of the Board of Trade (1876-97)—390
- Girard, Philippe de* (1775-1845)—well-known French engineer and inventor of dry and wet methods of flax spinning—23
- Gladstone, William Ewart* (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory

and later Peelite; a Liberal Party leader in the latter half of the 19th century, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55, 1859-66), Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94)—114, 224, 267, 298, 340, 350-52, 361-65, 369

Goderich, Lord—see *Ripon*

Godwin, William (1756-1836)—English writer and a founder of anarchism—29

Graham, Sir James Robert George (1792-1861)—British statesman, Peelite (moderate Tory)—44, 114, 267-70

Grant, James (1802-1879)—English radical journalist and author, editor of *The Morning Advertiser* (1850-71)—319

Granville, George Leveson-Gower, Earl of (1815-1891)—British statesman, Whig and later a Liberal Party leader; Foreign Secretary (1851-52, 1870-74 and 1880-85), Colonial Secretary (1868-70, 1886), President of the Privy Council (1852-54, 1855-58 and 1859-65)—240

Grey, Charles, Earl (1764-1845)—British statesman; a Whig leader and Prime Minister (1830-34)—248, 257, 293

Grey, Henry George, Earl (1802-1894)—British statesman, Whig, Secretary for War (1835-39), Colonial Secretary (1846-52); son of Charles Grey—104, 121, 293

Greg, William Rathbone (1809-1881)—English industrialist and essayist; Free-Trader—76, 77, 87

Grosvenor, Lord Robert (1801-1893)—English politician, Whig; later a Liberal M.P.—238, 242

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman; from 1840 until

the February 1848 Revolution he virtually controlled home and foreign policy; exponent of the interests of the big financial bourgeoisie—89, 95

H

Habsburg—name of the imperial family of the Holy Roman Empire from 1273 to 1806 (with intervals), of Austria (from 1804) and Austria-Hungary (1867-1918)—146

Hales, John (b. 1839)—English trade unionist, weaver by trade; member of the General Council of the First International (1866-72) and its Secretary (May 1871-July 1872); in 1872 he began opposing Marx and headed the reformist wing of the British Federal Council; he was expelled from the International by a General Council decision of May 30, 1873—368

Halliday, Thomas (b. 1835)—an English trade union leader, Secretary of the Amalgamated Association of Miners—369

Hargreaves, James (died 1778)—English inventor of the spinning-jenny—21

Hareny, George Julian (1817-1897)—prominent figure in the English working-class movement, Left-wing Chartist leader; editor of *The Northern Star*—60

Harrison, George—English worker, an active Chartist—228

Havelock, Henry (1795-1857)—British soldier, participant in the First Afghan (1838-42) and First Sikh (1845-46) wars; in 1857 he took part in the suppression of the Indian mutiny—324

Haynau, Julius Jacob (1786-1858)—Austrian general who

- crushed with great brutality the revolutionary movement in Italy and Hungary in 1848-49—328
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich* (1770-1831)—outstanding German classical philosopher; an objective idealist who set forth a comprehensive system of idealistic dialectics—29, 43, 150-51
- Hennessy, John Pope* (1834-1891)—Irish Conservative politician and M.P.—310
- Henry VIII* (1491-1547)—King of England (1509-47)—93
- Henry IV* (1553-1610)—King of France (1589-1610)—92
- Hogg, James Weir* (1790-1876)—British politician, follower of Peel, M.P.; president of the court of directors of the East India Company—165
- Hooson, Edward*—English worker, Chartist—193
- Hope, George* (1811-1876)—English farmer, advocate of Free Trade—76, 87
- Horner, Leonard* (1785-1864)—English geologist and public figure, factory inspector (1838-56); championed the workers' interests—157
- Howell, George* (1833-1910)—a reformist leader of the British trade unions; bricklayer by trade; former Chartist—368
- Hume, David* (1711-1776)—Scottish philosopher, subjective idealist, agnostic; historian and economist—13
- Hume, Joseph* (1777-1855)—British politician, a bourgeois radical leader, M.P.—123, 133, 138-40, 165, 234, 248, 251
- Hunt, Freeman* (1804-1858)—American publicist, publisher of the *Merchant's Magazine and Commercial Review*—301
- Huntsman, Benjamin* (1704-1776)

—English inventor of the crucible process in steel manufacture—26

- Hyndman, Henry Mayers* (1842-1921)—English socialist, reformer; founder (1881) and leader of the Democratic Federation reorganised in 1884 into the Social-Democratic Federation, a leader of the British Socialist Party from which he was expelled in 1916 for propaganda in support of the imperialist war—401, 402

J

- Jefferson, Thomas* (1743-1826)—American public figure and statesman, ideologist of the democratic circles of the American bourgeoisie in the American War of Independence (1775-83), author of the Declaration of Independence (1776), President of the U.S. (1801-09)—334
- Jones, Ernest Charles* (1819-1869)—prominent figure in the English working-class movement, proletarian poet and publicist, one of the leaders of the Chartist Left wing, an editor of *The Northern Star*, editor of *Notes to the People* and *The People's Paper* and a friend of Marx and Engels—121, 123, 124, 126, 140, 190, 192, 193, 212, 213, 229, 232
- Jones, William* (c. 1808-1873)—English watchmaker, Chartist, one of the organisers of the miners' revolt in Wales in 1839 after which he was transported to Australia for life—123

K

- Kant, Immanuel* (1724-1804)—outstanding German philosopher, founder of German

- idealism of the late 18th-early 19th century—150
- Kelly, Fitzroy* (1796-1880)—British statesman, Tory M.P.—155
- Kickham, Charles Joseph* (1826-1882)—Irish journalist, participant in the national liberation movement of the 1840s, Fenian, an editor of *The Irish People* (1865); in 1865 was arrested and sentenced to fourteen years' hard labour, released in 1869—349
- King, Peter John Locke* (1811-1885)—British politician, bourgeois radical M.P.—123, 251, 257, 294
- Khuli Khan*—see *Nadir Shah*
- L**
- Lavoisier, Antoine Laurent* (1743-1794)—French chemist—10
- Lawley, Francis Charles* (1825-1901)—English journalist, personal secretary of Gladstone (1852-54), *The Times* correspondent in the U.S.A. (1854-65)—226
- Lawrence, Sir Henry Montgomery* (1806-1857)—British soldier, resident at the protected court of Nepal (1843-46), headed the British administration in the Punjab (1849-53)—chief commissioner in Oudh (1857); during the suppression of the Indian mutiny of 1857-59 he commanded the British forces in Lucknow—281
- Layard, Sir Austen Henry* (1817-1894)—English archaeologist and politician, bourgeois radical, then Liberal, M.P.; in 1855 he was on the commission set up to investigate the conduct of the British expedition to the Crimea—227, 323
- Leeds, Thomas*. See *Osborne, Thomas*.
- Lessnes, Friedrich* (1825-1910)—active member of the German and international working-class movement; a tailor by trade; member of the Communist League, participant in the 1848-49 revolution; one of the founders of the Independent Labour Party in Britain; friend and associate of Marx and Engels—361
- Levi, Leone* (1821-1888)—English economist, statistician and lawyer—390
- Levy, Joseph Mases* (1812-1888)—one of the founders and publisher of the English newspaper *The Daily Telegraph*—320
- Liebig, Justus von* (1803-1873)—German scientist, one of the founders of agrochemistry—275
- Linnaeus, Carl von* (1707-1778)—Swedish botanist, founder of the system of classification of plants and animals—10
- Liverpool, Robert Banks Jenkinson*, Earl of (1770-1828)—British statesman, one of the Tory leaders, held several ministerial posts, Prime Minister (1812-27)—205
- Loch, James* (1780-1855)—Scottish economist and lawyer, manager of the Duchess of Sutherland's estates—145, 146
- Locke, John* (1632-1704)—English philosopher, founder of materialistic sensualism—20, 33, 91
- Louis Bonaparte*. See *Napoleon III*
- Louis Napoleon*. See *Napoleon III*
- Louis Philippe* (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of France (1830-48)—89, 172, 173, 283, 342
- Louis XIII* (1601-1643)—King of France (1610-43)—92
- Louis XIV* (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715)—90, 264

Lovejoy, Owen (1811-1864)—American clergyman and politician, abolitionist, member of Congress—333

Livett, William (1800-1877)—English handicraftsman, petty-bourgeois democrat; one of the Chartist leaders in the 1830s—234

Lowe, Robert (1811-1892)—English publicist and statesman, Whig and later Liberal; member of the legislative council of New South Wales (1843-50), editor of *The Times* in the 1860s, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1868-73), Home Secretary (1873-74)—307, 319

Lytton, Edward George Earle Lytton, Bulwer-Lytton, Baron (1803-1873)—English writer and politician, originally a Whig, he joined the Tories in 1852 and was Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1858-59—294

M

McAdam, John Loudon (1756-1836)—Scottish inventor of a system of road-making later named after him; appointed general surveyor of British roads in 1827—27

MacDonald, Alexander (1821-1881)—a reformist leader of British trade unions, Secretary of the National Union of Miners, M.P. from 1874, pursued Liberal policies—366, 369

M'Donnell, Robert—prison physician in Dublin, dismissed for protesting against the severe treatment of Fenian prisoners—351

Malthus, Thomas Robert (1766-1834)—English curate, economist, author of a misanthropic theory of population—144, 145, 210, 212

Mann, Ambrose Dudley (1801-1889)—American diplomat, Confederate representative in London (1861-62)—320, 326, 333

Marius, Gaius (c. 156-86 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman, seven times elected consul (107, 104-100, 86 B.C.)—35

Martin, Robert Montgomery (c. 1803-1868)—English historian and statistician, well-known traveller in the East—301, 302

Marx-Aveling, Eleanor (1855-1898)—prominent figure in the English and international working-class movement in the 1880s and 1890s, publicist; daughter of Karl Marx, wife of Edward Aveling; she took an active part in organising mass strike action among unskilled workers—401-04

Mason, James Murray (1798-1871)—American politician, Chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations committee; in the autumn of 1861 he was dispatched to England as Confederate diplomatic commissioner, which post he held to 1863—318, 323, 329, 330, 332, 333, 336

Matthews, John—English worker, Chartist—213

Mavo, Lord—see *Naas*

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary, one of the leaders of the Italian national liberation movement—332

Mehemet Ali (1769-1849)—Pasha of Egypt (1805-49), carried out a number of reforms in the interests of Egyptian landowners and merchants—145

Melbourne, William Lamb, Viscount (1779-1848)—British statesman, Whig, Home Secretary (1830-34), Prime Minister (1834, 1835-41)—253, 254, 258

- Mill, James* (1773-1836)—Scottish economist, vulgariser of Ricardo's theory; follower of Bentham in philosophy—29, 174
- Minto, Gilbert Elliot, Earl of* (1782-1859)—British statesman and diplomat, Whig; First Lord of the Admiralty (1835-41), Lord Privy Seal (1846-52); was with diplomatic mission in Italy (1847-48)—256-57, 264
- Montague, Lord Robert* (1825-1902)—British politician, Conservative M.P.—309-10
- Montesquieu, Charles* (1689-1755)—French sociologist, economist and author, theoretician of constitutional monarchy—283
- Moore, George Henry* (1811-1870)—Irish politician, a leader of the tenants' rights movement, M.P. (1847-57, 1868-70); championed the cause of the imprisoned Irish Fenians—350
- More, Sir Thomas* (1478-1535)—English statesman, Lord Chancellor, humanist writer, one of the early advocates of utopian communism, author of *Utopia*—147
- Morley, Samuel* (1809-1886)—English manufacturer and politician, Liberal M.P. (1865, 1868-85)—368, 369
- Morrill, Justin Smith* (1810-1898)—American politician, Republican, member of Congress (1855-67), author of the tariff act of 1861 which inaugurated the policy of high protection—332
- Morse, Arthur*—English Free-Trader—76, 77, 87
- Mottershead, Thomas* (c. 1825-1884)—English weaver, member of the General Council of the First International (1869-72); after the Hague Congress (1872) he headed the reformist wing of the British Federal Council; he was expelled from the International by a General Council decision of May 30, 1873—368
- Mulcahy, Denis Dowling* (b. 1840)—Irish journalist and physician, head of the Fenian organisation in Clonmel and one of the leaders of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, in 1865 he was sentenced to 10 years' hard labour but was pardoned in 1871—348
- Mun, Thomas* (1571-1641)—English merchant and economist, Mercantilist; in 1615 he became a director of the East India Company—177
- Murray, Charles*—English shoemaker; a leader of the English working-class movement and a Chartist; member of the General Council of the First International (1870-72) and the British Federal Council (1872-74); supporter of Marx and Engels—361
- Murray, Patrick Joseph*—warder of the Dublin hard labour prison—351
- Murrough, John Patrick*—British Liberal politician, M.P.—228

N

- Naas, Richard Southwell Bourke, Earl of Mayo* (1822-1872)—British Conservative statesman, Chief Secretary for Ireland (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68), Viceroy of India (1869-72)—351
- Nadir Shah (Tahmasp Kuli Khan)* (1688-1747)—Shah of Persia (1736-47), invaded and sacked India in 1739—166
- Napoleon Bonaparte* (1769-1821)—Emperor of France (1804-14, 1815)—13
- Napoleon III (Louis Napoleon Bonaparte)* (1808-1873)—nephew

- of Napoleon I, President of the Second Republic (1848-51), Emperor of France (1852-70)—265, 266, 267, 321, 324, 329, 388
- Nero* (A. D. 37-68)—Roman Emperor (54-68)—342
- Newman, Francis William* (1805-1897)—English professor of philology and author of works on religion, politics and economy—186
- Newton, Isaac* (1642-1727)—English physicist, astronomer and mathematician—10, 20
- Nicholay, J. A.*—British politician, bourgeois radical, in 1855 advocated extension of political rights for the industrial bourgeoisie by means of parliamentary reform; member of the executive of the Reform League in the 1860s—228
- Nicholas I* (1796-1855)—Emperor of Russia (1825-55)—204, 216, 220, 223
- Noakes, John*—English radical publicist—59
- Nolan, Lewis Edward* (c. 1820-1854)—British officer; served in India; took part in the Crimean War; author of several works on the cavalry—273
- North, Lord Frederick* (1732-1792)—British statesman, Tory, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1767), Prime Minister (1770-82), Home Secretary in Portland's coalition cabinet (Fox-North cabinet) (1783)—174
- O**
- Oastler, Richard* (1789-1861)—British politician, a prominent Tory-Radical who campaigned successfully for the legal limitation of the working day—97, 100, 105
- O'Connell, Daniel* (1775-1847)—Irish lawyer and politician, leader of the Right Liberal wing of the national liberation movement—49, 51, 68, 69, 70, 72, 234, 252, 253, 370
- O'Connell, John* (1810-1858)—Irish politician, Liberal, a son of the above—68, 69, 72
- O'Connell, Maurice* (d. 1853)—Irish politician, Liberal, a son of Daniel O'Connell—68, 69
- O'Connell, Morgan* (1804-1885)—Irish politician, who opposed the struggle for the repeal of the Anglo-Irish Union of 1801; a son of Daniel O'Connell—69
- O'Connor, Feargus* (1794-1855)—a leader of the Left wing of the Chartist movement, founder and editor of *The Northern Star*, after 1848 he became a reformer—60, 66, 69, 70-73
- Odger, George* (1820-1877)—a reformist leader of the British trade unions; shoemaker—368
- O'Donnell*. See *M'Donnell, Robert*
- O'Donovan Rossa, Jeremiah* (1831-1915)—one of the founders and leaders of the Irish Fenian Society; publisher of *The Irish People* (1863-65); in 1865 he was arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment; in 1870 he was pardoned and left for the United States where he led the Fenian organisation; he resigned from political activity in the 1880s—348, 350
- Osborne, Thomas* (Marquess Carmarthen from 1689 and Duke of Leeds from 1694) (1631-1712)—British statesman, Tory, Prime Minister (1674-79, 1690-95); in 1695 was impeached for bribery by Parliament—173, 295
- Owen, Robert* (1771-1858)—British utopian socialist—345

P

- Palgrave, Robert Harry Inglis* (1827-1919)—English banker and economist, publisher of *The Economist* (1877-83)—391
- Palmer, William* (1824-1856)—English physician; so as to receive insurance money he poisoned his wife, brother and friend, for which he was sentenced to death by hanging—302, 320
- Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount* (1784-1865)—British statesman, Tory; from 1830, one of the Whig leaders relying on the support of the party's most reactionary elements: Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41 and 1846-51), Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58, 1859-65)—60, 147, 202-09, 224, 242, 254, 266-71, 293, 297, 298, 306-12, 318, 319, 321, 327, 328, 330, 331, 336, 345
- Peel, Sir Robert* (1788-1850)—British statesman, moderate Tory, Prime Minister (1834-35, 1841-46), effected the repeal of the Corn Laws (1846) with the support of the Liberals—34, 100, 109, 114, 246, 253-57, 269
- Peel, Robert* (1822-1895)—English politician and diplomat, M.P., son of the above—133, 154
- Peene, Thomas*—London physician—158
- Pellatt, Apsley* (1791-1863)—English entrepreneur, bourgeois radical, M.P.—190, 228
- Perceval, Spencer* (1762-1812)—British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1807-09), Prime Minister (1809-12)—205, 257
- Pindar* (c. 518-438 B.C.)—Greek lyric poet—205
- Pitt, William, the Younger* (1759-1806)—British statesman, a Tory leader; Prime Minister (1783-1801, 1804-06)—174, 175, 296, 331
- Pius IX* (1792-1878)—Pope (1846-78)—257
- Plato* (c. 427-347 B.C.)—Greek idealist philosopher—163
- Poerio, Carlo* (1803-1867)—Italian politician, a Liberal, active in the national liberation movement; after the revolution in 1848 he became director of police and Minister of Public Instruction in Naples but resigned in May of the same year and led the constitutional opposition; imprisoned in Italy (1849-59); he was a deputy in the Parliament of the new Kingdom of Italy (1861-67)—351
- Pollexfen, John* (born c. 1638)—English merchant and author of writings on economics, advocated the abolition of the East India Company's monopolies—177
- Porter, George* (1792-1852)—English bourgeois economist and statistician—28
- Portland, William Henry Bentinck, Duke of* (1738-1809)—British statesman and Whig leader; Home Secretary (1794-1801), and Prime Minister (1783, 1807-09)—205
- Potter, George* (1832-1896)—one of the reformist leaders of the British trade unions; carpenter by trade; founder and publisher of *The Bee-Hive* in which he propagated a policy of compromise and compliance with the liberal bourgeoisie—368
- Praslin, Charles, Duke of Choiseul* (1805-1847)—French aris-

tocrat; his case in connection with the assassination of his wife had political repercussions—226

Priestley, Joseph (1733-1804)—English chemist and physicist, materialist philosopher—10

Q

Quesnay François (1694-1774)—French physician who led the Physiocratic school of political economy—85

Quetelet, Adolphe (1796-1874)—Belgian statistician, mathematician and astronomer—151, 152

R

Raffles, Thomas Stamford (1781-1826)—British colonial administrator, Governor of Java (1811-16), author of *The History of Java*—166

Raspail, François (1794-1878)—French naturalist, publicist, took part in the revolutionary movements of 1830 and 1848; deputy to the Constituent Assembly—260

Raumer, Friedrich (1781-1873)—German reactionary historian—33

Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—English economist, one of the prominent exponents of classical bourgeois political economy—79, 161, 163, 185, 186, 371

Ripon, Frederick John Robinson, Earl of (better known as Viscount Goderich) (1782-1859)—British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1823-27), Prime Minister (1827-28)—205

Robespierre, Maximilien (1758-1794)—outstanding leader of the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, Jacobin leader, head

of the revolutionary government (1793-94)—13, 35

Roebuck, John Arthur (1801-1879)—British politician and publicist, bourgeois Radical, M.P.; in 1855, chairman of the commission of inquiry set up to investigate the state of the army in the Crimea—244, 267

Rothschild, Lionel, Baron (1808-1879)—head of the Rothschild banking house in London; he became the first Jewish member of Parliament in which he served from 1858 to 1874—154, 258

Rowcliffe, William—English Radical, who joined the Chartists in the 1840s—60

Russell, John (1792-1878)—British statesman, Whig Party leader and Prime Minister (1846-52, 1865-66)—47, 114, 121, 137, 138, 140, 153-55, 207, 224, 243-59, 267-70, 298, 321, 328

Ruston, Benjamin (d. 1853)—English worker, Chartist—194

Rutland, Charles Cecil John Manners, Duke of (1815-1888)—English aristocrat, Tory—293

S

Sadleir, John (1814-1856)—Irish banker and politician, one of the leaders of the Irish party in Parliament, Junior Lord of the Treasury in 1853—221

Sadler, Michael Thomas (1780-1835)—English economist and politician, bourgeois philanthropist, joined the Tories—97, 105

Saltykov, Alexei Dmitrievich, Prince (1806-1859)—Russian traveller—200

Sandry, Mary Ann (1810-1853)—English woman worker—158

Schiller, Friedrich (1759-1805)—German writer—296

- Scholefield, William* (1809-1867)—British politician, bourgeois radical, M.P.—153
- Senior, Nassau William* (1790-1864)—English economist, who opposed the reduction of working hours—344
- Seward, William Henry* (1801-1872)—American statesman, a leader of the Right wing of the Republican Party; Governor of New York State (1839-43); a candidate for the presidential nomination (1856 and 1860), Secretary of State (1861-69); advocated compromise with the slave-owners of the South—328, 329, 335
- Shadwell*—surveyor and lawyer for Middlesex in the early 1850s—135
- Shaftesbury, Anthony, Earl of* (1671-1713)—British philosopher, prominent representative of deism, Whig politician—91
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of* (1801-1885)—British politician who headed a group of philanthropist Tories in Parliament in the 1840s; in 1847 he became a Whig—97, 100, 105, 156, 236, 237, 319
- Shelley, John* (1808-1867)—British politician, Free-Trader, M.P.—227
- Shipton, George*—English trade unionist, reformist, Secretary of the House Painters' Union and Secretary of the London Trades Council (1871-96)—404
- Sidmouth, Henry Addington, Viscount* (1757-1844)—British statesman, Tory; Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer (1801-04); as Home Secretary (1812-21) instigated repressive measures against the working-class movement—205
- Sismondi, Jean Charles Leonard de* (1773-1842)—Swiss economist and petty-bourgeois critic of capitalism—146, 163
- Slidell, John* (1793-1871)—American politician, member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee; sent as a Confederate diplomatic commissioner to France in the autumn of 1861; Confederate representative in Paris (1862-65)—318, 323, 328, 330, 332, 333, 336
- Smith, Adam* (1723-1790)—Scottish political economist, a prominent exponent of classical bourgeois political economy—10, 28, 144
- Smith, Edward* (c. 1818-1874)—English physician, medical adviser and representative of the Privy Council appointed to investigate the nourishment of the population in workers' districts—339
- Somers, Robert* (1822-1891)—English publicist and journalist—147
- Spencer, Herbert* (1820-1903)—English philosopher and sociologist, positivist.—186
- Spooner, Richard* (1783-1864)—English banker and politician, Tory M.P.—153
- Stafford, George Granville Leveson-Gower, Marquess, Duke of Sutherland* from 1833 (1758-1833)—big Scottish landowner—145
- Stanley, Lord Edward Henry, Earl of Derby* from 1869 (1826-1893)—English statesman, Tory and later Conservative (in the 1860s and 1870s), then Liberal; Secretary for India (1858-59), Foreign Secretary (1866-68, 1874-78), Colonial Secretary (1882-85), son of Edward Derby—194, 255, 257

- Steadman*—chairman of the anti-interventionist workers' meeting in London (January 1862)—332
- Steenstrand*—Dutch merchant, trader in England—396
- Stephens, Joseph Reynier* (1805-1879)—Scottish clergyman, in 1837-39 he took an active part in the Chartist movement in Lancashire—157
- Steuart, James* (1712-1780)—English economist, one of the last representatives of mercantilism—144
- Stewarts (Stuarts)*—royal family ruling in Scotland from 1371 and in Great Britain (1603-49 and 1660-1714)—93, 143
- Sugden, Edward*, Baron St. Leonards (1781-1875)—English lawyer and statesman, Tory, Lord Chancellor (1852)—258
- Sulla (Lucius Cornelius Sulla)* (138-78 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman, Consul (88 B.C.) and Dictator (82-79 B.C.)—35
- Sutherland, Elizabeth Leveson-Gower*, Countess of (from 1771), Marchioness of Stafford after her marriage in 1803 (1765-1839)—she was the owner of large Scottish estates and mother-in-law of Harriet Sutherland—145, 146, 148
- Sutherland, Harriet Elizabeth Georgina Leveson-Gower*, Duchess of (1806-1868)—owner of large Scottish estates and an active member of the Whig Party—142, 147, 148
- T**
- Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice de*, Prince (1754-1838)—French diplomat, Foreign Minister (1797-99, 1799-1807, 1814-15), France's representative at the Congress of Vienna (1814-15); notorious for his blatant lack of principles in politics and for avarice—268
- Taylor, James*—English Liberal politician, in 1855 he supported the industrial bourgeoisie's campaign for parliamentary reform—227
- Temple, Sir William* (1628-1699)—British diplomat and politician, adviser to William III of Orange—328
- Terbert, Michael*—Irish Fenian, in 1866 he was sentenced to seven years' penal servitude and died in prison in 1870—350, 351
- Thackeray, William Makepeace* (1811-1863)—English novelist—216
- Thiers, Louis Adolphe* (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836 and 1840); during the Second Republic was deputy to the Constituent and the Legislative Assembly, Orleanist; President of the Republic (1871-73), hangman of the Paris Commune—94
- Thompson, Thomas Perronet* (1783-1869)—British politician, Free-Trader; vulgar economist—66
- Tippoo Sahib* (c. 1750-1799)—Sultan of Mysore (1782-99), in the 1780s and 1790s waged war against the British in India—176
- Tite, William* (1798-1873)—English architect and politician, Liberal M.P.; Vice-President of the Administrative Reform Association (1855)—231
- Tooke, John Horne* (1736-1812)—British politician, bourgeois democrat—30
- Torrington, George Byng*, Viscount (1812-1884)—British

statesman, Whig, M.P., Governor of Ceylon (1847-50)—123
Trollope—English entrepreneur, head of a building firm—305
Tremendheere, Hugh Seymour (1804-1893)—English official and publicist, was repeatedly appointed a member of government commissions of inquiry into workers' labour conditions—341

U

Ure, Andrew (1778-1857)—Scottish chemist, vulgar economist, Free-Trader—84, 344
Urquhart, David (1805-1877)—Scottish diplomat, publicist and politician, Turkophile; received diplomatic appointments in Turkey in the 1830s, M.P. (1847-52)—235

V

Verity, E. A.—English priest—157
Victoria (1819-1901)—Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901)—251, 305, 326
Vidocq, François Eugène (1775-1857)—French criminal, detective: his *Mémoires* are of unreliable origin; his name is used to designate an adroit detective and scoundrel—206
Voltaire, François Marie (Arouet) (1694-1778)—French deist philosopher, satirist and historian; actively opposed absolutism and Catholicism—237

W

Wade, John (1788-1875)—English publicist, economist and historian—52, 54
Wakley, Thomas (1795-1862)—English physician and politician, bourgeois radical; in 1855

advocated extension of political rights for the industrial bourgeoisie by means of parliamentary reforms—69, 227
Walpole, Robert (1676-1745)—English statesman, Whig leader, Prime Minister (1721-42); initiated the system of cabinets which became independent of the King and which relied on the parliamentary majority; extensively resorted to bribery—91, 248
Ward, Henry George (1797-1860)—British colonial official, Whig; Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands (1849-55), Governor of Ceylon (1855-60) and Madras (1860)—123
Warren, Charles (1798-1866)—British officer, general (from 1858), served in India (1816-19 and 1830-38); took part in the Crimean War—198
Washington, George (1732-1799)—commander-in-chief of American forces in the American War of Independence (1775-83), first President of the United States (1789-97)—334
Watson, Henry (1737-1786)—British engineer, colonel; from 1764 served in the East India Company—302
Watt, James (1736-1819)—Scottish inventor of the steam engine—20, 21, 25
Webster, Daniel (1782-1852)—American statesman, a leader of the American Whigs, Secretary of State (1841-43 and 1850-52)—335
Wedgwood, Josiah (1730-1795)—English pottery manufacturer who introduced important new techniques to the industry—20
Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (1769-1852)—British soldier and statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1828-30),

- Foreign Secretary (December 1834-April 1835)—134, 136, 205, 248
- Wellington, Arthur Richard Wellesley*, Marquess of Duoro, Duke of (1807-1884)—British politician, Tory; son of the above—136, 208
- Wheeler*—Vice-President of the East India Company (1773-80)—302
- White, James*—British Liberal M.P., participant in the anti-interventionist meeting held at Brighton (December 1861)—322, 324
- Whitney, Eli* (1765-1825)—American inventor of the cotton gin—314
- Whyne*—participant in the anti-interventionist workers' meeting in London (January 1862)—333
- Wilberforce, William* (1759-1833)—English public figure and politician, bourgeois philanthropist, M.P., campaigned against the slave trade and slave-ownership in British colonies—335
- Wilkes, Charles* (1798-1877)—American naval officer and explorer, participant in the American Civil War on the side of the North, captain of the battleship *San Jacinto* (1861)—326-29
- William III of Orange* (1650-1702)—Stadtholder of the United Provinces of the Netherlands (1672-1702), King of England (1689-1702)—90, 92, 172, 173, 177, 206
- Williams, Zephaniah* (c. 1794-1874)—Chartist, an organiser of the miners' revolt in Wales in 1839; transported to Australia for life—123, 138
- Wilson, James* (1805-1860)—English economist and politician, Free-Trader, founder and editor of *The Economist*; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1853-58)—186
- Wiseman, Nicholas* (1802-1865)—English Catholic priest, Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal (from 1850)—256, 257
- Wood*—English worker, participant in the anti-interventionist meeting in Brighton (December 1861)—322
- Wood, Charles*, subsequently Lord Halifax (1800-1885)—English Liberal statesman, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1846), Chairman of the Board of Control for India (1852-55) and Secretary for India (1859-66)—121, 123, 124, 165, 166

Y

- Yancey, William Lowndes* (1814-1863)—American politician, member of the Democratic Party of the South, Confederate agent in London (1861-62)—320, 326, 333
- Yates*—participant in the anti-interventionist workers' meeting in London (January 1862)—333

LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL CHARACTERS

Achilles—bravest and swiftest and most handsome warrior in Agamemnon's army: one of the heroes in the *Iliad*—392

Agamemnon—in the Greek legend, king of Mycenae, one of the main characters in the *Iliad*, the leader of the Greek forces in the war against Troy; according to the legend he sacrificed his daughter Iphigenia to appease Artemis who prevented the Greek fleet from sailing for Troy—252

Bull, John—a popular name for England personifying the bluff, frankness and solidity of the English character which became widespread after *The History of John Bull* by Arbuthnot was published in 1712 and was later often used as a term of reference in political satire—268, 310, 326, 327, 329, 364

Iphigenia (Iphigeneia)—in Greek legend, Agamemnon's daughter—252

Epimenides—in Greek legend, prophet of Cnossos who did not wake up for 57 years—185

Jenkins—a popular image typifying servility and hypocrisy—319

Juggernaut (Jagannath)—in Hindu mythology a cult-title of the Hindu god Vishnu—166

Jupiter—in Roman mythology, the king of the gods—129

Mephistopheles—one of the main characters in Goethe's *Faust*—241

Moloch—the god of Sun in Phoenicia and Carthage, a deity which had to be propitiated by sacrifices of first-born children; later the name came to personify a hideous, all-devouring force—163, 301, 344

Yellowplush—the main character from *The Yellowplush Papers* by Thackeray published in 1837-38 which he signed with a pseudonym *Yellowplush*. The name came to personify sycophancy in English literature—326-29

INDEX OF PERIODICALS

- Arbeiter-Zeitung* (Vienna)—406
Cobbett's Weekly Political Register (London)—308
Daily Post (Liverpool)—335, 336
Daily Telegraph (London)—320
Der Sozialdemokrat (Zurich, London)—398
Der Volksstaat (Leipzig)—370
Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung—73
Die Neue Zeit (Stuttgart)—392
Die Presse (Vienna)—317, 321, 324, 334, 337
Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires (Paris)—265
L'Atelier, organe spécial de la classe laborieuse, rédigé par des ouvriers exclusivement (Paris)—62, 63
L'Egalité (Geneva)—353, 355
La Patrie (Paris)—328
Le Pays, Journal de l'Empire (Paris)—328
La Plebe (Lodi, Milan)—363
La Presse (Paris)—62, 63
Le Progrès (Locle)—405
La Réforme (Paris)—61, 67, 70
Macmillan's Magazine (London)—321
Neue Oder-Zeitung (Breslau, now Wrocław)—222, 230, 235, 242, 259
Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue (London, Hamburg)—95, 108
New York Daily Tribune—115, 124, 131, 136, 152, 159, 164, 171, 181, 187, 194, 201, 209, 213, 218, 259, 312, 330
The New-York Herald—311
The Commonweal (London)—392
The Daily News (London)—136, 212, 328
The Economist (London)—125, 127, 132, 159, 163, 164, 186, 187, 210-12, 329, 336
The Examiner (London)—54, 321
The Fortnightly Review (London)—354
The Globe and Traveller (London)—63, 320
The Hull Advertiser—139
The Labour Elector (London)—399
The Labour Standard (London)—19, 286, 297, 381, 385
The Manchester Guardian—63-64
The Morning Advertiser (London)—149, 227, 319
The Morning Chronicle—320
The Morning Post (London)—327, 328, 329
The Morning Herald (London)—320
The Morning Star—321, 328
The New Moral World, and Gazette of the Rational Society (London)—49
The Northern Star, and Leeds General Advertiser—49, 64, 71

- The Observer* (London)—321
The Pall Mall Gazette (London)
354
The People's Paper (London)—
115, 126, 134, 135, 148, 164,
215, 360
*The Poole and Dorsetshire Her-
ald*—127
Punch, or the London Charivari
—319
Reynold's Newspaper (London)—
326, 332
The Saturday Review (London)
321, 329, 354
The Spectator (London)—321,
354
The Standard (London)—320
The Times (London)—149, 150,
183-185, 187, 294, 307-311, 319-
321, 324, 327, 329, 334, 337
Vorwärts (Paris)—31, 58

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.